

Influence of Regulative Pressures on Strategy Implementation in Public Secondary Schools in Selected Counties in Kenya

Harun Kaumbuthu Mutea

Doctoral Candidate, Kenya Methodist University

Thomas Anyanje Senaji

The East African University

Nancy Gacheri Rintari

Kenya Methodist University

ABSTRACT

Preparation of strategic plans and their implementation in public secondary schools is mandatory for all schools in Kenya. However, the implementation is a challenge to the majority of the schools hence the need to investigate the factors that influence it. Being a relatively new management practice in public secondary schools, empirical studies in this area are limited. Drawing from the institutional theory, we conducted a descriptive structured self-administered questionnaire survey to determine the influence of regulative pressures on strategy implementation in public secondary schools. We further, examined the moderating effect of mimetic pressures on this relationship. We found that public secondary schools experienced moderate regulative pressures from the government to implement strategies and that through binary logistic regression model, regulative pressure significantly predicted the probability of successful strategy implementation (Wald = 13.682, df = 1, $p < .001$, exp (B) = 3.393). However, mimetic pressures did not significantly moderate the relation between regulative pressure and strategy implementation (Wald = .098, df = 1, $p = .754 > .05$, exp (B) = .737). Theoretically the study contributes to the scarce empirical literature on strategy implementation from the institutional theory perspective compared to strategy formulation. Practically, the study draws attention of stakeholders to the less investigated factors that influence strategy implementation namely: the regulative pressures. These findings have implications for government to strengthen the monitoring of public secondary schools to increase the likelihood of successful strategy implementation in public secondary schools.

Key words: Strategy implementation, regulative pressures, mimetic pressures, secondary schools, Kenya.

INTRODUCTION

The term strategy was first mentioned in organizational management from early 1960s but became more pronounced in the mid-1970s. This development in the organizational activities was mainly necessitated by the inefficiencies of the prevailing positions and perspectives then and the uncertainties of the environmental conditions (Cerniauskiene, 2014). However it took

a long time for the strategic management paradigm to permeate other sectors from the private enterprise domains. Strategic management was adopted in the public sectors in the second half of 1980s at the time when the liberal market paradigm began to dominate all organizational management thoughts (IIEP, 2010). From the middle of the 1980s there was an influx of private sector principles and tools into the public sector in an attempt to enhance the efficiencies and effectiveness of the public sector. The reform agenda was summarized as “New Public Management” (NPM) or “New Steering Model” in Germany (Mcbain & Smith, 2010, p 1).

Following the emergence of NPM the traditional bureaucratic style of management started to lose its appeal as Western countries such as the United States of America, Britain, Germany and Australia, Canada and New Zealand abandoned it for NPM model (Rubakula, 2014). NPM was a collection of emergent ideas and practices aimed at reforming the public sector that became popular in the late 1980s. It involved the infusion of private sector styles of management such as the introduction of performance contracting practices and adoption of overt standards and performance measurements. It was aimed at curbing the chronic failures characteristic of the traditional bureaucratic management style that was found to be too hierarchical, slow in response to issues and inefficient in general (Alexander, 2014).

From the Western countries NPM diffused to other parts of the world mainly through the influence of Breton Woods institutions namely World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, and the European commission. By the end of the twentieth century many developing countries had adopted the model mainly due to pressure from the donor community that had put structural economic adjustment programmes as a condition for aid. In the 1990s most of the African countries adopted the NPM model of administration hoping to improve efficiency and effectiveness in the public sector. As the majority of the Sub-Saharan countries such as Tanzania, Malawi, Zimbabwe and Kenya were passing through economic difficulties in the mid-1980s, the World Bank intervened by recommending the introduction of structural adjustment programmes (SAP) that according to it had to go together with the NPM model of administration (Rubakula, 2014).

The Structural Adjustment programmes were implemented in Kenya in mid 1980s with the assistance of the World Bank with the aim of turning around the economy into the growth and development path (Mbithe & Mwabu, 2016). It is averred that strategic planning was made a fundamental requirement in public sector institutions through reforms occasioned by NPM management model. The aim was to inculcate a management culture that ensured that public institutions were run strategically to enhance efficiency and accountability (Demirkaya, 2015).

Strategic Management in Secondary Schools

Strategic management was pioneered in Kenya’s public education sector in the year 2012 when the Decentralized Education Management Activity (DEMA), an initiative of the Ministry of Education in collaboration with USAID embarked on a capacity development among education managers at the sub-county and school level to enable them prepare and implement strategic plans (Kevogo, 2015). Further, the ‘Kenya vision 2030’ aims at providing globally competitive quality education, training and research to her citizens for national development and enhanced wellbeing. In connection to this, it became a requirement from the Ministry of Education that all secondary schools in Kenya formulate strategic plans covering 3 -5 years and annual action plans consistent with strategic plan. However as Itegi (2016) found out, majority of the schools

prepared strategic plans to comply with the policy requirements of the ministry but were not effectively implementing them.

These efforts notwithstanding, education at the secondary school level face unique management challenges attributable to poor implementation of plans. Lack of emphasis on proper strategic planning and implementation could have negative implications for schools in the current competitive environment. Strategic planning is viewed as a tool that creates conducive conditions for stakeholders to contribute more to the school's strategic objectives which result in long term sustainability and improvement in quality education. It is viewed as a tool for establishing institutional framework to enhance involvement and cooperation among all relevant stakeholders at the local, national and international levels. It is a process through which agencies come up with objectives to be achieved within a given period of time. Strategic planning helps the management to predict future conditions and realities, internal and external that may impact on their projections.

The strategic management approach brings forth work plans, objectives, tasks, procedures, responsibilities and timelines for activities; it enables the organization management to determine priorities and operations necessary to achieve the organization's vision. About 70% of secondary schools in Kenya were observed to have formulated strategic plans which cover about three to five years. However, many head teachers had not implemented the plans (Itegi, 2016). Based the foregoing, it is clear that formulation of strategic plans is the easier part of the strategic management process. The main difficulties lie in the implementation aspect of the process. Muriuki and Stanley (2017), avers strategy implementation is the most challenging phase of the strategic management process.

The public secondary schools in Kenya are managed by the Ministry of Education through delegation to various agencies such as the School Boards of Management (BoMs) and County Education Boards (CEBs). On the other hand teachers are managed by the Teachers' Service Commission which is government's independent constitutional commission. This implies that salience of regulative pressures cannot be ignored. It is against this background that this study sought to investigate the influence of regulative pressures on strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya.

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

Regulative pressures

Regulative pressures emanates from those who have legal authority and power over the organization. Due to the formal nature of these regulative forces they are distinguished from other institutional forces by the explicitness with which they are expressed. They are mainly manifested in form of laws, rules, regulations, directives, policies and sanctions. The regulative pillar is characterized by its coercive enforcement mechanism (Sutton, MacKenny & Namatovu, 2015). Thus a firm basically experiences regulative pressures wielded by entities which it relies on for its existence (Kauppi, 2013).

Coercive pressures in school setting mainly originate from the government laws and regulations (Masocha & Fatoki, 2018) concerning issues such as use of government funds, student admission criteria and staffing and management of teachers. Furthermore coercive forces include explicit regulative constraints such as rules, appraisals and code of regulations

(Kshetri, 2009). These regulations emanate from regulatory agencies and the existing legislature which regulates the organizations operations according to the sector's environment (Masocha & Fatoki, 2018). Regulative pressures are assumed to occur because firms are deemed to rely on external stakeholders for resources that ensure their survival. Consequently coercive pressures are a result of demands coming from external entities that provide crucial resources to the organizations (Gonzalez 2010). Additionally, the regulative element of the institutional theory concerns with aspects of the institution that is to do with the legal instruments applicable to the organization's environment. These pressures may originate from government legislation, regulations and policies that coerce organisations to comply with certain prescribed practices in order to appear legitimate (Edwards, Mason, & Washington, 2009).

Regulative pressures coerce the focal organisations to embrace particular management practices in running the organisations (Hu, Hart & Cooke, 2007). In general, a critical characteristic of regulative pressure is their coercive enforcement mechanism (Peton & Peze, 2014). DiMaggio and Powell (1983) argue that this regulative pressure has its roots in the resource dependency theory. According to this theory a more powerful organisation or individual that has control over scarce and essential resources may coerce another organisation that relies on it for resources to be in a certain manner to ensure its continued existence (Teo, Wei & Benbasat, 2003).

The enforcement of coercive pressures is legally sanctioned and comes in two forms; Imposition of cost for those not abiding with the forces or through induction where incentives are offered to those who abide with the forces (Scott 2001). Thus regulative pressures may be enforced as a compulsion, persuasion or invitation to join collusion (Othman, Darus & Arshard). On the other hand regulative pressures may be enforced by institutional seduction or inducement. Firms are offered incentives to adopt such practices. The incentives may involve promotion, awards, government grants (Masocha and Fatoki, 2018) or simply gaining legitimacy from the superiors.

In terms of education sector and in relation to this study the regulative force may be manifested in terms of the basic education act, the teachers code of regulations, promotion and career progression guidelines and other policy guidelines that may emanate from the ministry of education or the teachers service commission. Breach of any of these legal directives may lead to punishment or denial of benefits such as promotion.

A number studies have been done on the influence of regulative forces on organizational management practice. Bananuka, Night, Ngoma and Najjemba (2020) explored the influence of institutional forces on the adoption of internet financial in Uganda and found out that regulative pressures had a positive statistically significant association with internet financial reporting. Mate and Kaluyu (2018) analysed the influence of institutional pressures on strategy implementation success in public hospitals in Kenya where they concluded that there existed a strong, positive and statistically significant relationship between regulative pressures and strategy implementation in the hospital studied. The regression analysis also concluded that regulative pressures had a statistically significant influence on strategy implementation success at the hospital. Masocha and Fatoki (2018) investigated the impact of coercive pressures on sustainability practices of small businesses in South Africa. The study concluded that regulative

forces had a positive statistically significant influence on the adoption of sustainability practices.

The foregoing discussion led to the hypothesis:

H₀₁: Regulative pressures have no statistically significant influence on strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya.

Mimetic Pressures

The mimetic pressure was introduced in this study as a moderator variable. A moderator is a variable which influences the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables. This influence of the moderator variable is referred to as the interaction effect (Hayes, Glynn & Huges, 2012). According to Carter (2016) mimicry occurs when institutions duplicate practices of other organizations that they consider superior to them. Mimetic pressures arise when organizations imitate other organizations in the industry that are perceived to be doing well or appear to be legitimate. Organizations copy others' practices especially when they are operating in an environment of uncertainty. This implies that when the organizations lack clarity in what is expected of them then they are likely to copy practices from other organizations that seem to be doing better. An organization may also imitate organizations that continually out do them in a certain field.

The mimicry behavior is also referred to as modeling and may take various forms such as poaching employees from other firms, using the same consultants and participating in industry associations (Masocha & Fatoki, 2018). According to Rosalinde, Woolthuis and Taminiau (2017) mimicry arises as a response to anxiety and uncertainty. This makes an organization to mimic the practices of more successful organizations. When organisation's technologies are not well understood, the objectives are not clear or the organizations environment breeds uncertainty, an organization may often model itself on other organizations. Teodoro (2014) on the other hand avers that mimesis occurs as a result of standard responses by organizations to uncertainty. Additionally Pillay, Reddy and Morgan (2017) posits that mimicry takes place when public organizations perceive other public organizations as more successful than them and copy such institutions without acknowledging the unique context of such organizations and their peculiarities.

Miterev, Engall and Jerbrant (2017) supports this assertion through an empirical study where he found that temporary organisations mimicked managers that were thought to be successful and credible without doing due diligence to identify the short-comings of such managers. This form of pressures focus on the successes of the organizations they copy disregarding the failures that may be happening in such organizations.

Mimetic pressures occurs in three forms such as frequency based imitation, trait based imitation and the outcome based imitations To start with, frequency based imitation is the most basic form of imitation where an organization copies practices, designs and structures that have been adopted by the majority of the organizations in the sector (Wu, Daniel, Hinton & Quintas, 2013). Secondly, the trait based imitation contrast with frequency based imitation owing to its high level of selectivity. Trait based imitation happens when an organization exclusively aims at imitating firms possessing certain characteristics such as size or centrality. The underlying

assumption is that imitating mannerisms and decisions of organisations with the characteristics is most likely going to yield similar results for the imitator (Kauppi, 2013).

Finally, the outcome based imitation is almost the same as the trait based imitation in that it is also highly selective only that outcome base imitation selectively copies decisions and practices that have yielded prosperous results. Thus mimicry is said to be outcome based when the actions copied are those that lead to success. More specifically, trait based imitation refers to copying organizations with certain desirable features while outcome based imitation involves mimicking organizations that manifest particular desirable outcomes (Wu et al, 2013).

A number of empirical studies have been done on regarding the effect of mimetic pressures: Emamisaleh and Rahmani (2017) investigated the influence of internal and external drivers on the attitude of towards sustainability strategy among the food industry in Iran. The external drivers composed of the normative, mimetic and coercive drivers. The study found that mimetic pressures had no statistically significant role on strategic sustainability orientation among the food industries. Similarly, Dubey, Gunasekaran, Childe, papadopoulas, Giannakis and Roubound (2017) examined the effect of external pressures and organizational culture on shaping performance measurement systems for sustainability bench marking study concluded that mimetic pressures had no statistically significant influence on shaping environmental performance metrics. Huang and Yang (2014) did a study on reverse logistics, innovation, institutional pressures and performance where they found that mimetic pressures positively moderated the relationship between reverse logistics, innovation and environmental performance.

Strategic management is a relatively new phenomenon in public secondary schools, and therefore a likelihood of mimicry among schools that may impact the influence of regulative pressures on strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya. Based the foregoing, the study therefore hypothesizes that:

H₀₂: Mimetic pressures have no moderating effect on the relationship between regulative pressures and strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya.

METHODOLOGY

The objective of this research was to investigate the influence of regulative pressures on strategy implementation in public secondary schools and the moderating effect of mimetic pressure on the relationship between regulative pressures and strategy implementation by public secondary schools in Kenya.

Research design

To achieve this objective the research adopted a combination of descriptive survey and correlation research designs. Lavrakas (2008) argues that descriptive survey is the most common research design applied in non-experimental studies across disciplines. Further, the design is well suited for collecting large amounts of survey data from a representative sample selected from a target population using closed ended and/or open ended questionnaire. On the other hand correlation research helps to discover existence of relationships between dependent variable and independent variables by applying correlational statistics. It involves

collecting data and analyzing to establish whether and the strength of the relationship between the variables. These attributes informed the choice of the designs.

Population

The study population was the 672 public secondary schools in the four selected counties of Embu, Tharaka –Nithi, Meru and Isiolo. Out of this population the study sample was obtained

using the Slovin’s formula thus: $n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$, where n is sample size, and N and e are respectively

target population and margin of error.

Assuming a margin of error of 5% (e = .05), the sample size for this study was determined as

follows: $n = \frac{672}{1 + 672(0.05)^2} \approx 250$

A proportionate sample was obtained where each county contributed to the sample in the ratio of its population as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Study sample

County	Ratio	Sample size
Meru	$\frac{354}{672} \times 250$	132
Embu	$\frac{166}{672} \times 250$	62
Tharaka Nithi	$\frac{135}{672} \times 250$	50
Isiolo	$\frac{17}{672} \times 250$	6
Study Sample Size		250

The selection of participants from each county was done using random sampling technique to ensure that each study unit was equally likely to be part of the sample. The respondents were principals of the secondary schools in the target counties of Meru, Embu, Tharaka Nithi, and Isiolo.

Instruments

A self- administered structured questionnaire was used for data collection. This enabled us to collect data from a large sample as well as ensure high response rates since respondents could fill the questionnaire at their own free time before the filled questionnaires were returned. The questionnaire did not present any challenges to the respondents since they were all literate and could read and understand the items in the questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of closed ended items anchored on a five-point Likert Scale (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=

somewhat agree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree). These types of items were preferred because as Cooper and Schindler (2013) suggest, Likert scale items are easier to construct, and are reliable.

There were seven item measures of regulative pressures which were; The basic education act (2013) mandates the implementation of strategic plans in public schools, The ministry of education enforces the implementation of strategic plans, Career progression guidelines for teachers rewards those who have successfully implemented their strategic plans, The code of regulation for teachers enforces the implementation of strategic plans for teachers, Implementation of strategic plans is rated in the performance contract for principals, The ministry of education and Teachers Service Commission (TSC) field officers monitors the implementation of strategic plans in schools, Disbursement of Free Secondary Education (FSE) funds is timely and sufficient for successful implementation of strategic plans.

Furthermore, the mimetic pressures were measured using five items namely; Successful implementation of strategy by other schools provide a benchmark for our strategy implementation, Same level schools have a strong influence on strategy implementation in our school, Schools usually copy "best practices" from other schools, Principals often hold interschool visits and consultative meetings to learn from each other, There is pressure from education officials for schools to copy "high performing schools".

In addition the eight measures of strategy implementation included; We have met our set targets in the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) examination results for the last three years, The school population has been increasing/remained constant for the last three years, The school infrastructure have been improved in the last three years, My rating on financial management by my supervisor has been improving every year for the last three years, We have assigned responsibilities of strategy implementation to various teams in the school, We hold regular meetings to review the extent of achievement of short term strategic objectives, We allocate sufficient funds to various strategic objectives every year, We have always met our annual strategic objectives for the last three years. The questionnaire was tested for reliability before it was used for data collection. Subsequently the reliable questionnaires were hand delivered to the respondents, allowed them a week to fill before collecting for analysis.

Data analysis

The data collected was analysed in two parts: in the first part descriptive statistics including frequencies and percentages, mean and standard deviations were obtained and presented in tabular form. The second part involved inferential statistical analysis. First, the Spearman's rank correlation was used to assess the relationship between the variables (regulative pressure, mimetic pressure and strategy implementation). Finally, hypotheses were tested using binary logistic regression results. The logit model for the direct effect of regulative pressure on strategy implementation was of the form (Model 1):

$$\text{Logit } Y = \ln \left(\frac{P}{1-P} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + e, \text{ where, } Y = \text{strategy implementation, } X = \text{regulative}$$

pressures, β_0 = the constant term, β_1 = the coefficient of regulative pressure, and e = Error term

The test for the moderation effect of the mimetic pressures on the relationship between regulative pressures and strategy implementation was done in two stages: in the first stage, the combined direct effect of mimetic pressures and regulative pressures on strategy implementation was tested through as follows (Model 2 2):

$$\text{logit}Y = \ln\left(\frac{P}{1-P}\right) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 * X + \alpha_2 * M + e$$

where, Y = strategy implementation, X = Regulative pressure, M = moderator (mimetic pressures), α_0 = the constant term, α_1 = the coefficient of regulative pressure and α_2 = the coefficient of the moderator. This was followed by the introduction of the interaction term between regulative and mimetic pressures (X*M) (Model 3)

$$\text{Logit } Y = \ln\frac{P}{1-P} = \alpha_0 X + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 M + \alpha_3 X * M + e$$

Where Y, X, and M have their previous meanings (see Model 2) and X*M interaction term, α_2 = coefficient of regulative pressures and α_3 = coefficient of the interaction term.

RESULTS

Response rates and reliability of the instruments

The data was collected from the four selected counties of Embu, Tharaka Nithi, Meru and Isiolo. **Response rate.** The response rate per county was computed and summed up to give the overall response rate. Out of the 250 questionnaires distributed to the potential respondents, 205 questionnaires were returned representing a response rate of 82%. This rate was considered acceptable as Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) suggest a response rate of 50% as adequate, 60% as good and above 70% as excellent while Lewis and Thornhill (2009) recommends a response rate of between 30% and 40%. It is noted that though the response rate was satisfactory, the received questionnaires were less than the design sample hence the error margin in the results was slightly more than 5%.

Reliability of data collection instrument. The reliability of the data collection instrument was assessed using Cronbach's alpha statistics and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Reliability of instruments

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	N. of Items
Strategy implementation	0.722	7
Regulative pressures	0.749	6
Mimetic pressure	0.542	5

Source: Survey Data (2019)

According to Table 2 strategy implementation returned an alpha value of 0.722, while regulative pressure and mimetic pressure had an alpha value of 0.749 and 0.542 respectively. Though the moderating variable (mimetic pressure) had a relatively low Cronbach's alpha value ($\alpha=0.542$), an alpha of at least 0.4 is acceptable for some unstable psychological constructs such as the mimetic pressure. Ekolu and Quainoo (2019) argue that while there is

no universal agreement on the exact threshold for Cronbach's alpha, a commonly used interpretation regards $\alpha < 0.5$ as low reliability, $0.5 < \alpha < 0.8$ as moderate (acceptable) reliability and $\alpha > 0.8$ as high reliability. In this regard the instrument was acceptably reliable.

Respondents Characteristics

The distribution of the respondents based on gender, age, education and work experience were conducted and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Characteristics of respondents

Variable		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Male	108	52.7	52.7	52.7
	Female	97	47.3	47.3	100
	Total	205	100	100	
Age of respondents	Below 40 years	7	3.4	3.4	3.4
	41 - 50 years	105	51.2	51.2	54.6
	51 - 60 years	93	45.4	45.4	100
	Total	205	100	100	
Level of education	Diploma	6	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Bachelors degree	129	62.9	62.9	65.9
	Masters degree	69	33.7	33.7	99.5
	Ph.D	1	0.5	0.5	100
	Total	205	100	100	
Work experience	Below 5 years	40	19.5	19.5	19.5
	6 - 10 years	66	32.2	32.2	51.7
	11 - 15 years	70	34.1	34.1	85.9
	16 - 20 years	27	13.2	13.2	99
	Over 20 years	2	1	1	100
	Total	205	100	100	

Source: Survey Data (2019)

Table 3 shows that 57.7% of the respondents were male while 47.3% were female. Majority of the respondents (51.2 %) were aged between 41 – 50 years while those below 40 years were the least at 3.4%. On the levels of education, majority of the respondents (62.9%) had undergraduate degree while only 0.5% had PhD. Majority of the respondents (34.1%) had served as principals for a period of 11-15 years while only 1% had served for over 20 years. This result suggest that the respondents had sufficient experience that enabled them to provide accurate responses to the questions that were posed to them in the questionnaires. Further, the fact that they were principals, they were suitable respondents because they were in charge if the formulation and ensuring the implementation of strategic pans of their respective schools.

Summary of descriptive results

Descriptive statistics for each of the variables; strategy implementation (dependent variable), the independent variable (regulative pressures), and the moderating variable (mimetic pressures) were summarized as shown in the Table 4.

Table 4: Summary Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
Strategy implementation	205	3.50	0.46	-0.725	0.17	3.579	0.338
Regulative pressure	205	3.12	0.59	0.173	0.17	0.116	0.338
Mimetic pressure	205	3.82	0.49	-0.513	0.17	0.342	0.338

Source: Survey Data (2019)

Table 4 shows that the respondents perceived strategy implementation in their institutions as moderately successful ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.46$). The low standard deviation is indicative that the perception of the respondents regarding the level of success in strategy implementation approached homogeneity. Regarding the regulative pressures, the respondents perceived it as being low ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 0.59$). Low standard deviation again shows that the respondents neared agreement on their perception of regulative pressures. The respondents perceived mimetic pressures as being moderately high ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 0.49$). The standard deviation shows homogeneity of the perception across the respondents regarding the perceived mimetic forces.

Regarding the statistics on Skewness and Kurtosis, Table 4 further shows that the skewness statistics for strategy implementation was -0.725 while that of the regulative pressure was 0.173 . These results indicate that the distribution of all the variables approach a normal distribution since the skewness statistics were within the $-1 \leq S \leq +1$ threshold (Hair, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2017). However, Table 4.4 further shows that the kurtosis statistic for strategy implementation was 3.579 , while that of regulative pressure was 0.116 . This indicates that strategy implementation was not normally distributed because the statistic was above the $+1$ threshold. However the distribution of regulative pressure and mimetic pressure approached a normal distribution since their kurtoses were within the $-1 \leq K \leq +1$ threshold (Hair et al, 2017).

These results had implication for the analytical model that were used because the distribution of the data, particularly on the dependent variable (strategy implementation) was not normal hence violating the assumption of the classical liners regression model. In this study, the binary logistic regression models were used upon the coding of strategy implementation into a binary variable with $0 =$ "unsatisfactory strategy implementation" and $1 =$ "satisfactory strategy implementation".

Relationship between institutional factors and strategy implementation

In order to examine the strength and the direction of the relationship between regulative pressures and strategy implementation, Spearman's rank correlation on summated scores of all variables was done. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Relationship between institutional pressures and strategy implementation

Correlations	1	2	3
1.Strategy implementation(Y)	1		
2.Regulative pressure (X)	.480** <0.001	1	
3.Mimetic pressure(M)	.142* 0.042	.275** <0.001	1
N	205	205	205

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Survey Data (2019)

From the results in Table 5, regulative pressures had moderate, positive statistically significant relationship with strategy implementation ($\rho = .480$, $p < .001$). This implies that those agencies or individuals with the legitimacy to exert regulative pressures in public secondary schools should exert more pressure as it yields positive results in strategy implementation.

It was also found that there existed a weak but positive, statistically significant relationship between the mimetic forces and strategy implementation in public secondary schools ($\rho = .142$, $p = .042 < .05$). It is therefore advisable that this “band wagon effect” that is mimetic pressures be encouraged because it enhances strategy implementation in public secondary schools albeit marginally. The correlation results also confirmed the absence of multicollinearity between the regulative and mimetic pressures because their correlation coefficient was below the threshold of 0.8 for there to be a threat of multicollinearity.

Logit for direct influence of regulative pressures on strategy implementation

The direct effect of regulative pressures on strategy implementation was tested using the binary logistic regression. The results were as presented in the Table 6

Table 6 Influence of regulative pressures on strategy implementation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Regulative pressures	1.222	.330	13.682	1	.000	3.393
Constant	-.226	.169	1.795	1	.180	.797

According to the results the model takes the form:

$$\text{Logit (Y)} = \ln\left(\frac{P}{1-P}\right) = 1.222X$$

Where, Y = Strategy Implementation and X = regulative pressures

The results indicate that the regulative pressures a positive, statistically significant influence at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance on the odds for strategy implementation. In particular, the results indicate that for every unit increase in the regulative pressures, the likelihood of strategy implementation success increases 3.393 times ($\text{Exp (B)} = 3.393$, $p = 0.001 < 0.05$). This implies that the null hypothesis that *regulative pressures have no statistically significant influence on strategy implementation* was rejected. The conclusion therefore is that *regulative pressures have*

a statistically significant influence on strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya.

Logit for the moderating effect of mimetic pressures on the relationship between regulative pressures and strategy implementation

The moderating effect was tested in two steps whereby in the first step, the direct association between the moderating variable, independent variable and the dependent variable was tested. The results are shown in the Table 7.

Table 7 Direct association between Mimetic pressures and strategy implementation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Mimetic pressures	.342	.361	.897	1	.344	1.408
Regulative pressure	1.179	.333	12.527	1	.000	3.253
Constant	-.486	.324	2.252	1	.133	.615

The results presented in Table 7 indicate that there exists no statistically significant influence of mimetic pressures on likelihood of strategy implementation success in public secondary schools (Exp (B) = 1.408, $p = .344 > 0.05$). The last step of moderation test involved the inclusion of the interaction term (X*M) into the model and testing the effect and the results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Moderating effect of mimetic pressure

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Regulative pressures	1.442	.907	2.530	1	.112	4.231
Mimetic pressure	.395	.400	.976	1	.323	1.484
Interaction term	-.306	.975	.098	1	.754	.737
Constant	-.526	.350	2.262	1	.133	.591

According to the result in Table 8, the interaction term decreases the odds for strategy implementation success to 0.737. However this influence was not statistically significant at 5% level of significance (X*M: $\exp(B) = 0.736, p = 0.754 > 0.05$). The study therefore failed to reject the null hypothesis, that the *mimetic pressures have no moderating effect on the relationship between strategy implementation and regulative pressures*. This is because moderation is only observed if and only if the interaction term has statistically significant coefficient.

DISCUSSION

Data was collected data using questionnaires from four selected counties of Embu, Tharaka-Nithi, Meru and Isiolo where a response rate of 82% was achieved. The reliability of the research instrument was assessed using the Cronbach's alpha and the results were that it met the threshold of reliability. Pre-analysis tests used to establish the appropriate method for inferential analysis model included the test for multicollinearity and normality. Multicollinearity was tested using Spearman's rank correlation while the normality of the data was assessed using Skewness and kurtosis.

The first objective of the study was to assess the influence of regulative forces on strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya. The Spearman's rank correlation

indicated a moderate but statistically significant linear relationship between the regulative pressures and the strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya. This finding is corroborated by Alziady and Enayah (2019) who in their study on the effect of institutional pressures on the intention to continue green information technology usage found a moderate relationship between regulative pressures and the intention to continue green information technology usage ($r = 0.43$, $p < 0.05$). In this example, the intention to green IT usage is analogous to the strategy implementation.

The results of the logit model estimation show that regulative pressures had a statistically significant influence on the odds for (likelihood of) strategy implementation success in public secondary schools in Kenya. The results show that a unit increase in regulative pressures increases the odds of successful strategy implementation by a factor of 3.393. Therefore the null hypothesis that regulative pressure has no statistically significant influence on strategy implementation was rejected. This implies that increase in regulative pressures can help in improving the success rate of strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya implementation. This finding is in agreement with Mate and Kaluyu's (2018) finding that regulative pressures had a positive and moderate statistically significant relationship with strategy implementation. It is further corroborated by Kim and Stanton (2016) who found that regulative pressure had a positive statistically significant influence on data sharing behaviours by scientists. From the finding of this study and those of the two previous studies (Mate & Kaluyu, 2018; Kim & Stanton, 2016), regulative pressures are positively related with promotion of desired behaviours.

The second objective of the study was to examine the moderating influence of mimetic forces on the relationship between institutional factors and strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya. The binary logistic regression test for direct influence of mimetic forces on strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya showed that mimetic pressures had no statistically significant direct influence on strategy implementation. This finding concurs with that of Bananuka et al. (2020) who explored the influence of institutional forces and board role performance on the adoption of internet financial reporting. The study found that mimetic pressures had no statistically significant association with internet financial reporting.

On testing for the moderating effect of mimetic pressures on the relationship between regulative pressures and strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya, it was observed that the effect of interaction term on the odds of successful strategy implementation was not statistically significant. This meant that mimetic pressures had no moderating effect on the influence of regulative pressures on strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya. Therefore the null hypothesis that *mimetic pressure has no statistically significant influence on strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya* failed to be rejected. The implication of this finding is that whether public secondary schools mime each other or not it has no impact on the influence of regulative pressures on strategy implementation. This finding contradicts the finding by Huang and Yang (2014) who found that mimetic pressure positively moderated the relationship between reverse logistics innovation and environmental performance. This difference in the two findings could be attributable to the fact that competition in public sector is less intense compared to the private sector. Further, though the influence of mimetic forces on the regulative pressures – strategy implementation was

negative, it was not significant. In comparison with the finding by Huang and Yang (2014), the finding from the public secondary schools shore the opposite (negative) moderating effect though insignificant.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusion

On the influence of regulative pressures on strategy implementation in the public secondary schools in Kenya the following conclusions can be drawn: based on the descriptive results it can be concluded that the regulative pressures exerted on the schools to implement strategy is just moderate and homogenous across the respondents. The highest regulative pressure emanates from the Basic Education Act and the performance contracts. Regarding the tested hypothesis, it is concluded that regulative pressures have a statistically significant influence on strategy implementation. Thus an increase in regulative pressures increase the odds of success in strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya. This implies that coercive pressures from individuals or entities that have authority over the implementers and who can mete out consequences for non-compliance are effective in ensuring success in strategy implementation

Mimetic pressures were included in this study as a moderating variable on the relationship between regulative pressures and strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya. Based on the findings of this study it is concluded that strong mimetic pressures are exerted on the implementers of strategies in public secondary schools in Kenya. This finding is supported by that of Barton (2014) who found that there existed a weak but positive statistically significant association between mimetic pressures and senior management commitment to information system security management. However mimetic pressures did not have any statistically significant influence on strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya. Further mimetic pressures did not have any statistically significant moderating effect on the relationship between regulative pressures and strategy implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya though the influence was negative. This implies that whether schools mime (imitate) the activities and practices of other schools, it does not impact on the influence of the regulative pressures on strategy implementation in public secondary schools.

Implications

This study contributes to the scarce empirical studies on strategy implementation. It will therefore assist in reducing the imbalance between strategy formulation and implementation because as Amjad (2013) argues, there have been repeated calls in strategy literature for the need to conduct more research on strategy implementation issues from a broader perspective. However, the calls have not received much empirical interest and strategy implementation continues to receive less attention than the strategy formulation phase of strategy management process.

Secondly, this study ventures into less explored view of strategy. While previous studies have focused on either the resource based view or industry based view of strategy implementation, this study looked at strategy implementation through the lens of the institutional pressures. This perspective seeks to comprehend organizations' management practices as a function of social and institutional pressures rather than economic and market pressures.

On the practical front, the study draws the attention of strategic management practitioners to a different set of factors that may influence the implementation of strategies: the behavioral factors that draw from the institutional context. This is because traditionally it is factors such as technologies, organizational structures, employees' abilities, resources and leadership that have been considered to influence strategy implementation. The study therefore widens the scope of areas to pay attention to when considering the factors that influence strategy implementation to include institutional factors.

The study has found out that regulative pressures have a statistically significant influence on strategy implementation. This implies that increase in regulative pressures leads to increased likelihood of success in strategy implementation. The government can therefore ensure that strategies in public secondary schools are successfully implemented by ensuring that there are sustained regulative pressures through laws, regulation, directives, provision of sufficient resources and constant monitoring.

References

- Alexander, A. G. (2014). Privatization of Public Assets: NPM and Public Value Decision- Making Models for Public Managers. [Online] Available: <http://www.academia.edu/3749338>
- Alziady, A.A.D.J., & Enayah, S.H. (2019). Studying the effect of institutional pressures on the intentions to continue green information technology usage. *Asian journal of sustainability and social responsibility* 4(4), 1 – 20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/541180-018-0023-1>.
- Amjad, A. (2013). *Towards competitive theorizing of strategy implementation process – Empirical Evidence from Applying the RBV lens on implementation process* (Unpublished Ph.D thesis), University of Lancashire.
- Bananuka, J., Night, S., Ngoma, M., & Najjemba, G. M. (2019). Internet Financial reporting adoption: Exploring the influence of board role performance and isomorphic forces. *Journal of economics, finance and administrative science*, 24(48), 266 – 287.
- Carter, J. G. (2016). Institutional pressures and isomorphism: The impact on intelligence-led policing adoption. *Police Quarterly*.
- Cerniauskiene, N. (2014). *Strategic management of public sector institutions: Students work book*. Vilnius: Mykolo Romelo Universitetas.
- Cooper, D., & Schindler, P. (2013). *Business research methods (12th edition)*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Publishers.
- Dermikaya, Y. (2015). Strategic planning in the public sector. *Transylvanian review of administrative science*, 15 - 29.
- Di Maggio, P., & Powell, W.W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- Dubey, R., Gunasekaran, A., Childe, S. J., Papadopoulos, T., Hazen, B., Giannakis, M., & Rouboud, D. (2017). Examining the effect of external pressure and organizational culture on shaping performance measurement systems (PMS) for sustainability benchmarking: Some empirical findings. *International Journal of Production Economics* 193. 63 – 76.
- Edwards, J. R., Mason, D. S., & Washington, M. (2009). Institutional Pressures, Government Funding and Provincial Sport Organisations. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing* 6(2), 128-149.
- Ekolu, O.S. & Quianoo, H. (2019). Reliability assessments in engineering education using Cronbach's alpha, KR and Split-half methods, *Global journal of engineering education* 21(1), 24-29.
- Emamisaleh, K., & Rahmani, K. (2017). Sustainable supply chain in food industry: Drivers and strategic sustainability orientation. *Cogent business and management*, 2017(4), 1 – 18.

- González, J.M.G. (2010) Determinants of socially responsible corporate behaviours in the Spanish electricity sector. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 6, 386–403.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2013). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLSSEM)*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Hayes, A. F., Glynn, C. J., & Hude, M. E. (2012). Cautions Regarding the Interpretation of Regression Coefficients and Hypothesis Tests in Linear Models with Interactions. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 6(1), 1–11.
- Hu, Q., Hart, P., & Cooke, D. (2007). The Role of External and Internal Influences on Information Systems Security – A Neo Institutional Perspective. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 16(2), 153-172.
- Huang, Y. & Yang, M. (2014). Reverse logistics, innovation, institutional pressures and performance management. *Management research review* (37)7, 615 – 641.
- IIEP (2010). *Strategic planning Concept and rationale: Education Sector Working Papers*. IIEP Paris.
- Itegi, F.M. (2016). Financing Secondary Education in Kenya: Exploring Strategic Management Approach for Improving Quality of Education. *Universal Journal of Education Research*, 4(5), 949 -955.
- Kauppi, K. (2013) Extending the use of institutional theory in operations and supply chain management research. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 33, 1318–1345.
- Kevojo, A.A. & Waiganjo, E. (2015). Factors influencing implementation of strategic plans in public secondary schools in Kenya: a survey of public secondary schools in Thika West sub-county. *Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management* 2(2), 1899 – 1914.
- Kim, Y., & Stanton, J.M (2016). Institutional and Individual factors affecting Scientists Data Sharing Behaviours: A Multilateral Analysis. *Information Science Faculty Publications* (16). Online: Available on <http://uknowledge.uky.edu/545-Facpub/16>
- Kshetri, N. (2009). The development of market orientation: A consideration of institutional influence in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing Logistics*, 2, 19–40.
- Lavrakas, P. J. (2008). *Encyclopaedia of survey research methods. (Vol. 1)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Masocha, R and Fatoki, O. (2018). The Impact of Coercive Pressures on Sustainability Practices of Small Businesses in South Africa. *Sustainability* 10 (3032).
- Mate, M. F., & Kaluyu, V. (2018). Influence of institutional pressures on strategy implementation success in public hospitals in Kenya: A case of Ishiara level IV hospital. *International journal of economics, commerce and management*, 6(5), 482 – 507.
- McBain, L., & Smith, J (2010). Strategic management in the public sector, *E-leader Singapore*, 1 – 11.
- Mbithe, P., & Mwabu, G., (2016). Impact of Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) on agricultural sector growth in Kenya. *International Journal of economics*, 79 – 102.
- Miterev, M., Engwall, M., & Jerbrant, A. (2017). Mechanisms of isomorphism in project-based Organizations. *Project Management Journal*, 48(5), 9-24.
- Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Nairobi: African Centre for Technology Studies.
- Muriuki, J.M., & Stanley, K., (2015). Determinations of strategic plan implementation in organisations: a Case study of Chai Trading Company limited. *The international journal of business management* 3(4), 215 – 225.
- Othman, S., Darus, F., & Arshad, R. (2011). The influence of coercive isomorphism on corporate social responsibility reporting and reputation. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 7, 119–135.
- Peton, H., & Peze, S. (2014). The unsuspected dynamics of the regulative pillar: The case faute inexcusable in France. *Management* 17(3), 145 -179.
- Pillay, S., Reddy, P. S., & Morgan, D. (2017). Institutional isomorphism and whistle-blowing intentions in public sector institutions. *Public Management Review*, 19(4), 423-442

- Rosalinde, J. A., Woolthuis, K., & Taminiau, Y. (2017). Waves of change – The dynamics of institutional pressures, University of Groningen, working paper series 1711 – CSE
- Rubakula, G. (2014). The New Public Management and its challenges in Africa. *Public policy and research* 4(4), 85 – 95. www.iiste.org.
- Scott, W.R. (2001). *Institutions and organisations (2nd Ed)*. Thousand oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Scott, W.R. (2007). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas and interests*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Sutton, T., Short, J. C., MacKenny, A. F., & Namatovu, R. (2015) Institutional factors affecting expansion within East African Community: An analysis of managers' personal stories. In M.N Kiggundu and T. Walters (2015) *Managing in an Integrating East Africa. Africa Journal of management*, 1(4), 365 – 383.
- Teo, H.H., Wei, K.K., & Benbasat, I. (2003). Predicting Intention to Adopt Interorganizational Linkages: An Institutional Perspective. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(1), 19-49.
- Wu, T.; Daniel, E.M., Hinton, M. & Quintas, P. (2013) Isomorphic mechanisms in manufacturing supply chains: A comparison of indigenous Chinese firms and foreign-owned MNCs. *Supply Chain Management International Journal*, 18, 161-177.