

http://ijecm.co.uk/

# JOINT EFFECT OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITIES AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT ON SERVICE DELIVERY AMONG **AGRIBUSINESS STATE CORPORATIONS IN KENYA**

# Bahati Keranga Mwita

Phd Candidate, Faculty of Business and Management Science, University of Nairobi, Kenya keranga@yahoo.com

### **Zachary Awino**

Professor of Strategy and Management, Faculty of Business and Management Science University of Nairobi, Kenya

### **Martin Ogutu**

Associate Professor of Strategy, Faculty of Business and Management Science University of Nairobi, Kenya

## Winnie Njeru

Lecturer of Marketing, Faculty of Business and Management Science University of Nairobi, Kenya

#### Abstract

Agriculture is the key most sector in Kenya's economy with regard to its contribution to food security, GDP, supply of industrial raw materials and employment creation, having contributed to 34.15% of the country's GDP in the year 2020. Despite the introduction of various sectoral polices and strategic plans, service delivery in the Agribusiness sub-sector, administered by Agribusiness State Corporations in Kenya is riddled with inadequacies highlighted by among other complaints, unpaid produce supplies, dwindling finances, slumped agricultural extension



services and low produce prices, hence the need to determine how strategic planning, organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement jointly influence service delivery among agribusiness state corporations. A cross sectional survey design was carried out covering 73 agribusiness state corporations in Kenya. Data was collected using structured questionnaires. Pilot study was conducted to ascertain validity and reliability. Simple and multiple linear regression analyses were used to test the joint effect of strategic planning, organizational capabilities, and stakeholder involvement on serviced delivery. From the findings, an F statistic (F=52.5, p<0.05) indicated a significant relationship between strategic planning, organizational capabilities, stakeholder involvement and service delivery amongst agribusiness state corporations in Kenya. The study concluded that to enhance service delivery among agribusiness state corporations in Kenya are influenced by strategic planning, organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement. The finding supported the new public management theory, resource dependence theory and stakeholder involvement theory. These findings give direction to the management of agribusiness state corporations and government in policy formulations and implementation in order to enhance service delivery.

Keywords: Strategic Planning, Organizational Capabilities, Stakeholder Involvement, Service Delivery, Agribusiness, State Corporations

### **INTRODUCTION**

The strategic planning practice by public institutions and its service delivery impact has previously been studied in different national and sectoral contexts other than in reference to Agribusiness State Corporations in Kenya, albeit scantily, agriculture is the key most sector in Kenya's economy with regard to its contribution to food security, GDP, supply of industrial raw materials and employment creation, having contributed to 34.15% of the country's GDP in the year 2020 (KNBS, 2020). Accordingly, in an effort to improve service delivery in response to mounting public complaints on inadequacies in government ministries and departments, the government of Kenya has made major interventions including the introduction of various sectoral polices and strategic plans including the National Agribusiness Strategy (2012), the National Youth Agribusiness Strategy covering the years 2017 to 2021, the Climate Smart Agriculture Strategy covering the years 2017 to 2026 and the Agricultural Transformation and Growth Strategy covering the years 2019 to 2029 (GoK, 2012, 2017, 2019).

Small and medium scale farmers in the country continuously face a myriad of challenges including among others, unpredictable weather patterns, post-harvest losses, inaccessible markets among others (Mashombo, 2014; Deloitte, 2017). Kenya's agribusiness state corporations which comprise all public institutions involved in the administration of services with implications on agricultural production, trade and its enablers have over the years been involved in the development of many sectoral plans, policies, visions and strategies aimed at enhancing productivity and growth in the agricultural sector. Notwithstanding, and highlighted by complaints from various players, the sector is yet to realize its full potential in the spirit of the many strategic plans in place including among others, the National Agribusiness Strategy (2012), the National Youth Agribusiness Strategy covering the years 2017 to 2021, the Climate Smart Agriculture Strategy covering the years 2017 to 2026 and the Agricultural Transformation and Growth Strategy covering the years 2019 to 2029 (GoK, 2012, 2017, 2019). An interrelationship among the multi-concepts of strategic planning, organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement, is however yet to be explored in empirical literature, hence the conceptual gap motivating the present study.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

This paper reviewed literature on strategic planning, organizational capabilities, stakeholder involvement and service delivery. It unearthed the concepts of the study variables as well as how they have been employed in various past study. The concept of strategic planning has been incorporated by virtually all sectors of economies, as an integral avenue towards enhancing organizational performance (Garrison, Wakefieldm & Kim, 2015). Kazmi (2008) defines strategy as the decision pattern in an organization that reveals and determines its purposes, objectives or goals. According to Hendrick (2016), strategic planning is a deliberate attempt to produce important actions and decisions that guide and shape the organization's identity, activities and goals. Bryson, Crosby and Bryson (2016) defines strategic planning as a well-ordered determination to produce essential actions and decisions that both guide and shape what an establishment is, its core activities and business. There exist a variety of strategic planning approach. These include the comprehensive process-oriented approaches which are mostly applied in the public-sector and include variations of the Harvard Policy Model, strategic management systems, stakeholder management, and logical incrementalism (Cook & Harrison, 2015). Other approaches include content-oriented strategic planning which include competitive forces analysis and portfolio analyses (Bryson et al., 2016).

The purpose of strategic planning in institutions within the public sector is in the content and not the planning process, which is to guarantee the capability of a public organization to deliver value to the public, which is paramount in differentiating non-profit, private and public sector organizations (Trigeorgis & Reuer, 2017). This study adopted the operationalization of strategic planning by Bryson et al. (2016), as involving an institution's vision/mission, objectives/goals, internal analysis, external analysis and action plan.

The concept of organizational capabilities is widely employed in strategic management based on its linkage to the Resource-Based View Theory which underscores that firms leverage their unique resources to build up their organizational capabilities and earn competitive advantage (Teece, Pisano & Shuen, 1997). Organizational capability is the institution's ability to effectively manage resources, such as employees, finances and technology with a view to enhance service delivery (Potnuru & Sahoo, 2016). Developing organizational capabilities is a top priority for most organizations seeing to improve their service delivery (Sheng, 2017).

Organizations in the public sector are likely to demonstrate the kind of capability necessary in realizing their often-intricate array of institutional goals, to the extent that such public institutions are capable of skillfully deploying their human resources (Samal & Pradhan, 2015). In the present era of new public management and performance-based reforms in the public sector, the search of organizational capability is a matter of service delivery necessity and not political necessity (Potnuru & Sahoo, 2016). As such, the study operationalized organizational capabilities as the range of an organization's information technology capacity, knowledge capacity, collaborative capacity, financial resources, human resource capacity and organizational cultures.

On the other hand, stakeholders in an organization include competitors, prospective partners, employees, the government, the public, suppliers, and regulatory bodies (Thompson & Martin, 2016). Stakeholder involvement entails a spectrum of practices (Dess et al., 2012) including stakeholder planning and analysis which concerns among others, the determination of the likely rapport among stakeholders themselves; and dissemination and disclosure of information which entails the provision of adequate, accessible and timely information concerning a project with a view to provide informed, effective and meaningful participation in the design and execution of a project (Floyd & Wooldridge, 2017).

The whole strategy development process gets more manageable when an organization breaks down its environment into identifiable individual or group stakeholders (Graham, 2015). In the context of service delivery among state corporations in general and with reference to the functions of agribusiness state corporations, the main stakeholders include the ministries and state corporations whose core mandates impact agricultural production and its enablers, farmers as well as businesses and organizations involve in the agribusiness value chain.

Service delivery is any engagement with public sector institutions, during which citizens, residents or organizations seek or provide information, fulfil their duties or handle their affairs (OECD, 2017). Effective service delivery presupposes that the government guarantees, provides and promotes a citizen-oriented administration; and makes good administration a policy objective deliberately put into practice through various legislative and regulatory mechanisms (Samal & Pradhan, 2015).

According to Sulaiman (2016), public service's prime concern is who (constituencies, individuals, location) gets what (resources) and when (time). From a political standpoint, its provision may be regarded within the public policy perspective. The strategic decisions and policy concerning how public services are delivered fall within incumbent governments' mandates (Mogotlane & Dombeu, 2016). The incentive for enhancing service delivery can be diverse, including as a reaction to citizen demands either for greater accessibility or higher quality of services or as a result of an in-house search for better organization or more adequate ways of operating (Mogotlane & Dombeu, 2016). The study adopted operationalization of service delivery according to International Development Research Centre (IDRC) framework which measures service delivery along four dimensions including effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and financial viability (Lufonyo, 2018; Hassan, 2016; Garrison et al, 2015).

# Relationship between Strategic planning, Organizational capabilities, Stakeholder involvement and Service delivery

The theories underpinning this relationship are new public management theory (NPM) and resource dependence theory and stakeholder theory. Hood (1991) defines NPM as a sequence of procedures and organization themes pertaining to public sector reforms with a view to improve its efficiency and competitiveness in service delivery and resource use. NPM is a method of administrating public sector institutions which is employed in public service and government agencies and institutions at both national and sub-national levels. NPM underpins how Agribusiness State Corporations develop their strategic plans with a view to leverage their organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement to realize efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, responsiveness and customer satisfaction. Resource dependence theory posits that that reliance on eminent and crucial infrastructure and resources determine the organizational decisions and activities which can be attributed to the specific dependency circumstance. resource dependence theory is adopted to account for different organizational capabilities, depending on how well institutions are resourced in terms of information technology capacity, collaborative capacity, financial resources, stakeholder commitment capacity and organizational cultures. the stakeholder theory is concerned with organizational-stakeholder dynamics and participation, involvement cooperation of the different posits that and actors in public administration is a crucial mechanism for realizing territorial development (Charreaux 1997). The theory is instrumental in demonstrating how agribusiness state corporations in Kenya involve stakeholders and how the same influences the relationship between strategic planning and service delivery among agribusiness state corporations; as well as how stakeholder involvement in combination with strategic planning and organizational capabilities jointly influence service delivery.

The relationship among strategic planning, organizational capabilities, stakeholder involvement and service delivery has been scarcely studied from diverse indirect viewpoints in literature. In Turkey, Erdil, Kitapci and Timurlenk (2010) using the RBV empirically studied the core employee characteristics influence on firm performance and organizational capabilities. The capabilities including output, technical and managerial based capabilities and general organizational performance were analyzed and the outcome showed a higher organizational capability and organizational performance for firms utilizing the most valuable core employees. Lopez-Cabrales, Ramón and Ines (2006) in their empirical research in Spain sought to establish whether the value and the uniqueness of core employees' abilities, skills and knowledge are associated with different organizational capabilities, and whether CEs are also associated with firm efficiency. Yukl and Lepsinger (2015) established that strategic planning allows organizations to focus their decision making with regard to effort and resources towards improving organizational outcomes in Netherlands. It is however not clear from the empirical literature, how strategic planning, organizational capabilities, stakeholder involvement relate with service delivery in not only agribusiness sub sector but also in the Kenya context as a whole.

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Philosophical orientation in research study is the founding principle on how data about a phenomenon is gathered, analyzed and used (Saunders et al., 2007). The study was anchored on positivism paradigm. This paradigm maintains that the subjects and researcher are independent as they do not affect the outcome or each other. In tandem with the research philosophy, descriptive cross-sectional research design was used as it allows the use of structured questionnaires in data collection. The study was a census survey of all the 73 state corporations in the agribusiness sub-sector in Kenya.

The study used mainly primary data which was collected using a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire comprised of closed-ended questions on various study objectives measured on a five-point Likert type scale with 1 being no extent and 5 being very high extent. The researcher adopted the 'drop and pick later' technique whereby the institutional heads were given the questionnaires and allowed time to respond considering their busy schedules. Follow-up phone calls were made to avoid non-response.

Cronbach alpha > 0.7 was used to test on reliability of the questionnaire while factor analysis was used in testing construct validity. Multiple linear regression was used to test the goodness of fit, overall significant and individual significant of the model.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

The study was based on the formulated hypothesis, that is; H<sub>0</sub>: Strategic planning, organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement do not jointly have a significant effect on service delivery of Agribusiness State Corporations in Kenya. Using the hypothesis, the following model was tested;

SD =  $\beta$ o + $\beta$ <sub>1</sub>SP + $\beta$ <sub>2</sub>OC+ $\beta$ <sub>3</sub>SI + $\epsilon$ 

Where:  $\beta o = intercept$ 

SD = Service delivery

SP= Strategic planning

OC = Organizational Capabilities

SI= Stakeholder Involvement

 $\varepsilon$  = is the error term

Table 1: Summary of Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficients

| Variable                            | Operationalization   | Cronbach alpha | Decision |
|-------------------------------------|--|----------------|----------|
| Strategic Planning<br>(Independent) | <ul> <li>Vision/Mission</li> <li>Objectives/goals</li> <li>Internal analysis</li> <li>External analysis</li> <li>Action plan</li> </ul>  | 0.963>0.7      | Reliable |
| Organizational<br>Capabilities      | <ul> <li>Information technology capacity</li> <li>Collaborative capacity</li> <li>Financial resources</li> </ul>   | 0.950>0.7      | Reliable |
| Stakeholder<br>Involvement          | <ul> <li>Stakeholder planning and analysis</li> <li>Information disclosure and dissemination</li> <li>Meaningful consultation and participation</li> <li>Grievance and dispute resolution</li> </ul> | 0.973>0.7      | Reliable |
| Service Delivery<br>(Dependent)     | <ul><li>Effectiveness</li><li>Efficiency</li><li>Relevance</li><li>Financial viability</li></ul>   | 0.891>0.7      | Reliable |

The findings indicate that Cronbach alpha values were greater than 0.7, thus, the measurement tool was deemed to be reliable. Table 2 shows KMO and Bartlett's test for validity.

Table 2: Sampling Adequacy (KMO and Bartlett's Test)

|  | Service<br>Delivery | Strategic Planning | Organizational Capabilities | Stakeholder<br>Involvement |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | 0.708               | 0.729              | 0.718                       | 0.816                      |
| Approx. Chi-Square                               | 1794.4              | 1928.5             | 2143.4                      | 1641.9                     |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity df                 | 406                 | 300                | 703                         | 190                        |
| Sig  | 0.000               | 0.000              | 0.000                       | 0.000                      |

Table 2 above indicated the sampling adequacy for service delivery and strategic planning. Sampling adequacy for service delivery was significant (KMO = 0.708>0.7, pvalue = 0.000 <0.05); Sampling adequacy for strategic planning was significant (KMO = 0.729>0.7, P-value = 0.000<0.05); Sampling adequacy for stakeholder involvement was significant (KMO = 0.816>0.7, P-value = 0.000<0.05) and sampling adequacy for organizational capabilities was significant (KMO = 0.718, P-value = 0.000<0.05) hence data could be reduced. Thus, statements in each study variable were correlated and could be reduced into fewer and meaningful factors. This led to factor analysis through principal component analysis.

Table 3: The Joint Effect of Strategic Planning, Organizational Capabilities and Stakeholder Involvement on Service Delivery

| Model Summ | ary        |              |                   |             |                            |                   |
|------------|------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Model      | R          | R Square     | Adjusted R Square | Std. Erro   | Std. Error of the Estimate |                   |
| 1          | .779       | .607         | .600              | 10.76460    |                            |                   |
| 2          | .811       | .658         | .652              |             | 10.12447                   |                   |
| 3          | .750       | .563         | .555              |             | 11.35267                   |                   |
| 4          | .861ª      | .741         | .727 8.97113      |             | 8.97113                    |                   |
| ANOVA      |            |              |                   |             |                            |                   |
| Model      |            | Sum of Squar | es df             | Mean Square | F                          | Sig.              |
| 1          | Regression | 10380.004    | 1                 | 10380.004   | 89.578                     | .000              |
|            | Residual   | 6720.846     | 58                | 115.877     |                            |                   |
|            | Total      | 17100.850    | 59                |             |                            |                   |
| 2          | Regression | 11257.862    | 1                 | 11257.862   | 109.828                    | .000              |
|            | Residual   | 5842.782     | 57                | 102.505     |                            |                   |
|            | Total      | 17100.644    | 58                |             |                            |                   |
| 3          | Regression | 9625.630     | 1                 | 9625.630    | 74.685                     | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
|            | Residual   | 7475.220     | 58                | 128.883     |                            |                   |
|            | Total      | 17100.850    | 59                |             |                            |                   |
| 4          | Regression | 12674.181    | 3                 | 4224.727    | 52.493                     | .000              |
|            | Residual   | 4426.463     | 55                | 80.481      |                            |                   |
|            | Total      | 17100.644    | 58                |             |                            |                   |

| <br>Table 3 |
|-------------|

|       |                             |              | ndardized  | Standardized |        |      |
|-------|-----------------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------|------|
|       |                             | Coefficients |            | Coefficients |        |      |
| Model |                             | В            | Std. Error | Beta         | T      | Sig  |
| 1     | (Constant)                  | 7.177        | 11.314     |              | .634   | .528 |
|       | Strategic Planning          | 1.011        | .107       | .779         | 9.465  | .000 |
| 2     | (Constant)                  | 13.468       | 9.632      |              | 1.398  | .167 |
|       | Organizational Capabilities | .722         | .069       | .811         | 10.480 | .000 |
| 3     | (Constant)                  | 26.896       | 10.122     |              | 2.657  | .010 |
|       | Stakeholder Involvement     | 1.069        | .124       | .750         | 8.642  | .000 |
| 4     | (Constant)                  | -5.865       | 9.837      |              | 596    | .553 |
|       | Strategic Planning          | .490         | .178       | .372         | 2.754  | .008 |
|       | Organizational Capabilities | .429         | .096       | .482         | 4.473  | .000 |
|       | Stakeholder Involvement     | .106         | .197       | .074         | .538   | .593 |

- 1. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Planning
- 2. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Capabilities
- 3. Predictors: (Constant). Stakeholder Involvement
- 4. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Planning, Organizational Capabilities, Stakeholder Involvement

Dependent Variable: Service Delivery

The findings in Table 3 show that effect of strategic planning on service delivery was statistically significant ( $R^2 = 0.600$ ). Strategic planning accounted for 60 percent of the variation in service delivery. F- statistic (F = 89.578, P-value<0.05) shows that the overall regression model was statistically significant. Beta coefficient of strategic planning ( $\beta = 0.779$ , t = 9.465, pvalue >0.05) was statistically significant. This implied that for every one unit increase in strategic planning, service delivery increases by 0.779 units holding other factors constant.

The effect of organizational capabilities on service delivery was statistically significant  $(R^2 = 0.652)$ . Strategic planning accounted for 65.2 percent of the variation in service delivery. F- statistic (F = 109.828, P-value<0.05) shows that the overall regression model was statistically significant. Beta coefficient of strategic planning ( $\beta = 0.811$ , t = 10.480, p-value >0.05) was statistically significant. This implied that for every one unit increase in strategic planning, service delivery increases by 0.811 units holding other factors constant. The effect of stakeholder involvement on service delivery was statistically significant (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.555). Strategic planning accounted for 55.5 percent of the variation in service delivery. F- statistic (F = 74.685, Pvalue<0.05) shows that the overall regression model was statistically significant. Beta coefficient of strategic planning ( $\beta$  = 1.069, t = 9.465, p-value >0.05) was statistically significant. This implied that for every one unit increase in strategic planning, service delivery increases by 1.069 units holding other factors constant.

The joint predictive model becomes;

SD = -5.865 + 0.372SP + 0.482OC + 0.074SI

Where;

SD = Service Delivery

SP = Strategic Planning

OC = Organizational Capabilities

SI = Stakeholder Involvement

The findings further indicated that the joint effect of strategic planning, organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement accounted for 72.7 percent of the variation in service delivery. This presents a significant R2 change of 17.2 percent. F- statistic (F = 52.493, Pvalue<0.05) show that the model for joint effect was statistically significant overall. The joint effect was greater and significant (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.727, F = 52.493, P-value<0.05) as compared to the individual effect ( $R^2 = 0.600, 0.652, 0.555$ ; F = 89.578, 109.828, 74.685; P-value<0.05).

The hypothesis that strategic planning, organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement do not jointly affect service delivery of Agribusiness State Corporations in Kenya, was supported. The results are in line with the findings of Erdil, Kitapci and Timurlenk (2010) who found that a higher organizational capability and organizational performance for firms utilizing the most valuable core employees. The results also conform to those of Yukl and Lepsinger (2015) who established that strategic planning allows organizations to focus their decision making with regard to effort and resources towards improving organizational outcomes. Thus, in relation to theory, the study findings support New public management theory, which was the theory underpinning the study in its approach to a wholesome foci on all aspects with a view to positioning the citizen at the centre and the motivation towards public service delivery. NPM underpins how Agribusiness State Corporations develop their strategic plans with an intent to leverage organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement towards realizing efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, responsiveness and customer satisfaction.

### CONCLUSION

Strategic planning, organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement individually have a significant influence on service delivery in Kenya's Agribusiness state Corporations. Collectively (jointly), Strategic planning, organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement significantly influence service delivery among agribusiness state corporations, as evidenced by the rejection of the null hypothesis. Further, the joint effect was greater and significant in comparison to individual effects.

#### IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The finding may be associated with the fact that over the years, Kenya's agribusiness state corporations that comprise all public institutions involved in the administration of services, have been involved in the development of many sectoral plans, policies, visions and strategies aimed at enhancing productivity and growth in the agricultural sector. These agribusiness state corporations also focusing on both strategic planning, organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement can greatly and positively impact service delivery. Thus, management of agribusiness state corporations should embrace strategic planning, understand organizational capabilities and engage all relevant stakeholder in the running of the corporations.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Globalization, adding value, achieving profitability, defining organizational capabilities, adapting to change, dealing with technological innovation, securing competence and intellectual capital, and achieving organizational transformation are the eight key challenges that successful agribusinesses will face in the future. Based on the findings, it is therefore recommended that policy makers in agribusiness State Corporation in Kenya should embrace the concept of strategic planning, organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement. The plan should be cascaded from top to bottom and be understood by every employee in the organization. The study suggest that further research should be conducted in other state corporations in Kenya and the results be compared for generalization purposes.

### **WAY FORWARD**

The study explored the joint effect of strategic planning, organizational capabilities and stakeholder involvement on service delivery among agribusiness state corporations in Kenya. Despite ascertaining the significant joint effect, there is need to replicate similar studies in other sectors including manufacturing sector for comparison purposes. Also, future studies need to increase the unit of observations to avoid sampling bias. Since only primary data was relied upon, there is need for other studies collecting secondary data and integrate it with primary data. This will make the estimates more objective.

### REFERENCES

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. K. (2016). Understanding strategic planning and the formulation and implementation of strategic plans as a way of knowing: The contributions of actor-network theory. *International Public* Management Journal, 12(2): 172-207.

Charreaux, G. (1997). 'Versunethéorie du gouvernement des entreprises' in G. Charreaux (éd.): 1997, Le gouvernement des entreprises, Paris, Économica, 421-469.

Cook, M., & Harrison, T. M. (2015). Using public value thinking for government IT planning and decision making: A case study. Information Polity, 20(2-3), ): 183-197.

Creswell, J. & Clark, V. (2007). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. Sage, Thousand Oaks.

Dess, G.G; Lumpkin, G.T; Eisner, A.B; McNamara, G. & Kim, B. (2012). Strategic Management: creating service deliveries. 6th edition. Irwin, McGraw-Hill

Floyd S.W. & Wooldridge B. (2017). The Middle Management Perspective on Strategy Process: Contributions, Synthesises, and Future Research. Journal of Management, 34(6): 1109-1121.

Garrison, G., Wakefield, R. L. & Kim, S. (2015). The effects of IT capabilities and delivery model on cloud computing success and firm performance for cloud supported processes and operations. International Journal of Information Management, 35(4): 377-393.

GoK (2012). The National Agribusiness Strategy. Nairobi: Government Printer

GoK (2017). Kenya Climate Smart Agriculture Strategy 2017-2026. Nairobi: Government Printer.

GoK (2017). List of State Corporations and Tertiary Institutions Undertaking Performance Contracting.

GoK (2017). The National Youth Agribusiness Strategy (2017-2021). Nairobi: Government Printer.

GoK (2019). The Agricultural Transformation and Growth Strategy. Nairobi: Government Printer

Graham, K. (2015). Strategic Planning and Performance Management. President Press

Hood, C., (1991). The 'New Public Management' in the 1980s: Variations on a theme, Accounting, Organizations and Society, 20(2): 93-110.

Kazmi, D. (2008). Strategic management. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS), (2020). Economic Survey, 2019. Nairobi: Government Printer.

Lopez-Cabrales, Ramón and Ines (2006) The Contribution of Core Employees to Organizational Capabilities and Efficiency. Human Resource Management 45(1):81 – 109.

Lufonyo, H. (2018). Impact of Public Sector Reforms on Service Delivery in Tanzania. Public Administration and Policy Research, V,5(1): 26-49.

Mashombo, W. (2014). Factors Affecting the Delivery of Business Development Services to Agribusiness Based Micro and Small Enterprises in Kenya: A Case Study of Technoserve Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa).

Mogotlane, Kgotatso Desmond and Fonou Dombeu, Jean Vincent (2016) "Development and Semantic Exploitation of a Relational Data Model for Service Delivery in South African Municipalities," The African Journal of Information Systems: Vol. 8: Iss. 4, Article 2.

Mugenda, O.M. and Mugenda, A.G. (2003). Research Methods, quantitative and qualitative approaches. ACT, Nairobi.

OECD (2017), OECD Territorial Reviews: Monitoring Progress in Multi-level Governance and Rural Policy, OECD Publishing, Paris,

Erdil, O., Kitapci, H., & Timurlenk, B. (2010). Effects of core employees on organizational capabilities and firm performance. Journal of Global Strategic Management, 7(1), 30-38.

Potnuru, R. G., & Sahoo, C. K. (2016). HRD interventions, stakeholder involvement and organizational effectiveness: an empirical study. European Journal of Training & Development, 40(5): 345-365.

Samal, R., & Pradhan, S. K. (2015). Extended SERVQUAL Attributes, Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty: A relationship study of Public Sector Banks in Odisha. Asian Journal of Management, 6(3): 176-195.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. &Thornhill, A. (2016). Research methods for business students. Harlow, England: Pearson.

Sulaiman K., (2016) Stakeholder involvement and service delivery in the oil industry in Uganda: a case study of oil exploration in Buliisa District, western Uganda.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. Strategic management journal, 18(7), 509-533.

Yukl, G. & Lepsinger, R. (2015). Why integrating the leading and managing roles is essential for organizational effectiveness? Organizational Dynamics 34(3): 361-375.

