

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCES AND FIRM PERFORMANCE OF COMPANIES LISTED ON THE NAIROBI SECURITIES EXCHANGE

Agnes W. Gitahi 

Kenya Institute of Management, Thika, Kenya

agwngari@yahoo.com

Peter O. K'Obonyo

Professor, School of Business, University of Nairobi, Kenya

pkabonyo@uonbi.ac.ke

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to contribute to the extant knowledge on the relationship between resources and performance of companies listed on Nairobi Securities Exchange. A review of pertinent conceptual and empirical literature was done and a hypothesis formulated. A positivist paradigm relying on descriptive research design was used. The study was a census by nature. The population comprised 62 companies listed on Nairobi Securities Exchange and were active at the time of data collection. The respondents were managers in charge of finance and business strategy. A structured Likert questionnaire anchored on a five-point scale was used to collect primary data. Simple linear regression analysis was used in hypothesis testing. The results revealed that organizational resources significantly affect firm performance. The study contributes to theory building by demonstrating empirically that efficient bundling of resources results to firm capabilities which are harder to be imitated by competitors, and this contributes to superior performance. Further, it confirms the value and application of resource-based theory. This study may have been constrained by small target population and one respondent per firm. Future researchers could involve more respondents across the management hierarchy in each unit of analysis and also using longitudinal design.

Keywords: Organizational Resources, leadership style, Organizational Capacity, Non-Financial Performance, Nairobi Securities Exchange

INTRODUCTION

An organization's existing resource portfolio refers to all types of resources (tangible and intangible assets) under the management control, (Garbuio *et al.*, 2010; and Sirmon *et al.*, 2007). It establishes the upper limits of a firm's potential to create value at a point in time. A portfolio of resources encompasses the fundamental elements that are bundled and leveraged, therefore enabling and constraining the actions a firm can take (Barney, 2001a; Makadok, 2003). A resource is a relatively observable, tradable asset that contributes to a firm's market position by improving customer value and lowering cost or both. The main tenets of resource dependence are the significance of environmental sensitivity for understanding how an organization operates (Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003; Sirmon, *et al.* 2007) and the role resources play in determining the performance of business organizations.

Carlson (2004) observed from a resource-based view (RBV), that organizational strategy theory acquires competitive advantages through internally controlling resources. The company controls the internal factors and how they affect management through keeping up with the resources available and ensuring that the resources are used responsibly and correctly. As long as the management plans organizes, leads, and controls resources effectively, the company should be able to withstand any factor that may affect it. A basic concern premised on the resource-based view is that attention should be focused on vital differences in the resource endowment and strategic reorganization of these resources in a firm. Resources are part of organizational capacity (Sirmon, *et al.*, 2007).

In indeed, the issue of firm performance and the determination of such factors is an important issue in the field of strategic management. Studies tend to link such performance differences in either industry-specific factors with mixed results (Hawawini and Subramaniam, 2003; McNara *et al.*, 2005). This diversity has led some strategic management researchers to question the ability of empirical studies to consistently and objectively explain differences in organizational performance, broadly criticizing research sampling practices (Short *et al.*, (2002) performance measurement methods and dimensions (Denrell, 2004; Starbuck, 2004) and the effects of industry velocity (Brauer and Schmidt, 2006). In short, an effective performance system should be able to capture not only the financial aspect of business performance but also the non-financial elements, so as to present a clearer and wider perception and dimension of performance (Ishmail *et al.*, 2010).

Research Problem

Many studies have been done on firm performance variables. Some of these studies linked performance to internal organizational variables of which leadership and resources are

important. Howard and Walters (2004) from their study on Chinese manufacturing firms using configuration of resources and structures on performance did not confirm configurations based on their findings while a study by Gomes and Osbone (2009) on the role of stakeholders on local government performance confirmed that leadership and resources are key determinants of performance. Hill and Lynn (2004) and Forbes and Lynn (2005) gave an insight of performance studies and the different levels of determining variables under study. In the context of internal/external dichotomy is the classification by Boyne (2003) of sixty-five statistical studies on determinants of performance improvements. In his view, relevant external factors were resources, regulation, and market structure and for internal factors, he listed organizational change and management. Management referred in his study were issues of organizational culture, leadership styles, human resource management and strategy process and content. His overall conclusion was that performance is subject to systematic influences of different organizational factors and hence each variable orientation should be considered. Organizational resources has a critical responsibility of executing the strategy, as well as providing a foundation for strategy development, (Luliya *et al.*, 2013), but this lacked empirical support.

Companies listed on the Nairobi Securities Exchange play an important role in economic development through their performance in the capital markets which is of significant importance to investors. The listed companies play an important role in the Kenyan economy and government development strategic plan, the Kenya Vision 2030. But there had been an increasing trend of failure of some Kenyan firms such as KCC, Uchumi Supermarkets, A Baumann and Company and Bulk medical limited. Others have been performing poorly and this is reflected in their low dividend paid to the stockholders, for example, Eveready East Africa, (Maina and Sakwa (2010). Athi River Mining Limited and Kenya Airways have lately been in the daily newspapers with employees' dissatisfaction and accusation of mismanagement. Others such as Equity Bank, Kenya Commercial Bank, and Bamburi Portland Cement are expanding outside the Kenya's boundaries meaning they are performing well. So what causes variation in performances of these organizations? Listed companies provide a suitable opportunity to investigate the role resources play on causing variation in performance of business organizations.

Despite the many studies done on organizational performance, researchers have not been able to explain what variations in performance. Some contend that it is leadership, others resources, and others strategy. But organizations are still struggling with performance challenges. The big question for this study is, what is the role of organizational resources in business performance? The objective of the current study was to establish the relationship

between organizational resources and firm performance of companies listed on the Nairobi Securities Exchange

Supporting Theory

Resource-based view theory focuses on the idea of resource endowment of the firm as sources of business returns and the means to achieve superior performance and competitive advantage (Caldeira and Ward 2001; Koumaditis *et al.*, 2013). A firm can be understood as a collection of physical capital resources, human capital resources and organizational resources (Barney, 2001a). The resource-based view theory has gained a wide acclaim and attracted a lot of research in the recent past (Helfat, 2000; Newbert, 2007; Koumaditis *et al.*, 2013) and looks at the firm in its resource base.

Unique assets and resources of the firm has an effect on the organizational strategy and output,(Barney, 1986; Penrose, 1959). This perspective is interesting, particularly because it has been revived recently with the popularity of the resource-based view of the firm (Wernerfelt, 1984, 1995; Qureshi 2010). This perspective is consistent with the strategic management implementation model (Strictland and Gamble, 2007). Resource-based perspective, suggests that certain resource and asset differences may allow some firms to implement strategies that alter an industry's performance in ways that uniquely benefit these firms. For this reason, firm heterogeneity in terms of resources, represent an important source of competitive advantage for business firms, (Barney, 1986).

Peteraf and Barney (2003) argued that resources are assets while capabilities are processes, firm attributes or knowledge. Duta, Narasimhana Rajiv (2005) defined capabilities as the efficiency with which a firm employs a given set of resources (inputs) at its disposal to achieve certain objectives(output) Casselman and Samson (2007) extended the argument that to manage resources was capability. Makadok (2001) as cited by Bagire (2012) identified the distinction in terms of visibility. A resource is an observable asset but not necessarily tangible while a capability is not observable and hence necessarily intangible. Newbert (2007) contended that these distinctions were minimal, therefore the concept of resources and capabilities are closely related.

Galbreth and Galvin (2004) discovered that while RBV theory largely associates firm performance with intangible resources, the association may not always hold true empirically. One explanation may be that the strength of some resources are dependent upon interaction or combinations with other resources and therefore no single resource (intangible or otherwise) becomes the most important to firm performance. Miller (2003) through his study showed how some firms were able to build on asymmetries such as skills, processes or assets which the

competitors cannot copy at a cost that affords economic rents. They are rare, inimitable and non-substitutable.

In this study, the model uses indicators of resources as financial, physical facilities, employee skills, and technology. According to resource-based view theory, a competitive advantage occurs only when there is a situation of resource heterogeneity (different resources across firms) and resource immobility which brings out the inability of competing firms to obtain resources from other firms, (Barney, 2001a).

Critics of resource-based view such as Priem and Butler (2001) suggests that the theory is not prescriptive in that it does not provide managers with appropriate advice on which specific resources they should accumulate to gain competitive advantage. Barney (2001) claim that RBV is tautological and does not generate testable theories. He notes that majority of the studies applying RBV has failed to test its fundamental concepts, but have utilized the theory to establish the context of empirical research. In this vein, Wright *et al.* (2001) recommend that researchers should test the core concepts of resource-based view. The current study attempts to shade more light on relationship of organizational resources (financial, physical facilities, employee skills, and technology) and non- financial performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The resource-based and knowledge-based views of the firm have stressed that resources alone cannot achieve the competitive advantage and the firms with stronger dynamic capabilities are capable of exploiting available bulk of organizational resources (Grant, 1996; Newbert, et al., 2008; Herath and Mahmood, 2014). Newbert *et al.*, (2008) reported that the higher level of firm's internal capabilities of leveraging resources leads the firms to outperform their rivals with a low level of such capacities. Some scholars have also posited that dynamic capabilities play a pivotal role in exploiting the prevailing bulk of organizational resources to take advantage of opportunities, (Frishammar and Andersson, 2007; Hou, 2008; Sun and Anderson, 2010; Herath and Mahmood, 2014).

In a plausible extension of the debate and shading more light on resources as capabilities, studies have analyzed their interaction with other firm factors. Carmeli and Tishler (2004) tested the relationship between intangible resources with performance, focusing on managerial capabilities, human capital, perceived reputation, labor relations and organizational culture. Intangible organizational resources had a significant effect on firm performance. Mannikutty (2000) used the resource-based view to analyze the responses of Indian firms to environmental changes. He observed that businesses built their resource base gradually.

Hakala's (2010) study focused on the configuration of strategic orientation, which comprised of a constellation of entrepreneurial, market, learning and technology orientations. The study confirmed that it is a combination of the value position of the firm in the markets, its resources, and behavioral patterns that determine how the organization transforms its resources into performance. This constellation blankets wide range of behaviors and resources such as proactiveness, risk adjusting continuously to the dynamic environment, adapting new internal and external conditions, and taking behavior, innovativeness, shared vision, commitment to continuous learning, competitiveness, open-mindedness, and customer needs, Herath and Mahmood (2014). These resources and behaviors lead organizations to perform well by responding to customer needs and competitors' challenges (Sinkula, Baker, and Noordewier, 1997; Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Narver and Slater, 1990; Covin and Selvin, 1989). The study was based on the assumption that firms which maintain the strategic configuration of organizational resources have the possibility of achieving higher performance.

Firm performance generally refers to the organizational success, and success is considered an important factor in achieving organizational goals (Herath and Mahmood, 2014). Kaplan and Norton (1996) viewed firm performance as a multidimensional concept and all aspects of performance are relevant to the success of the organization. Firm performance has been widely used by many researchers. It is at the heart of strategic management (Venkatraman and Ramanujam, 1986; Herath and Mahmood (2014) and the construct was measured mainly in financial aspects (Rogers and Wright, 1998). Consequently a gap exist in measures of non –financial performance (Carton and Hofer, 2010; Brush and VanderWerf, 1992).

METHODOLOGY

The design chosen for this study was guided by the purpose of the study, the type of investigation, the extent of research involvement, the stage of knowledge in the field, the period over which the data is to be collected and the type of analysis. The study integrated the descriptive research into the cross- sectional design because it has been found to be robust in relationships studies given their ability to capture the population characteristics in their free and natural occurrences (O'Sullivan and Abela 2007). The study was a census since the population was small (Cooper et al., 2006), and the unit of analysis was the firm.

The target populations for this study comprised 62 companies listed at the Nairobi Securities Exchange and were active at the time of the study. These firms were preferred because the management employees are likely to exhibit elaborate relationships between the study variables since they have a better understanding of their organization goals and

objectives, they are varied in nature and by sector. Most of them are leading in Kenya in terms of capitalization and compliance with statutory requirements. The list of listed companies was available and accessible from Capital Market Authority's website.

This study relied on primary data collected through a semi-structured questionnaire which was structured into three parts capturing data of demographic information, organizational resources and firm performance. The questionnaire had self-rating Likert scale questions eliciting responses on financial resources, physical facilities, employees' skills and technology as suggested by Lusthaus *et al.*, (1999) and performance measurement system was based on non-financial performance, extracted from balanced scorecard framework (Kaplan and Norton, 2008).

Organizational resources had alpha coefficient of 0.662 while non-financial performance had 0.910. The study adopted a minimum Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.6 as recommended by Nunnally (1967), this indicated that the data collection tool was reliable. The measurement scales used in the questionnaire were deemed to have validity because they reflected the key issues in organizational resources and performance and was subjected to expert judgment, structuring the questionnaire into sections. Construct validity was assessed from conceptual framework and correlation of variables. Normality test was done by observing the skewness and kurtosis values of the measurements. From the analysis, organizational resources had -0.22 and firm performance was -0.19. A value of zero indicates a perfectly normal distribution. The skewness statistic measures did not indicate extreme departures from normality assumption; Skewness provides information about the symmetry of the distribution while kurtosis provides information about the "peakedness" of the distribution (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). When the variables were tested for multicollinearity, organizational resources had a Tolerance of 0.152 and VIF value of 6.559 and firm performance was 6.559 and VIF value was 2.899. These results established that the variables did not exhibit serious multicollinearity, hence the data was suitable for further analysis.

Descriptive statistics are used to describe the basic features of the data in a study. The study used standard deviation, and coefficient of variation which is a unit less ratio and more accurate and reliable than standard deviation as shown below.

Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation and Coefficient of Variation for Measures of Resources

Financial Resources	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient of Variation
The leaders effectively pool resources and expertise toward a shared goal	58	4.03	1.32	10.32
The leadership regularly access inventory and competencies and assets of the organization	58	3.84	1.39	10.36
My organization has adequate budgetary allocation for strategy implementation	58	3.17	1.27	10.40
My organization has adequate and ready sources of finance	58	3.34	1.35	10.40
My leaders ensure prudent utilization of funds budgeted for strategy implementation	58	3.58	1.38	10.38
Average	58	3.59	1.33	10.37
Physical facilities				
There is enough office space	58	3.43	1.33	10.38
There is extra space that can be used when need arises	58	3.15	1.28	10.40
In general, the facilities available are enough to cater for strategy implementation	58	3.13	1.40	10.44
The leadership regularly evaluates the capacity requirements needed as part of the planning process for any new programs, services and/or activities.	58	3.63	1.37	10.37
Average	58	3.24	1.34	10.41
Employees skills				
The organization has an overall approach to human resource development	58	3.65	1.46	20.40
Human resource development programs are tied to the needs for strategy implementation	58	3.51	1.47	20.41
The organization has a training and development policy that support strategy implementation	58	3.32	1.41	20.42
Average	58	3.50	1.45	20.41
Technology				
There are adequate planning, systems, and training in place for managing organizational technologies	58	3.06	1.40	10.45
The available Information Communication Technology facilities are adequate for corporate strategy implementation	58	3.12	1.29	10.41
The organization has acquired relevant and adequate technologies for strategy implementation	58	2.87	1.27	10.44
Average	58	3.02	1.32	10.43

The Table 1 above shows how respondents rated various items of the organizational capacity in terms of resources. The results in Table 1 shows that the rating on the leaders effectively pools resources and expertise toward a shared goal was the highest with a mean of 4.03 (SD= 1.32, CV=0.32), followed by the leadership regularly access inventory and competencies and assets of the organization (M=3.84, SD=1.39, CV=0.36). Items rated low by respondents include

organization has acquired relevant and adequate technologies for strategy implementation (Mean=2.87,SD=1.27, CV=0.44) and adequate planning, systems and training in place for managing organizational technologies (Mean=3.06, SD=1.40, CV=0.45).

The average mean scores for financial resources were 3.59 with a standard deviation of 1.33 and coefficient of variation 0.37, which implied that the respondents' rated financial resources variables as high. Physical facilities had an average mean of 3.24 and standard deviation of 1.34 and coefficient of variation 0.41. This implied that most respondents indicated that, there was enough office space, there was extra space that can be used when need arises, in general, the facilities available were enough to cater for strategy implementation and the leadership regularly evaluated the capacity requirements needed as part of the planning process for any new programs, services and/or activities.

On employees' skills, the mean was 3.50 and standard deviation of 1.45 and coefficient of variation 0.41. This implied that most respondents rated the organization had an overall approach to human resource development, human resource development programs are tied to the needs of strategy implementation and organizations had a training and development policy that support strategy implementation to a great extent.

On technology with an average mean of 3.02 and standard deviation of 1.75 and coefficient of variation 0.43, indicating that the organization has acquired relevant and adequate technologies, there was adequate planning, systems, and training in place for managing organizational technologies, and available information communication technology facilities are adequate for corporate strategy implementation. This means that the majority of respondents viewed their organization's resources as moderate- to a great extent. The results in Table 1 shows that the mean score for all variables were all above 3 of the Likert scale which means that the respondents viewed the companies listed in Nairobi Securities Exchange as well endowed with resources, implying that majority of companies had above average resources. Thus it can safely be concluded that the leadership of companies listed in Nairobi Securities Exchange had a high application of resources which were in the form of financials, physical facilities, employees' skills and technologies. This confirmed Carlsson (2004) position that considered from a resource-based view approach, that organizations achieve performance through internally controlling resources. The company controls the internal factors keeping up with the resources available and ensures that the resources are used responsibly and correctly.

Non-Financial Performance was measured using five items anchored by a five-point Likert scale where 1= Strongly Disagree 2= Moderately Disagree 3= Neutral 4= Moderately Agree 5= Strongly Agree. The results were presented in Table 2

Table 2: Mean, STD Deviation and Coefficient of Variation for
Measures of Non-Financial Performance

Firms Performance	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Coefficient of Variation
Our customers are loyal to our products/services	58	4.56	0.99	0.21
The customer satisfaction index is high	58	4.50	0.99	.0.22
The organization has growing market share	58	4.60	0.93	.0.20
We retain our employees because they are satisfied	58	4.39	1.09	10.24
The stakeholders are highly satisfied with organization performance	58	4.44	0.99	.0.22
Grand mean	58	4.50	1.00	10.22

The findings in Table 2 shows that our customers are loyal to our products/services had a mean of 4.56 (standard deviation of 0.99, CV=0.21).The customer satisfaction index is high had a mean of 4.50 (standard deviation of 0.99 CV=0.22).The organization has growing market share had a mean of 4.60 (standard deviation of 0.93, CV=0.20). We retain our employees because they are satisfied had a mean of 4.396 (standard deviation of 1.09, CV=0.24). The stakeholders are highly satisfied with organization performance had a mean of 4.44 (standard deviation of 0.99, CV=0.22). The grand mean was 4.50 (standard deviation of 1.00). The respondents strongly agreed that the non-financial indicators of performance were high in their organizations. This implies that customer loyalty; customer satisfaction, market share, employee retention and stakeholder satisfaction are suitable measures of performance. The grand mean was4.50, the standard deviation of 1.00 and coefficient of variance was 0.22, implying that the respondents viewed non-financial performance as high.

Organization Resources and Non-Financial Performance

The following hypothesis was tested:

H₁: There is a significant relationship between Organizational Resources and non-Financial Performance.

The regression results in Table 3 show that organizational resources accounted for 93.9 % of the variance in non-financial performance (adjusted R²=.939). The overall model was statistically significant (F (1, 56) = 876.692, p < .05). The overall model reveals a statistically significant relationship (p < .05) between non-financial performance and organizational resources, implying that organizational resources influence firm performance.

Table 3: Regression Results for the influence of Organizational Resources on Non-Financial Performance

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	0.970	0.940	0.939	0.37551	
ANOVA					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	123.621	1	123.621	876.692	0.000
Residual	7.896	56	0.141		
Total	131.517	57			
Coefficients					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-.027	.120		-2.227	0.821
Organizational Resources	1.048	.035	.970	29.609	0.000

1. Predictor: (Constant), Organizational Resources
2. Dependent Variable: Performance

Further, the beta coefficient for the effect of organizational resources on non-financial performance was positive and statistically significant ($\beta=1.048$ $t=29.609$, $p < .05$), meaning that a unit change in organizational resources increases firm performance by 1.048. Thus, the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between organizational resources and non-financial performance was confirmed. From the results, there is sufficient statistical evidence to support the relationship between organizational resources and non-financial performance. The results of this study support the work of Bagire (2012) who tested for sub-variables of resources with strategy as predictors of performance and concluded that resources (both tangible and intangible) have a role in understanding firm performance.

The resulting model was: Y (Non-financial Performance) = 1.048 Organizational Resources

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings from the test of hypothesis indicated that organizational resources had a significant effect on non-financial performance (adjusted $R^2 = 0.939$, $F=876.697$, $\beta = 1.048$, $t=29.609$, $p < .05$). A unit change in organizational resources led to an increase in performance by 87.6%. This implies that a firm can improve performance by increasing organizational resources (consisting of financials, physical facilities, employee skills, and technology).

The results of this study further support the findings by Bharadwaj (2000) which indicated that firms with high information technology capability as a resource tended to outperform a control sample of firms on a variety of profit and cost-based performance measures. Viewed from a resource-based perspective, the empirical findings of this study indicate that resource capability is an essential component of firm capacity to effect higher performance.

The results of the current study further confirm Barrick, *et al.* (2015) study findings which provided empirical evidence that collective organizational engagement mediates the relationship between the three organizational resources and firm performance. From their findings, they concluded that when organizations systematically design entry-level jobs to enrich and enlarge work, implement human resource investments and expectation-enhancing practices, and are led by a transformational leader, they maximize collective organizational engagement, which increases firm performance.

Further, the findings by this study that organizational resources affect performance lend support to the findings by Khandekar and Sharma (2005) that resource capability are positively correlated with organizational performance. In addition, human resource capability was found in this study to be a significant predictor of sustainable competitive advantage. This is consistent with Graton (2000) in her study which places the human resource capabilities at the center of activities to achieve performance. Firms that make greater use of their resource capabilities were likely to gain and enjoy superior performance. When an organization develops and upgrades employee skills, it creates a key lever for success. This increases firm's capacity to perform.

The findings that organizational resources affect performance to support the earlier findings of Hitt, *et al* (2001), whose study demonstrated that resources matter to firm performance. Wernerfelt (1984), in his study of resources and returns, also made the similar conclusion that resources such as brand names, technology, skilled personnel, trade contacts, machinery, efficient procedures and capital are the foundation for attaining and sustaining competitive advantage position.

The results of the current study indicate that a firm with appropriate resources has the ability to achieve its desired performance. Resources for this study include financial, physical facilities, employee's skills and technology. These variables contribute to strengthening organizational capacity. These findings are partly supported by Bharadwaj, (2000) who focused on the association between information technological capability and firm performance. Firm-specific information technology resources were classified as infrastructure, human resources, and information technology -enabled intangibles. Results indicated that firms with high

information technological capability tended to outperform a control sample of firms on both financial and non-financial performance.

The resource-based view of the firm has stressed that resources can achieve competitive advantage. Firms with strong dynamic capabilities are capable of exploiting available bulk of organizational resources (Grant, 1996; Newbert, Gopalakishnan, and Kirchoff, 2008). The findings of this study further support Newbert, *et al.* (2008) who reported that the higher level of firm's internal capabilities of leveraging resources leads the firms to outperform their rivals with a low level of such capacities. Other studies (Frishammar and Andersson, 2007; Hou, 2008; Sun and Anderson, 2010) support the findings of the current study that organizational capacity plays a pivotal role in exploiting the prevailing bulk of organizational resources to achieve desired performance.

The results supported the tenets of the resource-based view of the firm that superior performance is dependent on the organization's resources. . The resource-based view suggests that a firm can be understood as a collection of physical capital resources, human capital resources and organizational resources (Barney, 2001a) and that the strength of some resources is dependent upon interaction or combinations with other resources and this causes performance variations in different firms. Firms can protect themselves against resource imitation, transfer or substitution, (Barney, 1991; Peteraf and Barney, 2003; Duta, et al. 2005 and Casselman and Samson, 2007). Further the study supports the use of contingency approach that requires that managers diagnose a given situation and make decisions relative to the conditions present, (Miller 1988).

The first constraint was the small size of the population of the listed companies in the Nairobi securities exchange. There were sixty-two companies and after four of them were eliminated, only fifty-eight were eligible for the study. Generalizability of these findings may be limited by the small number of firms studied of the population studies. Future researchers should consider bigger populations involving more people across the management hierarchy and using different methodologies such as focus groups.

REFERENCES

- Ansoff, H. I. (1991). Critique of Henry Mintzberg's design school: Reconsidering the basic premises of strategic management. *Strategic management journal*, 12(6): 449-461.
- Awino, Z. B. and Gituro W. (2011). An empirical investigation of supply chain management best practices in large private manufacturing firms in Kenya. *Prime Journals. Business Administration and Management (BAM)*. Vol. 1(2): 26-31, March 2012. www.primejournal.org/bam
- Bagire Vincent (2012). The strategy – resource configurations and performance implications in Nongovernmental Organizations. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis: University of Nairobi.
- Barney, J.B. (2001a). Is the resource-based "view" a useful perspective for strategic management research? *Yes. Academy of Management Review*, 26, 41-56.

- Bharadwaj, A. S. (2000). A resource-based perspective on information technology capability and firm performance: An empirical investigation. *MIS Quarterly* Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 169-196
- Boyne, G. A. (2003). Sources of public service improvement: A critical review and research agenda. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(3): 367-394.
- Bridoux Flore, (2005). A resource-based approach to performance and competition: An overview of the connections between resources and competition. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(4): 633-639.
- Brush, C. G., & Vanderwerf, P. A. (1992). A comparison of methods and sources for obtaining estimates of new venture performance. *Journal of Business venturing*, 7(2), 157-170.
- Brunk, S.E. (2003), "From theory to practice: applying Miles and Snow's ideas to understand and improve firm performance", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 105-8.
- Calsson, S.A. (2004). Strategic knowledge managing in the context of networks, Chapter 32. In *Handbook of Knowledge Management Volume I*, (Ed) HolsappleCycle, Chicago.
- Casselmann, R. Mitch, and Samson, D. (2007). Aligning knowledge strategy and knowledge capabilities. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 19(1): 69-81.
- Canals, J. (2000). *Managing corporate growth*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Caldeira, M. M. and John, M. W. (2001). Using resource-based theory to interpret the successful adoption and use of information systems & technology in manufacturing small and medium sized enterprises. *The 9th European Conference on Information Systems Bled, Slovenia*, 27-29.
- Carmeli, A. and Tishler, A. (2004). The relationship between intangible organizational elements and organizational performance, *Strategic Management Journal*. 25, 1257-1278.
- Carton, R. B., & Hofer, C. W. (2010). Organizational financial performance: Identifying and testing multiple dimensions. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 16(1), 1.
- Covin, J. G., & Selvin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 75-87 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250100107>
- Chiyoge, B. S. (2009). Influence of Core-Competencies on the Relationship between Co-Alignment Variables and Performance of Profit – Oriented Parastatals in Kenya, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Nairobi.
- Cooper, D. R., Schindler, P. S., & Sun, J. (2006). *Business research methods* (Vol. 9). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Duta, S., Narasimhan, O. and Rajiv, S. (2005). Conceptualizing & measuring capabilities methodologies and empirical application. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 277-285.
- Forbes, M., and Lynn, L. E. (2005). How does public management affect government performance? Findings from international research. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(4): 559-584.
- Frishammar, J., and Horte, S. A. (2007). The role of market orientation and Entrepreneurial orientation for new product development performance in manufacturing firms. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, 19(6): 788. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09537320701711231>
- Galbraith, Craig and Schendel, Dan, (1993). A Making strategic planning 'fun and easy.' *Management Journal*, 4: 153-173.
- Garbuio, M., Adelaide, W., King A. W. and Lovallo, D. (2010). Looking Inside: Psychological Influences on Structuring a Firm's Portfolio of Resources. *Journal of Management*. Published online 6 Sept. 2012.
- Gomes, R. C. and Stephen P. Osborne (2009). The Role of Stakeholders in Determining Local Government Performance: Evidence from Brazil, *Public Management Review*, 10: 261-273.
- Grant, R.M. (1996). The resource-based theory of competitive advantage: implications for strategy formulation, *California Management Review*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 114-35.
- Graton M., De Briel, J. T., and Dalbiez, A. (2000). U.S. Patent No. 6,079,538. Washington, DC: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.
- Hakala, H. E. N. R. I. (2010). Configuring out strategic orientation. *Business Administration*, 95.
- Helfat, C. E. (2000). Guest editor's introduction to the special issue: The evolution of Firm capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11): 955-959.
- Herath, H. M., and Mahmood, R. (2014). Strategic orientations and SME performance: the moderating effect of absorptive capacity of the firm. *Asian Social Science*, 10(13): 95.

- Hill, C. J., and Lynn, L. E. (2004). Is hierarchical governance in decline? Evidence from empirical research. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(2), 173-195.
- Hitt, M.A., Bierman, L., Shimizu, K., and Kochhar, R. (2001). Direct and moderating effects of human capital on strategy and performance in professional service firms: A resource-based perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 13–28.
- Hou, J. J. (2008). Toward a research model of market orientation and dynamic capabilities. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 36(9): 1251-1258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp>.
- Kaplan, R. S., and Norton, D. P. (2008). *The execution premium: Linking strategy to operations for competitive advantage*. Harvard Business Press.
- Kariuki, A.W. (2014). Intellectual capital, corporate reputation, and performance of listed companies in Nairobi Securities Exchange. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Nairobi.
- Koumaditis, K., Themistocleous, M., and Rupino Da Cunha, P. (2013). SOA implementation critical success factors in healthcare. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 26(4), 343-362.
- Lumpkin, G.T., and Dess, G.G. (1995): Simplicity as a Strategy-Making Process: The Effects of Stage of Organizational Development and Environment on Performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (5): 1386–1407.
- Luliya T., Sununta S., Yuosre B. and Chotchai C. (2013), "Competitive strategies and firm performance: the mediating role of performance measurement", *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 62(2): 168 – 184.
- Lusthaus, C. M., Adrien, M.H.G., Anderson, G., Carden, F. & Montalvan, P. (1999). *Enhancing organizational performance: A Toolbox for self-assessment*, Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- Lyman, T. R. (2000). Supporting microfinance abroad: Introductory legal issues for US grantmakers. *The International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law*, 2(4), 222-224.
- Maina, F. G. & Sakwa M. M., (2010). Understanding financial distress among listed firms in Nairobi stock exchange: a quantitative approach using the Z-score multi-discriminant financial analysis model. *Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Nairobi, Kenya*.
- Makadok, R. (2001). Toward a synthesis of the resource-based and dynamic capability: Views of rent creation, *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 387-401.
- Manikutty, S. (2000). Family business groups in India; A resource-based view of the emerging trends. *Family business Review* 13 (4): 279-292.
- Miller, D. (1988). Relating Porter's business strategies to environment and structure: analysis and performance implications, *Academy of Management Journal*, 31: 280-308.
- Miller, D. (1997). Configurations revisited. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(1): 111-125.
- Mishra, G. P., Grunewald, D. & Kulkarni, N. A. (2014). Leadership styles of senior and middle-level managers: A Study of selected firms in Muscat, Sultanate of Oman. *International Journal of Business and Management*; 9(11).
- Narver, J., and Slater, S. (1990). The effect of market orientation on business profitability.
- Newbert, S. L. (2007). Empirical research on the resource-based view of the firm: an assessment and suggestions for future research. *Strategic management journal*, 28(2): 121-146.
- Newbert, S. L., Gopalakrishnan, S., and Kirchoff, B. A. (2008). Looking beyond resources: Exploring the importance of entrepreneurship to firm-level competitive advantage in technologically intensive industries. *Technovation*, 28: 6-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2008.05.001>.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ogbeide, G.A. and Harrington, J. R. (2010). The relationship among participative management styles, strategy implementation and performance in the service industry, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 23(6): 719-738.
- Ojokuku R. M, Odetayo T. A., and Sajuyigbe A. S., (2012). The impact of leadership style on organizational performance: A case study of Nigerian Banks. *American Journal of Business and Management*, 1(4): 202-207.
- O'Reilly, C., Tushman, M., and Harreld, J. B. (2009). Organizational ambidexterity: IBM and emerging business opportunities, *Leadership Quarterly*, 21(1): 104-113

- O'Sullivan, D., & Abela, A. V. (2007). Marketing performance measurement ability and firm performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(2), 79-93.
- Pertusa-Ortega, E.M., Claver-Cortes, E. and Molina-Azorin, J.F. (2009): Strategy, Structure, Environment and Performance in Spanish Firms, *Euro-Med Journal of Business*, 3(2): 223-239.
- Peteraf, M. A. and Barney, J. B. (2003). Unraveling the resource-based tangle. *Managerial and decision economics*, 24(4): 309-323. Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G. R., (2003). *The External Control of Organizations: A resource dependence perspective*, Stanford: Stanford Business Books.
- Priem, Richard L. and Butler, John E. (2001). Is resource-based "view" a useful perspective for strategic management research? *The Academy of Management Review*, 26 (1): 22-40.
- Qureshi, M. S. (2010). Determinants and outcomes of Marketing Capabilities in new technology-based firms in Berlin, Germany: an empirical study. Doctorate Dissertation, Berlin.
- Robbins, S. (2000). *Organizational Behaviour*. San Diego: Prentice Hall
- Rogers, E. W., & Wright, P. M. (1998). Measuring organizational performance in strategic human resource management: Problems, prospects and performance information markets. *Human resource management review*, 8(3), 311-331.
- Rumelt, R. P., Schendel, D. and Teece, D. J. (1991). Strategic management and economics. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(2): 5-29.
- Sinkula, J. M., Baker, W. A., and Noordewier, T. (1997). A framework for market-based organizational learning: Linking values, knowledge, and behavior. *Academy of Marketing Science Journal*, 25(4): 305-318. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0092070397254003>.
- Sirmon, D. G., Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Gilbert, B. A. (2011). Resource orchestration to create competitive advantage breadth, depth, and life cycle effects. *Journal of Management*, 37(5), 1390-1412.
- Stiles, J. (2003). A philosophical justification for a realist approach to strategic alliance research, *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 6(4), 263-271.
- Sun, P. Y., and Anderson, M. H. (2010). An examination of the relationship between absorptive capacity and organizational learning and a proposed integration. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(2): 130-150. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468.2370.2008.00256>.
- Tam, V.W. & Zeng S.X (2007). Towards business environment of foundry industry. *Emirates Journal for Engineering Research*, 12 (3): 109-115.
- Venkatraman, N., and Ramanujam, V. (1986). Measurement of business performance in strategy research: A comparison of approaches. *Academy of management review*, 11(4), 801-814.
- Venkatraman, N. and Ramanujam, J. (1987). Measurement of business economic performance; an examination of method convergence. *Journal of Management Review*, 11: 801-814
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based theory of the firm, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 5, pp. 171-80.
- Widodo, (2011) Building strategy quality, *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8 (6): 180-192.
- Wright, P. M., Dunford, B. B., and Snell, S. A. (2001). Human resources and the resource-based view of the firm. *Journal of management*, 27(6): 701-721.