Journal of Global Strategic Management | V. 7 | N. 2 | 2013-December | isma.info | 5-15 | DOI: 10.20460/JGSM.2013715662

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS AND ITS OUTCOMES: EVIDENCE FROM SAUDI ARABIAN BANKS

***Ibrahim Al-Kandi**
****Mehmet Asutay**
***Robert Dixon**
Durham University, Durham

ABSTRACT

The competitive advantage of an organization is illustrated by the distinctiveness of its capabilities and how it uses these capabilities to achieve extraordinary profits or returns in comparison to other organizations. One of the most important capabilities that organizations can adopt is an effective and strategic decision-making process. Within the framework of strategy implementation, this study focuses on the factors that influence this process and on the outcomes of the strategy implementation stage of strategic decisions. The primary data for this research has been assembled from a questionnaire conducted with one hundred and twenty middle managers belonging to three highly successful banks in Saudi Arabia; these banks have recently had a particular strategic decision implemented. The subsequent statistical and econometric analysis of this data indicates that factors from three main groups significantly influence strategic decision outcomes, thereby determining successful strategy implementation. These factors are as follows: (i) process and personnel factors, including involvement and communication; (ii) project factors such as time and the priority of the decision; (iii) organizational factors, including top management support, religion, and organizational structure. Contrary to expectations, other cultural and external factors, such as resource allocation, people, commitment, and motivation, appear less significant with regard to the outcomes of strategic decisions. Further, it was also revealed that all the correlation coefficients are positive between independent factors and the outcomes.

Keywords*: Strategy implementation; strategic decision; implementation process and outcomes.*

INTRODUCTION

During (and after) the global financial crisis in 2009, profitability and growth for the Saudi Arabian banking system continued to demonstrate strength and stability, due to good capitalization and high liquidity arising from the asset size and operational efficiency of the banks. Further, the level of competitiveness in the Saudi banking market is becoming increasingly pronounced, with high and aggressive business standards. As a result of these changes, the leadership behind the banks has had to employ strategies, tools, and innovative techniques in order to survive in this new economic climate. Some banks have managed to thrive in this highly competitive environment by adopting effective strategy implementation, yet others have struggled to utilize and implement their strategic decisions with the objective of developing a competitive edge for their organization. The underlying intention has then been to react to the internal and external threats facing these organizations, whereby the greater the threat or competitive pressure facing the Saudi banks necessitates a higher degree of strategic planning and implementation processes (Godard 1999).

Research into strategic decision-making has often been divided into two categories: content research and process research (Rajagopalan *et al*, 1997). Content research deals with issues of strategic content, such as portfolio management, diversification, mergers, and the alignment of a firm's strategies with environmental characteristics. Process research correspondingly assesses the means by which a strategic decision is made and implemented, alongside the factors that affect it. The main body of research over the last two decades has focused on content issues; process issues have, however, received less attention (Rajagopalan *et al*, 1997). These two categories are complementary, not alternate, so that each category is therefore able to influence the other (Mintzberg and Waters, 1985).

Although strategic planning is of paramount importance for both its practitioners and academics, it has received little critical attention in strategy management literature; this study thus aims to contribute to management knowledge by identifying the factors that influence the strategic decision outcomes of strategy implementation within the banking industry in Saudi Arabia.

LITERATURE REVIEW

It is evident that firms which implement strategic planning achieve better performances than those without such planning, but these strategies often fail due to problems encountered at the implementation stage (O'Regan & Ghobadian, 2002). Strategic decisions should, however, be implemented with an awareness that their success is vital for the organization in question. By identifying the factors that influence the process and outcomes of the strategy implementation stage, an organization will be better prepared for its future performance, which will ultimately contribute to its bottom line.

If a strategy fails because of unsuitable or poor implementation, then the effort invested during the formulation phases becomes worthless. Strategic thinking has no effect on a firm's performance, unless all the elements or factors of the strategy fit together using the appropriate capabilities, system, and structure (Okums, 2001, 2003). Since the implementation of strategies is often accompanied by changes in the process, system, and even structure of an organization (Hrebiniak & Joyce, 1984; Stonich, 1982), executives must make wise decisions when approaching certain strategies that could affect people and their overall implementation. Charan and Colvin (1999) found that 70% of strategies fail due to poor implementation, whereby managers were indecisive and lacked commitment, and not as a result of the strategic content or decision itself; other researchers estimate the rate of failure to be between 50% and 90% (*see:* Kiechel, 1982, 1984; Gray, 1986; Nutt, 1999; Kaplan & Norton, 2001; Sirkin *et al*, 2005).

Top management teams have discovered that formulating a strategic decision is a hard task; the execution or implementation of this strategy proves to be even harder (Hrebiniak, 2006). As Schaap (2006) states, the strategy-implementing or strategy-executing task is easily the most complicated and time-consuming part of strategic planning, frequently requiring a focus on creating strategic change.

For managers, challenges continually arise from different positions surrounding the process. Indeed, there is no definitive method for achieving successful implementation, it is instead a continuous challenge that requires a collective approach from managers and low-level staff.

Implementation (as a concept) is not clearly defined in the relevant literature, despite the presence of interpretations by Noble (1999), Schaap (2006), Singh (1998), Yang Li *et al* (2008), and Harrington (2006). Most studies have discussed it in a general way, encompassing economic, social, psychological, and strategic management (Miller, 1990). Although many authors offer a conceptual description of strategy implementation, it therefore lacks a universal definition. Miller, moreover, points out that 'the concept of implementation is not always clearly defined in the literature. Many studies discuss it in a general way. Implementation is thus often understood to mean "putting something into effect", "enacting" or "realising" something' (Miller, 1999 p. 47).

The most comprehensive definition of strategy implementation, which evaluates both the entire process and the stakeholders, is, perhaps, that of Yang Li *et al* (2008 p. 6), as 'a dynamic, iterative, and complex process […] 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'.

Despite these different interpretations within the implementation process, all the sources stress the importance of interaction between factors, process, and the desired outcomes. Most researchers emphasize the 'must fit' between variables, control, and time management in order to make the strategy work (Okumus, 2001, 2003; Hrebiniak & Joyce, 1984; Stonich, 1982; Miller, 1990). The key area for the discussion of strategy implementation is, however, that of the factors influencing the process and, by extension, the outcomes.

With regard to the empirical findings from previous investigations on this subject, a number of strategy implementation studies and frameworks have been developed since the 1980s, some of which are conceptual frameworks, whereas others are empirically tested or developed, such as that created by Okumus (2003).

A review of the relevant literature indicates that most of the previous frameworks categorize essential variables into the following groups:

- Context, process, and outcomes (Bryson & Bromiley, 1993);
- Planning and design (Hrebiniak & Joyce, 1984);
- Realizers and enablers (Miller, 1990, 1997);
- Content, context, process (Pettigrew & Whipp, 1991);
- Framework and process components (Skivington & Daft, 1991);
- Context and process (Schmelzer & Olsen, 1994);
- Context, system and action levers (Miller, 1997);
- Content, context, process, outcomes (Okumus, 2001, 2003);
- Formulation, process, outcomes (Stonich, 1982).

Table 1-1. The key implementation variables from previous studies

Author(s)	Variables
Stonich (1982)	Formulation, structure, cultural, planning, resource allocation, people, outcomes.
Hrebiniak & Joyce (1984)	Formulation, structure, people, control and feedback.
Galbraith & Kazanjian (1986)	Structure, people, planning, communication, outcomes.
Hamhavek & Cannella (1989)	Structure, people, rewards, resource allocation, internal and external communication.
Thomson & Strickland (1995)	Formulation, structure, cultural, planning, resource allocation, people, communication.
Waterman *et al* (1980)	Formulation, structure, cultural, resource allocation, people, communication.
Pettigrew and Whipp (1991)	Structure, cultural, resource allocation, people, environment, leadership.
Skivington and Daft (1991)	Formulation, structure, resource allocation, people, communication.
Schmelzer (1992)	Context variables (environment, formulation, structure, cultural) process variables (operational planning, people, resource allocation).
Bryson & Bromiley (1993)	Environment, cultural, resource allocation, people, communication, outcomes.
Kargar & Blumenthal (1994)	Formulation, structure, cultural, planning, resource allocation, people, communication.
Miller (1997)	Environment, formulation, structure, cultural, operational planning, resource allocation, outcomes.
Ghamdi (1998)	Environment, resource allocation, communication, leadership, people.
Okumus (2001, 2003)	Content, context, process, outcomes.
Ali & Hadi (2012)	Personnel, planning, management, organization, external factors.

As is illustrated by Table 1.1, the literature also indicates that a number of significant conceptual implementation frameworks have been developed, which discuss key implementation factors or variables that might affect the process (Stonich, 1982; Hrebiniak & Joyce, 1984; Galbraith & Kazanjian, 1986; Hambrick & Cannella, 1989; Alexander, 1985, 1986; Aker, 1995; Thomson & Strickland, 1995). These were the first implementation frameworks in the management field; none of these frameworks were empirically tested, but they showed that a number of variables play a major role in the implementation process, including formulation, organizational structure, communication, and outcomes. They also stress that there must be a fit between these variables in order for the strategy to be effective (Okumus, 2001, 2003). Other studies have also developed and tested frameworks, such as those by Waterman *et al* (1980); Skivington & Daft (1991);

Schmelzer (1992); Bryson & Bromiley (1993); Miller (1990, 1997); Ghamdi (1998); Okumus (2001, 2003); Obidat (2008); and, Ali & Hadi (2012).

A number of other available studies are, however, not mentioned in this investigation, since they do not necessarily contribute to the development of the literature or because they were not systematized adequately through an integrated understanding.

It should be noted that the aforementioned variables should not be limited when implementing strategy, but that they are found to be significant in various studies for particular cases. Given the large number of variable sets, their classification into five main groups can be perceived as an efficient strategy, especially in terms of preventing duplication. These groups are as follows: organizational factors; process and personnel factors; project factors; external factors; and, outcomes.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A quantitative research design, which involves analyzing the primary data collected through the specified questionnaire, has been employed in this study.

Research goal

This paper aims to identify the determining factors that influence the implementation of the strategic decision process and its outcomes for the case of Saudi Arabian banks. The paper thus explores the relationships between the factors themselves and between the factors and outcomes as dependent variables.

Sample and data collection

To achieve this aim, data was collected via a questionnaire survey directed at the middle management of three Saudi banks between July and September of 2011. When approaching the banks for this study, the main factor behind their selection was that each bank should have a recent case study related to the implementation of strategic decision (see Appendix A). The strategic decisions considered were expected to fulfil the following criteria: (i) that they are strategic in nature; (ii) that they have shaped the future of the bank; (iii) that they have contributed to the performance of the bank.

Thus, two hundred and sixty questionnaires were distributed among the three banks; one hundred and twenty were completed and returned. Data obtained from these questionnaires was analyzed using the SPSS statistical package programme. The identified relationships between variables and outcomes were tested using correlation and regression techniques to analyze the main dimensions of the process and their association with the main outcomes. This action is expected to prove the effectiveness of the process pursued by the banks in question within the formulated theoretical model for this study.

Analysis and results

Reliability test

Before commencing the statistical analysis, a reliability test was performed for the whole sample; the results show a satisfactory level of reliability, with Cronbach's Alpha being at 0.737.

Correlation matrix

The correlation matrix for the whole sample is displayed in Table USQ2a. All the correlation coefficients are positive, with a maximum value of 0.58 and a minimum value of 0.27. Furthermore, they are all significant at the 0.01 level, thereby implying that the coefficients are significantly different from zero. It should, however, be noted that this is not a cause-and-effect relationship.

Table USQ2a. Correlation matrix for the whole sample

	Process and Personnel Factors	Organisational Factors	External Factors	Project Factors	Outcome Factors
Process and Personnel Factors	1.00				
Organisational Factors	0.58**	1.00			
External Factors	0.31**	0.27**	1.00		
Project Factors	0.58**	0.33**	0.27**	1.00	
Outcome Factors	0.55**	0.39**	0.24**	0.52**	1.00

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

Factor analysis has been performed for the whole sample in order to confirm underlying scales in a questionnaire. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was found to be 0.57 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p=0.001 < 0.05$). These results indicate that a satisfactory factor analysis can proceed. There were fifty questions on the five-point scale, which were used for the factor analysis. After varimax rotation, eighteen components were extracted.

Linear regression analysis of sub-factors for the whole sample

After the correlation analysis, the impact of individual factors on the outcome was tested with a regression model in the form of:

$$\text{outcomes factors} = b_0 + b_1 * x_1 + b_2 * x_2 + b_3 * x_3 + \cdots + b_n * x_n + \varepsilon$$

Where *x* are the sub-factors; b_0 is the intercept of the line of best fit; *b* represents the coefficients of the sub-factors; *n* is the number of sub-factors; and where ε is the error term.

The output from the regression analysis for the whole sample is illustrated in Tables R1, R2, and R3. From Table R1, the ANOVA table, $F_{(1,\ 119)}=5.02$ and $p=0.001$ (<0.05). This indicates that at least one of the coefficients of the sub-factors is significantly different from zero. In order words, one of the sub-factors is a significant predictor of outcome factors.

Table R1. ANOVA

Model	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	P value
Regression	27.098	18	1.505	5.016	0.001
Residual	30.313	101	.300		
Total	57.411	119			

Table R2: Coefficients

	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	P value	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	1.344	.813		1.654	.101		
Resource Allocation	-.255	.293	-.078	-.872	.385	.650	1.539
People	-.044	.044	-.083	-1.001	.319	.759	1.318
Communication	.136	.071	.193	1.898	.060	.507	1.972
Involvement	.131	.077	.166	1.694	.073	.543	1.843
Commitment and Motivation	.039	.078	.047	.506	.614	.605	1.654
Control and Feedback	-.080	.065	-.118	-1.227	.223	.569	1.756
Interest Group	.097	.088	.099	1.104	.272	.657	1.523
Outsourcing / External Company	.037	.067	.051	.548	.585	.602	1.660
Organisational Structure	.118	.063	.162	1.868	.065	.694	1.441
Single Point of Contact	-.011	.045	-.020	-.246	.806	.761	1.314
Organisational Culture	.015	.082	.016	.178	.859	.668	1.496
Religion	-.124	.064	-.153	-1.944	.055	.847	1.181
Top Management Support	.090	.044	.167	2.066	.041	.800	1.250
External Factors	.084	.078	.093	1.073	.286	.702	1.425
Priority	.126	.061	.177	2.083	.040	.721	1.388
Size and Value	.083	.099	.069	.837	.404	.768	1.302
Time	.183	.070	.247	2.613	.010	.587	1.705
Project Technical Tasks	-.046	.043	-.092	-1.080	.283	.721	1.387

Depicting the coefficients, Table R2 further reveals that there are seven sub-factors which are significant predictors of outcome factors. Time, with a t statistic of 2.61 and a p value of 0.010 (<0.05), is a significant predictor of outcome factors. Priority**,** with a t statistic of 2.08 and a p value of 0.040 (<0.05), is similarly a significant predictor of *outcome factors*. Top management support, with a t statistic of 2.07 and a p value of 0.041 (<0.05), is also a significant predictor of outcome factors. The sub-factors of religion, organizational structure, involvement, and communication (with p values of 0.055, 0.065, 0.073, and 0.060) could equally be considered as significant in influencing outcome factors, since their p values are just slightly over the critical value of 0.05.

Table R3: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.589	0.347	0.324	0.57102

Table R3 shows the model summary. The value of R (also called multiple R) is 0.59. R^2=0.35 is the square of 0.59. R^2 is interpreted as the proportion of the total variation in outcome factors that are accounted for by the sub-factors within the model. In other words, they account for 35% of the variability of outcome factors. R^2 is a measure of how well the linear model fits; this is also known as the coefficient of determination. The sample estimate of R^2 tends to be an optimistic estimate of the population value. Adjusted R square closely relates to the population value and its result here is 32.4%.

Regression analysis of main factors for the whole sample

For the main factors, it is necessary to build a regression model in the form of the following:

Table MFR2: Coefficients

$$\textbf{Outcomes factors} = b_0 + b_1 * PPF + b_2 * OF + b_3 * EF + b_4 * PF + \varepsilon$$

Where PPF= process and personnel factors; OF= organizational factors; EF= external factors; PF= project factors; b_0 is the intercept of the line of best fit; h_1, h_2 are the coefficients of the main factors; and where ε is the error term.

The output from the regression analysis is shown in Tables MFR1, MFR2, and MFR3. From Table MFR1 (or the ANOVA table), $F_{(1, 119)}$=13.24 and p=0.001 (<0.05). This indicates that at least one of the coefficients of the main factors is significantly different from zero. In order words, one of the main factors is a significant predictor of outcome factors.

Table MFR1. ANOVA

Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	18.100	4	4.525	13.237	0.001
	Residual	39.311	115	.342		
	Total	57.411	119			

Correspondingly, Table MFR2 (otherwise known as the coefficient table), indicates that there are two significant predictors of *outcome factors*. Process and personnel factors, with a t statistic of 2.96 and a p value of 0.004 (<0.05), is then a significant predictor of *outcome factors*. Further, project factors, with a t statistic of 2.64 and a p value of 0.009 (<0.05), is also a significant predictor of *outcome factors*. Organizational factors and external factors, with t statistics of 1.70 and 0.46, alongside p values of 0.092 (>0.05) and 0.646 (>0.05), are, however, not significant predictors of *outcome factors*. Although their p values are not far removed from the significant value of 0.05, especially if the critical level is lowered to 10%, then it is possible to accept the "organizational factors" as equally significant. Thus, except for the external factors, the other three independent variables are accepted as significant.

Table MFR2: Coefficients

	Unstandardised Coefficients		**Standardized Coefficients**			**Collinearity Statistics**	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	P value	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	.524	.306		1.714	.089		
Process and Personnel Factors	.351	.119	.293	2.956	.004	.605	1.654
Organisational Factors	.186	.109	.157	1.700	.092	.702	1.425
External Factors	.035	.076	.038	.460	.646	.850	1.176
Project Factors	.257	.098	.234	2.639	.009	.757	1.320

Furthermore, Table MFR3 depicts the model summary. The adjusted R square is 29.1%, or more specifically, the four main factors in the regression model (project factors, external factors, organizational factors, and process and personnel factors) account for 29.1% of the proportion of the total variation in the outcome factors.

Table MFR3. Model summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.561	.315	.291	.58467

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, the analytical research has shown that the process and personnel factors, combined with the project factors, have greatly influnced the outcomes of strategy implementaion in Saudi Arabian banks. Although the organizational factors are seen as important among this group of factors, especially since their p

value is not far from the significant level, sub-factors such as time, priority of the decision, top management support, religion, organizational structure, involvement, and communication, still play major roles in the implementation process and therefore influence the outcome of the strategy.

It should be noted that all three banks involved in this study experienced a moderate to high level of successful strategy implementation, and in all these cases, the managers believed that positive challenges during the implementation process, rather than obstacles, possibly occurred and those challenges were thus considered at the formulation stage and improved during the process.

Process and personnel factors

The analytical results confirm that process and personnel factors have the highest impact (out of the four specified groups) in terms of influencing the outcomes of strategy implementation. In addition, involvement and communication, from among the seven items comprising the process and personnel factors, have the greatest impact on strategy implementation outcomes.

In the three studied strategic cases, it appears that involvement occurred when the strategic decision was made by top management (decision makers), although the people who implement the strategy (implementers) were also clearly involved in this process and their number is probably greater than those who actually made the decision. Therefore, their initial responsibility, besides involvement, is to map and design the strategic plan for the entire project, including the roles, responsibilities, goals, and objectives. The involvement process for all managers and implementers on all organizational levels is perceived as a crucial factor in the implementation process and it is, by extension, of paramount importance for successful implementation. Actual involvement could thus result in the coordination of top management, interest groups, and managers within the organization itself, to decide exactly how to implement the strategic decision, thereby allowing focus to be placed on effective implementation, which can in turn help to minimize potential conflicts and any resistance to change.

Communication is somehow connected to involvement, but it is not isolated. For instance, effective two-way communication between the decision makers in Saudi Arabia and the implementers in Malaysia resulted in a proper understanding of the business strategy with regard to the definition of goals and actual planning. Indeed, this was demonstrated by the case of the Malaysian operation of one of the sampled Saudi banks. Such a situation also guaranteed a form of commitment and support between different levels of the organization. If those managers in the Malaysian operation had not been involved in the decision and had not communicated effectively with the upper level management at their headquarters in Saudi Arabia, it would not have been possible for them to transmit and facilitate the business ideas and operational features of the project efficiently to those people who were running its everyday aspects. If, however, the upper level management in Saudi Arabia had failed to communicate with their partners in Malaysia, then they would probably not have approached the business strategy at the point of meeting their organizational aim.

The involvement of managers and their staff in the strategic decision-making, alongside their provision with an explanation as to why it has been made an entire process and combined with other initiatives such as promotion and rewards, would highlight the desired outcomes of the strategic decision, in that implementers would focus, desire, and work as a team towards achieving success. For as Ghamdi (1998) states, managers have to be involved at all levels and maintain focus during the implementation processes.

Project factors

From among the four factors influencing the outcomes of the strategy implementation, the project factors have the second highest impact. In addition, the time and priority of the project proved to have the most impact on the process in terms of influencing the strategy implementation outcomes, when compared to the other items within this grouping. For the time factor, over 40% of all the participants stated that the time taken to complete the project was one to three years; more than half of those questioned, however, stated that the project was completed in the specified period. This successful result can be attributed to the presence of a detailed plan for the entire project and because the implementation of such a strategic decision was put ahead of other decisions or commitments, making it a priority for the bank. Indeed, this corresponds to the value of the three strategic decisions contributing between 15% and 25% of the banks' total financial value.

Organizational factors

Although the organizational factors are seen as important, given that their p value does not show statistical significance, organizational structure, top management support, and religion are the items from within the grouping for organizational factors that have the most impact on the process and on influencing the strategy implementation outcomes. Almost 60% of the total participants stated that the organizational structure, in terms of implementing the strategy, facilitated the process with appropriately allocated and well-defined authority, roles, and responsibilities, thereby establishing project teams for each strategy function. Most importantly, 58% of all managers and supervisors agreed on the benefit of a single point of contact or, in other words, a department responsible for receiving and updating instructions and information related to the project, and also for resolving management and technical issues that might occur during the process.

Saudi Arabia, akin to any other country that has its own distinct business and cultural values which dominate business operations and practices, presents a context where religion and traditional values are strongly linked to everyday life, including the areas of organizational culture and operation. At least two of the banks involved in the study comply with Islamic rules and ethics, since they run *Shari'ah*-compliant businesses. The Islamic or *Shari'ah*-compliant concepts and mission, to which these banks and their employees adhere, provide or create a means by which managers can run the project in an efficient manner and can also establish a good "public face" (or image) for practices. Employees therefore believe, or are at least convinced, that religion as a concept and practice is linked to the success of the strategy by helping to create a sense of belonging to the objectives of the bank and its strategy. In addition, top management support has a great impact on the outcome; for the descriptive analysis shows that 62% of managers and supervisors receive strong support from upper levels through the provision of necessary resources, thus sharing responsibilities with their teams.

Further implications

Each case study has its own unique features and this investigation found that for the sampled Saudi Arabian examples "personnel" and "project" factors play an important role in determining the outcomes of strategic management. It is, however, difficult to make any generalizations based on a sample of only three banks, especially since sub-factors in other areas also demonstrate some significance. For example, as with the case where some items are listed under organizational factors. The findings of this research should therefore be treated solely as an indication of the overall situation; a further study involving a larger sample size may allow for more definitive results and equally enable these current findings to be reaffirmed. In addition, as the results from the analysis of the factors provide significantly different groupings of sub-factors under the main factor, the regression results should also potentially be regrouped according to the new components of the factor analysis in order to find out if there are any significant differences between the two sets. Furthermore, a comparison between conventional and Islamic banks could be considered in the future if the same patterns (in terms of sub-factors) govern the strategic implementation cases in both bank types, thereby referring to particular elements on the operational and functional levels of these two different types of bank. The findings of this study ultimately contribute to the critical literature by providing a critical and empirical analysis of Saudi Arabian banks.

REFERENCES

Ali, M., & Hadi, A. (2012). Surveying and identifying the factors affecting successful implementation of business strategies in companies of Fars Province industrial towns (case study: companies of good industries). *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3/1.

Barney, Jay. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17/1, 99 - 120.

Bryson, J., & Bromiley, P. (1993). Critical factors affecting the planning and implementation for major projects. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14/5, 319 - 337.

Charan & Colvin (1999). Why CEO's Fail, *Fortune*, June 21.

Galbraith, J., & Kazanjian, R. (1986). *Strategy implementation: structure, systems, and process*. (2nd ed.). New York: West Publishing Company.

Ghamdi, S. Al (2005). The use of strategy planning tools and techniques in Saudi Arabia: an empirical study. *International Journal of Management*, September, 22/3.

Gray, D. H. (1986). Uses and misuses of strategic planning. *Harvard Business Review*, January - February, 64/1, 89 - 97.

Hrebiniak, L. G., & Joyce, W. F. (1984). *Implementing strategy*. New York: Macmillan.

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2001). *The strategy-focused organization – how balanced scorecard companies thrive in the new business environment*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kiechel III, W. (1982). Corporate strategists under fire. *Fortune*, December 27, 34 - 39.

Kiechel III, W. (1984). Sniping at strategic planning. *Planning Review*, May, 8 - 11.

Miller, S. (1990). Successful implementation of strategic decisions. The implementation of top level decisions in organizations. PhD Thesis, Bradford University.

Miller, S. (1997). Implementing strategic decisions: four key success factors. *Organizational Studies*, 18/4, 577 - 602.

Nutt, P. C. (1999). Surprising but true: half the decisions in organizations fail. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13/4, 75 - 90.

Obeidat, B. (2008). A study of the implementaion stage of strategic decisions in the banking sector in Jordan. PhD Thesis, Durham University.

Okumus, F. (2001). Towards a strategy implementation framework. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13/7, 327 - 338.

Okumus, F. (2003). A framework to implement strategies in organizations. *Management Decision*, 41/9, 871 – 882.

O'Regan, N., & Ghobadian, A. (2002). Formal strategic planning: the key to effective business process management? *Business Process Management Journal*, 8/5, 416 - 429.

Pettigrew & Whipp (1991). *Managing Change for Competitive Success*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schmelzer, C. (1994). A data based strategy implementation framework for companies in the restaurant industry. *International Journal of Management*, 13/4, 347 - 359.

Sirkin, H. L., Keenan, P., & Jackson, A. (2005). The hard side of change management, *Harvard Business Review*, 83/10, 109 - 118.

Skivington, J., & Daft, R. (1991). A study of organizational frameworks and process modalities for the implementation of business-level strategic decisions. *Journal of Management Studies*, January, 28/1, 45 - 68.

Yang Li, Sun Guohui, & Eppler, Martin J. (2008). Making strategy work: a literature review on the factors influencing strategy implementation. Institute of Corporate Communication.

APPENDIX A

Banks and Strategic Cases*

Bank	Strategic case	Objective
Bank 1	Internationalization: the bank had to extend its operations to Malaysia as part of its growth strategy.	To be a progressive Islamic bank through the domination of consumers' loans. To establish a good brand internationally and to transfer the knowledge and experience from KSA to Malaysia.
Bank 2	Competition on the corporate market of the Saudi banks after success in retailing.	To increase the market share and establish a brand name at the corporate level.
Bank 3	Centralization: enhancing the quality and performance of the loans by making the loan process more compact and controlled.	To increase the market share and enhance the service that they provide to their customers by reducing the process time from ninety days to fourteen days. To improve the quality of the loans.

Note: (*) *The names of the banks are confidential, but the strategic cases are real.*