

Resource Based Approach To Competitiveness: A Case Study of Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

¹Nderu Bernice Njeri, ²Isaac Wambua Muinde

Abstract: The Resource Based Perspective is an emerging competitive strategy which emphasizes that for a firm to gain competitive advantage it has to also focus on its internal firm specific factors hereby referred to as resources. Before its emergence the mainstream theory of competitive advantage was externally focused, that is, different strategies that capitalized on the opportunities in the firm's environment. This research project was set up to assess the extent to which JKUAT uses the Resource Based Perspective as a competitive strategy. The study also looked at the challenges JKUAT has been experiencing in the implementation of RBP competitive strategy. The study collected data on different aspects of RBP from the chairmen of departments. This is because they are the individuals who are involved in the basic administrative unit of the university, and regulate the resource acquisitions, improvements and deficiencies. The study was analyzed using the mean, standard deviation, percentages and Eigen Values. The use of RBP in JKUAT has been evidenced by the internal adjustment strategies like the cultural change, consideration of resources availability before strategy implementation and steady increase in its resources. The study also showed that the use of RBP as a competitive strategy has increased JKUAT's competitiveness in the market. The challenges have been JKUAT's processes and structures which have hindered maximum benefits of RBP. In conclusion, the study realized that JKUAT uses RBP to a moderate extent to counter market forces and competition.

Keywords: Competitiveness, externally focused, RBP competitive strategy.

1. INTRODUCTION

As universities increasingly operate like corporations, new emphasis is being placed on market forces in higher education. To ensure that they survive and succeed, universities in Kenya have had to develop capabilities to manage threats and exploit emerging opportunities promptly. They have been forced to redefine their mission and review their curriculum to produce graduates with "global skills". Universities in Kenya have been forced to be universally competitive and use different strategies to stay competitive. These include benchmarking, ISO certification, TQM, Reengineering, educational marketing and the most recent resource based approach. Much of these changes in the Kenya Higher Education field have led to the emergence of a unified and rigorous approach to strategy called the Resource Based Perspective (RBP). The premise of RBP is that firms differ in fundamental ways because each firm possesses a unique bundle of resources. Because many of these resources cannot be accumulated instantaneously the firm's choice of strategy is constrained by its current resource stock and the speed at which it acquires or accumulates new resources. Resources are viewed as a substance of strategy and the very essence of sustainable competitive advantage (SCA) (Wemefelt, 1984).

Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology:

The Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology was established through an Act of Parliament in 1994 and its vision is to be a University of global excellence in Training, Research and Innovation for development, while its mission is to offer accessible quality training, research and innovation in order to produce leaders in the fields of Agriculture, Engineering, Technology, Enterprise Development, Built Environment, Health Sciences, Social Sciences and

other Applied Sciences to suit the needs of a dynamic world. JKUAT has been extending its facilities to cope with the rigorous academic programmes in its areas of specialization. In response to changing market demands, JKUAT has also been involving its' students in many of its' decision making organs. The university has also been forging partnerships with several academic and research institutions, locally and internationally through the signing of Memorandums of Understanding (MoU).

Statement of the Problem:

Like other organizations, universities in Kenya have gone through dramatic transformation. The introduction of performance contracting in Kenyan public institutions has made it necessary for institutions of higher learning including universities to be more performance and result oriented in the delivery of academic programs. According to Magutu (2006), the social demand with respect to higher education in Kenya has clearly intensified and this has been exemplified by the rise in enrollment in both public and private universities, the proliferation of more private universities and the establishment of self sponsored programmes in public universities. As an organization's environment changes, it is necessary that the firm continuously adapts its activities and internal configurations to reflect the new external situation. Failure to do this endangers the future success of the organization (Aosa, 1998). There have been studies done on different aspects of competitiveness of Universities. However, to the best of the researcher's ability no study has been done on the Resource Based Perspective in the universities in Kenya and especially not a case of Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology. With a changing relationship with the government, declining government funding, reduced donor support, poor infrastructure, growth in student enrollment, increased societal expectations and competition from private universities both locally and internationally, it has become increasingly challenging to run public universities in this very turbulent environment. This is what prompted the researcher to choose JKUAT as a case study.

Objectives of the Study:

To assess the extent to which JKUAT used the Resource based view of the firm in its strategy implementation

To establish the challenges experienced in the implementation of the resource based perspective

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Strategy and Corporate Strategy:

Strategy in general can be defined as the establishment of the long-term goals and objectives of an organization, including the taking of actions and allocation of resources for achieving these goals (Chandler, 1962). Strategy therefore not only focuses on the goals and objectives of the organization and the means of achieving them, but also gives an indication of the company and its business, both in the present and in the long run. Corporate strategy on the other hand defines the business in which a company will compete, preferably in a way that focuses on the resources to convert distinctive competences into competitive advantage. These strategic decisions are effective over long periods of time thus focusing and committing a significant portion of its resources to the expected outcome (Porter, 1987).

Strategy, Resource and Competitive Advantage:

Strategy is a major channel of connections between the competitive environment and resources of a firm. A competitive advantage exists when the firm is able to deliver the same benefits as competitors but at a lower cost (cost advantage) or deliver benefits exceeding those of competing products (differentiation advantage). According to Porter (1996), "the essence of strategy formulation is coping with competition." Thus competitive advantage enables a firm to create superior value for its customers and superior profits for itself. The principle determining whether a firm should perform an activity or to compete in a business is whether or not the firm possesses resources that provide a competitive advantage in that activity or business.

According to the resource based view, in order to develop a competitive advantage the firm must have resources and capabilities that are superior to those of its competitors. Without this superiority, the competitors simply could replicate what the firm was doing and any advantage would quickly disappear. The resource based view emphasizes that a firm utilizes its resources and capabilities to create a competitive advantage that ultimately results in superior value creation.

Resource Based Perspective:

The RBP emphasizes the firm's resources as the fundamental determinants of competitive advantage and performance. It adopts two assumptions in analyzing sources of competitive advantage. First, this model assumes that firms within an

industry (or within a strategic group) may be heterogeneous with respect to the bundle of resources that they control. Second, it assumes that resources heterogeneity may persist over time because the resources used to implement firm's strategies are not perfectly mobile across firms (i.e. some of the resources cannot be traded in factor markets and are difficult to accumulate and imitate).

Resources:

The premise of the resource based view is that firms differ in fundamental ways because each firm possesses a unique bundle of resources. Because many of these resources cannot be accumulated instantaneously firm's choice of strategy is constrained by its current resource stocks and the speed at which it can acquire or accumulate new resources. RBP defines resources as physical assets, intangible assets and organizational capabilities that are tied to the firm. Resources therefore are the substance of strategy, the very essence of sustainable competitive advantage (Wernerfelt, 1984). Resources can be classified into three categories namely tangible assets such as real estate, production facilities and raw materials, intangible assets which include company reputation, brand name, culture, technological knowledge, patents and trademarks, and finally organizational capabilities that are the complex combination of assets, people and processes that organizations use to transform inputs into outputs. Resources are the ultimate source of value creation both within and across businesses. Therefore identifying, building and deploying valuable resources are critical aspects of both corporate and competitive strategy.

Resources and Capabilities:

Capabilities refer to the firm's ability to utilize its resources effectively. Such capabilities are embedded in the routine of the organization and are not easily documented as procedure and thus are difficult for competitors to replicate. According to the resource based view, in order to develop a competitive advantage the firm must have resources and capabilities that are superior to those of its competitors. Without this superiority, the competitors simply could replicate what the firm was doing and any advantage would quickly disappear. Therefore the resource based view emphasizes that a firm utilizes its resources and capabilities to create a competitive advantage that ultimately results in superior value creation.

RBP, Profitability and Rent Generation:

A major contribution of the resource based model is that it explains long lived differences in firm profitability that cannot be attributed to differences in industry conditions (Schmalensee, 1985). The resource based view incorporates the insights of the early seminal contributions to strategic management in order to explain how firms generate rents. The traditional concept of strategy (Andews, 1971; Ansoff, 1965) considers the resource position of the firm. A firm selects its strategy to generate rents based upon their resource capabilities. On the practical side, the model may prove useful to managers seeking to understand, preserve, or extend their competitive advantage as its strategic implications depend on a firm's specific resources endowment. Because of its focus on imperfectly mobile resources, for which transactions cost of market exchange are high, resources- based perspective has important implications for corporate strategy and issues regarding the scope of the firm as well as single business strategy. Rent theory helps SWOT framework to identify exactly what can be real strengths and firm capabilities for strategic advantage. Differences among firms in terms of information, luck, and/or capabilities enable the firm to generate rents. The firms' unique capabilities in terms of technical know-how and managerial ability are important sources of heterogeneity that may result in sustained competitive advantage. In particular, distinctive competence and superior organization routines in one or more of the firm's value chain functions may enable the firm to generate rents from a resource advantage (Hitt and Ireland, 1985).

Sources and Types of Rent:

The existence and maintenance of rents depend upon a lack of competition in either acquiring or developing complementary resources. Rents derived from services of durable resources that are relatively important to customers and are simultaneously superior, imperfectly imitable, and imperfectly substitutable, will not be appropriated if they are non-tradable or traded in imperfect factor markets (Barney 1991). Rents may be achieved by owning a valuable resource that is scarce (Ricardo, 1817), monopoly rents may be achieved by government protection or by collusive arrangements when barriers to potential competitors are high (Bain, 1968) and entrepreneurial rent may be achieved by risk-taking and entrepreneurial insight in an uncertainly complex environment (cooper et al, 1991).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research employed stratified random sampling to come up with 40 units from which data was collected. The study used primary and secondary data to collect the information required. Questionnaires were used to guide the collection of

primary data and the drop and pick method was administered. The secondary data was obtained from records on past performance of JKUAT. The data collected was analyzed using a relational type of content analysis in order to show the semantic relationship that exists between responses, the turbulent environment and RBP. The study analyzed its data using the mean, standard deviation and Eigen values.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Systems for systematic comparisons with the competitors

The resource based perspective complements Porter's Industry Analysis by providing managers with a systematic and more complete methodology of deciding on a strategy to attain sustainable competitive advantage and therefore enable considerations of issues within the firm in conjunction with the environment model to provide a more realistic and inclusive framework for management research. 20 respondents (62.5%) felt that JKUAT facilitates systematic comparisons and evaluation of practices, process and performance with competitors. This shows that JKUAT compares its different aspects with the environment to a large extent.

Table 4.1 Comparison with Competitors

| Results | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Yes | 20 | 62.5 |
| No | 12 | 37.5 |
| Totals | 32 | 100 |

Source: Respondents data

Purpose of systematic comparisons:

According to the resource based perspective, in order to develop a competitive advantage the firm must have resources and capabilities that are superior to those of its competitors. For these resources to be superior, regular improvement and development regulation is necessary and achievement of a competitive advantage. The reasons the respondents gave for the comparisons are presented in table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2 Purpose of Comparisons

| Result | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Regulatory purposes | 5 | 25 |
| Development and improvement | 6 | 30 |
| Both | 9 | 45 |
| Total | 20 | 100 |

Source: Respondents data

45% of the population believed that the reason why JKUAT systematically compares itself with its competitors is for regulatory purposes, development and improvement purposes. JKUAT being a public institution there are government regulatory laws it ought to follow over and above meeting the market requirements of development and improvement to a world class institution.

Factor Consideration before Strategy Implementation:

The respondents were asked to comment on the extent to which certain factors are considered before implementing any strategy in JKUAT. The responses are presented in table 4.3 below. Financial requirements to a large extent of 47% are considered when implementing a strategy. Thus the financial requirements seemed to be the most considered in JKUAT before implementing a strategy. This is reflected by the high Eigen value it portrays i.e. 3.13. Resource availability to a very large extent of 47% is considered when implementing a strategy. It follows in importance with an Eigen value of 2.48, then the industry and competitor analysis with an Eigen value of 1.47. Human resource development, return on capital venture and government regulation are the least considered when implementing a strategy. This is reflected by either low Eigen values i.e. 1.002, 0.33 and 0.23 respectively. The interpretation of these findings is that JKUAT considers financial requirements and resource availability very important in implementation of a strategy.

Table 4.3 Factor Consideration Before Strategy Implementation

| Factor | Extent of Consideration | | | | | Total (Percentage) | Eigen Values |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | Very large | Large extent | Some extent | Small extent | Not at all | | |
| Financial requirements | 12(38) | 15(47) | 2(6) | 3(9) | 0(0) | 32(100) | 3.13 |
| Government regulation | 7(22) | 4(12) | 12(38) | 4(12) | 5(16) | 32(100) | 0.23 |
| Industry competitor analysis | 11(35) | 7(22) | 9(28) | 3(9) | 2(6) | 32(100) | 1.87 |
| Resource availability | 15(47) | 9(28) | 6(19) | 2(6) | 0(0) | 32(100) | 2.48 |
| Return on capital venture | 10(32) | 5(16) | 4(12) | 9(28) | 4(12) | 32(100) | 0.33 |
| Human resource development | 9(28) | 7(22) | 13(41) | 2(6) | 1(3) | 32(100) | 1.002 |

Source: Respondents data

Note: values in parentheses are percentages

Use of Other Strategies to Stay Competitive :

There being a very unpredictable environment in the higher education sector, JKUAT has had to definitely develop strategies to counter the competitive environment. The respondents were asked the extent of use of certain strategies by JKUAT to acquire competitive advantage and their responses are presented in table 4.4 below. Benchmarking and ISO certification were to a very large extent used i.e. 37% by JKUAT in order to remain competitive. Benchmarking seems to have a higher Eigen value of 1.88 thus being popular in JKUAT as a strategy. Culture change also featured as an important strategy to a very large extent of 31%. It had an Eigen value of 1.52 being a public institution JKUAT followed the performance contracting strategy of which the respondents ranked as having a Eigen value of 1. This strategy was used to a large extent of 37%. JKUAT has been trying to implement the ISO 9001 certification thus its popularity with respondents. It has a Eigen value of 0.67 this shows that even though ISO certification is on its way to implementation it has not yet been used as a competitive strategy. Reengineering and reconstruction and TQM are the least used strategies in JKUAT. This is shown by the Eigen values of 0.47 and 0.33 respectively. The interpretation of these findings is that JKUAT finds collaborated networks, its reputation and cultural change very important through its structures and processes inhibit it from gaining full potential.

Table 4.4 Use of Other Strategies

| Strategy | Extent of usage | | | | | Total Percentage | Eigen Values |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------------|--------------|
| | Very large extent | Large extent | Some extent | Small extent | Not at all | | |
| Bench marking | 12(37) | 7(22) | 6(19) | 5(16) | 2(6) | 32(100) | 1.88 |
| ISO certification | 12(37) | 6(19) | 6(19) | 4(13) | 4(13) | 32(100) | 0.67 |
| TQM | 7(22) | 3(9) | 7(22) | 10(31) | 5(16) | 32(100) | 0.33 |
| Re-engineering and reconstructing | 6(19) | 1(3) | 12(37) | 9(28) | 4(13) | 32(100) | 0.47 |
| Performance contracting | 9(28) | 12(37) | 2(6) | 5(16) | 4(13) | 32(100) | 1.00 |
| Culture change | 10(31) | 9(28) | 6(19) | 5(16) | 2(6) | 32(100) | 1.52 |

Source: Respondents data

Importance of Different Resources:

For an organization to compete within the external environment, the internal environment which mainly consisted of the resources and organizational capabilities should be well developed. The respondents were asked to rank the importance of the resources and organizational capabilities within JKUAT. As reflected in table 4.5 below, the collaborated networks have proved to be very important to JKUAT with a mean of 4.47 and a standard deviation of 0.01. this has caused the JKUAT brand name or reputation to increase with a mean of 4.35 and a standard deviation of 0.02. this reputation has in turn generated a culture change in the university with a mean value of 4.12 and a standard deviation of 0.02 even with all these positive aspects, the structure and process have remained highly rigid and bureaucratic thus attracting a mean of 3.14 for both and a standard deviation of 2.24 and 2.37 respectively.

Table 4.5 Importance of Different Resources

| Resource | Mean | STD DEV |
|--|------|---------|
| Collaborated Networks | 4.47 | 0.10 |
| JKUAT Name (Brand Name) | 4.35 | 0.02 |
| JKUAT Culture | 4.12 | 0.02 |
| Lecture Halls | 4.02 | 0.05 |
| Laboratories | 3.82 | 1.2 |
| Office Space | 3.82 | 1.57 |
| Production Facilities | 3.82 | 1.05 |
| New Campuses | 3.82 | 1.47 |
| Teaching Equipment/ Furniture | 3.82 | 1.05 |
| Staff | 3.82 | 1.27 |
| Technological Developments, patent and trademark | 3.65 | 0.14 |
| JKUAT Structure | 3.41 | 2.24 |
| JKUAT Process | 3.41 | 2.37 |

Source: Respondents data

External Drivers to Resource Improvements and Acquisition:

According to RBP, resources and capabilities within the firm must be improved continuously over and above acquisition of the same. There are issues within and outside the firm that compel the firm to acquire and/or improve its resources and capabilities. The respondents were asked the extent to which different external drivers affect resource improvements and/or acquisitions in JKUAT. The responses are presented in table 4.6 below. The respondents showed that 50% of the resources improvements and/or acquisitions are initiated by the customer/student requirements to a very large extent. On the other hand 43% of the resources improvements and/or acquisition to a large extent are due to the market/ industry requirements. 38% of the improvements and/or acquisitions to a very large extent are due to the competition in the higher education sector. Legislation affects resource improvements and/or acquisition to a small extent of 28.5%. These findings showed that JKUAT choice of resources is mainly market oriented and not due to legislation.

Table 4.6 External Drivers to Resource Improvements and Acquisition

| Drivers | Extent of resource improvements and acquisition | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|-------|
| | Very great extent | Great extent | Moderate extent | Small extent | Not at all | |
| Customer/student requirements | 5(50) | 4(40) | 1(10) | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Market requirements | 3(43) | 3(43) | 1(14) | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Competition | 3(38) | 2(25) | 2(25) | 1(12) | 0 | 8 |
| Legislation | 2(28.5) | 1(14) | 2(28.5) | 2(28.5) | 0 | 7 |
| Total (N) | 13 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 32 |

Source; Respondents data

Note: Values in parentheses are percentages

Resources and Capabilities with Superior Value:

A competitive advantage exists when a firm is able to deliver the same benefits as competitors but at a lower cost (cost advantage) or deliver benefits exceeding those of competing products (differentiation advantage). Thus competitive advantage enables a firm to create superior value for its customers and superior profits for itself (Porter, 1996).

Respondents were asked to name some resources and capabilities developed by JKUAT that have superior value compared to others in the higher education industry. Some of the resources narrated include:

- i) Innovations e.g. the walking tractor, the tissue culture bananas, etc.
- ii) Patents e.g. the JKUAT yoghurt, the architectural and designing programs, etc.

Level of Competition of the Programmes:

According to the RBP, a firm ought to know its competitive position in the market. The firm needs to know how competitive its products are in the market in relation to other competitors. This helps the firm develop and improve its current resources and even know which competitive resource to acquire. The respondents were asked to state the level of competition in the programmes offered. The responses are presented in table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7 Level of Competition of the Programmes

| Level of Competition | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Low competition | 4 | 12.5 |
| Medium competition | 6 | 19 |
| Highly competitive | 12 | 37.5 |
| Very competitive | 8 | 25 |
| Not competitive | 2 | 6 |
| Total | 32 | 100 |

Source; Respondents data

The respondents indicated that JKUAT programmes are highly competitive. 37.5% of the respondents were of this opinion. This showed that because JKUAT programmes are market driven they are highly competitive.

Bases of Competitiveness:

According to RBP, when a firm develops a product, it requires some performance measures relating to the product which help in checking if the product is still competitive in its industry. The respondents were asked to state the extent to which the stated performance measures have been used to check the competitiveness of the programmes. The responses are presented in table 4.10 below. 40% of the respondents felt that the number of students enrolled to a very large extent forms the performance measurement base for checking how competitive a programme is in the market before allocation of resources. This shows that JKUAT is offering market driven programmes of which the number of students enrolling for these courses indicate the competitiveness of the courses.

Table 4.8 Performance Measures of Bases of Competitiveness

| Performance Measure | Extent of use of a performance measure | | | | | Total (N) |
|---------------------------------|--|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------|
| | Very large extent | Large extent | Some extent | Small extent | Not at all | |
| Number of students enrolled | 4(40) | 3(30) | 2(20) | 1(10) | 0(0) | 10 |
| Number of students graduating | 3(37.5) | 2(25) | 1(12.5) | 1(12.5) | 1(12.5) | 8 |
| Revenue accruing to the program | 5(36) | 5(36) | 3(21) | 1(7) | 0(0) | 14 |
| Total | 12 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 32 |

Source; Respondents data

*Note: Values in parentheses are percentages

Challenges to Resources Allocations and acquisitions:

When implementing the RBP, there are challenges both within and outside the organization. The respondents were asked the extent to which they face the listed challenges both internally and externally. The responses are presented in table 4.8 below. According to the Eigen values, organizational structure is the most challenging internal aspect with an Eigen value of 2.35 and a high percentage of 41%. Inadequate physical resources rank second with an Eigen value of 1.35 and a percentage value of 31%. Financial resources are also challenging with a percentage of 28% and Eigen value of 0.94.

Management of the current resources and leadership style and culture change are least challenging with Eigen values of 0.43 and 0.25 respectively.

Table 4.9 Internal Challenges

| Internal Challenge | Extent of Challenge | | | | | Total (N) | Eigen Values |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-----------|--------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Leadership style and cultural change | 10(31) | 8(25) | 6(19) | 4(12) | 4(12) | 32(100) | 0.25 |
| Organizational structure | 5(16) | 2(6) | 4(12) | 8(25) | 13(41) | 32(100) | 2.35 |
| Financial resources | 6(19) | 4(12) | 6(19) | 7(22) | 9(28) | 32(100) | 0.94 |
| Inadequate physical resources | 4(12) | 4(12) | 8(25) | 6(19) | 10(31) | 32(100) | 1.35 |
| Management of current resources | 7(22) | 8(25) | 8(25) | 4(12) | 5(16) | 32(100) | 0.43 |

Source; Respondents data

Organizational structure and inadequate physical resources are the biggest handles internally in JKUAT. The responses are presented in table 4.9 below.

Table 4.10 External Challenges

| External challenge | Mean | Standard deviation |
|---|------|--------------------|
| Political changes | 0.25 | 1.25 |
| Economic trends | 4.67 | 0.07 |
| Technological trends | 1.9 | 1.06 |
| Organizational implementation capacity | 3.93 | 0.23 |
| Competitors replication ability of the programmes | 2.78 | 0.45 |

Source; Respondents data

According to the results, the economic trends have been the most challenging external aspect in managing competition. This has heavily impacted on the JKUAT organizational implementation capacity. Replication of JKUAT original programmes by competitors is also becoming a bid challenge. Being the technological era, technological trends have also affected the higher education sector. Of all the rest political changes has not been a challenge to JKUAT.

Summary of the Study:

The research problem or statement was to assess the extent to which JKUAT uses the RBP as a competitive strategy. The objectives of the study were;

1. Assess the extent to which JKUAT uses the RBP in its strategy implementation
2. Establish the challenges JKUAT is facing in the implementation of RBP.

To remain competitive JKUAT has to a large extent been benchmarking with the external environment and implementing a cultural change within its employees. When choosing the strategy to follow JKUAT to a large extent considers mainly the financial requirements and the resource availability at its disposal. JKUAT considers tangible resources and capabilities more important than intangible resources. This is reflected by considerable growth in collaborated networks, reputation, and culture change in comparison to that of production facilities, teaching equipment, office and laboratory space. This is also evidenced by their steady increase over the last five years. Resource changes have to a large extent been driven by the number of student enrolling in the highly competitive programs and their consequent requirements as customers. Internally, the rigid organizational structure and the inadequate tangible resources have been the most challenging hurdles. Externally the economic trends and the JKUAT implementation capacity are the most challenging hurdles.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, JKUAT has to a moderate extent used the RBP as a competitive strategy. This is evidenced by the use of internal adjustment strategies like the cultural change, consideration of resources availability before strategy implementation and a steady increase in its resources. This has not been done consciously but as a matter of trying to meet the market requirements and competition.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher came up with the following recommendations:

1. JKUAT should take seriously the RBP concept as it will enhance its competitiveness in the market.
2. JKUAT organizational processes and structure should be renewed to ensure these processes enhance the RBP.
3. Tangible, intangible resources and capabilities in JKUAT should be identified, built, deployed and used strategically.

REFERENCES

- [1] Andrews, K. (1971). *The Concept of corporate strategy*. Dow Jones – Irwin, Homewood, IL.
- [2] Ansoff, H.I. (1965). *Corporate Strategy; An Analytical Approach to Business Policy for Growth and Expansion*. McGraw – Hill New York.
- [3] Aosa, E. (1998). *The Leadership Challenge Facing Kenyan Organizations*. The Accountant Jan - March
- [4] Bain, J.S (1968). *Industrial Organization*. John Wiley, New York.
- [5] Bostock, W. (2002). *The Role of the Market in Higher Education: An Evaluation of the School of Government*. University of Tasmania
- [6] Chandler, A.D. (1992). *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the American Industrial Enterprise*. MIT Press Cambridge, MA.
- [7] Collis, D.J. (1994). "How Valuable are organizational Capabilities". *Strategic Management Journal*, Winter Special ISSUE 15, 143- 152.
- [8] Conner, K. (1991). A Historical Comparison of Resource Based Theory and Five Schools of Thought within Industrial Organization Economics: "Do We Have a New Theory of the Firm?" *Journal of Management*, vol.17, No. 1, 121-154.
- [9] Cooper, A.C, Gimeno- Gascon F.J & Woo G.Y (1991), A Resource Based Prediction of New Venture Survival and Growth, *Academy of Management Proceedings*
- [10] Demsetz, H. (1973). *Industry Structure, Market Rivalry and Public Policy*. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 16.
- [11] Kagwira, M. (2004). *A survey of the Extent to Which Kenyan Universities Practice Education Marketing*. Unpublished MBA project University of Nairobi.
- [12] Kitoto, L.A. (2005). *Competitive Strategies Adopted by Universities in Kenya*. Unpublished MBA Project University of Nairobi.
- [13] Magutu, P.O. (2006). *A Survey of Benchmarking Practices in Higher Education in Kenya: A Case of Public Universities*. Unpublished MBA project University of Nairobi.
- [14] Njimu, F.W. (2006). *Bases of Competitive Advantage of the School of Business of the University of Nairobi*. Unpublished MBA Project University of Nairobi.
- [15] Otieno, W. (2004). *The Privatization of Kenyan Public Universities*. *International Higher Education Summer III*.
- [16] Porter, M.E. (1987). "From Competitive Advantage to Corporate Strategy," *Harvard Business Review*, May – June.
- [17] Porter, M.E. (1996). "What is Strategy?" *Harvard Business Review*, Nov- Dec
- [18] Ricardo, D. (1817). *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. J. Murray, London.
- [19] Schmalensee, R. (1985), "Do Marketers Differ Much?" *American Economic Review*, 75.
- [20] Wernerfelt, B. (1984), A Resource Based View of the firm; *Strategic Management Journal*, 5, 171-180.
- [21] Williamson, O. (1991). *Strategizing, Economizing and Economic Organization*. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12: 75-94.