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Abstract

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between strategic leadership and strategy implementation at FUFA. The study was premised on strategic leadership theory. The objectives of the study were to examine relationship between: leadership competence and strategy implementation, investigate relationship between leadership communication and strategy implementation, to establish relationship between staff involvement and strategy implementation and to assess the relationship between monitoring and evaluation and strategy implementation. The population of the study were 45 staff at FUFA. Sampling was considered inappropriate due to smallness of the population and approach adopted was a census that covered all the staff in the population. The study used descriptive research design because it aimed at understanding how one variable produced changes in another and explain relationship among variables. The study used a self-administered questionnaire. Findings indicate that leadership competence and leadership communication have positive and significant relationship with strategy implementation. Findings also indicate that employee involvement and monitoring and evaluation have an insignificant positive relationship with strategy implementation. It is recommended that leaders at FUFA should prioritise on leadership competence as it enhances opportunities to realise its strategic goal while paying attention to employee involvement, monitoring and evaluation as part of less important aspects of their activities. Leadership communication is not a useful predictor of changes in strategy implementation at FUFA.
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Introduction

Organisations of different types and orientation (profit and non-profit making) thrive and succeed in the competitive marketplace due to the quality of their leaders. Leaders determine direction and provide quality in terms of timely decision making, resource allocation and staffing decisions. People who are responsible for organisation management provide stewardship and strategic leadership. Lussier and Achua, (2007) defined strategic leadership as a person’s ability to participate, envision, maintain flexibility, think strategically and work with others to initiate changes that will create a viable future for the organisation. Strategic managers have the responsibility to monitor the organisation’s internal and external environments, build company resources and capabilities, track industry and competitive trends, spot emerging market opportunities, identify business threats, and develop a vision for the future that followers can believe in (Wheelon & Hunger, 2011). Managers are hired to provide oversight and make decision for the good of their organisations. They steer and drive the organisation towards coping with change by guiding the organisation to deal with change or by providing the management skill to cope with the ramifications of constant change (Pearce & Robinson, 2011). One would describe leaders as change agents.

In competition sport, strategic leadership is centrally important because the aim is winning and therefore the topic of the effects of leadership is essential to sport management (Gammelsæter, 2013). In the recent past, leadership in sport management received extensive research where issues such as the impacts of leader characteristics, self-perception, or leadership styles on organisational effectiveness, employees’ job satisfaction, or occupational stress as well as the characteristics of transformational and
transactional leadership behaviour and its influences on effectiveness and organisation culture have been heavily examined.

Olaka, Lewa and Kiriri, (2017) in a study of strategic leadership and strategy implementation in commercial banks in Kenya recommended that the leadership and in particular the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) should focus on providing the strategic direction to the organisation if it is to achieve its strategic objectives of remaining competitive in the market. Olaka et al. (2017) further state that a strategic leader creates wealth by striking a balance between the constraining influence of financial controls and the long term focus of the strategic controls. In times of uncertainty and competitive pressure, it is the leaders who make critical investment or disinvestment decisions through methodical analysis of opportunities that are available or constrained in the market. If an organisation’s leaders cannot intervene in uncertain times, the survival of such an organisation may be jeopardised over time.

Many scholars have argued that strategic leadership is fundamental to successful strategy implementation. They posit that strategic leadership is a key driver to strategy implementation and the lack of it has similarly been identified as a barrier to strategy implementation (Bossidy & Charan, 2002; Hrebiniak, 2006; Kaplan & Norton, 2001). Strategic leadership drives effective strategy implementation resulting in rewarding performance that supports realisation of organisation objectives and increasing shareholder wealth. Effective leadership requires a belief in and passion for the ultimate goal while staying true to one’s own values and beliefs (Burnes & O'Donnell, 2011). In addition, there must be the necessary adjustments made to achieve the optimal work-life balance to perform at one’s best in line with that goal (Burnes & O'Donnell, 2011).

Burnes and O'Donnell, (2011) aver that sport, like business, is highly competitive, and success depends on continuously striving to outperform the opposition. Indeed, the aspect of striving to outperform the rival can only be led and championed by a competent leadership that understands competitive environment in addition to knowing what to do and when. Burnes and O'Donnell, (2011) show that there are lessons that can be learned in important areas of staff development, and most specifically the ability to welcome and bring about change. In this regard, leadership is primarily concerned with bringing about change because effective leaders are those who can adapt their leadership style to the context in which they are operating (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2000; Bass, 1995; Burns, 1978; Hitt, Miller & Colella, 2009). Weinberg and McDermott (2002) advocated need for effective leadership in sport especially strong interactions with others using positive reinforcement in their communication.

Statement of the problem

Federation of Uganda Football Associations (FUFA) is the governing body of football in Uganda. It was founded in 1924 and has been affiliated to Federation of International Football Associations (FIFA) and Confederation of African Football (CAF) since 1960. FUFA falls under the National Council of Sports (NCS), a statutory organ whose establishment, status and powers are enshrined under The NCS Act of 1964, to develop, promote and control sports activities in Uganda on behalf of Government of Uganda (GoU), under the Ministry of Education and Sports. Over the years, FUFA performed badly in managing football matters in the country because the national team, the Cranes had not participated at the African Cup of Nations for 41 years (Zziwa, 2011). Observers note that it took Uganda long to qualify for African Cup of Nations due to several factors, the major one being overall incompetence of whoever was in charge of FUFA (Zziwa, 2011). Other reasons include insecurity in the country, FUFA wrangles (Bakama & Muwanga, 2005; Oryada, 2012), Club politics and the lack of government will. After the 1978 Nations Cup, the country got engulfed in a civil war.

In 1980, the entire national team got dismantled by GoU and banned the national team from participating in any international events. Over the years, many leaders of the federation were appointed and fired depending on which minister was in charge of sport. Although FUFA is supervised by FIFA, it also has statutory obligations to NCS. This dual reporting structure may be some source of tension and friction at FUFA. Gammelsæter (2010) argues that the commercial mindset is only one of multitude that present-day commercialised sports clubs have to incorporate, rendering them pluralistic organisations that must play diverse “rules of the game.” On the 10th October 2019, FUFA President Moses Magogo was suspended from all football-related activity for two months and fined US$10,000
by FIFA for his role in the resale of 2014 World Cup tickets (BBC, 2019). This suspension arose after FUFA President entered a plea bargain with FIFA.

Over the years, FUFA has experienced strategic leadership problems that have resulted in endless wrangles (Oryada, 2012; Bakama & Muwanga, 2005) at FUFA. Against FIFA regulations, in some instances, matters were taken to court for warring parties to seek redress as there were allegations that former FUFA presidents had amended the Constitution without approval of the General Assembly (Supersport, n.d.; Ndagire & Kigongo, 2012). Such amendments of the constitution were made to ensure incumbent presidents remained in office longer than they were voted for. In 2004, another FUFA President was dragged to court, and later jailed for a fortnight, over embezzlement (Supersport, n.d). These developments suggest little signs of football wrangles in Uganda abating. In other developments, GoU was advised by the Accountant General in the finance ministry against Government funding FUFA/FUFA Limited following the Solicitor General’s opinion that the entity is operating illegally (Accountant General, 2017). Whereas the GoU has put in place an institutional body to manage football, and whereas adequate funding has and is appropriated to the football body, there are some challenges the institution has experienced over the past. These challenges therefore, compel one to ask whether the issue at FUFA is strategic leadership to streamline and develop football in Uganda. Chadwick (2009) has argued that the knowledge base, skill set, and practice of sport management is distinct from managing in other sectors (p. 192).

**Purpose of the study**

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between strategic leadership and strategy implementation in FUFA.

**Objectives of the study**

For this study, key specific objectives were identified as below

1. Examine the relationship between leadership competence and strategy implementation.
2. Investigate the relationship between leadership communication and strategy implementation.
3. Establish the relationship between staff involvement and strategy implementation.
4. Evaluate the relationship between monitoring and evaluation and strategy implementation.

**Hypothesis of the study**

The study had the following research hypothesis which were tested

1. There is a significant relationship between Leadership competence and strategy implementation.
2. There is a significant relationship between Leadership communication and strategy implementation.
3. There is a significant relationship between Staff involvement and strategy implementation.
4. There is a significant relationship between Monitoring and evaluation and strategy implementation.

**Scope of the study**

The study focused on strategic leadership and strategy implementation at FUFA. This study considered the period 2005 to 2019 because it represents period when objectivity and clear leadership started to manifest at FUFA. For example, in 2016, FUFA passed a 5-year strategic plan to develop the game of football in Uganda (Muyita, 2016). Among the main focus areas in the strategic plan are governance (to improve adherence to national laws, resource mobilisation and accountability, technical development, administration (become professional more human resources is needed to run football), marketing and communications (improve marketing strategy more branding to be visible to potential sponsors to generate more revenue) (Muyita, 2016). The study respondents were all employees at FUFA.

**Significance of the study**

This study will provide source of evidence and reference for sports administrators, policy makers, scholars and researchers on the importance of strategic leaders in an organisation, more so with regards
to strategy implementation. The recommendations of the study will be significant because they will guide in strengthening sports administration in Uganda and ensuring seamless and wrangle free federations, associations, clubs and unions. Relevant laws, regulations and statutory instruments will be revised and strengthened bearing in mind the findings of this study. Studying strategic leadership in sport organisations provides “objective measures of performance, reasonable measures of leader succession, and the ability to control for many alternative explanations of performance variation” (Rowe, Cannella, Rankin & Gorman, 2005, p.216).

**Conceptual framework**

This study was guided by the conceptual framework below. Independent variable was strategic leadership with components that included leadership competence, leadership communication, staff involvement, monitoring and evaluation with strategy implementation as dependent variable.

![Conceptual Framework](image-url)

**Source.** Researcher 2019

The remaining parts of this study are arranged as follows. Section two of the study presents literature review, section three presents the methodology whereas section four presents data and results as well as a discussion of the results. Section five presents conclusion and possible policy recommendations.

**Literature review**

**Strategic leadership**

Strategic leadership is a dynamic interplay of factors and roles that enhance achievement of organisational objectives. This interplay consists of coordination of actions, streamlining of processes, aligning the organisational composition, and keeping staff motivated and committed to strategy implementation. Hitt, Ireland & Hoskisson (2007) defined strategic leadership as the ability to envision, anticipate and maintain flexibility by the leader, in ensuring empowerment to others so as to create the necessary strategic changes; it involves managing through others. Strategic leadership typically involves communicating with and listening to those inside the organisation with the aim of spreading knowledge, creating and innovating new areas and solutions to problems (Lynch, 2009).

Over the years, a number of empirical studies have been conducted on strategic leadership. Kitonga, Bichanga & Muema, (2016) sought to examine the link between strategic leadership practices and organisational performance in not-for-profit organisations. The study used both explanatory and descriptive survey research designs aimed at establishing causal relationship between strategic leadership and organisational performance. The findings showed that if not-for-profit leaders use well the strategic leadership, they are likely to improve their organisational performance significantly. This
implies that leadership plays a crucial role in the achievement of organisational goals through effective strategy implementation.

Rahman et al., (2018) studied the impact of strategic leadership on operational strategy and organisational performance of the automobile industry in Malaysia using self-administered questionnaire survey distributed to selected senior executives, chief executive officers and members of the senior executive group. The study revealed a direct and positive relationship between strategic leadership operational excellence, strategic orientation and business performance. The study also proposed that strategic competitiveness would give companies an advantage to survive in an uncertain and turbulent era by formulating and executing their strategies successfully.

A study by Mui, Basit and Hassan, (2018) aimed at establishing the impact of strategic leadership on organisational performance on small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Malaysia with a theoretical framework having five major independent variables that included leadership vision, strategic direction, core competencies, developing people and innovation capability and dependent variable: organisational performance. The primary data was collected from the top management using convenience sampling via questionnaire design in a sample size of 100 respondents who were directors, CEO, managers and top executives. The findings indicated that leadership vision, strategic direction, core competencies had insignificant positive impact on organisational performance and developing people have insignificant negative impact on organisational performance. Although this finding is inconsistent with other previous studies, the impact of leadership on strategy implementation cannot be overemphasised.

**Strategy implementation**

The success of an organisation in terms of its overall performance is determined to a large extent by how its strategy implementation is undertaken. Strategy implementation is a connecting loop between formulation and control (Ouma&Gichinga, 2017). In other words, strategy implementation can be defined as a dynamic, iterative and complex process, which is comprised of a series of decisions and activities by managers and employees – affected by a number of interrelated internal and external factors – to turn strategic plans into reality in order to achieve strategic objectives (Lil, Guohuil &Eppler, 2008). Strategy implementation is the practice of putting strategies as well as policies into action during the development of programs, budgets and procedures (Bradford et al., 2000).

Strategy implementation is a more complicated and time taking part of strategic management (Thompson, Strickland & Gamble, 2010; Schaap, 2006). Strategy implementation is the third stage of strategic management. According to Pearce and Robinson(2011), this phase can only shift into a phase of translation of thoughts into organisational actions once strategies have been discussed and objectives set (strategy implementation), and to do this, is the priority of the top management to convert these strategies into effective action plans (Chapman, 2004).

Strategy implementation is the amplification and understanding of a new strategy within an organisation (Mintzeberg, 2014). Strategy implementation is concerned with the translation of strategy into organisation action through appropriate structure and design, resource planning and the management of strategic change (Johnson &Scholes, 2002).

**Empirical review**

**Leadership competence and strategy implementation**

Leadership competencies are leadership skills and behaviours that contribute to superior performance (Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), 2008). Leadership competencies can be described variously. Njeri and Rugami(2017) described it as the skills or abilities and behaviours that can enable the leader to achieve superior performance. Competence consists of knowledge, skills, attitudes, experiences and contacts that enable good performance in a certain situation (Sydänmaanlakka, 2003). These competencies support leaders in their endeavour to manage and steer organisations to achieve their objectives. They enable leaders to act quickly and make timely decisions. Leadership competencies are grouped in six clusters which are professional, interpersonal, efficiency, leadership, wellness and self-confidence competencies (Sydänmaanlakka, 2003). Leadership competencies are the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attributes that leaders need to possess and demonstrate in order to perform their roles and jobs competently (Das, Kumar & Kumar, 2011).
Daset al. (2011) conducted a study that sought to identify the specific leadership competencies required for implementing Total Quality Management (TQM) and also examined the influence of leadership competencies for implementing individual TQM principles as well as examine the relationship of the TQM implementation principles with TQM outcomes among the Thai manufacturing companies with different levels of leadership competencies. Using data from 265 ISO 9000-certified companies, the study confirmed the necessity for top management to perform as leaders for implementing TQM. That companies with high leadership competencies execute each of the nine TQM principles more effectively. It also found that the relationships of TQM implementation constructs and the outcome construct (product quality) differ based on different contexts of leadership competencies.

Pidgeon, (2017) states that if the leadership skills or competency of the leader is not adequate, then the manager role of the subordinate may not be optimal. In other words, the extent of the subordinate’s performance is determined by the level of leadership competence the leader possesses. There are various competencies and styles of leadership which may contribute to the success or failure of any programme (Pidgeon, 2017). An organisation or programme ought to recruit or develop leaders with adequate competencies if it is to deliver to the expectation of stakeholders. Over time, many of the competencies can be achieved by various activities, such as organising and facilitating meetings, networking, developing performance improvement tools, communication, and drafting policies, procedures, and guidelines (Kroeling, Kasehagen, Barradas & Ali, 2012).

Irtaimeh(2018) conducted a study to explore the impact of Strategic leadership competencies dimensions on core competency in AlManaseer Group for Industrial and Trading. Employing a questionnaire to collect data from 180 leaders, the study revealed that there was a statistically significant impact of Strategic leadership competencies with its dimensions on core competency. It recommended that it is necessary for the company to evaluate the core competencies; periodically and continuously in order to rebuild the critical resources which are the pillars of core competencies and in line with the requirements and conditions of strategic thinking and leadership competencies. Al-Zoubi (2012) examined the impact of leadership competencies on competitive advantage in the Jordanian telecommunications industry. Questionnaires were administered on the middle line departments’ managers, supervisors and team leaders. The study indicated that leadership competences had a significant impact on competitive advantage on the Jordanian telecommunication companies as well as existence of relationship between leadership competences and competitive advantage.

**Leadership communication and strategy implementation**

For an organisation to achieve its objective in terms of strategic vision, it must ensure that communication and feedback system are effective. To this extent, communication can be defined as “the process by which an idea is transferred from a source to a receiver with the intention of changing his or her behaviour” (Rogers & Agarwala-Rogers, 1976, p. 9). This is especially critical in a world characterised by frequent changes in technology, customer preferences, legislation and competitive pressure. Therefore, the rapid and frequent environmental change makes it virtually impossible to predict the future and develop a “perfect” strategy, incorporating voices and feedback from lower level employees in the process of implementation (Detert & Burris, 2007; Milliken, Schipani, Bishara, & Prado, 2015; Shimizu & Hitt, 2004; Sull, 2007). This requires a seamless and effective communication mechanism.

For strategy implementation, two types of communication are important. First, communication by top managers plays a key role in sharing organisational values, goals, and strategic objectives among organisational members (Shimizu, 2017). Without effective communication, strategy implementation is therefore likely to fail (Lovas & Ghoshal, 2000; Oswald et al., 1994). Second, communication by lower level organisational members with upper managers is crucial for strategy implementation as a way in which to generate feedback and improve ideas in the implementation process (Shimizu & Hitt, 2004; Sull, 2007).

Peng and Litteljohn(2001) examined the relationship between organisational communication and strategy implementation in three hotel chains, all UK PLCs with diversified business portfolios, and which were in the process of implementing a strategic initiative. The findings show that effective communication is a primary requirement of effective implementation but concluded that it does not
guarantee the effectiveness of implementation. This study is consistent with the literature that reveals the importance of communication for strategy implementation process knowledge (Alexander, 1989; Li Guohui & Eppler, 2008). A study by Alharthy, Rashid, Pagliari and Khan, (2017) found out that communication was among the factors that affect strategy implementation.

Appropriate channels, modes and means of communication should be developed and adopted by organisations because, without it, miscommunication or lack of it may breakdown organisation. Leaders should find more precise and efficient ways to present change to employees and be able to describe the appropriate communication channels to use (Njeri and Rugami, 2017). Poor communication which may be in the form of gossip, grapevine undermines chances of success. An agile, purposeful organisation with competent leaders should choose appropriate media and to begin to communicate at an early stage in the strategy implementation process to avoid misunderstandings (Mapetere, Mavhiki, Nyamwanz, Sikomwe, & Mhone, 2012).

**Staff involvement and strategy implementation**

Employees are central to organisational success in terms of strategy implementation. For this reason, they need to be involved (engaged) in the organisation activities and process. Employees are the lifeblood of an organisation because they are one of the pillars that help such an organisation business succeed (TMH Business Coaching, n.d). Employee engagement is the emotional and intellectual connection which an employee has with their employer and their job, and this increases emotional attachment to the organisation, increases emotional attachment to the role, increases intellectual attachment to the organisation and increases intellectual attachment to the role (Wright, 2019). Because of this wholesome attachment, employees feel a sense of belonging that will unleash their unreserved portfolio of energy and expertise. Generally, employee engagement has become a top business priority for senior executives, although most executives see a clear need to improve employee engagement. The basic needs of satisfaction have been found to directly relate to dedication of employees (Vandenabeele, 2014).

A report by the Harvard Business Review Analytic Services on more than 550 executives around employee engagement indicated that most leaders understand the importance of engagement, but majority of respondents said that most employees in their organisations are not highly engaged (HBR, 2013). There was a reported significant gap between the views of executive managers and middle. Another study was conducted by Maas (2015) on employees’ involvement in strategy implementation. The study revealed that middle level management and key lower level employees need to be involved during strategy formulation as well as its execution. Failure to involve key employees was found to lead to implementation failure. As stated by (Bolman & Deal, 2014), there is need for autonomy, intrinsic rewards, and influence are required to achieve employee engagement.

Organisations that have highly engaged employees have greater profits than those that do not (SHRM, 2014). Organisations with highly engaged employees experience increased customer satisfaction, profits, and employee productivity (Ahmetoglu, Harding, Akhtar, & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2015; Carter, 2015; Cooper-Thomas et al., 2014; Vandenabeele, 2014). Significantly, successful strategy formulation and implementation require the involvement and commitment of managers and employees on all levels, but importantly, employees because at the end, employees are to ones who have to execute the strategy.

**Monitoring and evaluation and strategy implementation**

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) play an important function in delivery of a project or organisation strategy. A study by Callistus and Clinton(2018) revealed that monitoring and evaluation is the only project activity which begins with the initiation of the project until project closure, and therefore monitoring and evaluation is an inseparable management function (Tache, 2011). M&E have distinct functions and roles they play in the life cycle of project delivery, yet complementary. Monitoring gives information on the progress of work at any given time (and overtime) relative to the planned or desired targets and outcomes, which is descriptive in intent (Kusek and Rist, 2004). Evaluation, on the other hand, gives evidence of the extent to which targets and outcomes are being achieved and it mainly seeks to address issues of causality. Kusek and Rist, (2004) further explained that evaluation is a complement
to monitoring in that when a monitoring system sends signals that the efforts are going off track, then good evaluative information can help address the major issues causing the delays.

M&E is a critical activity because it affects project performance positively by predicting the level of success (Tengan & Aigbavboa, 2018). As part of strategy implementation, it is critical that organisational leaders develop a reliable and objective M&E framework. In essence, M&E is concerned with ensuring that planned activities, resources, project elements and components are coordinated effectively and efficiently as planned (Otieno, 2000; Tengan & Aigbavboa, 2016). A study conducted by (Njeru & Luketero, 2018) to determine the influence of skills of monitoring and evaluation team on performance of medical camp projects in hospitals in Kenya revealed that monitoring and evaluation skills influenced performance at a very great extent.

Tengan, Aigbavboa, Guribie and Annor-Asubonteng (2019) conducted a study to analyse the outcome features of effective monitoring and evaluation in construction projects delivery. The study that employed questionnaires administered to 230 participants in local authorities in Ghana discovered that value for money, successful project closure, end-user satisfaction, timely completion of projects and fitness for purpose. Similarly, the study revealed that the three principal monitoring and evaluation outcome features were performance, satisfaction and value outcome. To strategy implementation, this implies that to get desired outcome, action needs to be taken in a timely manner in order to remedy any snag or inaction.

In practical terms, monitoring and evaluating the planning activities and status of implementation of the plan is paramount for any organisation. The process should take into account efforts in identifying strategic issues and goals. M&E ensures that an organisation follows the direction established during strategic planning.

**Theoretical review**

**Strategic leadership theory**

This study was guided by strategic leadership theory which contends that the top leadership determine and influence strategic decisions that have significant impact on effective strategy implementation. Applying this theory, it means that leaders at the strategic level have to develop awareness and knowledge, the capability to think outside the box and must be able to connect and create ideas (Goldman, Scott & Follman, 2012).

The theory posits that strategic leadership is the ability of someone to anticipate, make vision, maintain flexibility, think strategically and work together with other people to start a change which can bring a better future to the organisation (Gusmão, Christiananta & Ellitan, 2018). Gusmão et al. (2018) posit that strategic leadership has six components - determining strategic direction, exploiting and maintaining core competencies, developing human capital, sustaining an effective corporate culture, emphasising ethical practices, and establishing strategic control.

According to Carter and Greer (2013), much of the studies in this area revolved around transactional, transformational and charismatic leadership, and only recently is attention shifting to servant, authentic, and responsible leadership. To this extent, a paucity of studies has been conducted in strategic leadership and more so on the relationship of strategic leadership with organisational performance (Carter & Greer, 2013). Strategic leadership therefore requires expertise in managing many aspects of an organisation. Some aspects of strategic leadership include internal and external business environment, engage in a complex information processing (Debone & Ariratana, 2014). The extent of expertise in balancing the environment while taking into consideration available resources is the hallmark of strategic leadership. Many leaders who lead their organisations successfully use strategic leadership (Deeboonmee & Ariratana, 2014).

Evolving leadership theories typically focus on the charismatic, transformational and visionary leadership and consider the interpersonal processes and relationships that exist between the leader and the follower (Boal & Hooijberg, 2000). In this regard, other scholars like (Hitt Ireland & Hoskisson, 2013) consider transformational leadership as the most effective strategic leadership style, which entails motivating followers to exceed expectations, continuously enriching their capabilities and placing the organisation’s interest above their own. To this extent, it can be concluded that transformational leaders
develop and communicate a vision and formulate strategies to achieve the vision by continuously encouraging followers to strive for higher levels of achievement (Hitt et al., 2013).

Özera and Tinaztepe (2014) posit that transformational leadership emphasises inspiration, motivation, challenge, vision, personal development and superior performance by followers. From available studies, evidence suggests that transformational leadership is effective, and is positively related to subordinate satisfaction, motivation, and performance (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Transformational leadership is a significant aspect because it emphasises the importance of followers in the leadership equation simply because it goes beyond traditional transactional models, and also broadens leadership to consider a focus on follower development (Northouse, 2001).

Methodology

The study was carried out using descriptive research design because it was concerned with learning how one variable produced changes in another and essentially tried to explain the causal relationships amongst variables (Cooper and Schindler, 2014). While experimental study seeks to establish causality, descriptive study aims to establish relationship between variables without seeking to establish causality. And this was the main reason behind selection of descriptive design. The research adopted the survey approach for data collection using a self-administered questionnaire. The unit of analysis was employees of FUFA.

Target respondents for this study were 48 employees (consisting of senior management, supervisors and lower level staff). FUFA has a programme that engages interns on who work on voluntary basis and form part of the larger group of employees. However, for this study, this group were excluded because they do not form part of the full and core employee body. Of the employee included in the questionnaire distributed, 45 returned valid questionnaires representing 94 per cent response rate. Sampling was considered inappropriate due to smallness of the population and therefore the research approach adopted was a census to cover all the elements in the target population. This is consistent with the work of Cooper and Schindler (2014), who state two conditions to be considered before use of census population. First, confirm that it is feasible when the population is small and secondly, that it is necessary when the elements are quite different from each other. In this case, the composition of the respondents (senior management, supervisors and lower level staff) justify use of census population and therefore the population of 45 confirms that a census is feasible. The composition of the respondents in terms of diversity means that accurate sampling is difficult and any resulting values calculated as a sample would be incorrect estimates of the population values (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). As was the case from similar studies (Fourie, 2007; Serfontein, 2010), response rates are usually low. To avoid such effects, it was important to enhance the chances of the data being of sufficient quantity and quality by carrying out a census as opposed to a sample population. In addition, the study used a structured self-administered questionnaire, distributed by email to the respondents via their individual email accounts.

Measurement

In order to measure variables in this study, a structured survey was used where the questionnaire comprised different sections. Section A solicited information about the respondent’s demographic profile. The other variables strategic leadership dimensions (leadership competence, leadership communication, employee involvement, monitoring and evaluation) and effective strategy implementation were measured using five Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree); (Wendy, 2012); (Mintzberg, 2004) which measured the degree to which the respondents agree or disagree with each of the statements. The questions for strategic leadership behaviours was adapted from the previous works by (Bass and Avolio, 1992) and (House, 1998). For effective strategy implementation, the measure was adapted from (Mintzberg, 2004).

Techniques for data analysis

The data presented in this study were analysed using sets of techniques. The descriptive analysis was used to summarise the respondents’ demographic profile. A correlation analysis technique was used to assist in checking interrelationship between variables and their direction of their relationship.
**Research findings**

**Descriptive statistics**

**Demographic data**

Demographic data examined included gender distribution of the respondents, level of education, management level and years worked at FUFA as described in the next section.

**Gender distribution of respondents**

The majority of respondents in this study were male, 69 per cent and female, 31 per cent. This implies that most of employees at FUFA are males as illustrated in Figure 2 below.

![Gender distribution chart](image)

**Figure 1. Gender distribution**

*Source.* Researcher’s calculation based on primary data.

**Level of education of respondents**

As illustrated in Figure 3 below, 69 per cent of participants possess a Bachelors/undergraduate degree, while 29 per cent have Masters or Postgraduate qualification with only 2 per cent having other qualifications (like Certified Public Accountants). This therefore means that the majority of employees at FUFA have a first degree (undergraduate) as a minimum qualification.

![Level of education chart](image)

**Figure 2. Level of education**

*Source.* Researcher’s calculation based on primary data.
Management level of respondents

Regarding the level of management at FUFA, 47 per cent of respondents were lower level management, 38 per cent were in supervisory positions and 15 per cent were in senior management. Overall, this means that the majority of employees at FUFA are lower level management (47%).

![Pie chart showing management levels at FUFA]

Figure 3. Management level

Source. Researcher’s calculation based on primary data.

Level of service of respondents

Of the respondents, 64.4 per cent have worked at FUFA for between 4 to 7 years and 35.6 per cent have worked for less than 3 years. This means that the majority of employees at FUFA have worked there for between 4 to 7 years. The breakdown of the number of years’ employees have worked at FUFA is illustrated in table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years at FUFA</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;3 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source. Researcher’s calculation based on primary data.

Inferential statistics

The study investigated the relationship between leadership competence, leadership communication, staff involvement, monitoring and evaluation and strategy implementation. In the next section, detailed explanation of each predictor item is made.

Correlation analysis

Correlation analysis for the variables was conducted as illustrated in Table below. The results indicated a positive and significant relationship between leadership competence and strategy implementation characterised by a moderately strong correlation between the two variables (r=0.557, p=0.000). Similarly, the results indicated a positive and significant relationship between leadership communication and strategy implementation with fairly moderately correlation between the two variables (r=0.492, p=0.001). The results also indicated a positive and an insignificant relationship between staff involvement and strategy implementation with weak correlation (r=0.066, p=0.667).
Finally, the results indicated a positive and an insignificant relationship between monitoring and evaluation and strategy implementation characterised by weak correlation (r=0.134, p=0.379).

Table 2. Correlation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRIMP</th>
<th>LDRCOMP</th>
<th>LDRCOMM</th>
<th>EMPLOINV</th>
<th>MONEVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRIMP</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>557**</td>
<td>492**</td>
<td>066</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDRCOMP</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>989**</td>
<td>769**</td>
<td>885**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDRCOMM</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>492**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>848**</td>
<td>929**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOINV</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>066</td>
<td>769**</td>
<td>848**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONEVA</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>885**</td>
<td>929**</td>
<td>946**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

STRIMP = Strategy Implementation, LDRCOMP = Leadership Competence, EMPLOINV = Staff involvement, MONEVA = Monitoring and Evaluation

Source. Researcher’s calculation based on primary data.

Regression analysis

Table 3 below shows the overall model fitness in explaining variables under study. Dimensions of strategic leadership (leadership competence, employee involvement, monitoring and evaluation) adequately predicted changes in strategy implementation as evidenced by a coefficient of determination (R square) of 0.996. This means that 99.6% of variance in strategy implementation can be predicted from the variable’s leadership competence, employee involvement and monitoring and evaluation (dimensions of strategic leadership). Leadership communication has been excluded by the model. The R-Square is an overall measure of the strength of association, not extent to which a particular independent variable is associated with the dependent variable.

Table 3. Model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.998a</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.08274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), MONEVA, LDRCOMP, EMPLOINV

Source. Researcher’s calculation based on primary data.

As illustrated in Table 4 below, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) results indicate that the overall model was statistically significant. The p-value (p=0.000) when compared to the alpha level (p=0.05) is smaller implying that the independent variables (leadership competence, employment involvement, monitoring and evaluation) reliably predict the dependent variable (strategy implementation). This is supported by the F statistic for the ANOVA which is 3,247.841 implying that it meets the criterion for significant value.
Table 4. Analysis of variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>66.697</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.232</td>
<td>3247.841</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.978</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: STRIMP
b. Predictors: (Constant), MONEVA, LDRCOMP, EMPLOINV

Source. Researcher’s calculation based on primary data.

Table 5. Regression coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>-2.346</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>-8.819</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>-2.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDRCOMP</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>1.848</td>
<td>96.034</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOINV</td>
<td>064</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>10.010</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONEVA</td>
<td>-614</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>-1.718</td>
<td>-43.098</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: STRIMP

Source. Researcher’s calculation based on primary data.

Table 6. Excluded variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta ln</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LDRCOMP</td>
<td>6.512b</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>9.882E-005</td>
<td>10119.366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: STRIMP
b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), MONEVA, LDRCOMP, EMPLOINV

Source. Researcher’s calculation based on primary data.

Discussion and conclusion

As hypothesised, it was found that there was a positive and significant relationship between Leadership competence and strategy implementation although characterised by moderate correlation coefficient. It can be said that at FUFA, leadership competence satisfactorily explained strategy implementation The finding is consistent with the work of Pidgeon (2017) who found that if the leadership skills or competency of the leader is not adequate, then the manager role of the subordinate may not be optimal, and the extent of the subordinate’s performance is determined by the level of
leadership competence the leader possesses. Various competencies and styles of leadership may contribute to the success or failure of any programme (Pidgeon, 2017).

Similarly, a positive and significant relationship was found between leadership communication and strategy implementation characterised by relatively moderate correlation. However, regression analysis revealed that leadership communication is not particularly useful in strategy implementation in FUFA as it excluded it from the model analysis. The model summary indicated through R-Square that 99.6% of changes in strategy implementation can be explained by leadership competence, employee involvement, monitoring and evaluation. This is not consistent with the work of Shimizu (2017) who found that communication by top managers plays a key role in sharing organisational values, goals, and strategic objectives among organisational members, and communication by lower level organisational members with upper managers is crucial for strategy implementation as a way in which to generate feedback and improve ideas in the implementation process (Shimizu & Hitt, 2004; Sull, 2007). Peng and Litteljohn (2001) showed that effective communication is a primary requirement of effective strategy implementation and communication is among the factors that affect strategy implementation (Alharthy et al., 2017).

The results also revealed a positive and an insignificant relationship between Staff involvement and strategy implementation characterised by weak correlation coefficient. According to correlation analysis, employee involvement did not adequately predict strategy implementation as indicated by an insignificant positive relationship. This is explained by a marginal value of unstandardised coefficient (0.064).

From correlation analysis, a positive and an insignificant positive relationship was found between monitoring and evaluation and strategy implementation characterised by weak but positive correlation. However, regression analysis showed relationship confirmed by a negative unstandardized coefficient (-0.614). This finding is not consistent with the works of Njeru and Luketero (2018) and Tengan et al. (2019) who found that monitoring and evaluation influence performance of medical camp and in construction projects delivery respectively.

**Recommendations**

The study recommends that management at FUFA should maintain and prioritise the level of leadership competence and employee involvement because they are key in achieving strategy implementation. Leadership competence is critical because it provides stewardship role in strategy implementation. The study also recommends that although employee involvement is important (positive), it is not significant in strategy implementation as it has a positive but weak correlation. The study also recommends that monitoring and evaluation is important but insignificant in strategy implementation as it has a weak correlation. The study recommends little or no employee involvement because the more employees are involved, the more it reduces unit contribution to strategy implementation.

The study also recommends that leadership communication is not useful variable in achieving strategy implementation as the model used in this study excluded it from the analysis. It was found that leadership communication did not predict changes in strategy implementation.

The area of this research was restricted to internal stakeholder dimensions - leadership competence, leadership communication, employee involvement and monitoring and evaluation. However, FUFA has many stakeholders like government, sponsors, Football clubs, fans (spectators). It is recommended that research should include these key stakeholders. In addition, variables studied function with a certain organisational culture and structure. It is recommended that research should include these variables because they affect strategy implementation in general.
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