Entrepreneurial Judgment and Analysis for Successful Strategy Implementation
M Mukherjee

To cite this version:
M Mukherjee. Entrepreneurial Judgment and Analysis for Successful Strategy Implementation. International Journal of Advanced Engineering and Management, Technical and Scientific Publisher, 2017, 2 (1), pp.1 - 8. hal-01484499
Entrepreneurial Judgment and Analysis for Successful Strategy Implementation

Authors: M. Mukherjee
International Journal of Advanced Engineering and Management, India
e-mail: editorijoaem@gmail.com

Subject Category: Management
Sub Category: Strategy Management

Editor: Sahadev Roy

Volume 2 Issue 1 January 2017
Received on: 22.12.2016
Revised on: 06.01.2017

Keywords: Dynamic organization, Management framework; Organizational environment; Strategic business unit; Strategy-formulation; Strategic leadership.

M. Mukherjee, “Entrepreneurial Judgment and Analysis for Successful Strategy Implementation,” International Journal of Advanced Engineering and Management, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.1-8, 2017.
Entrepreneurial Judgment and Analysis for Successful Strategy Implementation

M Mukherjee

Abstract

This paper describes the various challenges, findings, and recommendations regarding the biggest challenges of strategy implementation. The primary purpose of this study is to describe the internal problems and external challenges of an organization. Internal problems include wrong management style, directors’ leadership, lack of proper policies regarding the organization are described here. The insufficient financial resources, the unsound reward system for the staff, unstructured organization strategies, miscommunication among the employees of the organization, etc. are affecting the organization. The external challenges are an economical problem in the international market, political insecurity, improper use of government rules and regulations, external competitors in the world market, etc. are also discussed here.

1. Introduction

The strategy formulation concept may be considered used as subjectively in the management study [1]. It may be included industry’s operation, performing arts an external assessment which are carried out a different plant inspection to produce different management strategies [2]. The process is also used to perform an exterior assessment [3]. It means the whole lot may be accurately planned for target achievement, perfect location selection, implement the different new strategy, the core, and existential rationalization company’s veracity by using different research methodology [4]. It must follow the philosophy of research [5]. The main characteristic of strategy formulation is to increase significantly ‘vision and mission’ of the target organization and also used to classify the different business’s external prediction, identifying different useful interior potential as well as diverse constrained to set up and implement various strategies [6]. It also used for solving different challenging strategies for new industry also [7]. The ‘Strategy formulation’ processed may be utilized for the new decision to set up new businesses, funds distribution policy, whether a particular company needs to expand and exact time to entry into the international markets, etc [8]. It contains the power of execution for the essential managerial process towards the company growth [9]. Strategic leadership mostly influenced by responsible persons capable of taking decision voluntarily to make decisions precisely for the steady growth and prosperity of the target organizations for long-term achievements by maintaining long-term financial stability and improvement [10]. To adopt various changes which are necessary to meet the desired goal, all the leadership qualities are essential. Sometimes many people become a good leader, though they do not have the capability of providing direction by motivating co-worker able to maintain the growth and also strategically implementing all the required changes. This paper analysis different strategy formulation in section 2, and administrative aspects of strategy implementation in section 3. The ideal organization structure is analysis in section 4. The four stage model and alternative organization forms are analysis in section 5 and 6 respectively. In section 7, briefly discuss different organization framework and proposed a dynamic organization management framework.

2. Strategy Formulation

Strategy formulation is used to determine different organizational strategic. It also helps to identify different comparative study of competitors’ strengths and weak point etc. It is also an important consideration for exterior audit. Proper utilization of the internet is also useful for process time minimization by performing different exterior assessments. All business process suffered different resource constrained proper utilization of the limited resources will provide the most excellent benefit to the organization [11]. Strategy-formulation and different decision extol the production to the specific goods, property, and machineries also its marketing strategy suitable for modern civilization. Strategies imply a ‘long-term’ economical gain, attractive facility and customer satisfaction. Strategic decision includes various multi-functional cost analysis and also personal property management programmed for the organization. The strategy planner has the greatest standpoint towards strategic formulation and its complete resolutions.

Let’s look at what strategy implementation involves:
What makes the job of the strategy manager so complicated when it comes to implementation is the number of tasks involved and the variety of ways to approach each task. Strategy implementation has to be tailored to the organization's overall condition and selling, to the nature of the strategy and the amount of strategic change involved and to the manager's own skills, style, and methods.

Four broad areas stand out:

(i). Performing the recurring administrative tasks associated with strategy implementation.
(ii). Creating "fits" between strategy and the various internal "ways of doing things" in order to align the whole organization behind strategy accomplishment.
(iii). Figuring out an agenda and a set of action priorities that matches up well with the organization's overall situation and the context of the-sling in which implementation must take place.
(iv). Managerial approach and leadership style to adopt in inducing the needed organizational changes.

The strategy implementers challenge in performing these tasks is to bring the organization's conduct of internal operations into good alignment with strategy and to unite the total organization behind strategy accomplishment. The implemented job is one of building such enthusiasm and commitment up and down the ranks that a virtual organization wide crusade emerges to carry out the chosen strategy.

Strategy-supportive matches are needed with organizational skills and capabilities, functional area activities, organization structure, reward systems, and incentives, policies and procedures, information systems and control mechanisms, budgets and programs, and shared values and cultural norms.

3. Administrative Aspects of Strategy Implementation

The Manager's role in the implementation process is to leading and keynoting the tone: pace, and style of strategy implementation. There are many ways logical proceed. A strategy implementer can opt for an active, visible role or a low-key, behind the scenes role. He or she can elect to make decisions authoritatively or on the basis of consensus, to delegate much or little, to be deeply involved in the detail of implementation or to remain aloof from the day-to-day problems. It is up to the strategy implementer to decide whether to proceed swiftly (launching implementation initiatives on many fronts) or to move deliberately, content with gradual progress over a long period.

To some extent, therefore, each strategy implementation situation is unique enough to require the strategy manager to tailor his or her action agenda to fit the specific organizational environment at hand. This forces the manager to be conscious of all that strategy implementation involves and to diagnose carefully the action priorities and in what sequence things need to be done. The manager's role is thus all-important. His or her agenda for action and conclusions about how hard and how fast to push for change are decisive in shaping the character of implementation and moving the process along.

Successful strategy execution depends greatly on good internal organization and competent personnel. Building a capable organization is thus always a top strategy implementation priority. Three organizational issues stand out as dominant:

(i). Developing an internal organization structure that is responsive to the needs.
(ii). Developing the skills and distinctive competences in which the strategy grounded and seeing that the organization has the managerial talents, technical expertise, and competitive capabilities it needs.
(iii). Selecting people for key positions.

4. Organization Structure

The following procedure serves as a useful guide for fitting structure to strategy:

(i). Pinpoint the key functions and tasks requisite for successful strategy execution
(ii). Reflect on how the strategy-critical functions and organizational units relate to those that are routine and to those that provide staff support.
(iii). Make strategy-critical business units and functions the main organizational building blocks. Determine the degrees of authority needed to manage each organizational unit, bearing in mind both the benefits and costs of decentralized decision making. Provide for coordination among the various organizational units.

a) Successful Strategy Execution

Pinpoint the key functions and tasks requisite for successful strategy execution are discussed here. In any organization, some activities and skills are always more critical to strategic success than others are. The strategy-
critical activities vary according to the particulars of a firm's strategy and competitive requirements [12]. To help identify what an organization's strategy-critical activities are, two questions can usefully be posed: "What functions have to be performed, extra well and on time for the strategy to succeed?" and "In what areas would mal performance seriously endanger strategic success. The answers to these two questions should point squarely at what activities and skills are crucial and where to concentrate organization-building efforts.

b) Understanding the Relationships among Various Activities

Activities can be related by the flow of material through the production process, the type of customer served, the distribution channels used, the technical skills and know-how needed to perform them, a strong need to centralize authority over them, the sequence in which tasks must be performed, and geographic location, to mention some of the most obvious ways. Such relationships are important because one (or more) of the interrelationships usually become the basis for grouping activities into organizational units [13]. If the needs of strategy are to drive organization design, then the relationships to look for are those that link one piece of the strategy to another.

c) Grouping Activities into Organization Units

If activities crucial to strategic success are to get the attention and visibility they merit, then they have to be a prominent part of the organizational scheme. When key functions and critical tasks are take a backseat to less important activities. The politics of organizational budget making usually leads to them being given fewer resources and accorded less significance than they actually have. On the other hand, when they form the core of the whole organization structure, their role and power in the overall scheme of things is highlighted and institutionalized. Senior managers can seldom give a stronger signal as to what is strategically important than by making key function and critical skills the most prominent organizational building blocks and, further, assigning them a high position in the organizational pecking order.

d) Determining the Responsibility

Activities and organizational units with a key role in strategy execution should not made subordinate to routine and non-key activities. Revenue-producing and results-producing activities should not made subordinate to internal support or staff functions. With few exceptions, decisions should delegate to those managers closest to the scene of the action. Corporate-level authority over operating decisions at the business-unit level and below should held to a minimum [14]. The crucial administrative skill is selecting strong managers to head up each unit and delegating them enough authority to formulate and execute an appropriate strategy for their unit.

e) Coordination among the Units

Providing for coordination of the activities of organizational units is accomplished mainly through positioning them in the hierarchy of authority. Managers higher up in the pecking order generally have authority over more organizational units and thus the power to coordinate, integrate, and otherwise arrange for the cooperation of the units under their supervision.

The chief executive officer, to chief operating officer, and business-level managers are, of course central points of coordination because they have broad authority. Besides positioning organizational units along the vertical scale of managerial authority, coordination of strategic efforts can also achieved through informal meetings, project teams, special task forces, standing committees, formal strategy reviews, and annual strategic planning and budgeting cycles. Additionally, the formulation of the strategic plan itself serves a coordinating role; the whole process of negotiating and deciding on the objectives and strategies of each organizational unit and making sure that related activities mesh suitably help coordinate operations, across organizational units.

5. Four Stage Model

Four distinct stages of strategy-related organization structure have singled out:

a) Stage I Model

Stage I organizations, are small, single-business enterprises managed by one person. The owner-entrepreneur has close daily contact with employees and each phase of operations. Most employees report directly to the owner, who mates all the pertinent decisions regarding mission, objectives, strategy, and daily operations.
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b) **Stage II Model**

Stage II organizations differ from Stage I enterprises in one essential aspect: an increased scale and scope of operations force a transition from one-person management to group management. However, when a strong strategic fit exists across related business units, it can be tough to get autonomy-conscious business-unit managers to cooperate in coordinating and snaring related activities. They are prone to argue long and hard about "turf" and about held accountable for activities not totally under their control.

**c) Stage III Model**

Stage III consists of organization whose operations, though concentrated in a single field or product line, are scattered over a wide geographical area and large enough to justify having geographically decentralized operating units. These units all report to corporate headquarters and conform to corporate policies, but they are given the flexibility to tailor their unit's strategic plan to meet the specific needs of each respective geographic area. Ordinarily, each of the geographic operating units Of a Stage III Organization is structured along functional lines. The key difference between Stage II and Stage III, however, is that while the functional units of a Stage II organization stand or fall together (in that they are built around one business and one end market), the geographic operating units of a Stage III firm can stand alone (or nearly so) in the sense that the operations in each geographic unit are not dependent on those in other areas. Typical firms in this category are breweries, cement companies, and steel mills having production capacity and sales organizations m several geographically separate market areas.

**d) Stage IV Model**

Stage IV includes large, diversified firms decentralized by line of business. Typically, each separate business unit is headed by a general manager who has profit-and-loss responsibility and whose authority extends across all of the unit's functional areas except, perhaps, accounting and capital investment (both of which are traditionally subject to corporate approval). Both business strategy decisions and operating decisions are concentrated at the line-of-business level rather than at the corporate level.

### 6. Pros and Cons of Alternative Organization Forms

There are essentially five strategy-related approaches to organization: (a) functional specialization, (b) geographic organization, (c) decentralized business divisions, (d) strategic business units, and (e) matrix structures featuring dual lines of authority and strategic priority which are discuss briefly in this section.

**a) The Functional Organization Structure**

Generally speaking- organizing by functional specialties promotes full utilization of the most up-to-date technical skills and helps a business capitalize on the efficiency gains resulting from use of [hose technical skills; it also helps a business capitalize the efficiency gains resulting from the use of specialized manpower, faculties, and equipment. These are strategically important considerations for single-business organizations, dominant-product enterprises, and vertically integrated firms, and account for why they usually have some kind of centralized, functionally specialized structure.

**b) Geographic Forms of Organization**

Used by large-scale enterprises whose strategies need to be tailored to fit the particular needs and features of different geographical areas. In the private sector, a territorial structure is typically utilized by chain store retailers, power companies, cement firms, and dairy products enterprises. In the public sector, such organizations as the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, the federal courts, the U.S. Postal Service, the state troopers, and the Red Cross have adopted territorial "structures in order to be directly accessible to geographically dispersed clients.

**c) Decentralized Business Units**

Grouping activities along business and product lines has been a clear-cut trend among diversified enterprises for the past half-century, beginning with the pioneering efforts of Du Pont and General Motors in the 1920s. Separate business/product divisions emerged because diversification made a functionally specialized manager's job incredibly complex. Strategy implementation is facilitated by grouping key activities belonging to the same business under one organizational roof, thereby creating line-of-business units which then can be subdivided into whatever functional subunits suit the key activities/ critical tasks makeup of the business.
The outcome is not only a structure, which fits strategy, but also a structure that makes the jobs of managers more doable. The creation of separate business units is then accomplished by decentralizing authority over the unit to the business-level manager. The approach, very simply, is to put entrepreneurial general managers in charge of the business unit, giving them enough authority to formulate and implement the business strategy that they deem appropriate, motivating them with incentives, and then holding them accountable for the results they produce.

d) **Strategic Business Units**

A strategic business unit (SBU) is a grouping of business units based on some important strategic elements common to each; the possible elements of relatedness include an overlapping set of competitors, a closely related strategic mission, a common need to compete globally, an ability to accomplish integrated strategic planning, common key success factors, and technologically related growth opportunities.

e) **Matrix Forms of Organization**

A matrix organization is a structure with two or more channels of command, two lines of budget authority, and two sources of performance and reward. The key feature of the matrix is that product (or business) and functional lines of authority are overlaid (to form a matrix or grid), and managerial authority over the activities in each unit/cell of the matrix is shared between the product manager and functional manager.

7. **Discussion**

Assembling a capable management team is an obvious part of the strategy implementation task. The recurring administrative issues here centre on what kind of core management team is needed to carry out the strategy and finding the people to fill each slot. Sometimes the existing management team is suitable and sometimes the core executive group needs to strengthened and/or expanded, either by promoting qualified people from within or by bringing in skilled managerial talent from the outside to help infuse fresh ideas and fresh approaches into the organization's management.

The proposed a dynamic organization management framework is represent in Fig. 1. Contextual factor analysis, key success factor analysis and environment and cultural analysis are essential after mission and vision of the proposed model. Regular performance analysis and evolution are essential part of the performance management system. Performance analysis is also depending on strategic plan and target setting. These processes are dynamic process and organization must adopt these process this for entrepreneurial judgment and analysis for successful strategy implementation.
In turnaround situations, in rapid-growth situations, and in those cases, where the right kinds of managerial experience and skills are not present in-house, recruiting outsiders to fill key management slots is a standard part of the organization-building process. Just being able to conceive bold new strategies is not enough. The general manager must also be able to translate his or her strategic vision into concrete steps that “get things done”.

Strategy formulation entails heavy doses of vision, analysis, and entrepreneurial judgment, successful strategy implementation depends on the skills of working through others, organizing, motivating, culture-building, and creating stronger fits between strategy and how the organization operates. Ingrained behavior does not change just because a new strategy has been announced. Practitioners emphatically state that it is a whole lot easier to develop a sound strategic plan for the long term gain.

8. Conclusion

According to the above study it is established that strategy implementation strength not be successful without the proper way to use it. If it is misunderstood by the stuff or if the affected parties refuse to accept its implementation as they do not understand it, then the strategies might be failed. The best quality management style and leadership should provide for the strategies achievement in an organization, otherwise for the different types of challenges it might be close down its business. From the above study it was recognized that the leaders must consign extra importance on implementation topic in drafting their plans. Leaders of the organization must be sure about the trouble/crisis detection, explanation and responsibility illumination. There should be progress of good communication and information system, comment system, also there should be member of staff and management concern in both the implementation and formulation of the strategies success.
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