International Journal of Business & Law Research 9(2):97-105, April-June, 2021

© SEAHI PUBLICATIONS, 2021 **www.seahipaj.org** **ISSN: 2360-8986**

Business Strategies and Their Respective Organizational Structures in the Nigerian Business Organizations

[1]Samuel, Ajiri Peter & [2]Lucent-Iwhiwhu, Helen E. O. (Mrs)

Department of Business Administration and Management
Delta State Polytechnic, Ozoro, Delta State, Nigeria
[1]samuelajiri@gmail.com; [2]heliner2001@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT
This theoretical paper is on business strategies and their respective organizational structures in the Nigerian business organization. The aim is to identify the relationship or connection between strategy and structure. It also advocates the resultant effect in terms of organizational performance judging from the relationship between them. In this review, it is clear that "structure follows strategy" it is hereby found out, that a high performance is bound to be experienced with an appropriate match and relationship between structure and strategy. It is hereby concluded in this paper that structure and strategy are in close relationship. It is therefore the recommendation of this paper that top management should be very concerned with the drafting of strategy, implementation and evaluation to see that structure, strategy and environmental factors are in alignment.
Keywords: Strategy, Structure, Organization, Performance, Business

1.1. INTRODUCTION

General Managers of organizations on behalf of the owners embark on strategic management by taking initiative to put the organization on a better footing. Strategic management enhances the performance of organization's resources.

The concept of strategic management specifies the mission, vision, development of plan, policies, objectives etc., in accordance with the programme of activities. Every organization owes its sense of direction to strategic management. For any organization and its environment to be consistent, there has to be a strategic alignment.

According to Nag, Hambrick and Chen (2007), when the expectation of management is in consonance with the actions of an organization then, we can talk about strategic consistency. As observed by Chandler (1962), strategy and structure has close interaction. Further, he said, for a company structure to have direction or focus, it must have a coordinated strategy. He was emphatic as to saying structure does follow strategy in common cases. According to Nelson and Quick (2011), organization's structure gives the organization the focus to function in its environment.

2.0. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.

The understanding of structure and strategy is the beginning of a better organizational performance. In order to fit into an environment, structure must be built to match the strategy that defines the goals, mission and the aspiration of the organization.

2.1. Conceptual Review

Organizational Structure

Greenberg (2011), had observed, that organizational structure is the formal configuration between individuals and group in the allocation of the tasks, giving of responsibility, assigning authority in the organization.

Strategy

According to Markiewick (2011), strategy is a management plan of action for the conduct of business operations. It consists of the moves by managers in growing a business, attracting customers in order to have planned level of performance in organizations. According to Agwu (2018), strategy is a massive future oriented management plan to interact with the competitive environment to maximize the attainment of organizational goals. Strategy is on how to determine the essential long term goals of an organization and then, the resources are allocated in order to carry out how to achieve the company's aims and objectives.

As observed by Unam (2017), strategy is the combination of competitive activities and business approaches that a manager can use to influence customers, compete favourably, maintain successful operation and the achievement of organizational goals and objectives. According to Eden and Aekerman (1998), strategy is a coherent set of individual discrete actions in the support of a system of goals and which are supported as a portfolio by a self-sustaining critical mass or momentum of opinion in an organization.

Glueck (1976) defined strategy, as a unified comprehensive and integrative plan which is designed to assure that the basic objectives of the organization are accomplished.

Management

According to Barett (2003), management is the art of getting things done through people. By this definition, anyone who can have things done by the effort or energy exerted by others is deemed a successful manager.

Strategic Management

As observed by Sabaru (2007), strategic management deals with decisions making in regards to the purpose of the organizational mission, vision, philosophies, objectives, strategies and a well-designed policy. It also encompasses the development of long-term plans for efficient management of environmental opportunities and threats in line with the organizational strength and weaknesses.

Organization

Daft (2012), defines organization as the framework that clarifies the strategy that enables the achievement of its goals.

Structure

According to Khairiah (2017), structure is a control mechanism that can influence the work of employees. It is the structure that describes a company's characteristics internally. It is an important factor that can influence the organization's commitment as it has positive and significant effect on the operation of the organization. According to Lewis, Goodman and Fandt (2001), the structure of an organization serves as an authority and responsibility for result achievement. They further opined, that the structure of an organization can positively impact organizational performance. Structure assumes pyramidal shape and it comprises of the following:

a. Relationship based on hierarchy between the superior and their subordinates.
b. The coordination of the different tasks and activities.
c. There is formal relationship with a well defined duties and responsibilities.
d. Different persons and departments are being assigned tasks and duties, e.g. formulation of a set of policies procedures, standards and method of evaluation of performance.

Organizational Structure

As observed by Lim (2007), an organizational structure does influence organizational actions and it gives the room for creating a foundation on which standard operating procedures and every time activities lie, it defines the person charged with the processes of making decisions. In a related development, Jacobides

(2007) opined that the structure shapes the organizational activities. He further said organizational structure could be viewed as a glass through which the organization and its environment are acknowledged.

Lim (2007) had said that an organization structure may be in different forms with the organization's objectives in mind. It determines the mode by which organization operates or performs her duties. It determines how allocation of responsibilities is made to different processes in the individual department, work group, etc. Furthermore, Lim (2007) had advocated that organization's structure should be flexible, caring, innovative and efficient in services delivery so that competitive advantages can be sustained.

2.2. Theoretical Review

According to Mbraka and Mugambi (2014), the theory of strategic management is hinged on the system and contingency theories where strategy must be a process by which organizational objectives are specified as it entails the development of policies and plans by which objectives are attained or achieved. According to Lance, Butt and Michels (2006), in another development, organization is an open system that cannot be divulged from its environment. The environment determines its growth and sustenance. No matter the size of any organization, the formulation of strategy cannot be possible except a proper evaluation, estimation or analysis of both the internal and external elements are considered. They further asserted that the external environment determines the state or position of such an organization in terms of the opportunities, the threats, strength and weaknesses. In this light, there is a unified and specific interaction between organizational structure and organizational strategy.

2.3. Empirical Review

According to Oliveira and Takahashi (2012), the earliest organizational structures were considered on the basis of either the function or products. In this view, Galbraith (2009) observed, that the matrix organizational structure joined both the function and product together. According to Brickley, Smith, Willet and Zimmerman (2002), organization structure was seen in the light of the relationship between organizational structure and organizational strategy. This view was a follow up of the work of Alfred Chandler (1962) who related it to the developmental trend of American large corporations. In the study of this pioneer researcher, it was found that an organization's strategy influences its structure. He further highlighted, that strategy has an indirect relationship with different organization's variables like its tasks, technology and the organization's environment that goes ahead affecting the stability and the effectiveness of the structure.

As observed by Miles, Snow, Meyer and Coleman (2011), Social Scientist in recent times, by building on the work of Chandler had said that an organization's strategy is the basis on which its environment tasks and technology are being built. To further buttress this point, they further opined, that the combination of the above variable with the growth rate and the level of the distribution of power do influence the structure of the organization.

2.4. Types of Business Strategy

Business strategies are of various types, the types of strategies determine the structure to be built around it. The business strategy is majorly of different levels or types. The levels in the organizational hierarchy determine the type of strategy. According to Miles, Snow, Meyer and Coleman (2011), the types are: Corporate Strategy, Business Strategy and Functional Strategy.

a. Corporate Strategy: This is the highest level, where decisions in an organization are being made. It covers the entire development of business in the organization. It helps to provide a direction for the organization as to the type of business to concentrate effort on in terms of investment. In every corporate strategic plan, the major areas of considerations are:

i. The present position of the organization.

ii. The aspired position of what is to be done.

iii. The way and manner by which you want to get to the place or the particular position.

b. Business Strategy: This type of strategy concerns firms that have different business units in which the units adopt a strategy that corresponds with or that is applicable to what the units requires. Despite the diversity in strategies, the overall vision and goals of the organization is conscientiously pursued. The major challenge at this level is on how to gain a competitive advantage.

c. Functional Strategies: The Functional Strategies as the name implies, are those applied at the functional level. It entails implementation of both the corporate and business strategies. It defines the steps by which effective implementation of strategies at the higher levels are being achieved. It is about working in line with specific function. This does manifests itself in a non-quantifiable action such as the satisfaction of customers. Again, it could be in a quantified action such as the number of orders placed or delivered in a day.

2.5. Business Strategy and its Effect on Organizational Performance

Long, Perumal and Ajabge (2012), states that a clearly defined strategy of a business will have sustainable basis for creating and maintaining a competitive advantage in any organization where it is being practiced. As observed by Solomon, Hashim, Mehdi and Ajagbe (2012), no matter the state of the strategy, it is most important that such is effectively implemented in order to achieve good result. They further asserted that an effective implementation of strategy is pivotal to the ability of an organization in attaining and sustaining an advantageous position over other competitors. In their view, there is a relationship between strategy and corporate performance.

In a similar view, Oreilly, Caldwell, Chatman, Tapiz and Self (2010), had said that with a clearly defined strategy an organization will have a sustainable basis for creating and maintaining a competitive advantageous stand in its industry. Likewise, Long, Mahamra and Ajagbe (2013), had posited that an effective strategy planning and implementation does contribute positively to the performance of the organization in a holistic manner and, when the strategies have been taken to the operational level, where the workforce can execute the strategy. At this point, there is a call to align such strategy with the structure by putting into consideration the operations for a better, profitable performance. However, Kavale (2012) have pointed out, that an effective performance is by firstly, having a clear view of how the organization's strategic processes look like. He also admitted that organizational performance is a critical success factor if the strategy is to be perfectly implemented. Nonetheless, in his view, the implementation is made possible when the organization's strategic goals and objectives are linked to the operational system's budget in order for such an organization to be effective, efficient and accountable.

2.6. Types of Organizational Structures

Fried (2011), had identified the different organizational structure which are:

a. Hierarchical Organizational Structure
b. Functional Organizational Structure
c. Horizontal or Flat Organizational Structure
d. Divisional (Market-based, product-based, geographic) Structure
e. Matrix Structure
f. Team-based Structure
g. Network Organizational Structure

However, there are three main organizational structures, these are: functional structure, divisional structure and a combination of two known as matrix structure. With the advent of the digital market place, others like decentralized, team –based organizational structure have emerged.

The five key elements of organizational structure or design are departmentalization, chain of command, span of control, centralization or decentralization, work specialization and the degree of formalization. Due to the different types of organizational structures, there are also different types of organizational chart.

1. **Hierarchical organizational Structure:** This is a type of pyramidal shaped organizational chart. This the most common type of organizational structure. The chain of command goes from top to down. Its advantages amongst others are; (1) levels of authority and responsibility are well defined (2) shows who to report to (3) career paths are clear for chances of promotion (d) each employee is given a specialty.

Some of the disadvantages are: (1) due to bureaucracy innovation can be slowed down (2) there are, shared interest between departments and the whole company (3) lower level employees find it difficult to express their ideas.

2. **Horizontal of Flat Organizational Structure:** This kind of structure matches organizations that have few levels between the top management and the staff (employees). Before businesses grow to large ones, the horizontal structure constitutes the starting point. It encourages less supervision as more employees get involve. The advantages include; employees are saddled with enough responsibility, it encourages open communication, it fosters coordination and the speed of implementation. The disadvantage among others are: Since employees do not have clear supervision there is always confusion, the employees produced are not generally specialized, it becomes difficult to control once the company goes beyond the startup stage.
3. **Divisional Organizational Structure**: In this, each division controls their resources, even within a larger organization. Each division operates its sales team, IT team and marketing team. This encourages large companies. The different aspects of the divisional organizational structures are:
   a. Market-based divisional organizational structure
   b. Product-based divisional organizational structure
   c. Geographic divisional organizational structure

   Some of the benefits of the divisional organizational structure are: It maintains large companies' flexibility, its response to industrial changes or customer needs are very quick, independence, autonomy and customized approach are highly promoted. Conversely, its demerits are: Duplication of resources, communication line are usually over crowded, the company can be said to compete with itself.
4. **Matrix Organizational Structure:** This type of structure is like a grid in which project teams are in cross functional form. For example, an accountant may regularly be member of a finance department led by a finance director but also is involved in a temporary project led by a project controller. The matrix is double faceted in its operation. Its merits are: The individuals' needs are chosen by supervisors, a comprehensive overview of the project is known, initiative of the individuals is encouraged, whereas the demerits include conflicting situation between department and project managers, charges are more frequent.
5. **Team-based Organizational Structure:** This structure is in direct opposition to the traditional structure of the hierarchical nature. This structure focuses on solving problem, cooperation and giving employees more control. The prospects are: Productivity, performance and transparency is encouraged. Growth is highly promoted. It encourages lateral movement of people; experience is recognized more than seniority, less managerial involvement. Its benefits include by passing a hierarchical structure, it promotes tiger team of highly skilled, handpicked roster of experts tasked with solving high-priority problems. Tiger teams have technical and methodologically deep expertize way of handling problems.
6. **Network Organizational Structure:** This structure does not make for the running of businesses under one roof. It makes sense of the spreading of resources. The internal structure is based on open relationship and communication instead of hierarchy. Its advantages are: It covers a wide variety of customers, flexibility and agility characterizes such companies, employees are enjoined to exercise their initiative to collaborate in making decisions, workflow and processes are encouraged. The constraints are: Due to complexities of operation, there is no hierarchical arrangement, it is difficult to know who to be answerable to.

2.7. The Relationship between Strategy and its Respective Structure

According to Ajagbe, Maduenji, Oke and Olatunyi (2015), it can be said, that there is a specific and unified relationship between strategy and organizational structure. According to Mintzberg (2009), the strategy an organization adopts and the extent to which it can practice the strategy is a product of five structural parts; simple structure, machine bureaucracy, professionals bureaucracy, divisionalized form and adhocracy. The work that started by Chandler extended by Mintzberg laid the ground work to understand the connection between organizational structure and organizational strategy.

According to Lunenburg and Ornstein (2012), organizational strategy and structure are related. As observed by Johnson, Scholes and Whithington (2008), structure has two part from any of the two perspective in which you will look at it. Firstly, it could be viewed from the line of authority and the way and manner managerial offices communicate with each other. In another development, it could be referred to as the information that will flows within the channel of communication. Furthermore, it is seen that

structure goes beyond the planned network rather; it involves the happenings within the network or the processes that transpire within and also between the different parts of the channel of communication.

Again, Johnson et al., (2008) had said, that firm's strategy must run in consonance with both the immediate and remote business environment. In other words, the environmental forces do impact majorly on the entire well-being of the organization. It therefore, depends on the firm to adapt to and also adopt the demands of the changes, dynamism and the complexities of the environmental forces. It becomes a way forward in coping with changes in the organization. In a similar development, Johnson et al. have noted, that the very moment the environmental forces determine the strategy to adopt, the structure is therefore identified by the strategies such that a structure is so made to match the strategy. This matching is known as "strategic alignment". The structure that flows from the strategy must be in agreement with the environmental peculiarities. After these matching, the strategy and structure is equally match with the firm's ability or capability otherwise known as "matching". In the consideration of strategic management, alignment and matching are processes that are very vital.

According to Johnson et al. (2008), a "strategy fit" is a union of strategy, structure, the environment and the capability of the firm. According to Chandler (1962), one of the pioneers of the knowledge of structure and strategy had identified, how the development of firms over time is of several stages or sequences. The stages include:

a. Resources in terms of raw materials and employees are acquired.
b. The increment of efficiency by establishing functional structures.
c. The ability to break through the boundaries of home markets by adopting strategic growth and diversification.
d. The management of large conglomerates by creating a revolution in a divisionalized form.

According to Mulcaster (2009), for a strategy to succeed, it will take the right structure. Consequently, as he observed, a firm usually adopts a structure that is dependent on the type of strategy that such a firm hoped to accomplish.

2.8. Juxtaposing Organizational Structure with Strategies

The adoption of structure is as a result of the type of strategy the firm bases its operation on. According to Kim and Mauborgne (2005), there are general structures that could match with different available strategies. According to Porter (1980), there are general grand strategies as a follow up of the generic product differentiation strategies, cost of leaders and the way forward for any organization. In his book on competitive advantage, it is said that firms should look out for the area where they have the highest competitive advantage to explore. As observed further by him, the organization applying a combination strategy ~~are~~ is in between with no focus for effectiveness and efficiency in which competitive advantage is lost.

2.9. Organizational Structure Based on Strategic Fit

a. Functional Organizational Structure: According to Oliveira and Takahashi (2012), the activities of production, finance, human resources, marketing, research and development and accounting constitutes the primary work of the functional organization. The traditional roles determine how responsibilities are shared. The strategic application is on the effectiveness and efficiency in coordinating the functional organization. This kind of structure is usually a product of single or product that is narrowly focused requiring a skill or a kind of specialization that is properly outlined. This specialization creates room for the acquisition of competitive advantages.

b. Strategic Business Organizational Structures: In the bid to improve a strategic implementation, an additional layer of management is created to handle issues more effectively. It's strategic fit is to improve on the company's strength through synergy in order to gain higher level of control judging by the diversities of businesses. Due to the diversity, size and numbers, in most cases, management likes to adopt this structure in order to overcome difficulties in the course of evaluation and the control of the different division's operations.

c. Matrix Organizational Structure: This is a combination of structures that can assume the form of a product and division. It is presented in form of demography or geography. It could also be functional and divisional structures being runned side by side. The diversity and the wide range of products and

efforts in projects dictate the strategies of large organizations. Hence, separate areas of resources and skills are put together across the boundaries of organizations as effective knowledge management is made possible. The matrix structure has its strategic fit on a dual network of authority, evaluation and control, responsibility for performance. Since areas of concerned in a matrix structure are varied, the workers are given both functional activities coupled with either product or project supervision. However, the matrix structure makes focus on resources simple as the strategic operations are narrowed down to specific project, product or the market to be served.

d. Virtual Organizational Structure: In collaboration with Collins (2007), Oliveira and Takahashi (2012), virtual structure is the connectivity of different department through the help of the internet. In this fit, distance is never a barrier as departments can be located in different geographical areas yet by reason of the internet they are networked assuming to be in one particular place or apartment. Collins (2007), had it recommended that such department can operate in an environment where there is cost effectiveness in the provision of resources.

e. Geographical organizational structure: This structure supports strategy for the geographical expansion. The expansion of sales in product and services to new geographic location creates room for the growth of such organization.

f. Divisional organizational structure: The strategy most appropriate for this type of structure is the product diversification strategy. Usually in this, heterogeneous customer groups are being served. Where a functional structure becomes grossly inadequate become the point at which divisional structure is most applicable. The divisional structure matches the coordination and the requirement for decision making that meet up with the level of diversity and the size of operation.

From the foregoing, it is hereby made known that the type of strategy an organization proposes to adopt gives rise to the type of organizational structure. Hence, the environment of business is dynamic giving rise to constant changes that can alter a previously adopted strategy. It becomes imperative for new structures to be developed in order for the new strategy to be profitable when implemented. In the light of this, Lim (2017) concluded that the combination of resources, conceptual understanding and the framework of functions in organizations make up the structure. According to Johnson (2008), Strategic planning is the activity of top management for the well-being of its strategies and structures for the survival of the organization.

Summarily;

a. Functional structure: The strategy is in the effectiveness and efficiency of coordinating the functional departments making the corporate body.
b. Strategic business unit organizational structure: The strategy to adopt is on how to improve on company's strength through synergy.
c. Matrix organizational structure: There should be a dual network of authority evaluation and control responsibility for performance.
d. Virtual organizational structure: The strategy fit is on how to network with others in order to create synergy.
e. Geographical organizational structure: The strategic fit is to expand geographical locations.
f. Divisional organizational structure: The strategy most appropriate for this type of structure is the product diversification strategy.

2.10. The Benefits of Business Strategies and the Respective Organizational Structures in the Nigerian Business Organizations

Maduenyi, Oke, Fadeyi and Ajagbe (2015), had said that, the benefits of Business Strategy to any organization are enormous. The benefits include:

a. It helps to recognize and respond to workers changes and new opportunities.
b. It brings about greatest commitment to achieve objectives, the implementation of strategies and also to work hard.
c. It can help to improve how competitors' strategies are understood.
d. It helps in defining management problems objectively.

e. If well implemented, can boost sales, profitability index and productivity.
f. It can lead to the reduction of resistance to change.
g. It improves communication between the managers and their employees.
h. It serves as a pattern to an organization on how to coordinate and control what goes on in the organization.
i. It engenders higher customer satisfaction.
j. Increase customer's loyalty
k. It helps to satisfy the need and demand of organizational stakeholders.
l. It gives the organization an edge over its rival.
m. Leads to increase in productivity
n. It brings about improvement in quality.

3.1. CONCLUSION

The aim of the review, is to find out the contributions of business strategies and the nature of its structures to the performance of organizations, considering the level of implementation by managers in collaboration with the lower level operatives. The study had shown that the present advancement in technology and high level of competition in today's business world, is a clear indicator that business managers should develop an appropriate business strategy that can take the organization to a height where its goals and objective can be effectively and efficiently realized. In this paper, it has been made clear that developing strategies alone does not warranty success rather, the strategies should be duly implemented putting into consideration the structure of such an organization. It is hereby, stated that the interplay between structure and strategy can lead to a very successful organization that is evidenced by a highly productive status. The benefits of strategy and structure are indicators to justify that a good performance can be reached if this factors are appropriately implemented, judging from the fact that the strategy is in alignment with the organizational structure. This development highlights the positive relationship between strategy and structure.

3.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is hereby recommended in this review that:

1. If a firm is not to be condemned to inefficiency, a match between strategy and structure is a must.
2. Top management should pay close attention to making sure that organizational structure is in alignment with the organizational strategy.
3. Hence, environmental forces are liable to changes, a restructuring and strategizing is necessary to cope with the operating environment.
4. Top management that are custodians of the long term plans of the organization should advocate for intimate relationship that should exist between strategy and structure.
5. The structure should be built on the strategy for goals to be achieved.
6. It is the duty of top management to monitor the organizational structure that flows from when strategy was crafted through to implementation and how it could be blended to the immediate and external environments for a better performance and productivity.

REFERENCES

Abdulkadir, D.S. (2012). Strategic Human Resources Management and Organizational Performance in the Nigerian Insurance Industry: The Impact of Organizational Climate. *Business Intelligence Journal, 5(1), 8-20.*

Agwu, M.E. (2018). Analysis of the Impact of Strategic Management on the Business Performance of SMEs in Nigeria. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 17(1), 1-20.*

Ajagbe, M.A., Maduenyi, S., Oke, A.O. and Olatunji, F. (2015). Impacts of organizational structure on organizational performance. *International Conference on African Development Issues. pp. 354-358.*

Arikan, C. and Kirci, S. (2015). Effects of organizational structure at outsourcing companies to operational performance: A practice. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences, 8(4), 263-272.*

Brickley, J., Smith, C., Willet, J. and Zimmerman, J.L. (2002). *Designing organizations to create value: from strategy to structure.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Chandler, A. (1962). *Strategy and Structure. Chapters in the history of industrial enterprise.* Doubleday: New York.

Chandler, A.D. (1962). *Strategy and structure. Cambridge*, M.A: MIT Press.

Collins, D. (2007). *Narating the management guru: In search of Tom Peters.* London: Routledge.

Daft, R. (2012). *Organizational theory and design.* Nelson Education, South-Western Publishers.

Fried, J. (2011). "Why I run a flat company" http://www.inc.com/ magazine/20110401/jason-fried-why-i-run-a-flat-company.html.inc.

Galbraith, J.R. (2009). *Designing matrix organizations that actually work: How IBM, Procter and Gamble and others design for success*. New York: Wiley.

Greenberg, J. (2011). *Behaviour in Organization (10th ed).* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Jacobides, M.G. (2007). The inherent units of organizational structure and the unfulfilled role of hierarchy: Lesson from a near-war. Organization Science, 18, 3, 455-477.

Johnson, G., Scholes, K. and Whittinglon, R. (2008). *Exploring corporate strategy: Texts and cases, 8th Edition.* Prentice Hall International, United Kingdom.

Kavale, S. (2012). The connection between strategy and structure. *International Journal of Business and Commerce,* 1(6), 43-52.

Kavale, S. (2012). The connection between strategy and structure. *International Journal of Business and Commerce, 1(6), 43-52.*

Lim, M. (2017). Examining the Literature on Organizational Structure and Success. College Mirror 43, 1, 16-18. http://www.cfpc.org.sg/publications/the-college-mirror/article/1098.

Long, C.S. Mahanra, R.L. and Ajagbe, A.M. (2013). Can Employees Share Option Scheme and Improve Firm's Performance? A Malaysian Case Study. *Information Management and Business Review,* 5(3), 119-128.

Lunenberg, F.C. and Orinstein, A.O. (2012). *Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices.* Belmont, C.A: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Mbraka, R.M. and Mugambi, F. (2014). Factors affecting Successful strategy: implementation in manufacturing sector in Kenya. *IOSR Journal of Business Management.*

Miles, R.E., Snow, C.C., Meyer, A.D. and Coleman, H.J. (2011). *Organizational strategy, structure and process*. Palo Alto, C.A: Stanford University Press.

Mintzberg, H. (2009). *Tracking Strategies: Towards a general theory of Strategy for Nation.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mulcaster, W.R. (2009). "Three Strategic Framework ". *Business Strategies Series.* Vol.10, No. 1.

Nag, R., Hambrick, D.C. and Chen, M.J. (2007). What is Strategic Management Really? Inductive derivation of a consensus definition. Definition of the field. *Strategic Management Journal, 28(9).*

Nelson, D.B. and Quick, J.C. (2011). *Understanding Organizational Behaviour.* Mason, OH: South-Western Cen gage Learning.

Oliveira, N. and Takahashi, N. (2012). *Automated organizations: Development and structure of the modern business firm*. New York, NY: Springer.

Oreilly, C.A., Caldwell, D.F., Chatman, J.A., Lapiz, M. and Self, W. (2010). How leadership matters: The effects of leaders alignment on strategy implementation. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21, 104-113.*

Porter, M.E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy*, Free Press, New York.

Silva, N.D., Hutcheson, J. and Wahl, G.D. (2010). Organizational Strategy and employee outcomes: A person-organizational fit perspective. *Journal of Psychology, 144(2), 145-161.*

Solomon, O., Hoshim, H.N., Mehali, B.T.Z. and Ajagbe, A.M. (2012). Employee Motivation and Organizational Performance in Multinational Companies: A Study of Cadbury Nigeria Plc. *International Journal of Research in Management and Technology, 2(3), 303-312.*