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ABSTRACT
Globalization has forced organization to change their operating strategies and adopt to the business environment in order to stay relevant. All organizations have moved to considering their service delivery as the new measure of organizational performance. More attention is thus shifting to factors that affect service delivery of various organizations as a whole or their core departments. This calls on the standards regulating agencies and more so the departments concerned with this to be at their utmost performance thus at their best service delivery. The most notable of these organizations is KEBS within the Kenyan context. The market surveillance department has the most important role in ensuring compliance to the standards. However, the performance of this department is not yet at par with the required standards under a global economy. Studies have thus been conducted to determine the reasons for this poor performance. Most of these studies fall short by giving mere symptoms of the problem but not the root cause which is strategic management. The main objective of the study was therefore to determine the effect of strategic management practices on service delivery by the surveillance department of Kebs this was supported by specific objectives which were to determine the effects of strategic formulation on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards; to determine the effects of strategic planning on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards; to determine the effects of strategy implementation on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards and to determine the effects of strategic evaluation on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards.

Introduction
The study was carried out in kebs as it is the main standards regulatory agency in the country and has all the elements in the other agencies thus the findings can be inferred to the others as well. The data for the study was collected from managers of KEBS ranging from junior management, middle level employees to senior management. The study used a sample based on the 10% of the target population therefore using 60 targeted respondents from whom responses was collected using Likert scale questionnaires. These were then sorted for consistency and accuracy leading to the use of 49 questionnaires which were coded and analyzed using mean and standard deviation followed by a simple regression analysis from which the findings of the study were drawn. The study found that there is a direct relationship between strategic management and service delivery. The highest contributor to this is strategic monitoring and evaluation followed by planning and implementation. It is thus surprising that the study found out that monitoring and evaluation was the weakest of the three strategic management variables. As a result, recommendation is made to have more emphasis on monitoring and evaluation, have stronger implementation as well as more attention on the weak areas of planning especially internal analysis and external analysis and involvement of junior employees in the process.

The last decade has seen organization worldwide experiencing significant change in their organizational design, competitive environments and information technologies. These changes have largely been driven by globalization and environmental changes as well as consumer preference shifts which have profoundly changed the world’s political, socio-cultural and economic landscape and created a turbulent environment of change. Thus to adapt to the changing environment, innovative organizations not only change their strategic priorities, but also implement new technologies and management practices (Kihara, 2013). Such changes involve even involve restructuring and coming up with new departments to effectively deal with the realization of the specific desired objectives

However, the performance of state corporations in Kenya has continuously been unimpressive to the public as well as other stakeholders. This has thus called for studies into the possible causes of this unsatisfactory performance of the state corporations and the methods in which this performance can be revived. The studies found out that the most notable cause for poor performance among the state corporations is the lack of strategies thus the state corporations were given an ultimatum by the government to embrace strategic management, (Awuondo and Abdikadir, 2013).
In Kenya, quality standards are increasingly being used by regulatory and other concerned agencies to ensure that the goods and services which are provided to users meet minimum quality, technical, safety and health requirements. Quality is a pillar for the socio-economic development of any country. In this era of rapidly growing international trade and globalization, the Kenya Bureau of Standards is committed to advancing standardization and allied quality facets through spreading the knowledge and application of quality standards to all producers and consumers of goods and services in the country. The vision of the Bureau is to be a global leader in standards based solutions that deliver quality and confidence. This is the reason kebs has introduced a market surveillance department, (Kebs, 2014).

Market surveillance hereby refers to the activities carried out and measures taken by public authorities to ensure that products comply with the requirements set out in the relevant technical legislation and do not endanger health, safety or any other aspect of public interest protection. The responsibility for market surveillance rests with the industry regulators and the standards regulatory authorities of the respective countries. It is for this reason that Kebs has the mandate of market surveillance in the country. These authorities need to have adequate resources at their disposal to ensure that they can deal with the volume of imported products, the needed dangerous product notifications and the technical complexity of the regulations and the standards. Moreover, marketing surveillance systems are based on information received from the field, (Massod, 2010).

Free market access of products worldwide is currently in development in nearly all product sectors over the globe either in the consumer field or even in the industrial field. The intentions of economic operators are clearly to ensure compliance to legal requirements and to limit cost of importing and other conformity assessment costs. Compliance with mandatory safety requirements is a requirement which is legitimate and in all cases evidence of (some) compliance must be provided by the Economic Operator, (Mugambi, 2013).

Regardless of conformity assessment system used to show compliance to its regulations, a country has to maintain a market surveillance system due to two reasons. First, illegal and unsafe products should not be allowed to be put on and remain on the market. Secondly, fair market conditions should prevail. Suppliers which follow the rules and bear the administrative costs and delays due to regulations should not be disadvantaged compared to those who do not comply to the rules, (Eliezer et al, 2007) Moreover, in the life time of a product, compliance to mandatory requirements may be requested at the design/production stage which is referred to as pre-market control and at the post-market surveillance stage also referred to as market surveillance. However in kebs, both functions are done by the marketing surveillance department, (Kebs 2015). Therefore, market surveillance is more and more recognized as an essential step in the process of putting a product on the market such as the compliance with essential requirements must be checked after the product was put on the market to ensure compliance with the technical regulations, (G.O.K, 2015)

Moreover, in the life time of a product, compliance to mandatory requirements may be requested at the design/production stage which is referred to as pre-market control and at the post-market surveillance stage also referred to as market surveillance. However in kebs, both functions are done by the marketing surveillance department, (Kebs 2015). Therefore, market surveillance is more and more recognized as an essential step in the process of putting a product on the market such as the compliance with essential requirements must be checked after the product was put on the market to ensure compliance with the technical regulations, (G.O.K, 2015)

Besides, market surveillance is carried out by exchanges and securities commissions to detect such market manipulation by market participants. The manipulative practices are varied in nature, although there are more “commonplace” practices that are easily identifiable, Free market access of products worldwide is currently in development in nearly all product sectors over the globe either in the consumer field or even in the industrial field, (Eliezer et al, 2007). The intentions of economic operators are clearly to ensure compliance to legal requirements and to limit cost of importing and other conformity assessment costs. Compliance with mandatory safety requirements is a requirement which is legitimate and in all cases evidence of (some) compliance must be provided by the Economic Operator, (Mugambi, 2013).

Locally, the demand for regulatory services has greatly expanded and, at the regional level the EAC SQMT Act and the EAC Metrology Bill require participation of all industry regulators. At the international level, the need for links to and networking with Standardization, Metrology and Conformity Assessment institutions in other countries and regions in the world has grown substantially. Consequently the ability of the industry regulators to achieve its Plan objectives depended on key success factors such as effective information and knowledge management; capacity to attract and retain high caliber staff; dynamic and proactive leadership, customer orientation, and sufficient and well equipped laboratories. This has made industry regulators come up with new departments to address specific result oriented initiatives. The most recent department is the marketing surveillance department, (Kebs, 2015).

However, kebs has been poorly performing in monitoring the standards of products especially products entering the country. This is because the quality and standards inspection department has been far overstretched in its mandate calling for other departments to assume specific roles thus relieving some of the functions from the department which has historically been doing almost everything in standards assurance thus loosing on unity of focus. In addition kebs has been relying on public goodwill in getting information about counterfeit goods and substandard commodities in the market. Besides, there has been an influx of substandard and counterfeit products in the country mainly from the Chinese cheap imports and the fraudulent business men in Kenya who specialize in counterfeit goods most notably being the alcohol industry as well as most consumer goods. The distributors and retailers are however reluctant in providing the required information as well as ensuring the products on their shelves are genuine save for the supermarkets. This thus calls for kebs to go out into the market and constantly monitor the goods on the shelves to ensure compliance with the standards. This has been the rational for the introduction of a market surveillance department in Kebs. It is on this background that the study will seek to determine the impact this department has on performance of kebs Standards, Metrology and Conformity
assessment are important to an economy in a number of interdependent ways which support economic development through the production of competitive products and also enhance the quality of life through the promotion of safety, quality, health and environmental protection, (kebs, 2015). Consequently an effective Standardization infrastructure is a vital pillar for a country’s sustainable socio-economic development. The Kenya Government recognizes the importance of a quality infrastructure and has shown commitment to its development as indicated in its major economic policy papers such as the ERS, the Export Strategy Paper and the Kenya Vision 2030. This heightens the important role made by market surveillance in realizing these standards. Market surveillance also ensures that the consumer protection (Awuondo & Abdikadir, 2013).

This being the basic roles of KEBS and notably the market surveillance department which was purposely formed to support the standards and quality inspection department as well as monitor the standards of products in the shelves of business enterprises with major focus on the SMEs and other retail outlets. This is specifically to address the issue of counterfeit products and low standard products that find their way into the Kenyan market by circumventing the existing inspection mechanisms. The department thus has to have an impact on the performance of kebs as a whole, (kebs, 2015).

There however exists considerable debate about the effectiveness of surveillance in economies especially in light of exchanges demutualizing, moving from the not-for-profit model to for-profit model and the resulting conflicts of interest from markets competing with one another. DeMarzo, et al, (2005) insists that surveillance should be basically an internal affair by the producing firm as a way of maintaining loyalty. Carson, (2003) disagrees with this statement basing on the dishonesty of business world in the chase for quick profits calling for consumer protection thus an active surveillance department in the industry regulatory agencies. Fleckner, (2006) supports this by using example of European countries where the business circle often runs amok whenever there is any small window in the monitoring and control. This heightens the need to have a very effective surveillance department among the industry regulators. There is however very poor performance in this department (Awuondo & Abdikadir, 2013).

As a result various studies have been conducted to determine the root cause of this poor performance. There are researchers who argue that the poor performance is caused by poor training of staff, (Okanya, 2008, Shaheen et al 2013 & Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009). Others argue that it is a result of department capacity, (Aldamoë et al, 2012, and Massod, 2010). Another school of thought is that of interdepartmental relationships (Hahn, 2007, Demirel, 2009 & Kingsford, 2009)

Kihara (2013) however argues based on the theory of reasoned action to show that these are just small components of a major problem and points out strategic management as the root cause behind the symptoms such as poor training, low organizational capacity and poor interdepartmental relationships. The literature review however did not find any empirical study to support this argument.

It is for this reason that the current study was aimed at investigating the assertions of Kihara (2013) and provide an empirical evidence to show that strategic management is the key behind service delivery of the surveillance departments of the industry regulators. The study used kebs as it is the most crucial of the industry regulators given its central role in the country as well as the region. The choice of kebs for the study was also grounded on the fact that Kebs as an organization has fully embraced strategic management yet its key role which is performed by the surveillance department is not successful.

Research hypotheses

1.4.1 Hypothesis one

H0Strategic formulation has no effect on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards.

H1Strategic formulation has an effect on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards.

1.4.2 Hypothesis two

H0Strategic planning has no effect on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards

H1Strategic planning has an effect on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards.

1.4.3 Hypothesis three

H0Strategy implementation has no effect on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards

H1Strategy implementation has an effect on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards.

1.4.4 Hypothesis four

H0Strategic evaluation has no effect on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards.

H1Strategic evaluation has an effect on service delivery by the surveillance departments of Kenya bureau of standards.

Related literature

Theoretical review

The study is anchored on the surveillance theory though it will borrow a few concepts from the social marketing theory and the theory of reasoned action

a. Surveillance theory

The theory emphasizes on the importance of surveillance in monitoring behavioral tendencies and quality. The theory was first introduced by Marx and Weber (1916) to refer to political and social control of subjects by governments. It was later however adopted imply economical monitoring of activities within a political jurisdiction. This is the modern application of the theory in business where a legally mandated authority is empowered to monitor business interests within a jurisdiction for purposes of quality and standards assurance as well as consumer protection, (Demirel, 2009).

This should not however give the impression that many contemporary surveillance approaches have gone too far beyond Marx, (Machuki et al., 2012). As much as there are Marxist approaches that elaborate upon workforce control but do not use the notion of surveillance in this context, more studies in Marxist theories reveal that it forms the bedrock for surveillance. Such approaches include Thornton & Ocasio (2008) who argue that all the post modern arguments on surveillance have their foundation on the Marxist approach of market structure and market forces that are in the struggle between the owners of capital and the need to...
regulate this relationship by setting standards of conformity. The same notion is shared by Reynolds et al (2010) with the assertion that competition and quality in the market is just but an extension of the class struggle and strive for domination that has found a manifestation in the market.

Lyon characterizes Marxian surveillance concepts as modern because they rely on ‘nation-state, bureaucracy, technologic, and political economy’. Postmodern surveillance approaches focus on how ‘digital technologies “make a difference”’ (Lyon, 2006). This then answers the critic of Marxist theories (Lyn, 2005; Rowe, 2007 & Kinywa, 2009) who argue that market surveillance is not merely a review of the capital structure and forces but a survey of personalities and attitudes in the market place with specific emphasis on fairness, justice and welfare. Sharma (2011) further asserts that these attributes cannot be measured and are only implied on the quality of the items on the shelves and services offered thus market surveillance is still all about product and service regulation to ensure that the highest possible standards are maintained, (Shaheen et al, 2013).

This then makes the theory a major perspective in understanding not just the need for setting of standards and monitoring these standards through surveillance, but also the underlying rationale behind the need to consistently carry out surveillance, (Carson, 2003). For instance, the surveillance theory gives an insight why the competition forces in the market do not lead to higher standards but rather to desire to cheat and deal unfairly. This then calls for a neutral player who is neither the buyer nor the seller or the producer or consumer and non of the intermediaries to ensure that there are standards in the market, (Okanya, 2008). This player is thus not only supposed to set standards but to constantly monitor and ensure conformity. The study will thus look at the surveillance department and its role in ensuring conformity to the standards set by kebs.

b. Social marketing theory

Social marketing began as a discipline in the 1970s and differs from commercial marketing mainly with respect to the objectives of the marketer and his or her organization. Kotler & Andreasen, (2005) explain that “social marketing seeks to influence social behaviors not to benefit the marketer, but to benefit the target audience and the general society. Andreasen (2007) refers to social marketing the application of proven concepts and techniques drawn from the commercial sector to promote changes in diverse economically important behaviors such as honesty, integrity and social responsibility. Social marketing can also be said to be the design, implementation and control of programs calculated to influence the acceptability of social ideas and involving considerations of product planning, pricing, communication, distribution, and marketing research, (Hunter & Milton, 2009)

This theory is used by industry regulators and standards regulatory agencies in the advocacy role where these organization are supposed to inculcate virtues in the players and other stakeholders in the industry. It explains why Kebss is of keen interest to conduct advocacy facing various cases of counterfeit products and illicit brews flooding the Kenyan market and this borders on the dishonesty and lack of integrity in the players of the affected industries. This then gives a founding knowledge to the structure of the study in understanding the role of surveillance as not just implementation of standards but inculcating values that would ensure the standards are adhered to.

c. Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA)

TRA organizes itself around the constructs of behavioral and normative beliefs, attitudes, intentions and behavior. An extension of TRA, the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) adds the additional construct of self-efficacy – one’s perceived control over performance of the behavior. In TRA, the most important predictor of subsequent behavior is one’s intention to act. This behavioral intention is influenced by one’s attitude toward engaging in the behavior and the subjective norm one has about the behavior. Attitude, in turn, is determined by one’s beliefs about both the outcomes and attributes associated with the behavior, (Rosli, 2012).

According to the theory, subjective norms are based on one’s normative beliefs that reflect how significant referent people appraise the behavior – positively or negatively. Referents may range from one’s family, to one’s physician, peers or models. The TPB adds the additional construct of perceived behavioral control that is determined by one’s control beliefs, (Raduan et al, 2009).

Social marketers often employ TRA and TPB, although it is most often implicit and incomplete. Subjective norms and referents, for example, are often the focus of social marketing programs even though the theoretical model may not be familiar to the planners, (Maria et al, 2010). This will be the aspect used by the study to further develop the social marketing aspect of marketing surveillance.

Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness and efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource utilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
flexibility or adaptability to change situations in the future so that it continues to fulfill the desired objective set while maintaining optimal efficiency. The conflicting attributes of operations management to fulfill its predefined operational objective is important to take into consideration while defining its performance indicators. Ganeshan et al. (2001) put forward one alternative ways of seeing the most important factors in choosing the performance indicator of any enterprise. These can be put into three main categories: customer service metrics, asset metrics and time/speed/flexibility metrics.

The customer service measures how satisfied are both the internal and external customers of the enterprise. Asset metrics related with the capacity utilization. The most widely used performance indicator from the enterprise perspective includes delivery lead-time and inventory turns while traditional lean floor plant measures, such as cost per unit and manufacturing cycle time, are too shortsighted to address the interests of the different actors, (Awuor, 2014).

This therefore makes service delivery the most vital measure of organizational performance as organization move from product centered approach to customer centered approach. Service delivery is often defined as a system that provides something that the Public or User needs and organized by a Government or Private Company (Oxford Advanced Dictionary).it is often seen in terms of achievement of the desired objectives which in this case would be the achievement of standards conformity and action taken on deviant players in the industry or market (kebs, 2015)

**Strategy Formulation**

According to WMO (2014) strategy formulation involves answering eight major strategic questions which become the pillar of the success of the strategy and thus service delivery. The key questions are; What is your mission? How do you accomplish your mission? What are your goals and how can we contribute? How do you use our services? How can we improve them? What types of decisions do you have to make? What would help you make better decisions? And How do you measure success?

This is supported by Mugambi (2013) who asserts that the act of setting formal performance objectives converts the organization’s mission and direction into specific performance targets to be achieved and protects against drift confusion over what to accomplish and toleration of underdemanding results. It should also be considered that an organization is only able to draw short range objectives that determine the immediate results to achieve and long range objectives that specify the actions to take in the present to have the organization in position to produce results later through sound strategy formulation.

**Strategic Planning**

Strategic planning process has an important role in every organizational setting (Höppner, 2006). Organizations have developed networked cooperation to develop their activities. Each strategic plan has particular merits that are related to the external environment, internal processes and structures, financial resources and human capabilities. Strategic evaluation is used to judge these merits and the strategic planning process. The evaluation of strategic plans requires a framework and sensible judgments on different strategic objectives weighted against each other. The various strategic objectives should be aligned with each other in a balanced way so that the strategic plan is able to build bridge between the perceived present situation and the desired future position described by the vision, (Awino & Mutua, 2014).

Njoroge et al. (2015) observed that planners were better than non-planners at identifying opportunities, setting goals and objectives, and setting proper strategies and effective tactics to achieve them as evidenced by their higher growth rate and higher operational efficiency ratios. He also points out that planners are also more aggressive than non-planners in pursuit of business objectives. Imposed strategy the external environment dictates patterns in the actions either through direct imposition or through implicating pre-empting or bounding organizational choice, (Mugambi, 2013).

**Strategy Implementation**

Strategy implementation is a vital component of the strategic management process. Implementation addresses who, where, when and how of reaching desired goals and objectives. Many scholars have defined strategy implementation in different but similar terms Strategic planning is not an end in itself; the exercise would be completely worthless without implementation in practice. The purpose of strategic planning is not to produce a Strategic Plan that is going to sit on the shelf gathering dust, but rather to provide a practical plan which makes a difference when it is implemented, (Awino & Mutua, 2014). It is thus essential to ensure that there is a seamless transition from the planning process to implementation. Indeed, some of the final steps in planning, such as preparation of the Immediate Action Plan, can equally be viewed as the beginning of implementation. The purpose of this section is thus largely to recap on earlier messages, rather than to provide new guidelines. Obtaining necessary approvals and budgets, Building consensus, Feasibility studies, Public awareness and education, this also raises the need for a champion who will carry the mission and vision and pull all the others into their realization, (Ambrosini, & Bowman, 2003).

Implementation also ensures that Current and evolving user needs are put into consideration and this normally involves; Provider capabilities, including strengths and limitations; What services will be provided and how they will be provided; How services will be used; Expectations of acceptable outcomes and provider performance; Acceptable costs or levels of effort and risks inherent in applying information to decision-making, (Machuki et al, 2012).

**Strategy Evaluation**

Service delivery does not stop once the product or service has been delivered. User outreach and engagement must continue to ensure that services are received and acted upon and that full benefit is achieved by the user. Organizations should thus have a core set of metrics to measure the end-to-end-to-end service delivery process and its outputs. Each metric should only measure a specific aspect of the process but collectively, the metrics should enable an organization to demonstrate its strengths and identify areas for improvement in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, impact, satisfaction and value to its stakeholders, customers, users, partners and employees, (Njoroge et al, 2015).

More specifically, metrics should be: Specific thus precisely targeted to the area being measured. For example, a good metric for customer satisfaction would be direct feedback from customers on how they feel about a service or product.
A poorer metric would be the number of customer complaints because it is not specific nor directly correlated with customer satisfaction and can therefore be misleading. (Awino & Mutua, 2014).

The metric should also be Measurable: able to collect data that are accurate and complete as well as Actionable implying easy to understand, interpret and act upon. Another requirement is relevance in that they should measure only things that are important and relevant to an organization’s goals and objectives. A common mistake is to measure everything, which is time consuming and produces meaningless results. (Semmar, 2012).

Finally, the metrics should also be timely, agreed upon such that they are not imposed on any of the players allowing them to be owned such that they should have clearly identified owners. Ideally, these owners should have the ability, influence and resources to take action to ensure that targets are met as well as being consistent such that any two given metrics do not promote conflicting behaviors since continuity with the planning process is desirable. (Maranga, 2012).

As a result, Adeyoyin (2005) recommends that the Steering Committee should serve not only for the purposes of the initial strategic planning study but also to oversee implementation of the plan. As implementation proceeds, the frequency of Steering Committee meetings can be reduced, initially to every four months and then perhaps to six-month intervals. When this is done effectively, the Steering Committee will form a crucial link between the strategic plan champion and other departments who need to be involved to ensure effective implementation.

Critique of Literature Review

As depicted in the surveillance theory (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008 and Reynolds et al 2010), there is need for not just setting of standards but monitoring the market regularly to ensure these standards are upheld and a balance is achieved between the market competitive forces and the welfare of the consumer. This is supported by the theory of reasoned action (Rosli, 2012 and Maria et al, 2010) supporting the notion of inculcating values into the market that would allow for voluntary adherence to the standards. This calls for utmost performance of the organizations charged with the responsibility of setting and monitoring standards in any market or industry, (Massod, 2010). The industry regulators and standards regulatory agencies must thus perform at their utmost. The review however shows that this is not the case as these agencies are struggling at the brink of poor performance (Machuki et al, 2012) making the causes of their underperformance a great concern for scholars. Most of the studies have however concentrated on the symptoms of this problem rather than the root cause. This is seen by the studies dwelling on poor training of staff, (Okanya, 2008, Shaheen et al 2013 & Aguinis & Kraiger (2009) department capacity, (Aldamoe et al, 2012, & Massod, 2010) and interdepartmental relationships (Hahn, 2007, Demirel, 2009 & Kingsford, 2009) as the causes of this poor performance. The theoretical review however shows that these are manifestations of a deeper problem within the organization causing weak links and inconsistencies of purpose. The answer thus lies in strategic management of the organizations as this is what brings a seamless interdependence within an organization leading to success by following a single strategic direction.

Research methodology

Research design

The study adopted a descriptive survey design which is a scientific study done to describe a phenomena or an object (Brown et al, 2003). This kind of study involved a rigorous research planning and execution and often involves answering research questions. The descriptive survey method uses structured questionnaire. This method allowed the study to be affordable and quick. The purpose for employing this method was to describe the nature of a situation as it existed at the time of study (Chandran, 2004).

The study targeted junior employees working in the surveillance department of kebs in Mombasa region as well as, junior managers and middle level managers directly in touch with the department.

Due to difficulties in managing a study of all the a larger target respondents as a result of time and costs, a sample of 10% as recommended by Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) was used. This is on the basis of homogeneity of the target respondents thus allowing for sampling. The study therefore used random stratified sampling where the target respondents was first grouped into their respective categories, such as senior managers, middle level mangers and junior mangers after which the desired number of respondents were randomly selected from each target group. This gave 59 respondents.

Data analysis and presentation

The collected data was first checked for completeness, reliability and consistency which was done through analysis of internal reliability and internal consistency. The data was then coded and analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean scores, mode and standard deviations. This was followed by a regression analysis.

A regression analysis results in a regression coefficient (R), which is an indicator of the association between satisfaction and performance. Regression coefficients have a range of -1.00 to +1.00. Values close to 0.00 indicate that there is very little relationship between the variables. Negative values indicate that when one variable increases the other decreases while positive values show that the variables move in the same direction that is as one increases or decreases, the other does the same. The value gives the magnitude of the change such that 1 is perfect correlation where for every single change in X variable, the Y variable changes by the same quantity while 0.5 shows half correlation such that for every Y changes by half the quantity of the change in X.

The regression analysis used the model

\[ Y = \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \beta_4 x_4 + \delta \]

Where Y is Service delivery
\( \beta \) is the coefficient of correlation
\( x_1 \) is strategy formulation
\( x_2 \) is strategic planning
\( x_3 \) is strategy implementation
\( x_4 \) is strategy evaluation
and \( \delta \) is the constant

The findings have then been presented using tables, bar graphs and pie charts that allow description and explanation of findings in the next chapter.

Research findings

Response Rate

The study was conducted using 60 questionnaires. However, the returned questionnaires were 53 of which 4 were discarded, due to failure of the internal consistency test.
and being incomplete, during sorting. As a result, 49 questionnaires were used for the analysis. This gives an 82% response rate which is well within the 67% response rate recommended by Baruch & Holtom, (2008).

**Strategic management practices**

The general objective of the study was to determine the effect of strategic management practices on service delivery. This was done by first deriving the independent variables that would be deduced to get the strategic management side of the equation before determining the dependent variable which is service delivery before doing a regression analysis. Section 4.4 was thus dedicated to the analysis of the independent variables thus strategic planning, strategy implementation as well as strategy monitoring and evaluation

a. **Strategy implementation**

Table 4.1. Strategic planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of all stakeholders in the formulation of strategic plan</td>
<td>3.2449</td>
<td>.99017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of good objectives</td>
<td>3.5918</td>
<td>.91101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of all stake holders in strategic planning</td>
<td>3.1633</td>
<td>1.06745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Proper internal analysis</td>
<td>3.4082</td>
<td>.95565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Helpful internal analysis</td>
<td>3.1429</td>
<td>.93541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching of strategic needs with strategic goals</td>
<td>3.5306</td>
<td>.89214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Achievable objectives</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 above shows that the respondents agreed that the organization formulates good objectives (mean 3.59, standard deviation 0.91101), sets achievable objectives (mean 3.57, standard deviation 1.00), and matches strategic needs with strategic goals (mean 3.53, standard deviation 0.89214).

However, The table also shows that the respondents are neutral on whether the organization conducts proper internal analysis (mean 3.4042, standard deviation 0.95565), includes of all stakeholders in the formulation of strategic plan (mean 3.2489, standard deviation 0.99017), includes all stakeholders in strategic planning (mean 3.1633, standard deviation 1.06745) and conducts helpful internal analysis (mean 3.1429, standard deviation 0.93541).

This implies that the organization formulates good objectives, sets achievable objectives, and matches strategic needs with strategic goals. This is however countered by the somehow weak internal analysis, inclusion of all stakeholders in the formulation of strategic plan, inclusion of all stakeholders in strategic planning and conducting of helpful internal analysis. This therefore gives above average level of strategic planning based on the balance of the strong areas and the somehow strong areas

b. **Strategy implementation**

Table 4.2. Strategy implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy implementation dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the plan</td>
<td>3.3878</td>
<td>.95342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitization of the staff members on the strategic plan</td>
<td>3.3265</td>
<td>.80072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of the members to be able to meet the strategic objectives</td>
<td>3.2449</td>
<td>.99017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of all stakeholders towards the realization of the strategic objectives</td>
<td>3.1429</td>
<td>.97895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient management structure</td>
<td>3.1633</td>
<td>.96495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 above shows that the respondents were neutral on whether the organization has succeeded in implementation of strategic plan (mean 3.3878, standard deviation 0.95342), sensitization of the staff members on the strategic plan (mean 3.3265, standard deviation 0.80072), facilitation of the members to be able to meet the strategic objectives (mean 3.2449, standard deviation 0.99017) has efficient management structure (mean 3.1633, standard deviation 0.96495) and commitment of all stakeholders towards the realization of the strategic objectives (mean 3.1429, standard deviation 0.97895).

This implies that the organization is average on implementation of strategic plan, sensitization of the staff members on the strategic plan, facilitation of the members to be able to meet the strategic objectives, management structure and commitment of all stakeholders towards the realization of the strategic objectives. Thus an average strategic plan implementation

c. **Monitoring and evaluation**

Table 4.3. Strategy monitoring and evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and evaluation dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of management interaction with customers to evaluate the plan</td>
<td>2.9796</td>
<td>.85366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of the stakeholders in strategic plan evaluation process</td>
<td>2.9184</td>
<td>.95387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting a working monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td>3.2245</td>
<td>.91891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making vital adjustments to the strategic plan during evaluation</td>
<td>3.2245</td>
<td>.98457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation running concurrent with the implementation</td>
<td>3.1429</td>
<td>.95743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 above shows that the respondents were neutral on whether the organization makes vital adjustments to the strategic plan during evaluation (mean 3.2245, standard deviation 0.98457), sets a monitoring and evaluation system (mean 3.2245, standard deviation 0.91891), runs monitoring and evaluation concurrently with the implementation of the plan (mean 3.1429, standard deviation 0.95743), uses management interaction with customers to evaluate the plan (mean 2.9796, standard deviation 0.85366) and involves the stakeholders in strategic plan evaluation process (mean 2.9184, standard deviation 0.95387).

This implies that the organization is average on making vital adjustments to the strategic plan during evaluation, setting a monitoring and evaluation system, running monitoring and evaluation concurrently with the implementation of the plan, using management interaction with customers to evaluate the plan and involving the stakeholders in strategic plan evaluation process.

**Service Delivery**

The dependent variable in the study was service delivery. This was tested by section C of the questionnaire and given in table 4.4 below

Table 4.4 above shows that the respondents agreed that the employees serve diligently (mean 3.7143, standard deviation 0.73598), have team work (mean 3.6735, standard deviation 0.98716), are security conscious (mean 3.5918, standard deviation 0.83960), maintain high professionalism (mean 3.5918, standard deviation 0.99830), are understanding (mean 3.5714, standard deviation 0.76376), handle explosive situation calmly (mean 3.5714, standard deviation 0.81650), serve with justice and fairness (mean 3.5510, standard deviation 1.01141), maintain decorum and etiquette at all times (mean 3.5510, standard deviation 0.79218), Serve with the needed speed (mean 3.5102, standard deviation 0.89262) and are sensitive to citizens requirements (mean 3.5102, standard deviation 1.04328).
However, the table also shows that the respondents were neutral on whether the employees serve with a human face (mean 3.4694, standard deviation 0.91520), are firm and fair (mean 3.3878, standard deviation 0.90867), meet desired targets (mean 3.3469, standard deviation 1.01141) and respond adequately to challenges faced by residents (mean 3.2245, standard deviation 1.12297).

This implies that the employees serve diligently, have team work, are security conscious, maintain high professionalism, are understanding, handle explosive situation calmly, serve with justice and fairness, maintain decorum and etiquette at all times, Serve with the needed speed and are sensitive to citizens' requirements.

However, the study also implies that the employees somehow serve with a human face, are firm and fair, meet desired targets and respond adequately to challenges faced by residents.

**Regression Analysis**

The study was a regression analysis which involved running an analysis of the relationship between the independent variables; strategic planning, strategy implementation and strategy monitoring and evaluation against the dependent variable, service delivery. This was done and the findings given in tables 4.5 to 4.7 below

**Model summary**

The model summary gives of the total variability in the dependent variable explained by the model. This then indicates the percentage of the variability in the dependent variable explained by factors not included in the study

**Table 4.5. Model summary.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), MONITORING, PLANING, IMPLEMENT

Table 4.5 above shows that the adjusted $R^2$ is 0.409 which shows that 41% of the total variability in service delivery is explained by strategic management. This therefore implies that 59% of the variability in service delivery is explained by variables not included in this model. It also shows that there is a positive correlation of 0.508 between the dependent variables and the independent variables.

The analysis used a 2 tailed test of significance which would imply that the alternative hypothesis would be adopted if the computed t is greater than the tabulated t which is 3.12

**Table 4.6. ANOVA for performance operational as dependent variable.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6.918</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.306</td>
<td>5.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>19.896</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.814</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), MONITORING, PLANING, IMPLEMENT

b. Dependent Variable: VAR00002

Table 4.6 above shows that the p value for the model is 0.004 and this implies that the model is statistically significant as it is lower than the significance level of 0.05.

Given that ANOVA showed that the study was significant, it proceeded to analyze the coefficients of correlation also known as regression coefficients

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>4.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLANING</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMPLEMENT</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MONITORING</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: VAR00002

Table 4.7 gives the following regression equation for the relationship between the variables of the study:

$Y = 2.007 + 0.102X1 + 0.075X2 + 0.298X3$

From the equation, the study found that holding all other independent variables in the model at zero, then service delivery would be 2.007. A unit increase in planning efficiency would lead an increase service delivery by a factor of 0.102; a unit increase in strategic plan implementation efficiency would lead to an increase in service delivery by a factor of 0.075 and a unit increase in strategic plan monitoring and evaluation would lead to an increase in service delivery by a factor of 0.298.

This therefore implies that there is a positive relationship between strategic planning, strategic plan implementation and strategy monitoring and evaluation with service delivery.

**Discussion**

The study thus found out that the surveillance department has strong strategic planning as seen in the formulation of good objectives, setting achievable objectives, and matching strategic needs with strategic goals. This is in agreement with the study by Awino & Mutua, (2014) most organizations in Kenya and more specifically state corporations have very good and effective strategic plans. Njoroge et al (2015) however argues that the strategic planning process among the state corporations is not yet seamless and there are always a number of shortfalls. This is clearly seen in the findings of the study where there are weaknesses seen in internal analysis, inclusion of all stakeholders in the formulation of strategic plan, inclusion of
all stakeholders in strategic planning and conducting of helpful external analysis. Mugambi (2013) specifically points at exaggeration of strengths and playing down of weaknesses as well as a null comprehensive external analysis as the major shortcomings of the strategic planning process among these institutions. Machuki et al., (2012). Also shows that the most prominent weakness in the strategic plan is the fact that these organizations do not include all stakeholders in the process by having it mostly done by the senior management and consultants.

Previous studies also show that as much as strategic planning is strong, the implementation is very weak (Adeyoyin, 2005, Okanya, 2008 and Semnar, 2012) and often disjointed form the plan. (Kinywa, 2009, Awuondo & Abdikadir, 2013, and Kihara, 2013). This is reflected in the study showing that the organization is average on implementation of strategic plan, sensitization of the staff members on the strategic plan, facilitation of the members to be able to meet the strategic objectives, management structure and commitment of all stakeholders towards the realization of the strategic objectives.

The biggest challenge in the process is however more on monitoring and evaluation rather than planning and implementation. This is advanced by Massod, (2010) and Reynolds et al (2010). This is reflected in the finding on the challenges in making vital adjustments to the strategic plan during evaluation, setting a monitoring and evaluation system, running monitoring and evaluation concurrently with the implementation of the plan, using management interaction with customers to evaluate the plan and involving the stakeholders in strategic plan evaluation process.

The findings on service delivery shows that employees serve diligently, have team work, are security conscious, maintain high professionalism, are understanding, handle explosive situation calmly, serve with justice and fairness, maintain decorum and etiquette at all times, Serve with the needed speed and are sensitive to citizens’ requirements. It however also shows that the employees somehow serve with a human face, are firm and fair, meet desired targets and respond adequately to challenges faced by residents. This is contrary to the previous findings that showed that service delivery in departments of state corporations is always below par (Okanya 2008, Kinyua 2009 and Maranga (2012). It is however closer to the findings by Awino and Mutua (2014) who show improvement in service delivery in state corporations after the adoption of strategic management and performance appraisal systems which brought more accountability on the employees.

The study determined that strategic management accounts for 41% of service delivery therefore other factors not included in the study accounted for 59% of service delivery. This is a very high variability given that the other factors are unlimited ranging from employee satisfaction, working environment, customer tastes and preferences, political environment among many others. This makes strategic management the biggest contributor to service delivery. This can be implied with other studies showing on the job training accounting for 14% of service delivery (Sotia, 2005) and organizational structure accounting for 6% of service delivery (Mungala 2014).

It also shows a positive correlation between strategic management and service delivery to imply that improved effectiveness of strategic management would lead to better service delivery a deeper analysis of this shows that eh highest relationship between service delivery is on monitoring and evaluation followed by strategic planning and finally strategic planning.

Conclusion

The study thus found out that successful strategic management exercise leads to improved service delivery this however has challenges especially when it comes to strategy implementation and strategic monitoring and evaluation which are still not effectively done. There is thus need to continue improving the effectiveness of strategic management in order to reach the most anticipated optimal service delivery in the surveillance department as well as other departments of state corporations.

Recommendations

Recommendations for theory and practice

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations are made

There should be more effort put at strategy monitoring and evaluation as it has the highest relationship with service delivery yet it is the weakest of the strategic management variables. The concerned parties should thus device ways of strengthening monitoring and evaluation and more specifically to ensure monitoring and evaluation is concurrent with implementation and that needed adjustments to the original plan are made at this time for more effective strategies to be implemented.

The study also recommends there to be a stronger implementation process with more stakeholders involved in the implementation as opposed to the current state of affairs where it is the management primarily in charge of the implementation. There should also be a relationship between the people involved in planning and the ones involved in implementation to eliminate the current disconnect between the two.

Finally, the study recommends that there should be more attention to the weak areas in the planning process and more specifically the internal analysis and external analysis to be more objectives rather than exaggeration of strengths. There should also be more stakeholders involved in the process and more specifically the junior employees and customers as opposed to the current system where it is senior management oriented exercise.

Recommendations for further study

The following areas have also been recommended for further studies.

The study recommends for a qualitative analysis to explore all factors that contribute to effective service delivery given that strategic management accounts for 41% of this. All the factors that contribute the remaining 59% should be identified and listed such that all of them can be incorporated to have 100% effective service delivery.

A study should also be conducted on the challenges facing monitoring and evaluation of strategic plan implementation. This is because the study has shown that it is the weakest and a deeper understanding of the underlying challenges behind this will enable the improvement of monitoring and evaluation.

Finally, the study recommends for a longitudinal study to trace the improvement of service delivery in relation to the increased application of strategic management among the state corporations. This is because the study has revealed that there is an improvement in service delivery. This is however not conclusive if not supported by an event study as this need
specific methodologies rather than the regression analysis as used in the current study.
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