

STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP IMPLEMENTATION AND SERVICE QUALITY IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES IN NIGERIA

UKPONG, UWEM JOHNSON^{*}, OSSIA, ETHELBERT NDUKA^{**}

ABSTRACT

The study looked at the effect of strategic leadership implementation and service quality in manufacturing industries in Nigeria. The population of this study consists of 32 employees of the said industries operating. The sample size covered 32 employees of the industries. The research data was gathered with a structured questionnaire. and the analysis done with the help of SPSS. The study found that Strategic Leadership Implementation (with culture and structure as sub-dimension) aspects of strategic leadership implementation relate positively and significantly with all the measures of service quality which includes, reliability and assurance. Therefore we conclude that; the strategic nature of the strategy implementation must not be downplayed. Hence, managers are expected to create a common interactional platform where views are commonly expressed and shared by all stakeholders to implementation. This will help managers to sufficiently clear ambiguous areas associated with policy or strategy crafting which will also hinder quality service delivery.

KEYWORDS: Strategic Leadership Implementation, Service Quality, Reliability, Assurance, Manufacturing Company.

INTRODUCTION

The need to make improvements on the quality of service delivery among employees of an organisation is based on Leadership implementation. However, recent empirical research had indicated the impact of leadership implementation and had further noted that leadership formulation alone is never been a key indicator or prerequisite for superior organisational performance. (Holman, 1999; Flood, Dromgook, Canoll & Gordon 2000; Kaplan & Norton 2001). As written by Robinson, "Managing the implementation and execution of strategy is demanding and time consuming part

of the strategic management process. Good strategy implementation entails that managers pay adequate attention key functional business process are performed and see to it that employees" efforts are directed toward desired goal and operational results. The task of implementing the leadership strategy necessitates analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness of a company's internal activities and a managerial awareness of new technological developments that would improve business processes" (Robinson & Pearce, 2007).

^{*}Akwa Ibom State University.

^{**}Department of Management, Faculty of Business Studies, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt.

Correspondence E-mail Id: editor@eurekajournals.com

This also applies to manufacturing industries especially with the current dynamic environment, calling for effective leadership formulation and implementation. In other words, leadership implementation is the process in which an agreed strategy is put into action. Thompson, *et al*(2005) puts forward that a well formulated strategy and effective implementation of the said strategy results in effective and enhanced organisation.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

There are multiple studies related to strategy formulation rather than of leadership implementation (Huy, 2011; Johnson, *et al*2018). Bossidy and Charan (2002) argued that the subject of implementation poorly addressed subjects in today's organisation and its absence has been identified as the single biggest obstacle to the success of organisations. Many studies mentioned that there are noticeable absence of deep and coherent body of literature in the field of strategy execution which has consequences for business practice and growth (Jiang & Carpenter, 2013; Poton & Wagner, 2012; Gottschalk, 2006; Ranjbar, Shirazi, & Blooki, 2014; Almsjah, 2011; Waweru, 2011).

On the other hand, the present study is undertaken to examining the relationship between leadership implementation and service quality in manufacturing industries setting to open new lines of thought from an under-researched work setting. The variables selected for this study have been suggested to be adopted by future authors who dedicated their work to service quality in other industry(s) (Bolton, Lemon & Bramlett, 2006; Al-Mudimigh, 2009; Rahim 2010; Saaty, 2011; Duodu & Amankwah, 2011; Upadhyaya & Badlani, 2011; Sivesan, 2012).

As far as manufacturing industry is concerned, customer service quality constitutes an integral part of the philosophy upon which the industry is grounded (Upadhyaya & Badlani, 2011).

Consequently, it is highly important for manufacturing industries to determine the key success factors influencing the provision of service quality as this would have a greater positive impact on customer satisfaction and in turn, create loyal customers. This would help manufacturing companies survive in intense competition and rapidly changing market. A number of success indices that have been found to sway the manufacturing industry's provision of service quality have emerged in literature.

More so, empirical endeavours undertaken to determine the relationship between strategic leadership implementation and service quality are scarce in the management literature. Globally, while some empirical literatures has been established in relation to this (Saaty, 2011; Payne, 2006; Groggaard, 2012 Kalio & Zeb, 2018), the need to bridge the gap elicited the need to embark on this study.

THE FOLLOWING RESEARCH QUESTIONS ARE STATED TO GUIDE THE STUDY:

1. To what extent does strategic leadership implementation relates with reliability in the service quality in manufacturing industry in Nigeria?
2. To what extent does strategic leadership implementation relates with assurance in the service quality of manufacturing industry in Nigeria?

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between strategic leadership implementation and reliability in the service quality of manufacturing industry in Nigeria.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between strategic leadership implementation and assurance in the service quality of manufacturing industry in Nigeria.

LITERATURE REVIEW

STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP IMPLEMENTATION

Several authors had proposed distinctive models to structure the execution process which guide companies for better implementation of their strategies (Kaplan, 1998; Myers, 1996 and Ballve, Davila & Kaplan 2000). Hrebiniak & Joyce (1984) provided one such model with the argument that the first critical ingredient of the implementation process is a good-articulated strategy. According to Cater, *et al* (2010), the design of a primary organisational structure, the establishments of operational-level objectives, the design of operating structures, and the creation of proper incentives with control mechanisms which support the execution come after this provision. Organisations thus regularly take care of planning and organisational design from the top level, and executing strategies from the top levels of the organisation down to the bottom levels of hierarchy (Cater & Pucko, 2010).

Most of the concepts included in Hrebiniak and Joyce's (1984) model are also included in the recently proposed models. Higgins (2005) proposed a revision of McKinsey's original "7S" model with the proposition of "8S" model which "comprises strategy, structure, systems and processes, leadership style, staff, resources, shared values, and strategic performance to enable managers have better focus on strategy execution" (Higgins, 2006).

CHALLENGES IN STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPEDIMENTS

There has been multiple impediments to effective strategy implementation as shown in empirical literatures (Hrebiniak, 2006; Morgan, *et al.* 2007). In general, there has been discriminant, planned variations of strategic implementation by organizations which are actually been executed (Mintzberg, 1994). Morgan, *et al.* (2007) found only ten percent of well-planned strategies being

translated into execution. Raps (2004) reported that the success rate of strategy implementation and execution is around ten to thirty (30) %. Many challenges have been pointed out to be associated with overcoming resistance to change as well as making people to be committed to process of change (Speculand, 2006). These challenges are as follows: "a) gaining support and action; b) communicating the change; c) overcoming resistance from staff; d) support of senior management; e) aligning processes; f) tracking the success of execution; g) changing rewards and recognition; h) acquiring customer feedback; i) executing new technology; j) acquiring budget" (Speculand, 2006).

Raps (2004) noted that "the problem associated with most traditional strategy execution efforts is that they over stressed the structure over other important elements such as culture, organisation, people, control systems and instruments". Hrebiniak (2006) also claimed that poor execution is due to too much emphasis on planning and lack of adequate knowledge on how to execute strategy. He considered the factors affecting strategy execution to be as follows: a) Managers are trained to plan, not execute; b) the belief by some top-level managers that strategy execution is meant for lower-level employees; c) planning and execution are interdependent; d) execution is a process that takes longer time than formulation; e) execution involves more people than strategy formulation (Bhatti, 2011; Hrebiniak, 2006).

Hrebiniak (2008) added another five obstacles to the strategy execution. These obstacles include: "a) inability to effectively manage change and overcome resistance to change b) poor or vague strategy; c) absence of guidelines or a model to guide strategy execution efforts d) poor or inadequate information sharing among individuals/units responsible for strategy execution e) working against the power structure" (Hrebiniak 2006). Furthermore, Hansen, Boyd and Kryder (1998) pointed other

execution problems as thus: a) failure to change the plan periodically or adapt it to changes in the business environment; b) deviation from original objectives; and c) lack of confidence about success.

According to Rutan (1999), during the planning phase, all the aspects of implementation are essential for execution because the time to do that will not be available during execution. Everyone on the team should understand and agree on the detail plan. Management must be committed to remain focused on the plans agreed upon and make the necessary changes to the plan after careful consideration of the overall implications and consequences of the change. Nickols (2000) asserted that "strategy is the implementation". The author has mentioned four cases of strategy execution as follows: flawed strategy and flawed execution, sound strategy and flawed execution, flawed strategy and sound execution, and finally sound strategy and sound execution.

The organisation has a brighter chance to succeed only with sound strategy and execution, excluding environmental and competitive influences. Delisi (2001) investigated "the six strategy killers of strategy execution". He found that out of these six factors, four of them actually hinder strategy implementation. These are a) ineffective senior management; b) top-down or laissez-faire senior management style; c) unclear strategies and conflicting priorities; and d) poor coordination across functional boundaries (Delisi, 2006).

Brannen's (2005) proposed that "in order to improve implementation, certain issues relating to inadequate or unavailable resources, poor communication of the strategy to the organisation, ill-defined action plans, ill-defined accountabilities, and organisational cultural barriers must be tackled and solved". He added that failure to empower or give people more freedom and authority to execute will constitute

a significant obstacle to execute strategy effectively. Welbourne's (2005) examination of items on what's getting in the way of execution observed that habit and past experience reflects on new strategy and these have effects on strategy implementation.

In the discussion of the gap between the formulation of strategy and performance, Crittenden and Crittenden (2008) observed that performance often suffers due to programs, systems, and policies that are not compliant with the strategic planning and execution efforts. In addition, several organisations could not effectively connect planning to implementation, due to an overemphasis on planning rather than execution.

STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP IMPLEMENTATION

Implementing corporate strategy requires a team effort headed by your organisation's leadership team. Each person involved in change management has their responsibilities, and it is important for the entire organisation to understand the role of leadership in strategic implementation to make delegating responsibility more effective.

Strategic implementation of any kind of new company policy or program requires participation from all of the departments that will be affected. Company leadership needs to identify what those departments are and create an implementation team that consists of representatives from each affected group. Management needs to create a structure that identifies various group leaders, the responsibilities of those group leaders and an accountability system that insures that the implementation team meets its timetable for getting the new program or policy(s) in place.

Implementing change or any new strategy within an organisation requires a feeling of urgency on the part of the entire organisation. It is the job of management to create that urgency by explaining to its' employees the necessity for the

implementation. Leadership needs to help the employees understand how the organisation stand to benefit from the new implementation policies, but it also needs to get the organisation to see the setbacks of not making a change.

Strategic implementation within an organisation is not an exact process. It is a dynamic procedure that needs to be monitored by management and altered to meet implementation goals. It is the responsibility of leadership to put a monitoring system in place, analyze the data that is being generated during the implementation and make any necessary changes to make the implementation more efficient (Johnson, *et al* 2018).

Leaders can positively or negatively impact the capacity to foster change and innovation within the organisation (Damanpour & Schneider, 2006; Gumusluoglu & Ilsev, 2009) and therefore are instrumental in facilitating a positive atmosphere for innovation and positive attitudes which can lead to effective service delivery. Although the role of leadership in strategy implementation is often discussed anecdotally, there has never been an empirically examined research in relation to it. The limited empirical research in this area supports the presence of a relationship between general leadership ability and implementation of innovative practices, but focuses less on identifying specific behaviors that leaders may enact to facilitate implementation within the organisation. To stimulate and support additional empirical work in this area, there is a need for brief and efficient measures to assess specific actions leaders may engage in to influence the success of implementation efforts in their organisations or programs.

In the management literature, empirical evidence for the importance of leadership in predicting the success of implementation efforts exists. For instance, transformational leadership (the degree to which a leader can inspire and motivate others) has been shown to predict employees'

reported use of an innovative practice being implemented in their organisation (Michaelis, Stegmaier, & Sonntag, 2010). Much of the empirical research on leadership and implementation has focused primarily on identifying mechanisms through which leaders affect implementation. These include a positive organisational climate, supportive team, and positive work attitudes (Aarons, Sommerfeld, & Willging, 2011; Bain, Mann, & Pirola-Merlo, 2001; Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2008).

Generally, leadership plays a pivotal role in the implementation of strategic process. However, studies in this area has not necessarily outlined specific behaviors that leaders may exact in order to strategically influence followers to support the larger goal of successful implementation. Insight into such behaviors can be garnered from existing literature demonstrating that strategically-focused leadership predicts the achievement of specific goals. Interestingly, there are multiple implementation strategies. Unfortunately, only a few focused on leadership as an implementation factor. In view of the above submissions, (Klein, Conn, & Sorra, 2001) opined that; "strategy leadership by way of motivation and reward-centered leadership can lead to effective service delivery".

Two key components of strategic leadership implementation is noted but will not be empirical examined on their own merit. They will be examined as critical components of strategic leadership implementation. It is noted that leadership is a management function at various levels of abstraction depending on the kind of leadership to be examined. More so some of the leadership styles that have been frequently examined in the management literature are transformational leadership, transactional leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2005), authentic leadership (Walumbwa *et al.*, 2008), destructive leadership (Krasikova, Green & LeBreton, 2013), lazier-faire leadership, inclusive leadership (Carmeli *et al.*, 2009), etc. One primary

characteristics of these leadership styles are that they are made of elements of rewards and motivation.

Leaders often reward their subordinates for job well done, and by extension motivate them into working harder in achieving set organisational goals and objectives. Subordinates need to be rewarded and motivated as such, hence the need to implement strategic leadership characteristics.

REWARD SYSTEM

Scholars define "reward system has related set of processes through which behaviors are directed and motivated to achieve individual and collaborative performances" (Shah & Nair, 2014; Shaap, Stedham, & Yamamura, 2008). Ranjbar, sees it as "a set of processes which is comprised of goal setting, assessing performance, distributing rewards, and communicating feedback" (Ranjbar, *et al.*, 2014; Almsjah, 2011; Waweru, 2011; Slater, *et al.*, 2010; Homburg, *et al.*, 2004). An efficient reward system can have a constructive impact on leadership implementation success. Homburg stresses that Reward, "consist of monetary compensation such as salary and remuneration but can also include non-monetary compensation such as compliments, positive attention, praise, recognition, and good performance assessment interviews". Other non-financial rewards could be award giving to an employee at the end of the year for a positive contribution in the organisation, and other attributes like ensuring that the workers are psychologically enhanced to carry out their activities to achieve the organisational growth (Johnson, *et al.* 2018) However, organisation should not only reward performing members, they should also address non-performing member as well.

However, in strategic leadership implementation several researchers have outlined the impact of effective rewards system in strategy leadership implementation (Neilson, *et al.*, 2008; Hrebiniak,

2008; Higgins, 2006; Okumas, 2003; Noble, 1999; Hussey, 1996; Floyd and Wooldridge, 1992; Hrebiniak and Joyce, 1984). Hrebiniak, opined that "Organisations need a reward system that monitors progress toward full execution and demonstrates senior management's interest and investment in attaining the goals of the strategy" (Hrebiniak, 2005). The greater the organisational internal change that has impacts on the organisation the better the strategic impact on the effectiveness of the organisation's incentive. (Okumas, 2001). Rewarding the workers in the organisation to a greater extend is imperative in achieving and enhancing workers performance (Hrebiniak, 2008; Hrebiniak & Joyce, 1984).

A lack of adequate reward system to a greater extend has a negative effect on execution which are as follows: "a) there is no financial inducement for members of the organisation to enable them perform well in the cause of task execution effort. b) Members of the organisational get inadequate feedback on task accomplishment". When members of an organisation have no rewards feedback mechanism, they have no way of learning from their performance, making it hard to advance on performance.

THE CONCEPT OF SERVICE QUALITY

Physical environment include buildings, offices and interior design affects customer beliefs, attitudes and satisfaction (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2000), and provides an opportunity to tell the correct story about a given service (Berry *et al.*, 1989). Matters such as how well one's dress up, articulates, writes, designs and presents proposals seems like no meaning because they are intangibles (Levitt, 1981). As tangible input, "the service personnel, the organisation and the marketers, represent the service in the customers' eyes" (Zeithaml & Bitner, 1996). The management of quality for a service personnel includes such things as motivating, managing information, training, career planning and

recruiting and retaining of right people (Normann, 1991); Zeitharrll & Britner, 1996).

It is true that service business is personnel intensive, meaning that quality supplied to the customer is essentially a result from the way personnel perform (Normann, 1991). Schneider (1990) showed that both employees and customers will experience more positive outcomes when the organisation operates with a customer service orientation and management supports. This may be linked to the external service value within the service profit chain suggest by Heskett *et al.* (1994), which described employee satisfaction as the underlying factor in the formation of customer perceived quality. The other important element is service culture, which means in an organization, all employees are embedded with the culture of being customer focus and customer oriented. This can be achieved by participating in the production process, gaining customers influence and determined service culture before providing the service (Lehtinen, 1985).

Service quality is multi-dimensional (Gronroos, 1982, 1990; Parasuraman, *et al.*, 1985), there is no general agreement as to the nature or content of the dimensions (Brady & Cronin, 2001). However, a review of the service quality studies to date explicitly shows that scholars have made a great influence on the study of service quality dimensions. That is, the contemporary discussions on the dimensions of service quality have been initiated by scholars. Lehtinen & Lehtinen (1982) defined service quality "in terms of physical quality, interactive quality and corporate quality, physical quality to him "relates to the tangible aspects of the service", interactive quality "involves the interactive nature of services and refers to the two-way flow that occurs between the customer and the service provider, or the company representative, including both automated and animated interactions", corporate quality refers to the "image attributed to a service provider by its

current and potential customers, as well as other publics".

Organisations face many challenges as they function with increasingly competitive pressures, due to the liberalization/globalization policies geared towards enhancing the sector, which had led organisation to focus most of their primary strategies toward improving service quality in order to enhance customer satisfaction and loyalty (Siddiqui & Sharma, 2010; Johnson, *et al* 2017). They also stated "consumer taste has increased tremendously and their need for adequate and enhanced service heightened for higher standards". They further added that "it is difficult for service providers to manage their services effectively, because the advancement of technology, especially in information technology, enables the consumer to make accurate and quick comparisons on product and services". They concluded that "this in turn leads to the fact that customer expectations and perceptions are continually changing and evolving".

Several researchers has seen service quality as an abstract concept that is dynamic with no acceptable definition or an indices for it's' measurement, (Carman, 1990; Parasuraman *et al.*, 1988; Parasuraman *et al.*, 1991). In any particular service, customer perception on the service can be categorized into two dimensions - functional quality and technical quality - in service quality modeling (Gronroos, 1984). Meanwhile, a gap model in service quality has been proposed, which operationalised the quality of service in terms of the distance between customer expectation and customer performance perception (Parasuraman *et al.*, 1985). Following this, a broad definition of service quality was presented by Zeithaml, *et al.* (1993), which was the "consumers' assessment of the overall excellence or superiority of the service". This concept has also been viewed as the overall judgment or attitude of the consumer toward the level of excellence of the service rendered, which is measured by a comparison of the performance

and expectation. According to different service applications, previous researchers had attempted to operationalise service quality from different viewpoints. Culiberg & Rojsek (2010) defined service quality as perceived quality, which means a customer's judgment of a particular service. Thus, service quality is agreed upon to be viewed and perceived in different fields and industries in which each industry needs to develop their own service quality model (Siddiqui & Sharma, 2010). Parasuraman *et al.* (1985) proposed the gap model of service quality that operationalised service quality as the gap between expectation and performance perception of the customer. The following section addresses the various gaps that appeared in Parasuraman, *et al.* (1985) model.

RELIABILITY AND SERVICE QUALITY

Reliability refers "to the timeliness and precision of service employees' ways of handling customer issues and fulfilling their promises to the customers" (He & Li, 2011). It can immensely affect the service quality perception of customers. Early research suggested reliability as one of the significant attributes on which customers form their expectations of service quality (Dabholkar 1996). Moreover, reliability according to Johnson, *et al* (2018) is a key to the attainment of a functional service quality which in turn enhanced the organisations' capability to execute the service as promised, in an accurate and dependable manner".

Furthermore, reliability connotes handling customers' service problems, performing services right for the first time, provide services at the promise time and maintaining error free record. Reliability also consists of accurate order, fulfillment, accurate record, accurate on billing, accurate calculation of premium and commission and keeping services promise. All these reliability attributes make customers recognize the consistency and creditability of employees which

leads to service quality and overall performance to the organization`.

ASSURANCE AND SERVICE QUALITY

The human resource of organisation forms the assurance component that is part of the service quality dimension. These employees are viewed to be skilled workers that the consumer will trust and have confidence in during the rendering of service. Therefore, in occurrences when the consumer is far from comfortable when coming face to face with the employee, there is a greater probability that the consumer would cease dealing with the company and would take his or her money and patronage elsewhere. Parasuraman *et al* (1985) defined assurance as "knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to inspire trust and confidence". Mildred, *et al* (2017) sees assurance as the courteous and responsive workforce that delivers services to the customers as at when due, knowledgeable and experience management team. In other words the dependability of the workforce guarantees' a deliverable service quality.

METHODOLOGY

Interestingly, before ascertaining the validity and reliability of the construct, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was employed to measure the sampling adequacy to confirm the suitability of conducting factor analysis. Kaiser's (1970) classification as cited by Hair *et al.* (1998) who stated that a KMO value of more than 0.50 is acceptable. The Cronbach Alpha was use to measure the reliability of the constructs. Nevertheless, Nunnally, Bernstein, and Berge (1967) propose the following minimum standards: Cronbach alpha of 0.7 for exploratory research, 0.8 for basic research and 0.9 for critical issue research and those having specific measurement scores. In the study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for all the constructs indicated a good level of internal consistency; in other words strong reliability.

Specifically, the alpha values of all constructs range from 0.857 to 0.892 concluding an acceptable level of internal consistency (Nunnally Jum & Bernstein Ira, 1978).

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF CONSTRUCTS

Mean has been defined by Fah & Hoon (2009) as the average value of data set. It constructs a mathematical number that we can use to report central tendency. Whereas standard deviation is

used to calculate the “dispersion” or “spread”, It can be obtained by summing the squared values of the deviation of each observation from the mean, dividing by the total number of observation which is variance and then taking the positive square root of the result (Gorard, 2005). According to Uma Sekaran (2003), in order to test the relationship between independent and dependent variables, we should know the means and standard deviations of each variable.

Table 1.Descriptive Result on Assurance Measure of Service Quality

S/N	Assurance	SA (5)	A (4)	MA (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	\bar{X}	Std
5	Sincerity and patience in resolving customers’ complaints/problems is paramount	10 (33)	8 (27)	7 (23)	3 (10)	2 (7)	3.34	1.148
6	The behaviour of employees in instilling confidence in customers should be encouraged by management	9 (30)	7 (23)	8 (27)	4 (14)	2 (7)	3.84	1.333
7	Employees’ use of required skills and knowledge to answer customers’ questions should be encouraged.	10 (33)	9 (30)	6 (21)	2 (17)	3 (10)	3.60	0.927

Source: Survey Data, 2019

All figures in parenthesis are percentages (%)

Table 1 shows data on the assurance measure of service quality. The response distribution descriptively asserts the extent of assurance customer expects. From the results, the 21st question item which is concerned with sincerity and patience in resolving customer complaints/problems has a mean score of 3.2 which is only moderate agree range of the scale. This means that most of the respondents agree to sincere and patient approach to handling customers concerns on services, instilling confidence on customer which is the 22nd question items. This is shown by the mean score of also had a mean score of 3.60. This implies descriptively that where complaints arose they the assurance of the companies through attention granted them.

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

According to Pallant (2011), correlation analysis is

advantageous in “describing the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables”. Succinctly put, the Pearson correlation analysis (continuous variables) was employed to assess and clarify the strengths of the relationship among the study variables. In order to determine the strength of the correlation, Hair, *et al.* (2010) recommended that the correlation 0 shows no relationship, while the correlation ± 1.0 shows perfect relationship. Cohen (1988), on the other hand, interpreted the correlation between 0 and 1.0 as follows; the correlation (r) between ± 0.1 and ± 0.29 shows small relationship, between ± 0.30 and ± 0.49 shows medium relationship and above ± 0.50 shows strong relationship.

Ho₁: *There is no relationship between leadership implementation and reliability*

Table 2. Correlation Result on the Relationship between Leadership Implementation and Reliability Correlations

		leadership implementation and reliability	Reliability
Spearman's rho Leadership Implem.	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.418**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	30	30
Reliability	Correlation Coefficient	.418**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	30	30

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

The results shown in table 2 indicate that a relationship exists between reward system and reliability. The rho value = 0.418 indicates a relationship between leadership implementation and reliability in the sector investigated. Further, a significant relationship is also found @ p 0.01 which means that a positive and significant

relationship exist between leadership implementation and reliability in the studied manufacturing industries therefore the alternate is accepted.

Ho₂: *There is no relationship between leadership implementation and assurance*

Table 3. Correlation Result on the Relationship between Leadership Implementation and Assurance Correlations

		leadership implementation and assurance	Assurance
Spearman's rho Leadership Implem.	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	0.377**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	30	30
Assurance	Correlation Coefficient	0.377**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	30	30

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

The results of the analyzed data as shown in the table above has a rho value of 0.377 which shows a weak positive relationship between leadership implementation and assurance which is also significant @ p 0.051. This means that the null hypothesis earlier stated is rejected and the alternate is accepted. It implies that leadership implementation component of strategy implementation relates significantly with the

assurance measure of service quality in the studied manufacturing industries.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study result indicates strongly the relationship of leadership implementation with service quality. Good leadership enhances success of implementation effort. Transformational leadership is the degree to

which leaders can motivation and inspire others and it has been shown to predict employees reported use of innovative practice been implemented in organisation (Michaelis, Stegmaier & Sonntag, 2010). The correlation outcome showcases the fact that behaviour of targeted stakeholders is positively prompted to achieve the desired ends. The findings here conform to extant position on the research effort aimed at investigating what behavioural outcome is expected where leadership implementation is introduced. Waweru (2011) noted that the first hand attempt at ensuring quality product or service delivery is by institutionalizing a reward culture for employees the form notwithstanding. It induces the psychological tact that is needed as incentive for improved creature approaches that guarantee quality. The results as noted strengthen this position. Employees in the sector are inclined to reward as incentive for committed implementation compliance.

The manufacturing industries practically require a rewarding and motivating system that stimulates employee capacity to attract patronage considering the peculiarity that is associated with the services rendered. The long-term nature of the proceeds that customers expects, require that they have a robust and non-inhibited feedback mechanism that creates closer ties and reliability. Once performance parameters are set and employees are able to meet set targets, they naturally expects rewards either financing or non-financial and this is with the objective of getting them stimulated for either superior tasks or expanded operational responsibility. In instances where this is lacking, the implementational result will be for short of the desired performance goals. Eisenberger, *et al.* (2001) argued that rewards are inducement for employee and they ensure a reciprocal behaviour which in this circumstance is commitment to implementation goal of quality service delivery. Rhoades, *et al* (2001) also acknowledged rewards capacity to

make employees develop high levels of organisational support.

Allen, *et al* (2003) research findings are indeed a reinforcement of the empirical relationship between leadership implementation and employee commitment to work goals (Krasikova, *et al.*, 2013). Recognizing employees operational or administrative capabilities often times ensures that the organisation reposes the confidence that enables management to open up a wide latitude for undertaking tasks. Williams, *et al* (2006) argued that such recognition is reciprocated through such efforts that improve product or service quality. The end point beneficiary is the customer who is provided with tangibility, reliability and assured services. From the study result, rewards is not viewed as a feature for effective and efficient implementation processes rather it is a major component that accompanies strategic leadership implementation with a view to providing for service quality as endpoint goal.

Further, based on the norm of reciprocal gestures, perceived organisational leadership that is focused on rewards and motivation, suggest that employees who believe that they receive a higher level of support from the organisation (reward and motivation) perform better in discretionary work situation. They are expected to exhibit positive behaviour and attitude that are favourable to the entire strategy implementation scheme. It is in this light imperative that organisation that seeks competitive advantage should consider reward for employees and perhaps customers as a fulcrum for strategy implementation. Consequently, the reward scheme which the insurance sector have created for the employees and in some instance for customer may be the premise for the extra-role behaviour that have enabled service quality and continued survival in an industry that is inundated with lull in customer preferences and awareness.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study results revealed that leadership implementation (reward system and motivation) in the organisation during strategy implementation have positive and significant relationship with the measures of service quality (reliability and assurance).

This study primarily examined the influence of leadership implementation on service quality. The strategic management framework had considered the implementation stage of strategy as being critical to several organisational outcomes. What this simply suggests is that leadership implementation must be conducted in a manner that it leads to realization of intended objectives. In order to conduct this study primary questions that reflect on the dimension and measures of the constructs were drawn as guide to the study. Based on the obtained data and analysis, there are clear-cut findings in the study that indicates the nature of relationship between leadership implementation and service quality. The strategic leadership implementation (reward system and motivation) was also shown as playing significant role in shaping service quality in relation to strategy implementation practices. From the foregoing, it is concluded that leadership implementation which is wholly aimed at carrying out formulated strategies is an important aspect that engenders service quality. Strategy implementation practices are conducted with a new to reaching goals which in this circumstance is quality service delivery in the studied sector.

Based on the findings and conclusions the following recommendations were made:

1. Putting the right leaders in the right place is a key to effective service delivery. Transformational leadership has been found to be motivational and incentive delivery which spurs the employees to perform better

and deliver service quality. Therefore, management should have leaders that are transformational, motivational and reward driven as this will ensure better performance and service quality.

2. Prompt and timely reward system is key to achieving a sense of positive behaviour reinforcement. The rewards system of the organisation must be seen to be fair and equitably dispensed so as to enlist their support and commitment rather than being a disincentive for employee commitment. Motivation of employees is also critical in ensuring improved service quality. This is one area that leaders can show leadership by action.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Andrew, R., Boyne, G., Law, J., & Walker, R. (2011). Strategy Implementation and Public Service Performance. *Administrative & Society journal*. 1-29.
- [2]. Ansari, Z. A. (2011). Analysis of the impact of reforms on insurance industry of Saudi Arabia. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, 1(8), 28-37.
- [3]. Ansoff, H.I. (1965). *Corporate Strategy: Business Policy Growth and Expansion*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [4]. Bain, P.G, Mann L, Pirola-Merlo (2001). A: The innovative imperative: the relationships between team climate, innovation, and performance in research and development teams. *Small Group Res.*, 32: 55-73.
- [5]. Ball, D., Coelho, P.S., & Machas, A. (2004). The role of communication and trust in explaining customer loyalty: an extension to the ECSI model. *European Journal of Marketing*, 38(9/10), 1272-1293.
- [6]. Barlett, J. E., Kortlik, J.W., & Higgins, C.C. (2001). Organizational Research: Determining Appropriate Sample Size in Survey Research. *Information Technology*,

- Learning, and Performance Journal*, 19(1), 43-50.
- [7]. Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173-1182.
- [8]. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: MLQ; Sampler Set; Technical Report, Leader Form, Rater Form, and Scoring Key for MLQ Form 5x-short*. Mind Garden.
- [9]. Beatty, K., & Quinn, L. (2010). Strategic Command Taking the Long View for Organizational Success. *Leadership In Action*, 30(1), 3-7.
- [10]. Beck, T. & Webb, I. (2003). Economic, Demographic, and Institutional Determinants of Life Insurance Consumption across Countries, *The World Bank Economic Review*, 17(1), 51-88.
- [11]. Bell, P. Dean, G.& Gottschalk, P.(2010).Information management in law enforcement: The case of police intelligence strategy implementation. *International Journal of Information Management*. 30.343–349.
- [12]. Bendle, M. F. (2007). Secret Saudi funding of radical Islamic groups in Australia. *National Observer*, 72, 7-18.
- [13]. Berkley, B. J., & Gupta, A. (1994).Improving service quality with information technology. *International Journal of Information Management*, 14, 109-211.
- [14]. Bhatti, O. (2011). Strategy Implementation: An alternative choice of 8Ss, *ANNALS of Management Research*, 1(2). 52-59.
- [15]. Blal, I. (2011). The Role of middle management in the execution of expansion strategies: the case of developers selection of hotel projects. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 30. 272-282.
- [16]. Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Transaction Publishers, UK.
- [17]. Bolton, R.N., Lemon, K.N., & Bramlett, M.D. (2006).The effect of service experiences over time on a supplier's retention of business customers. *Management Science*, 52, 1811–1823.
- [18]. Bossidy L, & Charan, R. (2002). *Execution: The discipline of getting things done*. Crown Business: New York.
- [19]. Brannen, L. (2005). Upfront: The 33 1/3 percent strategy solution. *Business finance, Business Review*. 83(10). 72-80.
- [20]. Brown, S.W., Swartz, T.A. (1989). A gap analysis in professional service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 53(4), 92-98.
- [21]. Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and quality in social research*. Unwin Hyman, publishers, U.K..
- [22]. Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2003).*Business Research Methods*. New York: Oxford University publishers, UK.
- [23]. Bulloch, L. (2011). *Alignment and integration for strategy execution in baldrige award winning organizations*. ProQuest Publishing. PhD Dissertation.
- [24]. Candido, C. & Santos, S. (2008). TQM: How difficult is to implement it? cases discussion paper. Faro, Portugal: Centre for Advanced Studies in Economics and Econometrics, Faculty of Economics, University of Algarve.
- [25]. Carmeli, A., Brueller, D., & Dutton, J. E. (2009). Learning behaviours in the workplace: The role of high-quality interpersonal relationships and psychological safety. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 26(1), 81-98.
- [26]. Cater, T. & Pucko, D. (2010). Factors of effective strategy implementation: empirical evidence from slovenian business practice. *JEEMS*, (5)207-237.
- [27]. Chandler, A.D. (1962). *Strategy and Structure*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [28]. Charan, R. & Colvin, G. (2002). Why CEOs & Fail. *Fortune Archives* 6(2) 18-24.

- [29]. Chebat, J. (1999). Special issue on strategy implementation and assessment research: research on implementation deserve as much attention as strategy formulation. *Journal of Business Research*. 45, 107-109.
- [30]. Chen, L, & Tan, J. (2004). *Technology Adaptation in E-Commerce: Wells publishers, USA.*
- [31]. Christopher, A. & Ballantyne, O. (1991). *The Essence of service marketing' in Payne, Adrian, Prentice, Hall International (UK) Ltd.*
- [32]. Cochran, W.G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques, Third Edition, John Wiley and Sons, Inc, New York.*
- [33]. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Science.* Hillsdale, Erlbaum.
- [34]. Cohen, M.A., Cull, C., Lee, H.L., & Willen, D. (2000). Saturn's supply-chain innovation: high value in after-sales service', *Sloan Management Review*, 41 (4), 93–101.
- [35]. Crittenden, V. & Crittenden, W. (2008). Building capable organization: the eight levers of strategy implementation. *Business Horizons*. 51(4). 301- 309.
- [36]. Culiberg, B. & Rojsek, I. (2010). Identifying service quality dimensions as antecedents to customer satisfaction in retail banking. *Economic and Business Review*, 12(3): 151–166.
- [37]. Dabholkar, P.A. (1996). Consumer evaluations of new technology-based self-service operations: an investigation of alternative models. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 13(1), 29-51.
- [38]. Damanpour F, & Schneider, M. (2006). Phases of the adoption of innovation in organizations: effects of environment, organization and top managers. *British Journal of Management*, 17: 215-236.
- [39]. Delisi, P. (2006). Strategy execution: an oxymoron or a powerful formula for corporate success?. *Organizational Synergies, Journal* 5(2) 18-24.
- [40]. Dobni, B. (2003). Creating a Strategy Implementation Environment. *Business Horizons*. 46(2). 43-6.
- [41]. Elbanna, S., Child, J., & Dayan, M. (2013). A Model of antecedents and consequences of intuition in strategic decision-making: Evidence from Egypt. *Long Range Planning*. 46(1-2). 149-176.
- [42]. Esho, N., Kirievsky, A., Ward, D., Zurbruegg, R. (2004), Law and the determinants of Property-Casualty insurance. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 71(2): 265-283.
- [43]. Fernandez, S., & Rainey, H. (2006). Managing successful organizational change in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*. 66(2) 168-179.
- [44]. Finkelstein, S., Hambrick, D. & Cannella, A. (2009). Oxford University Press. Retrieved 25-12-2011, from www.Amazon.com.
- [45]. Floyd, S. & Wooldridge, B. (2000). *Building strategy from the middle: conceptualizing strategy process*, Sage, and Thousand Oaks, CA.
- [46]. Gottschalk, P. (2008). Organizational structure as predictor of intelligence strategy implementation in policing. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*. 36(3). 184-195.
- [47]. Gumusluoglu L, & Ilsev A. (2009). Transformational leadership, creativity, and organizational innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 62: 461-473.
- [48]. Guth, W. & Mc-Millan, I. (1986). Strategy Implementation versus Middle Management Self-Interest. *Strategic Management Journal*. 7. 313-327.
- [49]. Hair Jr, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2010). SEM: An introduction. *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective*, 5(6) 629-686.
- [50]. Hair, Jr., J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis (7th Ed.)*. Uppersaddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education International.

- [51]. Hakonsson, D., Burton, R., Obel B., & Lauridsen, J.(2012). Strategy implementation requires the right executive style: evidence from danish SMEs. *Long Range Planning*. 45. 182-208.
- [52]. Hall, B., & Khan, B. (2003). Adoption of new technology. NBER Working Paper. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=410656.
- [53]. Hambrick, D.C. (1982). Environmental Scanning and Organizational Strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 3:159-174.
- [54]. Hansen, L. Boyd, M. & Kryder, A. (1998). Implementing Strategic Plans. Woodland publishers, USA.
- [55]. Hauc, A. & Kovac, J. (2000). Project Management Strategy Implementation – Experience in Slovenia. *International Journal of Project Management*. 18. 61-67.
- [56]. He, H., & Li, Y. (2011). CSR and service brand: The mediating effect of brand identification and moderating effect of service quality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100, 673-688.
- [57]. Higgins, J. & McAllaster, G. (2004). If you want strategic change, don't forget to change your culture artifacts. *Journal of Change Management*. 4(1). 63-73.
- [58]. Higgins, J. (2005). The Eight "Ss of successful strategy execution. *Journal of Change Management*. 5 (1). 3-13.
- [59]. Hilman, H. (2010). *Strategic Management*. 2nd Ed. McGraw Hill, publishers, USA.
- [60]. Hoffman, K. D., & Bateson, J. E. (2001). *Essentials of services marketing: Concepts, strategies and cases*. South-Western Publishers, USA.
- [61]. Hrebiniak, L. & Joyce, W. (1984). *Implementing Strategy*. McMillan. Newyork publishers,
- [62]. Hrebiniak, L. (2008). Making strategy work: overcoming the obstacles to effective execution. *IVEY Business Journal*. 72(2). 1-6.
- [63]. Hrebiniak, L.G & Joyce, W.F. (1985). Organizational adaptation: strategic choice and environmental determinism. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 30, 336-349.
- [64]. Hussy, D. (1996). *The implementation challenge*. Chichester: John Wiley, London.
- [65]. Jiang, N. & Carpenter, V. (2013). A case study of issues of strategy implementation in internationalization of higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*. 27(1). 4-18.
- [66]. Johnson UU, Nissi K, Ignatius OO. Resilience and Operational sustainability of Oil Companies in Port Harcourt. *J Adv Res Petrol Tech Mgmt* 2018; 4(3&4): 28-35.
- [67]. Johnson UU, Uchechukwu O, Sibom MT. Self-Efficacy and Operational Sustainability of Oil Companies in Port Harcourt. *J Adv Res Oper Markt Mgmt* 2018; 4(3): 1-10.
- [68]. Johnson UU, Nissi K. Job Rotation and Quality of Work-life of Manufacturing Companies. *J Adv Res Oper Markt Mgmt* 2018; 4(4): 1-10.
- [69]. Kara, A., S. Lonial, M. Tarim., & S. Zaim (2005). A paradox of service quality in turkey the seemingly contradictory relative importance of tangible and intangible determinants of service quality. *European Business Review*, 17, 5-20.
- [70]. Kazmi, A. (2008). A proposed framework for strategy implementation in the indian context. *Management Decision*. 46(10). 1564-1581.
- [71]. Kinjerski V, Skrypnek BJ: The promise of spirit at work: increasing job satisfaction and organizational commitment and reducing turnover and absenteeism in long-term care. *J Gerontol Nurs*. 2008, 34: 17-25.
- [72]. Klein, K. & Sorra, J. (1996). The challenge of innovation implementation. *Academy of Management Review*. 21(4). 22-42.

- Klein, K. J., Conn, A, B, & Sorra, J. S. (2001). Implementing computerized technology: an organizational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 811-824.
- [73]. Kohtamäki, M., Kraus, S., Mäkelä, M., & Rönkkö, M. (2012). The role of personnel commitment to strategy implementation and organisational learning within the relationship between strategic planning and company performance. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*. 18(2), 159-178.