European Journal of Business and Management
ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online)
Vol.6, No.39, 2014

Assessment of Participatory Management in Strategy Implementation: Case of Mabati Rolling Mills Company Limited, Mombasa

Stephen Ogonda Juma
Ph. D candidate, School of Business at Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture & Technology.

Abstract
Most studies on reasons for good and poor performance in companies in Kenya and the world over have been done and findings and recommendations made whose adoption have not aided in enhancement of the profit margins of the said companies. Most of the recommendations have been focusing on methods like retrenchment, diversification and concentration strategies which have not been effective in improving the companies' performance as envisaged in their strategic plans. These studies have failed to consider the management styles whose adoption could lead to improved output by all employees. This study looked into the detailed relationship between participatory management and employee commitment towards strategy implementation with an aim of resolving the question that "Does participatory management payoff in terms of employee performance in strategy implementation?" Research results in this area clarified the relationship. This, it achieved through an analytic study of the employee participation in management as well as the level of strategy implementation at the company. The study used cross sectional descriptive involving systematic collection and presentation of data to give a clear picture of the situation with participative management as the independent variable and strategy implementation as the dependent variable. The design was preferred because it allowed deep analysis of the units under study. Data was collected at two levels namely; management staff and junior staff levels in MRM. Data was analyzed using SPSS version 21 to determine the relationship between the two main variable namely extent of participatory management and performance. The study established a positive and significant relationship between employee participation in management and strategy implementation and formulation at the company. This implies that, the more satisfying the employee involvement in the management of the affairs of the company the greater the extent of strategy implementation in a company. Overall, employee participation in management influences significantly strategy formulation and implementation at MRM. It would be of interest to consider how the company involves other stakeholders such as suppliers in its strategic plans' formulation and implementation as well as find out the effect of the risk of not involving employees in the management process with an aim of assessing the costs and benefits of implementing stakeholder focused strategic plans for the company.

Key Words: Participatory Management, Strategy Implementation, Mabati Rolling Mills Company Limited, Mombasa**.**

1.0 Background Information

One of the significant concepts in contemporary management is participatory management, its origin of which is traced by most writers in the academic literature to post World War II by writings of such scholars as Kurt Lewin, Douglas McGregory, H. Igor Ansoff and Michael Porter (Kauffman, 2001). A number of management scholars have also written more on the history of participatory management such as Carroll and Schorler (1983) who said that participatory management can be traced to the early 1960s, the writings of behavioral scientist such as Douglas McGregory and Rensis Likert. It is opined that the writings of Kurt Lewin, inspired the concept of participative management (Cotton, 1994).

Started after world war 11 in the United States, European Countries like Britain, France, Italy and later to modern African economies like South Africa. The practice was necessitated by the need to improve productivity in the developing and developed World. Companies in Kenya such as MRM which have embraced this leadership style have seen a greater growth in their profitability over the years.

Another research explained the origin of participatory management as the idea of industrial democracy stated by Rockefeller, gained currency in the late 1910s and translated to idiom of participatory management (Kauffman, 2001). "Participative management should be looked at as an evolution of the organization that will ultimately lead to achievement of corporate objectives" (Yohe, 2003). Undoubtedly today in order for an organization to be successful, it should take care of its employees as important assets and keep them satisfied. Employee participation is a complex management tool which can be effective in improving performance, productivity and job satisfaction when applied properly (Nykodym *et al*, 2008). The one intent of participation is developing cooperative and strong workforce. It can be interpreted in three distinct ways. First it can be seen as industrial democracy, second it may represent that subordinate employee involved more in one or more aspects of the organizational decision making and third, it may show a specific evolutionary development to promote greater employee influence within the organization (Salamon, 1992 and Huang, 1997).

1.1 Dimension of participative management

According to Somech, 2002, participatory management consists of several dependent dimensions. He went on to outline the following challenges to effective participatory management; - Organizational bureaucracy; a culture that doesn't include participative management as a norm or value; increase in workload and stress; lack of knowledge and skills by subordinates; lack of incentives for participation; fear of making incorrect decisions; conflicting managerial priorities and poor or lack of communication. Participative management in Kenya has been practiced by both private and public organizations like NBK, KCB as it was noted that to devolve decision making to staff level creates harmony with managers and motivates employees to work with minimum supervision as well as promotes a balance between employees' private life and work environment. Analysis of extent of participative management as a tool of strategy implementation involves a critical study of the relationship that exists between the two variables namely participative management as the independent variable and performance as the dependent variable. The influence of strategy implementation in the company under study on the participation of employees and performance was critically evaluated and achieved the study objective.

Most studies and recommendations made by various scholars in improvement of organizational performance have been based on treatment of the business environment, both internal and external, as the key factors towards achievement or non-achievement of set objectives. Such analyses have resulted in continued inability of the organizations to achieve the said targets. Questions have been raised as to what could be the real cause of this unsatisfactory performance in some of the big companies in Kenya and the world over. This research paper delves into unearthing the role of participatory management in performance enhancement through employees. It is not easy to pinpoint the problems causing this failure over the years. A paradox therefore exists in that, increases in usage of different strategies like expansion/growth and retrenchment have not aided the growth of performance in many business organizations. An in-depth analysis of organizational system like participatory management needs to be carried out to determine the actual cause of this dismal performance.

It appears that participatory management may lead to high employee performance as it does seem eminent that employees actively involved in the decision making process namely strategy formulation, participate positively in its implementation resulting in enhanced performance. However, many studies have been carried out seeking to establish a positive and unmistakable correlation between participatory management and performance with nothing being proven. The unfortunate consequence of this lack of that cause and effect relationship as Dogan (2009) notes is that "when management discovers there is no one –to – one correlation between participatory management and performance interest usually wanes. This research basically aims at resolving the question "Does the participatory management approach to management pay off in terms of employee performance?" Research results in this area would clarify the relationship. A big gap exists between the potential and momentum levels of many organizations all over the world. This research looks into this isolated contributory factor which to researcher's opinion has been ignored though could be the factor which plays pivotal role in performance enhancement.

1.3 **Problem Statement**

Participation as a management style was suggested in the classical Hawthome experiments of the 1930s. The experiments reposts that when small groups of workers feel their work environment is supportive, gain more satisfaction and work better (Crane, 1979). Participatory management results in higher company revenue, job satisfaction, a sense of belonging, achievement of company targets and creation of a harmonious working environment due to effective team work. However at MRM, the extent to which the mentioned results are influenced by participatory management has not exactly been determined. This is despite MRM having embraced a participative management style in its operations. The main idea behind adopting this management style is to create values and bring sense of belongingness in employees through ideas, suggestions and complaints. The whole procedure is backed by a strong and comprehensive reward policy that encourages employees to perform better each time.

The problem at hand was to establish the extent of participatory management in successful strategy implementation and more so how it influences performance at the company. This study was therefore specifically geared towards identifying and analyzing the extent to which employees are involved in the strategy implementation and further, to fill the gaps identified.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 *Employee Participation in Management and Strategy implementation*

As changes in the economy and in business organizations continue to transpire, it is continually becoming imperative for managers in various firms to continuously enhance their strategic decision making skills, Decision making is one of the many skills managers and leaders employ on daily basis regardless of their management style. However, it is common knowledge that decision making strategy varies from one manager to another depending on the management style employed by the particular managers. A manager who predominantly employs a directive management style is likely to destroy the improvement of his /her subordinates in strategic decision making than a manager who predominantly employs a participatory management style (Northern, 2008). Directive management style is characterized as a management style where the leaders instruct their subordinates on what is to be done, how it is to be done and when it is to be done. A directive leader clearly makes decisions, set standards of performance and make them clear to the subordinate. The major political benefit of directive management style includes its ability to get the job done (Merrill, 2008). In contrast, participatory management is characterized as a management style where leaders invite subordinates to share in the decision making. A participatory manager confers with subordinates and integrates their suggestions, ideas and opinions into the decision making process. Some of the potential benefits of participative management include its positive impact on employees' motivation. Its ability to get job done and its likelihood to increase quality decision making.

Decision making has been an area of study with a variety of perspectives. Earlier studies indicate decision making process tactics can be categorized into three primary types and are identified as analysis, judgment and participative tactics. Harrington and Ottenbacher (2009) considered how managers in various firms make significant organizational decisions and how this process is impacted on by contextual features. The study found direct and interacting relationships among several contextual features with decision making tactics. Key contextual features included decision urgency, risk level, complexity dynamism level of the decision maker and internal or external support. It points to the importance of a participative approach to decision proven success which included manufacturing and other high contact service business sectors.

Despite some of the advantages of participatory management style, the breadth and depth of organization member's participation in the strategic process varies from one organization to another. Breadth of involvement relates to the opportunity to gain knowledge from business units, departments, projects, teams and stakeholders of the organization (Forbes and Milkin, 1999). Depth of involvement relates to involvement through organizational hierarchy. Past studies on the relationship between the breadth of involvement and implementation success is not clear and can be described as mixed. Thus further industry research is required in this regard to examine the relationship breadth of involvement and implementation success in various industries.

Based on a synthesis of research in the strategic management and innovation area, Harrington and Ottenbacher (2008) provided a matrix defining categories that influence distribution types during strategic decision making process. These types are defined by the level of depth and breadth of involvement within and across the organization. These two collective processes have been suggested as ways for teams to utilize more heterogeneity in their background under the assumption that the team will make better strategic decisions. The basic idea is that diversity in specific knowledge will provide more information, a better understanding of the situation and more alternatives. The possible downside of this more collective approach is that if not properly managed, teams have more dissention and in some cases can be unable to reach consensus.

Several studies in various firms have indicated a relationship between higher level of involvement of organizational members and higher firm success. However, these studies were based on case, qualitative approaches, small sample sizes or conceptual features that need further studies for a better substantiation. This study draws from the previous research but employs a quantitative research method and a larger sample size to examine the relationship between participative management style, organizational structures as it relates to degree of participation and strategy implementation success. Strategic management is the art of and science of formulating, implementing and evaluating cross-functional decisions that enable an organization to achieve its objectives. Its main focus is the integration of management functions so that all organizational efforts are geared towards achievement of the common organizational goals and objectives. It is therefore imperative that for successful strategy implementation all sections of the organization should work as a team. This requires management efforts to ensure that employees at all levels are involved from the formulation to the implementation of the strategic plans. Participatory approach is therefore deemed to be mandatory in the achievement of this objective.

2.2 Employee participation in management

The business world is entering a new frontier composed of rapid unpredictable change and substantial uncertainty that are transforming the nature of competition. Success in the business world today requires new managerial mindsets that emphasize global markets, strategy flexibility, and the ability to tolerate and harness change (Wren, 2008). Furthermore, the time frames of all strategic actions are significantly being reduced (Wren, 2008). This new business requires new forms of managerial thinking and organizational structures, global mindsets, considerable strategic and structural flexibility and innovative methods for implementing strategies. A scientific reawakening will bring about the rise of new industries, change how businesses compete and possibly transform how companies are managed (Milleman et al 2000).

Business leaders know that plans made in the past are unlikely to be implemented unchanged (Bozeman and Straussman, 1980). Business strategy has entered the aptly named market driven era because of its central focus on market as the basis for strategy design and implementation (Cravens, Greenly, Piercy, Slater, 1994). In order to cope with these dynamic changes for the strategic management field, more research is needed in this field (Okumus, 2007). This study had three research objectives; (1) to identify where possible, effective or ineffective leadership behaviors encountered by senior-level leaders who worked exclusively in the Nevada Casino industry and had to implement their strategic plans, (2) to determine what involvement senior-level leadership had with achieving the company's financial and /or strategic performance targets; and (3) to determine what senior-level leadership changes should possibly be needed to further assure that the performance targets set by the company are in fact met. In this study, implementation is operationally defined as those senior-level leadership behaviors and activities that will transform a working plan into a concrete reality.

In1991 a previous survey of 93 fortune 500 united states firms revealed that over half of the corporations experienced the following 10 problems, listed in order of frequency when they attempted to implement from a leadership behavior perspective, a strategic change (Alexander, 1991). These were: - implementation took more time than originally planned; unanticipated major problems arose; activities were ineffectively coordinated; competing activities and crises took attention away from implementation; the involved employees had insufficient capabilities to perform their jobs; lower level employees were inadequately trained; uncontrollable external environmental factors created problems; departmental managers provided inadequate leadership and direction; key implementation tasks and activities were poorly defined and the information system inadequately monitored activities.

According to Richard A. Cosier, Dean of Purdue University, Krannert graduate school of management, there are five behavioral factors that lead to failed leadership; (a) Poor change management, (b) Greed, (c) Lack of focus, (d) Failure to listen, and (e) Bad luck. It is also alleged that up to 70% of the strategic initiatives fail (Higgs and Rowland 2005). They fail because senior level leaders do not make realistic assessment of whether or not the organization can execute the plan (Bossidy and Charan, 2002). Since such a high percentage of business strategies fail, the rationale of this study was to understand the competencies of implementing a strategy among senior-level leaders. Guffy (1992) investigated at least part of the demographic impact on communication and the most effective level of management perceived by employees in terms of communication. The findings of Guffs research also support the Mathieu and Zajac (1990) suggestion that effective leadership communication and organization commitment are correlated. Rappert et al (2000) stated that communication and shared understandings play a principal role in the implementation process.

Howel (2005) on effective leadership behavior in which 38 organizations were studied, concluded that effective champions are distinguished by three behaviors; (a) conveying confidence and enthusiasm about the innovation (b) enlisting the support of and involvement of stakeholders and (c) persisting in the face of adversity. Finally in a survey conducted in association with Robert Kaplan of the Harvard Business and Business intelligence, (Rousseau and Rousseau, 1999) more than 40% of senior managers and more than 90% of all employees stated that they did not believe they had a clear understanding of their company's strategy. Therefore it is imperative that successful strategy implementation is determined by the logical decisions and actions of all employees at all levels of the organization and not just by the people who originally defined the strategy.

2.3 Employee participation in management and strategy implementation

This study builds on previous studies with hypothesis focused on the level of involvement of each organizational level. In this study, the researcher hypothesizes that organizational structures will require greater levels of involvement at all organizational levels for effective strategy implementation. Past studies have indicated a relationship between the likelihood of organizational performance and the level of involvement (Ashmos et al 2002 and Harrington, 2005). However, due to discrepancies and inconsistencies in their measurement of the level of involvement, further industrial studies with a complete measurement of hierarchical involvement cannot be determined. Early studies have indicated that comparative relationships and interactions such as those in this study are relatively unaffected by mono methods of bias distortions (Dooley and Fry Xell, 1999 and Kerlinger, 1986). Degree of participation was measured by averaging the level of involvement for each organizational level in strategy implementation and execution of decisions and descriptive statistics used to assess the profile of the respondents. While earlier studies have suggested that managers prefer to use low involvement methods in action plan implementation (e.g. Nut 1989), this study also supported the notion that greater levels of involvement by a variety of management levels was related to greater strategy implementation success.

3.0 Methodology

Research design is the blueprint for the collection, measurement and analysis of data (Cooper and Schindler, 2006). This study used descriptive research design. Primary data was collected using questionnaires and analyzed quantitatively. The study utilized descriptive design specifically the descriptive comparative where demographic characteristics of the respondents were gathered and descriptive correlation strategies used to validate extent of employee involvement and strategy implementation in MRM Company Limited in Mombasa Kenya. The target population in the study was the employees of MRM Company Limited in Mombasa Kenya with population of 14 management staff and 560 employees of the company. It is from these that all departments were selected and employees sampled from each. Two types of sampling techniques were used for this study i.e. purposive sampling- used to select one MRM departmental head or his/her assistant and simple random sampling used to select eight employees from each of the seven departments selected in the study. **The entire population sample was 63 which represented 11% of the entire population; which the sample size chosen fell within the parameter set by Gongera and Shiundu(2013).** The data analyzed was quantification of Likert scale categories and was done by assigning numerical values to the various categories in order to facilitate statistical representation of data.

4.0 Findings and Discussions

4.1 Extent of employee participation in Management at MRM

After successfully establishing the socio demographic characteristics of the sampled employees, the study tested the statements meant to evaluate and provide further insight on the employee involvement in the management of the affairs of the company. These were tested on a 5 point likert scale aimed at establishing the degree of approval or lack of it with respect to essential elements of involvement of employee in the company's affairs. The study established when it was inquired of the employees sampled in the study that 82.2% of the employees agreed that there were regular meetings assigned to plan for departmental activities. Of these, there was a 62.2% strong case of agreement among the employees and a slight agreement by 27.0% of the employees. The remaining employees sampled in the study were not sure whether or not there departments held regular meetings to plan for activities. As to free interaction among the employees and supervisors, 64.8% (strongly agree-45.9%, agree-21.6%) confirmed that they interacted freely with the supervisors and other colleagues with 21.6% of the employees being unsure as to the level of interaction in the company. Of all the employees under study, 13.5% (disagree-10.8%, strongly disagree-2.7%) mentioned that there was no interaction between supervisors and employees and that the supervisors were widely in accessible.

Further, 67.5% (strongly agree-45.9%, agree-21.6%) of the employees confirmed that the issues raised concerning them as employees were given priority in the company planning process. Of them all, 29.7% of the employees were not aware whether or not their issues as raised were prioritized at the company planning process while 2.7% of the employees interviewed felt that the company did nothing or little to champion their interests in company planning process.

Other than through meetings, it was confirmed by 46.9% (strongly agree-29.7%, agree-16.2%) of the employees that administrators consulted employees in critical decisions in the company. A substantive 43.2% of the employees could not tell whether or not the administrators involved the employees in critical decisions affecting the company. However, 10.8% of the employees interviewed were sure that the administrators in their company did not involve them in critical decisions affecting the company.

When asked whether or not they were ready and willing to implement the decisions by the management, 81.0% (strongly agree-40.5%, agree-40.5%) of the employees were ready and willing, 16.2% were unsure while 2.7% of the employees interviewed were not ready and willing to implement management decisions mentioning the oppressive nature of such decisions as the main reason.

Finally, while assessing the willingness to deliver results and commitment to the ideals of the company, it was established that 56.7% of the employees interviewed regularly met assignment deadlines even when time accorded was not enough. Here, 27.0% of the employees could not give a definite response as to whether or not they delivered on their assignments even with scarcity of resources though 16.2 of the employees were sure not to deliver anything on time if the resources such as time were in adequate. This is shown in table 1 below

Table1. Employee participation in Management at MRM

Questions/Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
There are regular meetings assigned to plan for this department.	62.2% (23)	27.0% (10)	10.8% (4)	-	-
Employees interact freely as colleagues with their supervisors.	27.0 (10)	37.8 (14)	21.6 (8)	10.8 (4)	2.7 (1)
The issues raised concerning employees are given priority in the company planning process.	45.9 (17)	21.6 (8)	29.7 (11)	2.7 (1)	-
Other than through the meetings, administrators consult their employees in critical decisions in the company.	29.7 (11)	16.2 (6)	43.2 (16)	10.8 (4)	-
Employees are willing to implement management decisions.	40.5 (15)	40.5 (15)	16.2 (6)	2.7 (1)	-
Employees regularly meet assignment deadlines even when time accorded is not enough.	32.4 (12)	24.3 (9)	27.0 (10)	16.2 (6)	-

4.2 Extent of strategy implementation at MRM

To further study the extent to which strategies formulated are implemented in the company, several statement administered at 5 point likert scale were administered to the employees upon which rates of approval of each was to be determined. It was established that 8.8% of the employees interviewed at MRM, employees were regularly delegated their duties in each department according to formulated plans. There was a strong rate of approval (58.8%) compared to just normal approval (32.8%) from the employees interviewed.
Still on the matter of extent of implementation of strategies in the company, the study revealed that 64.8% of the employees interviewed confirmed (strongly agree - 32.4%, agree - 32.4%) that whenever duties were delegated in the company, necessary resources are provided or allocated towards their completion. On the contrary, 14.5% of the employees did not agree (disagree – 11.8%, strongly disagree – 2.7%) that the company provided resources for accomplishing set tasks. 23.5% of the employees were not sure whether or not resources were provided for the accomplishment of tasks set out or delegated to the employees.

Also established from 67.6% (strongly agree – 50%, agree – 17.6%) of the employees was the fact that during delegated assignments, the employees of the company had power to take certain decisions. Only 2.9% of the employees interviewed felt that the company did not empower them to take certain decisions with 29.4% of all the employees interviewed were not sure whether or not they were capable of making decision in the light of duties delegated to them.
At MRM as was established from 88.2% of the employees interviewed in this study (strongly agree – 38.2%, agree – 47.1%), employees are always expected to give written reports to the management in respect of the duties delegated to them. Of those interviewed, 11.8% were not aware of the existence of such a policy in the company and as such, did not give written reports of any duties that were assigned to them. It was further established from 70.6% of the employees interviewed in this study (strongly agree – 41.2%, agree – 29.4%) that the company expected supervisors to still oversee the implementation of the duties assigned to the other company employees. The other proportion of employees – 29.4%, were however not aware that the company had such an expectation on the part of its employees.
In addition to the above findings, the study also established that employees at the company shared and exchanged information freely with their colleagues as well as supervisors on a daily basis as a company policy as was attested to by 81.0% of the interviewed employees of the company, a situation that saw 40.5% strong and passive approval from among the employees. 2.7% did not agree that such a state of the affair while 16.7% of the employees were not sure whether or not that was the state of affairs as exchange of information between employees and their supervisors or those at the management level of the company was concerned.

Finally, it was reliably established from 56.7% of the employees interviewed that the managers of the company were accessible and their offices open to junior employees during the office hours. It was the opinion of 16.2% of the employees interviewed that it was not true that the manager's offices were open to employees during the office hours. This also saw 27.0% of the employees interviewed saying they were unable to tell whether or not manager's offices were accessible to other employees especially the junior ones in the company.

4.3 Extent of strategy implementation at MRM

Table2. Extent of strategy implementation at MRM

Questions/Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Employees are regularly delegated their duties in this department.	58.8% (20)	32.4% (11)	8.8% (3)	-	-
Whenever delegated duties, resources necessary to accomplish the assignments are allocate.	32.4 (11)	32.4 (11)	23.5 (8)	11.8 (4)	2.7 (1)
During delegated assignments, the employees have power to take certain decisions.	52.0 (17)	18.5 (8)	29.4 (10)	-	-
Employees always give written reports to the management in duties delegated to them.	38.2 (13)	47.1 (16)	11.8 (4)	2.9 (1)	-
While an employee is assigned duties, the supervisor still oversees the implementation of their duties.	35.3 (12)	23.5 (8)	29.4 (10)	11.8 (4)	-
Employee share and exchange information freely with co-workers and supervisors.	40.5 (15)	40.5 (15)	16.2 (6)	2.7 (1)	-
Managers' offices are open to employees during office hours.	32.4 (12)	24.3 (9)	27.0 (10)	16.2 (6)	-

The above findings established that the employees of MRM are regularly delegated their duties in each department according to formulated plans as attested to by majority of the employees in the company and in the instances that it happens, necessary resources are provided or allocated towards the completion of set out tasks while in instances when this was not the case very little or no resources are set aside for the completion of the tasks as set out in the strategic plan of the company. It was further determined that during delegated assignments, the employees of the company had power to take certain decisions. A scenario that was refuted by less than 3% of the employees of the company and not reliably responded to by 29.4% of all the employees. Also clear was the fact that the company expected its employees to always give written reports to the management in respect of the duties delegated to them as was confirmed from around at most 9 in every 10 employees of the company. The other employees did realize that such an expectation existed in the company. Moreover, the company expected supervisors to still oversee the implementation of the duties assigned to the other company employees and while at it encourage information sharing among colleagues on a daily basis as a company policy. And finally, it was reliably established that the managers of the company were accessible and their offices open to junior employees during the office hours and even to some extent, beyond scheduled work hours.

4.4 Strategy formulation and Implementation

Testing for correlation between sustainability, the study revealed weak and significant positive correlation between employee involvement in strategy implementation and formulation in the company and frequency of strategy planning meetings (r=0.549, ρ>0.05), prioritization of employee interests in the planning process of the organization (r=0.360, ρ>0.05), critical decision making (r=0.409, ρ>0.05), readiness and willingness of the employee of the company to partner in the implementation of the management policy decisions (r=0.249, ρ>0.05) and the general capacity building program for the implementation of management policy decisions (r=0.649, ρ>0.05). The positive correlation implying that the more satisfying the employee involvement in the management of the affairs of the company was, the more likely it was to find the more strategic planning meetings in the company, more prioritization of employees' issues in the planning process of the organization, more involvement of staff in critical decisions affecting the organization, readiness and willingness of the employees in the company partner and implement management policy decisions in the company.
The study did establish a strong positive correlation r=0.992 between employee participation in management and the strategy formulation and implementation at MRM. This relationship was significant at ρ<0.05. This is shown in table 3 below.

Table3 Correlations between employee participation in management and strategy implementation at MRM

		Employee participation in management	Strategy formulation and implementation
Employee participation in management	Pearson Correlation	1	.992(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0
	N	6	6
Strategy formulation and implementation	Pearson Correlation	.992(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	
	N	6	6

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

5.1.2 Extent of employee participation in Management at MRM

Strong evidence exists to confirm that MRM in its management approach involves its employees through regular meetings assigned to plan for departmental activities where opportunities also arise for employees to interact freely with their supervisors. The company always ensures that priority is given to issues raised by the employees at the planning process of its strategies. This makes the employees feel involved in the affairs of the company. This is further experienced by the employees who feel that the company engages them in critical decisions that affect the `running of the company. This makes most of the employees have the willingness to implement the decisions made by the management. Finally, there is commitment on the part of employees in delivering quality results especially due to the fact that majority of the employees are also committed to the ideals of the company and hence regularly meet assignments deadlines even when the resources such as time are limited.

5.0 Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Extent of strategy implementation at MRM

MRM regularly delegate duties in each department according to formulated plans as attested to by majority of the employees in the company. This happens even necessary resources are not provided or allocated towards the completion of set out tasks due to scarcity of such resources. Furthermore, the company empowers its staff to make certain critical decision in fulfilling the expectations of the tasks delegated to them. Also clear is the fact that the company expects its employees to always give written reports to the management in respect of their duties. Moreover, the company expects supervisors to still oversee the process of implementation of the duties assigned to the other company employees and while at it encourage information sharing among colleagues on a daily basis as a company policy. Finally, the employees of the company feel that managers of the company are very accessible and their offices open to junior employees during the office hours and even to some extent, beyond scheduled work hours.

5.2 Employee participation and level of strategy implementation

The company also has a sustainable general capacity building program aimed at enhancing employee participation in the management of the company affairs as well as sustainable employee retention program that by and large give assurance to the employees that their jobs are secure. It is this form of job security that has motivated most of the employees to be more accountable with respect to the responsibilities and decisions prescribed in the job descriptions. This company has in place an employee reward scheme that reward its employees based on the quality of their individual performances.

5.2.0 Conclusion

Though weak, a positive and significant relationship does exist between employee involvement in strategy implementation and formulation in the company and frequency of strategy planning meetings, prioritization of employee interests in the planning process of the organization, critical decision making, readiness and willingness of the employee of the company to partner in the implementation of the management policy decisions and the general capacity building program for the implementation of management policy decisions. This implying that the more satisfying the employee involvement in the management of the affairs of the company was, the more likely it was to find the more strategic planning meetings in the company, more prioritization of employees' issues in the planning process of the organization, more involvement of staff in critical decisions affecting the organization, readiness and willingness of the employees in the company partner and implement management policy decisions in the company. Overally, employee participation in management influences significantly strategy formulation and implementation at MRM.

5.3 Recommendations

The main focus of this study was assessing the employee participation strategy in the management on the implementation of the company strategy. It would be of interest to investigate the effects of this situation on the overall performance of the company. It will also be important to consider how the company involves other stakeholders such as suppliers in its strategic plans' formulation and implementation. Finally, a study on the effect of the risk of not involving employees in the management process with an aim of implementing company strategies would provide valuable information towards assessing the costs and benefits of implementing stakeholder focused strategic plans for the company.

References

Anderson, D.J (2008). *Essentials of Management Science Application to decision*. St. Paul, Minn; West Publishing Co.
Bryson, J. M. (2009). *Strategic Planning For Public and Non Profit Organizations.* New York: Jossey Bas
Chakravarthy, B. (1999). *Measuring Strategic Performance.* Strategic Management Journal, 7(5), 437-458
Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2003) *Business Research Methods*, 8th ed. McGraw-Hill
Douglas McGregor (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York; McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc.
Dyson. R.G. and Foster. M.J. (2002). *The relationship of participation and effectiveness in strategic planning.* Strategic Management Journal. 3: 77-88
Ebert. R. (1999). *Organizational Decisions, Concepts and Analysis*. New York: Crane, Russak, and Company.
Freeman, E.B, Robinson, R.B. and Pearce, J.A. (2008). *Planning Effectiveness: An empirical investigation of the consequences of formal strategic planning. Proceedings.* Southern Management Association, 344-346.
Hamal. G and Prahalal C. K (2009) *Strategic Intent: The General Management and Strategy.* Harvard Business Review. May – June pg 63-76.
Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of Management.* New York; McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
Merrill, H. (2008) ed. *Classics in management.* New York: American Management Association.
Mintzberg, H. (2006). *The structuring of Organisations.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J; Prentice-Hall Inc.
Porter. M.E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors.* Revised version. (2008). New York: The Free Press.
Shrader. C.B, Taylor. L and Darton. D.R (1999). *Strategic Planning and Organizational Performance: A critical appraisal journal of management studies.* 10: 149-171
Tabs. J. (2010) *Strategic Management Practices, A Kenyan Perspective.* Lelax Global (K) Ltd, Nairobi.
Wren. D. (2008). *Evolution of management*. New York: Ronald Press (revised edition).