

INTEGRATED STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND PERFORMANCES OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN KENYA

James Ochieng Sika & Constatine Wesonga Opiyo

Maseno University, P. O. Box Private Bag, Maseno, Kenya.

*Corresponding author: E-mail address: drjamessika@yahoo.com

Transforming higher education institutions in Kenya using modern paradigm is a dream yet to be realized in Kenya. However, the World Bank economic update indicates that ICT sector in Kenya has outperformed all other sector of the economy, growing by 20 percent annually and propelling Kenyan economy to the second largest in Africa. This in turn creates an opportunity for universities to ride on this wave and increase their research output. The Kenya vision 2030 identifies science, technology and innovation as one of the six foundations for socio – economic growth and transformation. The national university strategy recognizes that information and communication technology infrastructure is one of the four pillars of emerging knowledge economy and that ICT infrastructure is essential for achieving increased quality of university education. This raises questions on the effectiveness of integrated strategic management that universities purport to practice. In addition, there is limited literature regarding the level of adoption of integrated strategic management, the factors that contribute to the implementation of strategic management, the challenges faced during implementation and the outcome of this practice. Moreover, it is not clear on how the practice of integrated strategic management has impacted on the performance of public universities in Kenya.

Keywords: ICT; performance; management practices; strategic plan; universities; infrastructure

carrying out the strategy that drives the firm's operations.

Introduction and Background

Integrated strategic management is a concept that concerns with making decisions and taking corrective actions to achieve long term targets and goals of an organization. The importance of integrated strategic management in institutions of higher learning can be answered by analyzing relationship between strategic management and organizational performance. Generally integrated strategic management practices can improve efficiency in various organizations. Integrated Strategic management is the full set of commitments, decisions, and actions a firm requires to carry out its strategy to gain sustainable competitive advantage (Wheelan & Hunger, 2002). Integrated strategic management guides how the basic work of the organization is approached; ensures the continual renewal and growth of the institutions of higher learning, and provides a context for developing and

The goal of institution strategic management process is that firms obtain a sustained competitive advantage by carrying out strategies that exploit their internal strengths, through responding to environmental opportunities, while neutralizing external threats and avoiding internal weaknesses (Hitt, Ireland, & Hoskinsson, 2009). The idea of a sustained competitive advantage (sustained above-average returns) is more in line with the concept of firm performance and wealth creation. Integrated Strategic management practices therefore include strategic planning; strategy implementation and strategy evaluation and control, which have in the past studies been seen to influence the competitive positioning of the firm in the industry, thus determine the performance. Generally, integrated strategic management practices can improve efficiency in various organizations.

Integrated strategic management practice consists of four basic elements, strategy formulation,

implementation, evaluation and control. Institutional Strategy formulation is the development of long-range plans for the effective management of environmental opportunities and threats, in light of corporate strengths and weaknesses. It includes defining the corporate mission, specifying achievable objectives, developing strategies and setting policy guidelines. Strategy implementation is the process through which strategies are put into action throughout the organization by deriving short-term objectives from the longterm objectives and further deriving the functional tactics from the business strategy. This process assists management in identifying the specific immediate actions that must be taken in the key functional areas to implement the business strategy. Strategy evaluation and control is the process of comparing the actual performance against the desired performance. Strategy evaluation involves setting control processes to continuously review, evaluate and provide feedback concerning the implemented strategies to determine if the desired results are being accomplished such that corrective measures may be taken if warranted (Pearce & Robinson, 2008).

The field of integrated strategic management has gained a sustained prominence in the management of public services in the past two decades. Public organizations and institutions are increasingly being asked to use it as part of their management techniques for performance contracting. It has become an attractive management tool to reformers, and as Bovaird (cited in Maleka, 2014) argues, for an organization to be without a strategy is to appear directionless and incompetent. It is not an exaggeration to say that, the use of institution strategic management particularly in this era, when public organizations are considered under-performing and uneconomical in their use of public resources, could, among other things, help to enhance public organizations' image and legitimacy. The general mood of the public has been that public managers must 'do more with less', the situation that requires strategic thinking in order to 'reduce wastes' (Bovaird in Maleka, 2014).

Institutional strategic management is a systematic process for managing the organization and its future direction in relation to its environment in a way that will assure continuous success. It has thus

been touted as one of the effective management tools in strengthening organization performance through effective decision making and systematic strategy formulation and implementation. Although institutional strategic management was more prevalent in the private sector since the concept was first developed, the interest of using integrated strategic management in the public sector has increased over the last decade. Since 2000 there have been a series of reforms taking shape in the public sector in Kenya, resulting from increased awareness on the importance of quality in the public sector (Thujo & Kimenyi, 2011).

The Kenyan society is in transition and this affects the student learning environment. For the last few years, there has been evidence of volatility, student unrest, and loss of life due to arson in public universities. In most cases, the responses have been reactive almost always after a tragedy has occurred. The university leadership community has always been caught by surprise when these incidents occur. The recent tragic deaths of students in Maseno, Egerton, Nairobi and Kenyatta Universities was due to arson is a wakeup call to establish the extent to which integrated strategic management is practiced in the universities because the university leadership should have had Early Warning Systems thresholds which trigger necessary precautionary steps before tense situations escalate to violence (Sang et al., 2015).

University leadership are expected to be proactive by being able to anticipate society change and gauge its impact on university environment and student learning, through use of data and student environment indices to respond appropriately. Increased insecurity, social and administrative issues will increasingly become more challenging and this will require long-term solutions. University leadership are often confronted by issues of drugs and social problems which require a concerted effort with all university stakeholders. This raises questions on the effectiveness of integrated strategic management that universities purport to practice. In addition, there is limited literature regarding the level of adoption of integrated strategic management, the factors that contribute to the implementation of strategic management, the challenges faced during implementation and the outcome of this practice.

Moreover, it is not clear on how the practice of integrated strategic management has impacted on the performance of public universities in Kenya.

Institutional ICT Readiness

The Kenya Education Network currently provides Internet bandwidth to 59 member institutions and 73 campuses, including all of the large research universities of Kenya. KENET peers directly in London with the European Regional research and education Network, GEANT through the African regional research and education network, UbuntuNet Alliance. Its network carries both commodity and research and education traffic.

Apart from connectivity and bandwidth services, KENET provides network training services, network applications services (web hosting, e-mail, disaster recovery, and top-level domain registration) and consultancy services (e.g. preparation of bidding documents and evaluation, designing and specifying technology solutions for members, and training and awareness services) to member institutions. KENET also acts as a research grantee for foundations and other donor agencies. In the past, KENET has received the following grants:

- \$1.1 million infrastructure grant from USAID in 1999-2002;
- Over \$1 million from the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa in past 5 years (Rockefeller Foundation grants for e-readiness research, infrastructure, and capacity building; and Ford Foundation grants for e-readiness research, capacity building and content development) (2005 – 2011); and
- \$21.5 million infrastructure and bandwidth grant from the Government of Kenya (2008 – 2011).

At present, KENET is under pressure to continue providing broadband connectivity services to the higher education community. It is also the founding member of UbuntuNet Alliance, the Southern and Eastern Africa network.

The Statement of the Problem

Integrated strategic management is applauded for reshaping organizations and improving their performance. Formal integrated strategic management significantly improved organizational performance. In Kenya, it's a ministerial requirement that public organizations including educational institution develop integrated strategic plans as a means of enhancing results based management and efficiency in their operations. Ideally these plans should provide direction in regard to resource targeting and program implementation (MOE, 2005). Despite the use of integrated strategic management, Universities are still facing challenges including; student unrest and loss of life due to arson in universities. Besides, lack of enough lecturers, ineffective management of curriculum implementation in universities, and autocracy in universities governance, inadequate funding and mismanagement of universities funds are some of the issues common in public and private universities. This raises concerns over the effectiveness of the adoption of integrated strategic management in the institutions. Though the Kenyan government embraced the use of strategic management and advocated for its use in the public sector institutions which include public and private universities. This research study therefore sought to establish the influence of the use of integrated strategic management practices on the performance of the public and private universities in Kenya.

Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following specific objectives:

- i) To determine the influence of integrated strategic environmental analysis on the organizational performance public universities.
- ii) To determine the influence of integrated strategic organizational direction on the organizational performance of public universities in Kenya
- iii) To determine the influence of integrated strategy formulation on the organizational

performance of public and private universities in Kenya

- iv) To establish the influence of integrated strategic implementation on the organizational performance of public universities in Kenya v) To establish the influence of integrated strategic evaluation and control the organizational performance of public and private universities in Kenya vi) To determine the combined influence of environmental analysis, organizational direction, strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation and control on organizational performance of public universities in Kenya.

Hypotheses

HO1: Environmental analysis does not significantly influence strategic performance of the public and private universities

HO2: Establishing organizational direction does not significantly influence strategic performance of public and private universities

HO3: Strategy formulation does not significantly influence strategic performance of the public and private universities

HO4: Strategy implementation does not significantly influence strategic performance of the public and private universities

HO5: Strategy evaluation and control does not significantly influence strategic performance of public and private universities

HO6: There is no combined influence of environmental analysis, organizational direction, strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation and control on organizational performance of public universities

Literature Review

Kenya is expected to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. Improving the efficiency and transparency of public administrations in education sector will significantly

strengthen economic competitiveness through encouraging business confidence and improving standards of public service. The challenges of new, knowledgebased public sectors in Kenya are forcing public organizations to seek and expand comparative advantages mainly through the intellectual capital in the management of public service institutions so as to be able to continuously incorporate strategic change management issues. Different internal and external drivers from the dynamic public sector environment are impacting on adoption of strategic management practices in the public sector institutions and consequently requiring new, knowledge-based managerial tools for innovative change management processes.

Mazzarol and Rebound (cited in Okwako, 2013), state that organizational performance can be measured as achieving sustainable growth over time using such indicators as annual turnover, the number of employees, size of assets and equity in the balance sheet, market share and profitability. Measurement of performance in a school set-up will therefore include academic excellence, land infrastructure development, discipline and school culture, stakeholder satisfaction, financial stability and excellence in non-academic activities.

For a country to develop, its education sector plays a pivotal role. Education in Kenya aims at achieving the following goals: Foster nationalism, patriotism and promote national unity, promote social, economic, technological and industrial needs for national development which include; Social needs which Prepare children for the changes in attitudes and relationships which are necessary for the smooth process of a rapidly developing modern economy. Economic needs which Produce citizens with skills, knowledge, expertise and personal qualities that are required to support a growing economy, technological and industrial needs which provide the learners with the necessary skills and attitudes for industrial development, education also promote individual development and self-fulfillment, sound moral and religious values, social equality and responsibility, respect for and development of Kenya's rich and varied cultures, international consciousness and foster positive attitude towards other nations and promote positive attitudes towards

good health and environmental protection. Strategic planning is a relatively new innovation in the public sector management, and according to some observers, it represents a major change in the management of public sector organizations. According to Poister and Streib (2005) strategic management was only introduced into the public sector 20 years ago, with much of the early literature focusing on local government applications. This observation implies that strategic management is basically a new management instrument imported to the public sector. It is a ministerial requirement that public organizations including educational institution develop strategic plans as a means of enhancing results based management and efficiency in their operations. The plans provide direction in regard to resource targeting and program implementation (MOE, 2005). One factor that stands out as a key determinant to university success is university planning effectiveness. According to commission of university education (MOE, 2005), strategic planning is a line of action designed by the university to achieve desired targets with a scale using available resources. Planning is a process of identifying a purpose and then deciding upon the approaches, techniques, methods, procedures, time horizons, resources and all that must be done to accomplish a purpose. The central role of planning is the projection of targets looking and thinking forward in time. Plans contain practical guidelines, precise goals and targets and a timetable for attainment. Targets can be articulated without ambiguity and measurements of attainment against them set out.

Integrated strategic management, according to Ansoff (1984), encompasses the process of determining organization's mission and goals, managing strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy control. Strategic management can be viewed as a series of steps covering the tasks of analyzing the opportunities and threats that exist in the external environment. It also involves; analyzing the organization's strengths and weaknesses within the internal environment, identifying agency stakeholders, establishing organization's mission and goals, formulating strategies by matching the organization's strengths and weaknesses with the environment's opportunities

and threats, implementing the strategies, and finally engaging in strategy control activities to measure the implementation progress and ensure achievement of the stated goals.

According to Wright, Kroll and Parnell (1998) an organization's external environment consists of all the conditions and forces that affect its strategic options as well as define its competitive situation. The analysis of the external environment can be done by means of environmental scanning, competitive analysis and scenarios. It consists of an analysis and or study of the changes and trends in the following environments: international environment; political environment; economic environment; social environment; technological environment; physical environment; institutional environment; and the market environment. When performing internal analysis or diagnosis organizations do an investigation, or conduct an audit, of the current quantity and quality of the organization's financial, human, and physical resources. It should also assess the strengths and weaknesses of the organization's management and organizational structure. The organization assesses its past successes and is usually concerned with the organization's current capabilities in an attempt to identify the organization's future capabilities and/or potential (Harrison and John, 1998). The analysis of the environment takes place with the aim to identify opportunities, threats, key success factors and the competitive advantage of the "business". An opportunity is a favourable or unexploited situation in one or more of the management environments that can be utilized proactively by top management to the advantage of the organization. A threat is an unfavourable situation in one or more of the management environments that, without proactive management, could lead to damage for the organization.

Establishing the organization's direction consists of developing long term plans to guide the organization towards effective management of environmental opportunities and threats, in line with corporate strengths and weaknesses. It includes: formulating an organizational vision; establishing the organization's mission and social responsibility; determining the institutional mandate and setting an organization's objectives (Hussey, 1994).

Research Methodology

This research employed exploratory and descriptive design. Descriptive research is the most commonly used and the basic reason for carrying out descriptive research is to identify the cause of something that is happening. According to Lockesh (1984) the study used both descriptive and inferential analyses. Descriptive analysis involved the computation of frequency distribution, mean, and standard deviation, which were useful to identify differences among groups. Inferential analysis assisted in understanding relationships between the study variables. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the contribution of each of the independent variables to dependent variable. In order to test the strength of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables, regression coefficients were used to evaluate the strength of the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. R2 was the multiple correlation, which represented the percent of variance in the dependent variable (organizational performance) explained collectively by all of the independent variables. Thus the R2 value in the model provided a measure of the predictive ability of the model. The closer the value to 1, the better the regression equation fit the data. The following study multiple linear regression model was tested.

$$OP = \beta_0 + \beta_1EA + \beta_2OD + \beta_3SF + \beta_4SI + \beta_5SEC + e$$

Where: β_0 = Intercept or constant $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$ & β_5 = Regression coefficients or slope of the regression line of the independent variables 1 to 5. They indicate the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable

EA = Environmental Analysis

OD = Organizational Direction

SF = Strategy Formulation

SI = Strategy Implementation

SEC = Strategy Evaluation and Control

ε = Error or random term.

In regression analysis, the decision rule is: Reject null hypothesis if F calculated > F critical at $\alpha = 0.05$ (5% level of significance). However, if F calculated < F critical, we do not reject the null hypothesis. Another way of drawing conclusion on the

significance of the regression is that if the p-value (probability) calculated by the regression is less than our significance level (0.05) then it means the probability of drawing another sample from the population that gives similar results and satisfies the null hypothesis is so low that we reject the null hypothesis. A p-value is a probability that provides a measure of the evidence against the null hypothesis provided by the sample. Smaller p-values indicate more evidence against the hypothesis (Anderson, 2009). Hence if p-value of the regression (population) < 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis but if p-value > 0.05, then do not reject the null hypothesis.

Results and Discussions

Table 1

Top Ten Universities in Kenya

The Webometric Ranking of Kenya Universities and their performance

The best known measure of academic ranking of universities originates from Shanghai Jiao University. It publishes the rankings depended on the outputs and it puts weights on six index common to the Universities. However, the choice of the criteria is quite arbitrary and the weights put on them are also quite arbitrary. The truth about African universities and especially in Kenya is that we are performing badly in world rankings except University of Nairobi (table 1).

The webometric ranking of world universities is updated twice yearly and is based on composite indicators that include both the volume of web content and the visibility and impact of web publications according to the number of external links the

range '101 to 151'. Universities below 500 are not given a number but arbitrary approximate number can be computed to determine the performance of universities.

Top Ten Universities in Kenya Jan. 2017	Africa ranking	World ranking	rank	Presence rank	Impact rank	Openness rank	Excellent rank
University of Nairobi	9	775	11	785	910	1513	
Egerton University	22	1727	5311	495	4272	2941	
Kenyatta University	32	2020	499	3028	1339	2829	
Jomo Kenyatta University	65	2851	1773	6705	2402	2842	
Maseno University	103	3544	7789	7827	2803	3339	
Strathmore	144	4718	1338	5824	7241	4916	
Catholic University	187	5822	2089	11455	6795	4482	
Masinde Muliro University	194	6021	3329	13912	3971	4482	
Kenya medical colleges	196						
South Eastern University college	202	6537	2223	10828	3058	5778	
Kenya Methodist University	203	6561	1206	6419	8060	5778	

institution receives. The University of Nairobi recorded a marked improvement internationally by emerging 775 out of over 25,000 ranked universities. The University of Nairobi's performance is the best result result posted by any local university since the advent of web ranking in 2004. This confirms the scholarly competition edge UoN has steadily maintained in Kenya, Africa and the world.

The world's highest university is given the number 1 and so on down to number 100. After that, universities' ranking are indicated by a numerical

Influence of Integrated Strategic Management Practices on the Performance of Public and Private Universities in Kenya

Integrated Strategic Management practices were hypothesized to influence organizational performance of public and private universities. An index for each of the integrated strategic management practices or dimensions was calculated to represent all the items that were used to measure this construct. Organizational performance index and strategic

management indices were used to test the relationship between them. Correlation analysis was used to test the relationship between integrated strategic management practices and organizational performance of public and private universities. The following hypotheses were tested to establish the relationships among the independent variables and their influence on dependent variable

HO1: *There is no significant relationship between environmental analysis and organizational performance of public and private universities in Kenya* The result of Pearson correlation analysis provided in table 1.1 shows that environmental analysis is significantly, positively correlated to organizational performance. The result shows a coefficient of .389** at $p=0.01$ ($r = .389^{**}$, $p < 0.01$) which shows that the two constructs, environmental analysis and organizational performance are positively related. The correlation coefficient of $r = .389^{**}$ shows that there is a significant positive relationship between environmental analysis and organizational performance of public and private universities in Kenya. Therefore, the hypothesis should be rejected.

HO2: *There is no significant relationship between organizational direction and organizational performance of public and private universities.* The result of Pearson correlation analysis provided in table 1.1 shows that organizational direction is significantly, positively correlated to loyalty. The result shows a coefficient of .898** at $p=0.01$ ($r = .898^{**}$, $p < 0.01$) which shows that the two constructs, organizational direction and organizational performance are positively related. The correlation coefficient $r = .898$ shows that there is a significant strong positive relationship between organizational direction and organizational performance of public and private universities in Kenya. Therefore, the null hypothesis should be rejected.

HO3: *There is no significant relationship between strategy formulation and organizational performance of public and private universities* The result of Pearson correlation analysis provided in table 1 shows that strategy formulation is significantly, positively correlated to organizational performance of public and private universities. The result shows a coefficient of .789** at $p=0.01$ ($r = .$

.789**, $p < 0.01$) which shows that the two constructs, strategy formulation and organizational performance are positively related. The correlation coefficient of $r = .789$ shows that there is a significant positive relationship between strategy formulation and organizational performance of public and private universities.

Therefore, the hypothesis should be rejected.

HO4: *There is no significant relationship between strategy implementation and organizational performance of public and private universities* The result of Pearson correlation analysis provided in table 1 shows that strategy implementation is significantly, positively correlated to organizational performance. The result shows a coefficient of .978** at $p=0.01$ ($r = .978^{**}$, $p < 0.01$) which shows that the two constructs, strategy implementation and organizational performance are positively related. The correlation coefficient of $r = .978$ shows that there is a significant positive relationship between strategy implementation and organizational performance of public and private universities. Therefore, the hypothesis should be rejected.

HO5: *There is no significant relationship between strategy evaluation and control and organizational performance of public and private universities* The result of Pearson correlation analysis provided in table 1 shows that strategy evaluation and control is significantly, positively correlated to organizational performance. The result shows a coefficient of .634** at $p=0.01$ ($r = .634^{**}$, $p < 0.01$) which shows that the two constructs, strategy implementation and organizational performance are positively related. The correlation coefficient of $r = .634$ shows that there is a significant positive relationship between strategy implementation and organizational performance of public and private universities. Therefore, the hypothesis should be rejected.

HO6: *There is no significant combined relationship between environmental analysis, organizational direction, Strategy formulation, Strategy implementation and Strategy evaluation and control on organizational performance in public and private universities.*

An analysis of the relative importance of the strategic management practices was carried out using a regression model. The results revealed that R^2 was

.876 or 87.6 % which was significant at 0.001 level. This implied that these strategic management practices accounted for about 87.6 % of the variation in organizational performance in this model. The results indicate that 12.4% of organizational performance of the public and private universities can be explained by factors not included in the regression model. This study empirically established that organizational performance of public and private universities is strongly influenced by strategic management practices. It can be observed from table 2c that using beta values to measure the variation in organizational performance indicated that strategy evaluation and control ($\beta = .424$) contributed to the highest variability followed by organizational direction ($\beta = .342$), environmental analysis ($\beta = .254$), strategy implementation ($\beta = .099$) and strategy formulation ($\beta = .047$) respectively. The study results indicate that there is a positive relationship between integrated strategic management practices on the

organizational performance of public and private universities. Pearson Correlation coefficients show that there is a positive relationship between all the integrated strategic management practices and the organizational performance of public and private universities. Specifically the coefficients were: environmental analysis $r = 0.559$, organizational direction $r = 0.775$, strategy formulation $r = 0.136$, strategy implementation $r = 0.064$ and strategy evaluation and control $r = 1.493$, respectively. All these correlations are significant at $p < 0.01$. The findings are consistent with those of Harrington, Lemak, and Reed (2004) who concluded that a firm's integrated strategic management practices should guide all those activities necessary to adapt the environment. Anderson (2000) explains further that formal integrated strategic management practices enable the management in establishing right and proper strategic path for public organizations as a whole.

Correlations between Strategic Management practices and organizational performance

		Enronindex	Orgdirindex	Sformindex	SImplendex	Sevaindex	Operfindex
Enronindex	Pearson Correlation	1	.199	.263	.006	.206	.389
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.301	.185	.981	.312	.077
	N	31	29	27	16	26	21
Orgdirindex	Pearson Correlation	.199	1	.708**	.840**	.686**	.898**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.301		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	29	32	30	18	29	22
Sformindex	Pearson Correlation	.263	.708**	1	.892**	.765**	.789**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.185	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	27	30	31	17	29	21
Simplendex	Pearson Correlation	.006	.840**	.892**	1	.913**	.978**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.981	.000	.000		.000	.001
	N	16	18	17	18	18	15
Sevaindex	Pearson Correlation	.206	.686**	.765**	.913**	1	.634**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.312	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	26	29	29	18	30	22
Operfindex	Pearson Correlation	.389	.898**	.789**	.978**	.634**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.077	.000	.000	.001	.000	
	N	21	22	21	15	22	22

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

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.936 ^a	.876	.787	2.85560

a. Predictors: (Constant), Sevaindex, straindex, Sformindex, orgidindex, Simplendex

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	401.842	5	80.368	9.856	.005 ^a
	Residual	57.081	7	8.154		
	Total	458.923	12			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Sevaindex, Enronindex, Sformindex, Orgidindex, Simplendex

b. Dependent Variable: Operindex

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-2.682	7.998		-.335	.747
	Enron index	.559	.359	.254	1.558	.163
	Orgidindex	.775	.773	.342	1.004	.349
	Sformindex	.136	.848	.047	.160	.878
	Simplendex	.064	.255	.099	.251	.809
	Sevaindex	1.493	1.248	.424	1.197	.270

a. Dependent Variable: Operindex

Conclusions and Recommendations

The study established that strategic management practices influence organizational performance of public and private universities. Thus the board of management of public and private universities should embrace integrated strategic management practices so as to improve the performance of their organizations. This was consistent with those of David (2011) who found that organizational performance improved performance was enhanced by the utilization of strategic management practices. These findings are also in agreement with those of other studies which observed that indeed there is a relationship between strategic management and organizational performance (Miller & Cardinal, 1994).

The study established that integrated strategic management influences organizational performance and that the adoption of strategic management practices has a significant effect on the performance of the public and private universities. All the dimensions of strategic management practices influence the performance of the public and private universities. The management of the universities should adopt the practices to influence performance.

References

- Anderson, T. J. (2000). Strategic planning, autonomous actions and corporate performance. *Long Range Planning*, 33(2), 184-200.
- Ansoff, H. I. (1984). *Implanting strategic management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- David, F. R. (2011). *Strategic management: Concepts and cases* (13th ed.). Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Harrington, R. J., Lemak, D. J., & Reed, R. (2004). A question of fit: The links among environment, strategy formation and performance. *Journal of Business management*, 10, 15-36.
- Hitt, M.A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskinsson, R. E. (2011), *Strategic Management: Competitiveness & Globalization*. Mase, OH: Thompson South-western.
- Hussey, D. E. (1994). *Strategic management: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Lockesh, K. (1984). *Methodologies of educational research*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House PVT Ltd.
- Maleka, S. (2014). *Strategic management and strategic planning process*. A conference paper presented in DTSP Strategic Planning & Monitoring, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Miller, C. C., & Cardinal. L. B. (1994). Strategic planning and firm performance: Q synthesis of more than two decades of research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(6), 1649-1665.
- Ministry of Education (MOE). (2005). *Ministry of Education strategic plan*. Nairobi : Government Printer.
- Okwako, A. D. (2013). *Strategic planning and performance of public secondary schools in Rarieda district, Kenya* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Pearce, J. A. & Robinson, R. (1999). *Strategic management: Formulation, implementation and control* (4th ed.). Boston: Homewood.
- Poister, T. H., & Streib, G. (2005). Elements of strategic planning and management in municipal government: Status after two decades. *Public Administration Review*, 65(1), 45-56.
- Sang, F. K., Kindiki, K. N., Sang, J. K., Rotich, G. J., & Kipruto, K. (2015). Availability and the level of implementation of strategic plan in secondary schools in Nandi County, Kenya, *SAGE Open*, 5(2), 2158244015577417.
- Thuo, M., & Kimenyi, W. (2011). *Leadership training for school principals*. Retrieved from Mwakilish.com.
- Wheelan, T., & Hunger, D.(1992) *Strategic management and policy* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Addison -Wesley Publishing Company.
- Wright, P. L., Kroll, M. J., & Parnell, J. A. (1998). *Strategic management: Concepts and cases*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.