Organizational Restructuring and Project Implementation in Kenya Investment Authority (Keninvest)

Eunice Munyuny[1], Dr. Joanes Kyongo[2]

School of Business and Economics, Daystar University, Kenya

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200240

Received: 16 February 2026; Accepted: 21 February 2026; Published: 03 March 2026

ABSTRACT

Despite the critical role played by the Kenya Investment Authority (KenInvest) in fostering economic growth in Kenya, the organization has demonstrated a relatively slow rate of project implementation over the past five years. This inefficiency has been attributed to poorly organizational restructuring such as inadequate business process redesign, low level of organizational innovation and poor integration processes. Consequently, this study sought to examine the relationship between organizational restructuring and project implementation at KenInvest. The study was anchored on Lewin's Three-step Change Theory and Stakeholder Theory to provide a theoretical framework to understand organizational transitions. The study adopted a descriptive research design for providing a comprehensive overview of the variables. The target population for the study included all 303 employees of KenInvest across various departments, with a specific focus on 91 managers and supervisors who had served for a minimum of three years. A census approach was utilized, ensuring that all 91 targeted respondents were included in the study. Primary data was collected using semi-structured questionnaires. To ensure the effectiveness of the research tool, pretesting was conducted at the Kenya Revenue Authority (KRA) using 10% of the sample size. Both content and face validity were established, while reliability was determined using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, which yielded an overall value of 0.764, indicating acceptable internal consistency. Data was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics with the help of SPSS version 26.0. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was performed to establish the strength and direction of the relationship. The findings established a significant and positive relationship between organizational restructuring and project implementation. The study recommends that KenInvest should align its structural frameworks with contemporary business process redesigns to ensure successful implementation of projects.

Keywords: Organizational restructuring, Project Implementation, Kenya Investment Authority (KenInvest)

INTRODUCTION

Depending on the structure or the size, organizations keep adopting various strategies in order to achieve anticipated output results. In order to achieve the desired implementation of projects, organizations have opted to formulate appropriate strategies. A restructuring organization as argued by Change Adaptive (2021) comprises of the changes in the formal arrangement of roles, responsibilities and reporting relationships to support strategic objectives. This simply means that these organizations have the ability to pinpoint Consequently, Worley and Doolen (2018) view organizational restructuring as the process that fundamentally dictates team configuration, communication flow, decision-making processes, and resources allocation, which can greatly influence project success or its failure. Adoption of organizational restructuring can promote effective communication; accelerate decision-making and enhance organizational agility, which are critical for successful project implementation.

Similarly, Hambric and Cannella (2022) noted that approximately 50% of developed projects in public institutions do fail to materialize due to lack of organizational restructuring as a strategic intervention, finally, this undermines the success of project implementation. Furthermore, Elezaj et al. (2020) emphasized that organizational restructuring establishes framework in which projects are organized and operated. However,

firms should critically examine their structural arrangements and implement changes where necessary to improve effective project completion.

Benitez-Avila et al. (2019) described project implementation as the completion of projects within the needed timelines and within financial constraints, at the same time achieving the intended objectives such as quality, meeting the client requirements and satisfaction. In similar vein, Abok et al. (2023) defined project implementation as the execution of designed activities aiming to achieve desired results, supported by continuous monitoring of progress in accordance with the work plan. The authors further revealed that project implementation is evaluated based on indicators such as scheduling, cost management (cost of the project), quality assurance (quality of the project), employee satisfaction, time management (time of the project) and employee safety. Therefore, as guided by these perspectives, the current study assessed project implementation at KenInvest using three key indicators: Project cost, project time and project quality.

Background of the Study

Globally, it is approximately estimated that 50% of all developed projects fail to advance to the implementation stage (Hambrick & Cannella, 2022). Project implementation failure is often assigned to poor formulation of strategies into actionable results. The effectiveness of any instrument depends on how it is used, its value of the strategy depends on its implementation. Firms adopt strategies as tools to try and take advantage of opportunities in the business environment. Therefore, even if an appropriate strategy is established, effective implementation remains key factor of success.

Particularly, in India, a study by KPMG (2023) showed that 25% of ongoing project programmes experienced delays due to poor organizational restructuring, poor planning, and limited innovation in modern technologies adoption. This study further indicated that staff incompetence, lack of process redesign and lack of construction facilities contributed to project delays, which negatively affected the project quality, time and cost, specifically in road construction projects.

Similarly, in the Spanish wine industry, Gil and Garcia-Alcaraz (2020) examined the effect of organizational restructuring in managing change processes during project implementation. This study established that organizational restructuring, innovation and training strategies were predominant change management strategies that positively affected project implementation within the Rioja wine industry. The study further observed that over the last decade, enhancements in project implementation were hugely attributed by organizational restructures which were initiated by the managers. In the context of public institutions, Sung and Kim (2021) found that organizational restructuring, effective communication, planning and training positively and significantly influenced the implementation of the projects in Korea. The results further demonstrated that organizational restructuring, alongside with other change management strategies improved overall the project implementation.

In African context, Arinaitwe (2021) established that organizational restructuring positively affected project implementation at Nile University's projects in Nigeria. In similar vein, Kamugisha and Irechukwu (2023) reported that project implementation in many firms in Rwanda confronted persistent difficulties due to poor top management support, lack of structured change management strategies, resistance to change from middle management, inadequate defined change scopes, oversized projects, user resistance to change, cost overruns, failure to match organizational restructures and process redesigns with new conditions, unclear goals and objectives. These determinants collectively led to prolonged and negatively influenced project implementation period.

Statistics, in Kenya, has revealed that the nation accounted for about 1% of global investment promotion of project implementation in 2015, which increased to approximately 3% in 2018, however it subsequently dropped to 2% between 2020 and 20223 due to Covid-19 (Ali et al., 2022). The authors further note that this decline highlighted the need for organizational restructuring to address systemic problems within firms like KenInvest. In response, the Kenyan government has implemented organizational restructuring, public service

reforms, technological innovations, and process redesign as well as re-engineering initiatives which transform the implementation of the parastatals to enhance public sector's investment projects (Martin, 2021).

Machuki (2018) argued that the Kenyan ministries have faced internal and external limitations in implementing change, largely because of the challenges related to organizational restructuring. In addition, Kihara et al. (2021) found that state owned agricultural corporations adopted organizational restructuring as a strategy to turnaround and enhance project implementation results. Further evidence from Jain et al. (2025) revealed that organizational restructuring played a fundamental role in influencing the success of the Kenyan public sector investment project implementation.

Statement of the Problem

Kenya Investment Authority (KenInvest) has played a critical role as a catalyst for economic growth by promoting and enabling investments in Kenya. However, it has experienced a persistent decline in project implementation rates over the past five years. This slow pace has been attributed to various factors including insufficient revenue generated from investments activities, poorly organizational restructuring, inadequate business process redesign, low level of organizational innovation and poor integration processes (KenInvest Strategic Plan, 2017/2022). These challenges point toward a critical issue of organizational restructuring, innovation and adaptability to meet both internal and external pressures for change. Furthermore, external forces have emerged as dominant effects of change in organizations like KenInvest, which has necessitated the capability to navigate through a complex and dynamic environment (Jain et al., 2025).

In addition, research on public sector investment projects has indicated that organizational restructuring, innovation and adaptability are vital in navigating both internal pressures (like project prioritization, resource allocation) and external forces (like government policies) that critically impact project implementation. Statistics has indicated that Kenya accounted for about 1% of global investment promotion project implementation as of 2015. This figure rose to approximately 3% in 2018, but it subsequently dropped to 2% between 2020 and 2023, following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2019 (Ali et al., 2022). This downward trend reveals urgent need to adopt systemic organizational restructuring change within in order to improve the effectiveness of project implementation.

Organizational Restructuring

The concept of "Organizational Restructuring" refers to adjusting the formal arrangement of roles, responsibilities and reporting relationships to support strategic objectives (Change Adaptive, 2021). This can promote better communication; faster decision making and increase agility which are fundamental for successful project implementation. In the view of Lazakis and Van Der-Meer (2023), organizational restructure involves the decentralized system that controls the hierarchical and functional relationship of team members and provides the fundamental basis for completing the project successfully. Zhang et al. (2024) notes that organizational restructure includes task assignment and responsibility and effects the functions of communication, coordination, and decision-making in project execution.

Furthermore, Hu et al. (2024) argued that choosing the right organizational restructure can adequately assist the project team, while incompatibility with the project nature can cause problems frustrating the process. These authors found that organizational restructure positively and significantly affected the implementation of projects. Similarly, Ahmadya et al. (2016), added that organizational restructure can be regarded as the framework of relationships regarding jobs, systems, operational procedures, individuals, and groups. The authors further reveal that regular reviews and adjustments to structures to adapt to changes enables efficient knowledge transfer, leading to transfer leading to enhanced project implementation without delays.

The form of the restructure will affect the relationship between the project members and between the project and other projects and the outside world. The document will dictate the authority structure, the role of all the project members, and the communication channels, supervision, coordination, and cooperation among the team members (Cristobal et al., 2018). The structure of the organization of the company can also affect the degree of

project management, final project decision-making power, communication of the project goals and activity, and interdependence between the team and project manager.

Project Implementation

Mahianjo and Njeru (2016) defined project implementation as the stage in which the project's financial resources are allotted and the project's vision and plans come to fruition. The needs of the beneficiaries or the local population are frequently not met by many projects that fail during implementation. According to Chandra (2018), project implementation is the process of bringing the investment plan to life by putting particular structures and procedures in place to operationalize the investment idea and later reap the project's intended advantages.

Abok et al. (2023) regards the project as effectively implemented, it should be evidenced by its completion in alignment with the planned budget, the achievement of established goals, and the satisfaction of employees. Therefore, while traditional measures such as cost, budget, and quality are significant indicators of performance, it is also essential to consider additional factors like the effect on the environment, as well as beneficiary and client satisfaction. The implementation of the project is assessed based on completion time, budget adherence, stakeholder satisfaction, efficiency, reduction of disputes and conflicts, as well as ensuring safety and effectiveness.

Burke (2023) revealed that only 18% of projects are completed within budget, 50% of them go over budget, and 30% of them are so costly that they are canceled before they are finished. Furthermore, White (2021) notes that there is only a 65% chance that a project will meet the expectations of the project participants. Meredith and Mantel (2021) state that 80-85% of all project activity and resource use occur during the project the implementation phase.

Kenya Investment Authority (KenInvest)

The Kenya Investment Authority (KenInvest) was established under the Investment Promotion Act, no 6 of 2004, with the mandate to promote and facilitate both foreign and domestic investment in Kenya. Investment plays a key role in the development agenda, with private investment projections to increase at least 20% of GDP during the 2017-2022 period to support the achievement of Vision 2030. The growth promoted sectors including construction, manufacturing, information and communication technology (ICT), infrastructure, and telecommunications.

During this period, the Kenya's business environment enhanced rapidly due to extensive economic and structural reforms, which resulted to the enactment of several business-friendly legislations between 2013 and 2017. This included the Business Registration Services Act of 2015, the Insolvency Act of 2015, the Public Private Partnership Act of 2013, and the Nairobi International Finance Act, No. 25 of 2017. Originally, KenInvest was developed from the Investment Advisory and Promotion Centre, which was established by the Ministry of Finance (1982) to speed up the approval of new private investment in the country to reduce bureaucratic processes which were related to the issuance of permits and licenses. This advisory further appreciated the Foreign Investment Protection Act of 1964, which served to safeguard investors against anti-expropriation.

Then, in 1986, the Parliament formally enacted the Investment Promotion Centre Act (IPC), section 485 of the Kenyan laws. Later, the Act allowed the issuance of General Authority (GA) new investments in 1992, which guaranteed potential investors with all the required permits and licenses and permits would be automatically issued. In 2004, the Investment Promotion Act, No. 6 of 2004 was enacted and replaced the GA framework by providing investment certificate issuance procedures for new investments. The Act also established the Kenya Investment Authority (KenInvest), which took over from the IPC, which core mandate of promoting and enabling innovation in the quality standards in private investment in Kenya.

Furthermore, KenInvest plays a role of advisory by examining the investment environment and recommending policy, regulatory as well as administrative reforms to the government and other stakeholders to promote

investment climate. This authority also includes investment site identification, land planning and management as well as development of related infrastructure and facilities. In order to enhance service delivery and coordination, KenInvest now operates a One Stop Centre (OSC) which brings together all the government agencies responsible for direct facilitation of private investments under one roof, by providing investors with more streamlined services.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

This study was anchored on Lewin Three-step Change Theory and Stakeholder Theory. Kurt Lewin (1951) developed this model as a foundational framework for comprehending and managing organizational restructuring within firms. This model is based on three stages: Unfreezing, changing, and refreezing which guide the firms to go through transformation while considering both interpersonal dynamics and structural processes of the success of project implementation. This model is relevant to this study since it supports change initiatives like organizational restructuring which is vital for improving the success of project implementation.

Stakeholder Theory was introduced by Milton Freeman (1984). It states that a stakeholder is "any group or individual without whose support the firm would cease to exist". This theory stresses that there is need for firms to put into consideration the interests and expectations of stakeholders when formulating strategic decisions. Hence, the theory was relevant to this study as integrating stakeholder feedback into organizational restructuring is fundamental to establish trust and accountability, which are critical factors to minimize resistance to change and enhance the success of project implementation (Conraud et al., 2014).

Organizational Restructuring and Project Implementation

Nizma et al. (2024) evaluated the role of organizational restructuring on project implementation. The study used qualitative approach and case study techniques. Data was collected from secondary sources such as Google Scholar, Ebsco and Natioal Library. The study population included project managers, project leaders, senior managers and project team members. The findings revealed that organizational restructure significantly affects communication, coordination and decision making during project implementation. However, this study presents a methodological gap, since it was qualitative approach, while the current study adopted a quantitative approach.

Also, Crispin (2020) examined the impact of organizational restructuring on project outcomes in Sierra Leone. The study was guided by institutional and contingency theories. The findings of the study established that organizational restructuring and strategic goals significantly affected the project outcomes. This study concluded that organizational restructuring significantly affects project outcomes. However, this study solely relied on secondary data and not including primary data collection; In contrast, to the current study which was field-based and used primary data collection, revealing a methodological gap. The current study addressed this by collecting primary data using a survey questionnaire.

At the local level, Koech and Obuba (2024) investigated the effect of organizational restructure on the implementation of government-funded projects at the Kenya Ports Authority. The study was anchored on systems theory. It utilized descriptive research design, with a population of 1,210 management employees. A sample size of 300 was determined using Slovin's Formula, and stratified random sampling approach was used in the selection of respondents. The study collected both primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected via semi-structured questionnaires. Quantitative data used descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive statistics used means, percentages and standard deviation, whereas inferential statistics used Pearson's product moment correlation and multiple regression. Reliability was determined through Cronbach alpha coefficient. The findings affirmed that organizational restructuring (p=.001) had a significant relationship with project implementation. However, there was a methodological gap existed in the sampling approach, this study relied simply on Slovin's Formula; while the current study employed a census technique to collect data.

In another study, Mutegi and Mutuku (2025) examined the effect of organizational restructuring on the implementation at Kenya Medical Supplies Authority projects in Nairobi City County. The study was anchored on RBV theory, institutional theory, structural theory and contingency theory. A descriptive research design was used. Data was collected from 86 respondents drawn from 109 KEMSA employees, health officials and service providers across four different projects. Primary data was collected using questionnaires. Reliability was assessed through Cronbach Alpha. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, which were presented through means and standard deviations, tables and charts. While, inferential statistics was performed through multiple regression. The findings of the study showed that organizational restructure had positively and significantly effect on project implementation in KEMSA. However, this study focused specifically on clear communication channels as a dimension of organizational restructure. Hence, presenting a contextual gap. The current study focused on clearly defined roles and responsibilities within the firm.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a descriptive research design. According to Zikmund et al. (2021), descriptive research primarily relies on quantitative data and self-reported information to describe phenomena as they happen. The study targeted managers and supervisors at Kenya Investment Authority (KenInvest), this group was directly targeted because they are involved in the project implementation processes. The population of the study comprised all 303 employees of KenInvest across different departments (KenInvest Human Resource Department, 2024). This study therefore targeted the managers and supervisors of KenInvest, particularly those with over three years of experience in project implementation, as they possess greater expertise in this area.

In total, 91 managers and supervisors met these criteria. A census approach was adopted, whereby all 91 eligible respondents were selected. Furthermore, the study utilized stratified sampling to categorize respondents into strata, including managers and supervisors across all the departments of KenInvest. Primary data was collected using semi structured questionnaires integrating closed-ended items which were measured on a five-point Likert scale. The study adhered to all ethical requirements, such as obtaining approvals from Daystar University Institutional Scientific Ethical Review Committee (DU-ISERC) and NACOSTI (National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation). Data was analyzed using SPSS version 26.0, employing both descriptive and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation analysis.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Response Rate

The study distributed 91 questionnaires to the employees of KenInvest. Table 1 presents the results.

Table 1: Response Rate

Questionnaires		
Issued	Returned	Response Rate
91	72	79.1%

The returned questionnaires gave a response rate of 79.1%, which was considered to be sufficient for data analysis and generalizing findings. This concurs with Hamed and Madanchian (2024) who reiterated that a response rate of 50% is considered sufficient for analysis and reporting and also noted that higher rates improve the quality of the analysis.

Organizational Restructuring

The study sought to establish whether the various aspects of organizational restructuring were available in the firm and the descriptive statistics regarding this is indicated in Table 2.

Table 2: Organizational Restructuring (N=72*)*

Statements	Min	Max	Mean	Std Dev
Division of tasks is clearly defined.	1	5	4.21	0.903
Regularly reviews & adjusts its structure to meet dynamic needs of projects.	1	5	4.26	0.872
Training on roles and responsibilities is provided adequately.	1	5	4.25	0.915
Workforce alignment is conducted to given tasks.	1	5	4.25	0.835
Knowledge sharing among different project teams.	1	5	4.26	0.904
Clear lines of communication and command among project stakeholders.	1	5	4.25	0.868

Table 2 shows that majority of the respondents strongly agreed that KenInvest the division of tasks are well-defined, as indicated by a mean of 4.21 and standard deviation of 0.903. This suggests a moderate level of variance in responses, which indicates that a shared understanding of roles and responsibilities among employees. An indication to effective role clarity among project team members. This finding agrees with Daddey (2012), who found that clear roles and responsibilities were fundamental for successful project implementation.

Regarding whether there were regularly reviews and adjustments of structure to meet dynamic needs of projects, as supported by a mean of 4.26 and standard deviation of 0.872, suggesting that high a strong commitment and adaptability within the company to address changes in projects demands. In support, Ahmadya et al. (2016) noted that the regular reviews and adjustments to structures to adapt changes enables efficient knowledge transfer, leading to transfer leading to enhanced project implementation without delays.

Furthermore, regarding the statement of training on roles and responsibilities, the study established a mean of 4.25 and standard deviation of 0.915, implying that KenInvest was committed to equip employees with necessary knowledge and skills related to task requirements. This matches Bowen et al. (2021) who found that identification of roles within a team is necessary in project management in order to achieve effective implementation of projects. Similarly, Zhang et al. (2024) argue that the organizational structure encompasses the allocation of tasks and responsibilities, while also impacting communication, coordination, and decision-making processes during project implementation.

In regard to whether the workforce alignment was conducted to given tasks, the study obtained a mean of 4.25 and standard deviation of 0.835, suggesting that there is an effective process in place for aligning employees with tasks that match their expertise and skills. According to Okumbe (2015), members should match well their roles and skills to enhance project success through efficient use of resources.

In addition, the respondents indicated a strong perception of knowledge sharing among different project teams, with a mean of 4.26 and standard deviation of 0.904; suggesting a high level of agreement which indicates that there are effective ways of communication and sharing knowledge across teams. This agrees with Cristobal et al. (2018) who found that knowledge sharing norms within teams significantly enhance project implementation.

Lastly, the clarity of communication and command among project stakeholders received a mean of 4.25 and standard deviation of 0.868; suggesting that KenInvest has put in place clear communication channels to prevent misunderstanding and ensure all stakeholders are informed. Mahamud et al. (2019) revealed that

effective communication fosters a shared understanding of project goals and enables engagement of various stakeholders, leading to improved cooperation hence easy implementation of projects.

Project Implementation

The study sought to establish the extent of project implementation at KenIvest. The findings are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Project Implementation

Statements	Min	Max	Mean	Std Dev
Project consistently meet stakeholder expectations.	2	5	4.28	0.755
Projects adhere to established quality standards.	2	5	4.39	0.64
Investment-related projects are completed within the initially scheduled timelines.	3	5	4.4	0.573
Project managers consistently develop clear and detailed timeliness for each phase of investment projects.	1	5	4.42	0.666
Projects managed by KenInvest frequently experience cost overruns beyond the initially approved budget.	2	5	4.32	0.646
Budgeting process for projects at KenInvest is clear and well-defined.	2	5	4.42	0.599

Table 3 reveals that majority of the respondents strongly agreed that the projects of KenInvest consistently met the stakeholders' expectations, as supported by a mean of 4.28 and standard deviation of 0.755. This indicates that a sizable majority of respondents are certain that project results meet stakeholder criteria and requirements. This view is critical to the long-term viability of KenInvest's projects since a high degree of stakeholder satisfaction is necessary to uphold trust and promote future partnerships. Zhang et al. (2024) argue that project deliverables should align or even exceed stakeholder expectations by adhering to established quality standards.

Furthermore, the statement that our projects adhered to established quality standards had a mean score of 4.39 and standard deviation of 0.640, suggesting that staff members believe there is a high commitment to project implementation quality. According to this study, KenInvest successfully employs quality control procedures that project teams like. These findings match those of Qayyum et al. (2021) who highlight that issues related to project quality were addressed through different strategies such as total quality management (TQM), international organizational for standardization (ISO) and six sigma within the investment institutions.

Regarding the statement that the completion of investment-related projects within originally planned timescales. As supported by a mean of 4.40 and standard deviation of 0.573. This result points to a successful history of meeting deadlines, which is an essential part of efficient project management. This finding agrees with Rosalinda (2023) who indicates that project time involved the process of organizing, arranging and overseeing all tasks are finished within the allocated time limit.

In another statement, the respondents strongly agreed that project managers consistently developed clear and detailed timelines for each phase of investment projects, as supported by a mean of 4.42 and standard deviation of 0.666. This suggests a strong conviction that KenInvest project managers successfully prepare and convey schedules, which is crucial for preserving project momentum and concentration. Sami et al. (2023) note that project managers should complete projects within predefined schedules since delays often lead to high costs.

Concerning whether the projects managed by KenInvest frequently experienced cost overruns beyond the initially approved budget. This statement obtained the highest mean score of 4.32 and standard deviation of 0.646. This suggests that cost overruns were still a major worry, even though a high score could indicate that this difficulty was acknowledged. This finding is in accordance with Haaskjold et al. (2023) who contended that project managers should prevent cost overruns and guarantee that project provides value for money.

Finally, KenInvest's budgeting process for projects is clear and well-defined statement received the same mean score of 4.42 and standard deviation of 0.599. This implies that the budgeting procedures used are seen favourably, which supports the idea of generally good project management. This finding matches Irfan et al. (2021) who argue how a well-communicated budgeting contributes to the adaptability to both operational demands and project requirements, hence enhances stakeholder trust.

Correlation Analysis

Product Pearson Moment Correlation was performed to determine the strength of the relationship between organizational restructuring and project implementation. Table 4 presents the results.

Table 4: Correlation Analysis

Correlations	Project Implementation	Organizational Restructuring
Project Implementation	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	N	72
Organizational Restructuring	Pearson Correlation	.716*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	72

Table 4 shows the findings of the study which determined that organizational restructuring and project implementation had a correlation coefficient of (r=.716), with a significance level of (p=.000). These results suggest a strongly positive and statistically significant at 0.05 relationship; means the effectiveness of the organizational restructure improves project implementation likely by the same amount. This implies that a restructured organizational framework can facilitate clearer communication, defined roles among others are crucial for successful project implementation. These findings are supported by Zhang et al. (2024) who found that organizational restructure encompasses the allocation of tasks and responsibilities, while also impacting communication, coordination, and decision-making processes during project implementation.

DISCUSSIONS OF FINDINGS

The objective of the study was to determine the relationship between organizational restructure and project implementation at KenInvest. Based on this objective, the study found that the employees strongly agreed that there was clarity of roles and responsibilities at KenInvest with mean=4.21. This finding agrees with Daddey (2012) who highlighted that clarity in roles and responsibilities is critical for the success of the implementation of various projects in the organizations. Similarly, Bruch et al. (2018) revealed that employees are expected to comprehend their roles for better commitment as well as preparedness for change.

Finally, the study performed Pearson Product Moment correlation between organizational restructure and project implementation; and the study established there was a strongly positively and significant relationship between organizational restructure (r=0.716) and project implementation. This suggested that adoption of organizational restructure promoted clearer communication and delineated roles and responsibilities which

were considered critical for the success of project implementation. This finding agrees with Arinaitwe (2021) who found that organizational restructure favorably affect the implementation of the University's projects through effective communication and regular reviews in Uganda.

CONCLUSION

The findings were that there were clarity of roles and responsibility with a (mean=4.21) and commitment to regularly reviewing its restructuring to adapt to project demands. It can be concluded that these elements are paramount in KenInvest, as they contribute to defining clear expectations among team members, thereby minimizing complexities that can hinder the project implementation progress. Furthermore, the study found that KenInvest provided trainings to employees to implement change. It can therefore be concluded that training is a strategic measure for change management. That by investing in employee development, KenInvest not only equips its workforce with necessary skills but also provides an adaptive culture that is responsible to the dynamics of project work.

Finally, the study found that KenInvest has established protocols for preventing misunderstanding and ensure all parties are adequately informed. It can therefore be concluded that KenInvest has promoted clarity in communication within project settings. Effective communication reduces the likelihood of misinformation, ensures alignment on project goals and facilitates coordinated efforts among stakeholders.

REFERENCES

1. Abok, A., Waititu, A., Gakure, R. & Ragui, M. (2023). Culture's role in the implementation of strategic plans in non-governmental organizations in Kenya. Prime Journal of Social Science (PJSS), 2(4), 291-295. https://doi.org/10.47941/jbsm.1204
2. Ahmadya, G.A, Mehrpour, M & Nikooravesh, A. (2016). Organizational structure. 3rd International Conference on New Challenges in Management and Organization: Organization and Leadership, Dubai, UAE. Procedia, Social and Behavioral Sciences, 230, 455-462. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.09.057
3. Arinaitwe, D. (2021). Practices and strategies for enhancing learning through collaboration between vocational teacher training institutions and workplaces. Empirical Research in Vocational Education and Training, 13(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40461-021-00117-z
4. Bruch, H., Gerber, P., & Maier, V. (2018). Strategic change decisions: Doing the right change right. Journal of Change Management, 5(1), 97-107. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010500067390
5. Conraud, T., Jammes, L., Morales, L. V., & Cordoba, J. (2014). Fair dialogue and co-creation: A shift in stakeholder engagement and global performance of industrial projects. SPE International Conference on Health, Safety, and Environment. https://doi.org/10.2118/168387-ms
6. Crispin, G. (2020). How organizational structures affect project outcomes. International Journal of Science and Research, 9(2). https://DOI:10.21275/SR20217013035
7. Daddey. F. (2012). Project management. Open educational resources. Downloaded from https://pressbooks.bccampus.ca/fdaddey
8. Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Boston, MA: Pitman.
9. George, G., Fewer, T. J., Lazzarini, S., McGahan, A. M., & Puranam, P. (2024). Partnering for grand challenges: A review of organizational design considerations in public-private collaborations. Journal of Management, 50(1), 10-40. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221148992
10. Haaskjold, H., Andersen, B., & Langlo, J. A. (2023). Dissecting the project anatomy: Understanding the cost of managing construction projects. Production Planning & Control, 34(2), 117-138. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2021.1891480
11. Hamed, T. and Madancian, M. (2024). The impact of survey response rates on research validity and reliability. Advances in Library and Information Science, 177-206. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-1135-6.ch009
12. Irfan, M., Khan, S. Z., Hassan, N., Hassan, M., Habib, M., Khan, S., & Khan, H. H. (2021). Role of project planning and project manager competencies on public sector project success. Sustainability, 13(3), 1421. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031421

13. Kamugisha, J., & Irechukwu, E. N. (2023). Project team empowerment and performance of learning through play project in Rwanda. Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management, 7(15), 56-66. https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t2269
14. KenInvest Human Resource Department (2024). List of Kenya Investment Authority (InvestKenya) employees. https://www.signalhire.com/companies/kenya-investment-authority-keninvest/employees
15. Koech, E. K. and Obuba, R. (2024). Impact of organizational structure on the implementation of government funded projects at Kenya ports authority. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 22(3), 1991-1999. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.22.3.1971
16. Lazakis, I., & Van Der Meer, R. 2023). Organizational structure on figurations, their application and contribution to business performance in Greek shipping companies. WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs, 1-28. https://DOI:10.1007/s13437-023-00315-4
17. Mahamud, Z., Yusuf, D. M., & Ogolla, P. (2019). Factors affecting implementation of national government projects in Mvita constituency of Mombasa county. Strategic Journal of Business &Amp; Change Management, 6(3). https://doi.org/10.61426/sjbcm.v6i3.1358
18. Mehmood, T., Alzoubi, H. M., Al-Gasaymeh, A., & Ahmed, G. (2019). Schumpeterian Entrepreneurship Theory: Evolution and relevance. Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 25, 1-10. https://DOI:10.4236/ojbm.2023.116178
19. Mutegi, P., & Mutuku, M. (2025). Effect of organizational structure on the implementation of Kenya Medical Supplies Authority projects in Nairobi city County. International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research, 13(2), 188-194. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15324336
20. Nizma, C., Bangun, R., Benhur, B., Cahyoginarti, C., & Zuardi, M. (2024). The Role of Organizational Structure in Project Management. Jurnal Syntax Transformation, 5(2), 590-597. https://doi.org/10.46799/jst.v5i2.928
21. Qayyum, S., Ullah, F., Al-Turjman, F., Mojtahedi, M. (2021). Managing smart cities through six sigma DMADICV method: A review-based conceptual framework. Sustain. Cities Soc, 72, 103022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2021.103022
22. Rosalinda, R., Nizmah, N., Makmur, M., & Rarasanti, D. (2023). Analysis of project time and cost control with CPM, PERT and crashing project methods in shop building projects at cv. Mentari Permai. Scientific Journal of Reflection: Economic, Accounting, Management and Business, 6(1), 85-94. https://doi.org/10.37481/sjr.v6i1.622
23. Sung, W., & Kim, C. (2021). A study on the effect of change management on organizational innovation: Focusing on the mediating effect of members' innovative behavior. Sustainability, 13(4), 2079. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042079
24. Zhang, X., Denicol, J., Chan, P. W., & Le, Y. (2024). Designing the transition to operations in large inter-organizational projects: Strategy, structure, process, and people. Journal of Operations Management,70(1), 107-136. https://DOI:10.1002/joom.1275
25. Zikmund, W. G., Babin, B. J., Carr, J. C., & Griffin, M. (2021). Business research method (8th ed.). New Delhi: McMillan Publishers.