

「BOUGHT IN?

DOES THE SUPPORT OF SOME INTERNAL
STAKEHOLDER GROUPS MATTER MORE THAN OTHERS
TO STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION SUCCESS?

DAVID MITCHELL, PH.D.

Assistant Professor, University of Central Florida

Implementation of Priority Projects

- Successful strategic implementation centers upon buy-in from those involved.
- Stakeholder support is essential to not only strategic planning, but also implementation—across most project types and phases. (Van de Ven et al., 1999; Mitchell 2014, 2018)

Stakeholder Support

- Previous studies highlight importance of support for implementation from
 - Elected officials and senior executives
(Bergen, 1982; Kemp et al., 1993; Young & Jordan, 2008)
 - Middle managers (Huy 2002; 2011)
 - Affected employees (Trader-Leigh, 2002)
 - Few studies have analyzed the impact of these groups in a single study.

Hypotheses

- H₁: Policymaker and executive support matter at the planning and closing stages of implementation.
- H₂: Support of affected employees is vital during the execution of implementation.
- H₃: Initiative context affects the type of buy-in that leads to successful implementation.

Data

- 207 strategic initiatives from 43 US municipalities
 - Randomly selected from GFOA Distinguished Budget Presentation Award winners
- Dependent Variable (Mitchell 2014):
$$IEI = \text{Complete [binary]} * (\text{Est./Actual Time}) * (\text{Est./Actual Cost})$$
- Data sources
 - Research variables: 35,000-observation dataset generated by Qualtrics surveying of project leaders, city managers, and elected officials
 - Dependent variable: Information requests to project leaders
 - Context variables: Research team review

Measuring Stakeholder Support

	Project Planning Phase	Resource Acquisition Phase	Initial Execution Phase	Midstream Execution Phase	Final Execution Phase	OVERALL
As a whole, individuals and groups with a vested interest in the implementation of this project were supportive.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Elected officials were supportive of this project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senior executives, including the city manager, were supportive of this project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Affected employees were supportive of this project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The organization and the community were enthusiastic about this project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Results: Descriptive Statistics Overall Measures

Variable Name	Level	Scale	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min.	Max.	N
Stakeholder Support	Project	1=Strongly Disagree 5=Strongly Agree	4.29	0.73	1	5	196
Organization and Community Support	Project	1=Strongly Disagree 5=Strongly Agree	4.01	0.85	1	5	196
Elected Official Support	Project	1=Strongly Disagree 5=Strongly Agree	4.40	0.74	1	5	196
Senior Executive Support	Project	1=Strongly Disagree 5=Strongly Agree	4.63	0.60	1	5	197
Affected Employee Support	Project	1=Strongly Disagree 5=Strongly Agree	4.40	0.74	1	5	195
Adequate Implementation Funding (control)	Project	1=Strongly Disagree 5=Strongly Agree	4.09	1.10	1	5	192
Manager-Council Form of Govt (control)	Organizational	0=No, 1= Yes	0.90	0.30	0	1	207
CAO Tenure (control)	Organizational	Continuous	6.89	0.46	0	24	207
Fund Balance (% of GF annual expenses) (control)	Organizational	Continuous	48.27	42.27	8.59	222.14	207
Organization FTE (per 1,000) (control)	Organizational	Continuous	0.60	1.07	0.02	5.82	207
Implementation Complexity (control)	Project	0=No Reform, 1=Process Re-Engineering, 2=New Service, 3=Transformation of Service	0.75	0.10	0	3	207
Initiative Priority (control)	Project	0=Low , 1=High	0.47	0.50	0	1	206
IEI		Continuous	0.52	0.46	0	1	186

#ICMA2019

Fixed-Effects Multiple Regression Analysis upon Overall Implementation

	Coefficients
Stakeholder Support	0.103 (0.073)
Organization and Community Support	0.094 (0.070)
Elected Official Support	0.037 (0.079)
Senior Executive Support	-0.052 (0.103)
Affected Employee Support	-0.138** (0.066)
Adequate Implementation Funding	0.100** (0.041)
Manager-Council Form of Govt	----- -----
CAO Tenure	----- -----
Fund Balance	----- -----
Organization FTE (per 1,000)	0.008 (0.202)
Implementation Complexity	0.009 (0.038)
Initiative Priority	0.059 (0.113)
Adjusted R ²	-0.151
n	170

The Council-Manager Form of Government, CAO Tenure, and Fund Balance control variables were included in the fixed-effect multiple regression analysis, but were removed during the analysis due to multicollinearity issues with the fixed effect created at the organizational level.

DV: Implementation Efficiency Index

* $\alpha < 0.10$

** $\alpha < 0.05$

*** $\alpha < 0.01$

#ICMA2019

Fixed-Effects Multiple Regression Analysis by Implementation Phase

	I Implementation Planning	II Resource Acquisition	III Initial Execution	IV Midstream Execution	V Final Execution
Stakeholder Support	0.105 (0.065)	0.160*** (0.059)	0.104* (0.056)	0.060 (0.058)	0.023 (0.057)
Org and Community Support	0.123** (0.049)	0.100* (0.053)	0.088 (0.060)	0.083 (0.066)	0.067 (0.064)
Elected Official Support	-0.035 (0.074)	-0.023 (0.065)	-0.045 (0.075)	0.089 (0.065)	0.142** (0.068)
Senior Executive Support	-0.079 (0.087)	-0.094 (0.076)	-0.027 (0.091)	-0.085 (0.103)	-0.080 (0.110)
Employee Support	-0.129** (0.056)	-0.138*** (0.050)	-0.123** (0.056)	-0.118* (0.063)	-0.094 (0.067)
Adequate Impl. Funding	0.118*** (0.041)	0.114*** (0.044)	0.110** (0.045)	0.084* (0.103)	0.073 (0.048)
Organization FTE (per 1,000)	-0.089 (0.212)	-0.096 (0.208)	-0.080 (0.216)	-0.022 (0.208)	----- -----
Implementation Complexity	0.007 (0.038)	0.005 (0.038)	0.009 (0.039)	-0.001 (0.038)	-0.019 (0.038)
Initiative Priority	0.077 (0.110)	0.042 (0.113)	0.026 (0.118)	0.056 (0.116)	0.081 (0.115)
Adjusted R ²	-0.156	-0.117	-0.194	-0.204	-0.180
n	168	166	163	160	156

* $\alpha < 0.10$

** $\alpha < 0.05$

*** $\alpha < 0.01$

#ICMA2019

Examining Project Context

Project Contexts			
Complexity	High	<i>Internal Innovation</i>	<i>Centerpiece</i>
	Low	<i>Routine</i>	<i>Responsive</i>
Low <=Priority=> High			

Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis by Initiative Context

	I Routine	II Responsive	III Internal Innovation	IV Centerpiece
Stakeholder Support	----- -----	----- -----	0.274*** (0.073)	----- -----
Organization and Community Support	----- -----	----- -----	----- -----	0.192* (0.099)
Elected Official Support	----- -----	----- -----	----- -----	----- -----
Senior Executive Support	----- -----	----- -----	----- -----	----- -----
Affected Employee Support	----- -----	-0.281* (0.144)	----- -----	----- -----
Adequate Impl. Funding	0.195*** (0.051)	0.194*** (0.055)	----- -----	----- -----
Fund Balance	----- -----	-0.003** (0.001)	----- -----	----- -----
Constant	-0.203 (0.213)	1.166* (0.651)	-0.615* (0.313)	-0.242* (0.401)
Adjusted R ²	0.244	0.281	0.227	0.065^
n	43	40	46	41

DV:
Implementation
Efficiency Index
* $\alpha < 0.10$
** $\alpha < 0.05$
*** $\alpha < 0.01$

^ This model is
significant at the
0.06 level, not
the standard 0.05
level

#ICMA2019

Hypotheses

H₁: Policymaker and executive support matter at the planning and closing stages of implementation.

SUPPORTED

H₂: Support of affected employees is vital during the execution of implementation.

NOT SUPPORTED, REVERSE RELATIONSHIP

H₃: Initiative context affects the type of buy-in that leads to successful implementation.

SUPPORTED

THANK YOU

Questions?

ICMA | conference