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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to establish the role of Porters’ strategies on the growth of public universities in Kenya. The study sought to determine the role of cost leadership strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, to examine the role of differentiation strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, and to determine the role of focus strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya.

This study used a descriptive survey that endeavored to show the relationship that exists between study factors. The population of the study consisted of KU employees who were 5486. The sample frame for this study was acquired from the human resource department and the population was divided between academic staff and administrative staff. Stratified sampling technique was used to select respondents, the sample size of the study constituted of 5% of the total population between the academic staff and administrative staff of KU bringing the sample size to 274 respondents. Data gathered was analyzed through descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. The researcher used Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze the data. Results of the study were presented using tables and figures. Inferential statistics involved the use of correlation and regression analysis.

The study showed that analysis of internal association of KU and its assets in view of its end goal was significant to its competitive advantage, and the university operates within a great fit between itself and its outer market setting and its inner abilities/ capabilities. The cost leadership strategy of the university is to provide learning services at the most minimal cost and the institution has the capacity to work at a lower cost compared to other public institutions.

The study showed that the institution has built a solid personality or brand that separates it from its competitors within the same market, and it has a solid innovative work skills and leadership capabilities that facilitate its capacity to create differentiation within the market. The university differentiates its services through having a responsive customer service, technological innovations and engineering design, and its embeddedness and interconnection provides its competitive advantage since it impacts its behavior in seeking a social and economic fit. The study showed that the institution utilizes differentiation strategy in view of product benefit to customers, and it has selected a
market niche where its customers have distinctive preferences for services provided. The study revealed that the institution knows the overall dynamics and forces in its marketplace, and understands how these forces impact its business, and it has the zeal to make its service better, and its strategy revolves around differentiation tied to product superiority.

The study concludes that the institution had the ability to ensure its overheads were low through establishment of a cost effective culture, formed partnerships with expert organizations, and other providers in order to fence on cost abuse. The institution used differentiation strategy by focusing on putting resources into growth strategies and things that were discernable for clients to see, and its focus strategy differentiation depended on its buyer segment demanding unique service attributes.

The study recommends KU’s management to comprehensively understand its capability to ensure that it adopts viable focus strategies. The management should understand that, as its market becomes vigorous and vibrant, it will need the university to position itself to effectively and efficiently satisfy these needs.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Strategy is a firm’s game plan that enables the firm to create a competitive advantage (Pearce and Robinson, 2000). The firm needs to analyze itself bearing in mind what the competitors are doing. Ansoff and Mc Donnel (1990) define strategy as a set of decision making rules for guidance of organizational behavior. Strategy is thus used as a yard stick to measure a firm’s performance and define its relationship with the external environment.

Porter (1998) described competitive strategy as the search for a favorable competitive position in an industry; the fundamental arena in which competition occurs. He further explains that competitive strategy aims to establish a profitable and sustainable position against the forces that determine industry competition. This involves identifying sources of competition in the ever changing environment then developing strategies that match organizational capabilities to the changes in the environment. According to Porter (1998), competitive strategy is about being different. This means deliberately performing activities differently and in better ways than competitors.

Competitive strategy consists of all those moves and approaches that a firm has and is taking to attract buyers, withstand competitive pressure and improve its market position (Thompson and Strickland, 2002). It concerns what a firm is doing in order to gain a sustainable competitive advantage. Porter (1980) outlined the three approaches to competitive strategy these being Striving to be the overall low cost producer, that is, low cost leadership strategy, secondly Seeking to differentiate one’s product offering from that of its rivals, that is, differentiation strategy and lastly Focus on a narrow portion of the market, that is, focus or niche strategy.

Porter (1980) argued that superior performance can be achieved in a competitive industry through the pursuit of a generic strategy, which he defines as the development of an overall cost leadership, differentiation, or focus approach to industry competition. If a firm does not pursue one of these strategy types, it will be stuck-in-the-middle and will experience lower performance when compared to firms that pursue a generic strategy.
Porter (1980). Porter argues that strategy is about selecting the set of activities in which an organization will excel to create a sustainable difference in the marketplace.

Day and Wensley (1988) focused on two categorical sources involved in creating a competitive strategy; superior skills and superior resources. Other authors have elaborated on the specific skills and resources that can contribute to a design of competitive strategies. For example, Barney (1991) stated that not all firm resources hold the potential of sustainable competitive advantage; instead, they must possess four attributes: rareness, value, inability to be imitated, and inability to be substituted.

Competitive strategy consists of all those moves and approaches that a firm has and is taking to attract buyers, withstand competitive pressure and improve its market position (Thompson and Strickland, 2002). A company has competitive advantage whenever it has an edge over its rivals in securing customers and defending against competitive forces (Thompson and Strickland, 2002). Sustainable competitive advantage is born out of core competencies that yield long term benefit to the company, even for universities.

A university has been defined as a high-level educational institution in which students study for degrees and academic research is done. It is therefore, an institution of higher (or tertiary) education and research which awards academic degrees in various academic disciplines (Johnson, 2012). It is an institution of advanced education and research, which gifts scholastic degrees at all levels, in an assortment of subjects as guided by the University statutes give both tertiary and quaternary training (Gathoga, 2011). As an aftermath of the freedom, turbulence in the economy, and new government approaches, universities have been experiencing changes to survive and contend successfully. To adapt to the progressions, universities have used this requirement for training by understudies and extended the ability to handle additional understudies. They have additionally created advertise redone courses to fit in the diverse market portions, to encourage growth (Karanja, 2012).

Growth is something which most institutions endeavor, paying little respect to their size. Little firms need to get enormous, huge firms need to show signs of improvement. Authoritative growth, be that as it may, implies distinctive things to various organizations. There are numerous parameters an organization may use to gauge its
growth. The organizations may utilize physical extension, incomes, achievement of a product sharing, or they may choose to utilize expanded piece of the pie. At last, achievement and growth is to be gaged by how well a firm does with respect to the objectives it has set for itself. In the present element business environment, firms need to continually concentrate on enhancing their focused methodology. Focused methodology alludes to the way a firm can increase unmistakable favorable position over others working in a comparative market. Competition is a key fixing to change and growth. Without rivalry, strategy would be insignificant (Gathoga, 2011).

Strategy goes past operational change. Strategies effortlessly imitated do not constitute a strategy. Essentially enhancing operations or quality does not constitute a focused strategy (Thompson and Strickland, 2002). An aggressive procedure includes the analysis of the structure and contenders existing in the business keeping in mind the end goal to recognize an ideal position. An aggressive methodology additionally coordinates the qualities and assets of the firm to build up a competitive advantage. A manageable aggressive methodology requires ceaseless change with vital coherence (Porter, 1980).

According to Gathoga (2011) competitive procedure goes for building up a gainful and feasible position against powers that decide industry rivalry and from there on prompt to upper hand. To guarantee survival and achievement, firms need to build up the capacity to oversee dangers and adventure rising open doors quickly. This requires detailing of procedures that continually coordinate abilities to ecological prerequisites.

The universities have likewise framed linkages with other supplementary institutions, for example, center level schools, doctor's facilities and research organizations with a push to improving business sector manageability and shaping linkages with clients to help in expanding market development and sustainability. Epstein and Roy (2011) having a helpful area in the greater part of the real towns in Kenya and a wide branch organize builds showcase development and manageability. In any case, it is not clear how these Porters’ generic strategies have influenced the growth of universities in Kenya.

In Kenya, Public universities were made under the Act of parliament to do look into utilizing their assortment of qualified staff in various controls. The privatization of universities and linearization of the Kenya economy in the 1990s changed the focused
environment in which the administration ventures worked. This added to the universities repositioning themselves for the test and improvement of both vital and performance goals.

There are sixteen universities in Kenya. In all African nations, universities get budgetary help from the administration. The outcome is that the level of advanced education offices in Kenya has for since quite a while ago relied on upon the soundness of the national monetary performance. From the 1980s, most African nations experienced money related limitations because of poor financial performance and fast population development, added to the need to give different administrations like essential training, sustenance and sanctuary. University training in this way, has confronted serious rivalry from other division for restricted government stores (Berg and Gall, 2015). Universities are built up and keep on being set up in Kenya with a specific end goal to enhance the level of advanced education, learning and assimilation of swelling number of understudies from secondary schools. The quick development of university training is an unconstrained reaction to the appeal.

According to Grant (2012) he recognizes four crucial aggressive techniques; cost initiative, separation, concentrate on cost and concentrate on separation. It is from these four aggressive procedures that organizations then infer their upper hand and use the upper hand as a fixing in their journey for development. With the expansion of universities from seven(7) to more than sixty(60) universities in the most recent 10 years there has been uncommon change in the working environment of universities. Though the Government goes for expanding access to University training to a greater amount of it population there is expanded rivalry for the accessible understudies as understudies increment their inclination of universities. Combined with the way that private universities are additionally vying for similar understudies, Public universities have needed to change class to build their development while staying important in the new focused environment (Gregson, 2015). This research therefore, sought to fill the gap by carrying out a research on the role of Porters’ generic strategies on the growth of Public Universities in Kenya.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

The competitive strategies include marketing portfolios with satisfactory human and capital assets, social responsibility activities, brand images, convenience retailing, marketing share position and period of time in the business (Thompson, 2013). The privatization of university worldwide and freedom of understudy determination since the arrangement of commission of University Education in 2012 changed the nature in which the public universities worked. To guarantee survival and adaptability in the commercial center, the public universities need to receive focused methodologies to guarantee that they outwit their rivals. Public universities taking after competitive strategies may have an advantage over business rivals that seek after other strategy or methodology sort or those that are stuck in the center.

Through studies that have been done in African universities, government and worldwide benefactors have tested universities in Africa to legitimize their reality and their cases to the huge assets designated to them. Competitive strategies used by firms in their operations shift generally relying upon the working environment. The current operational set up in Kenya's instruction segment is a dynamic one and exceptionally focused with the development of numerous private universities. This has brought about a sharp increment in combined repetitive shortages from Kenya Shillings (Ksh.) 503,280,937 in 2006 and afterward to Ksh.1, 336,099,937 in 2012 (Mwiria, Ng’ethe and Ngome, 2013). This is as a consequence of interest postured by the expanding number of understudies throughout the years. Various studies have been done on Porters’ generic strategies yet under various settings in Kenya. Ngome (2013) concentrated on focused strategies by commercial banks in Kenya.

The study revealed that banks in Kenya utilize different means with a specific end goal to stay aggressive. The concentrate additionally presumed that venture into different regions by opening new branches has likewise been used as a methodology; Ng’ethe (2013) did a study of focused procedures of genuine public firms 1in the viewpoint of Porter’s nonexclusive model. These studies revealed numerous universities have not completely used sufficient aggressive techniques that would some way or another prompt to the development of the universities.
In spite of this foundation, restricted studies have been done to decide the impact of competitive strategies on public universities in Kenya. Subsequently, there have been lacking government approaches which has eventually observed growing of numerous private universities, public universities have been experiencing difficulties to survive and contend insufficiently and more specialized universities were granted contracts to end up distinctly completely fledged universities. This study was inspired along these lines to fill the crevice in information. The study hence looked to build up on the role of Porters’ generic strategies on the growth of public universities in Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to establish the role of Porters’ strategies on the growth of public universities in Kenya.

1.4 Specific Objectives
To achieve the general objective, the study sought to study the following specific objectives:

1.4.1 The role of cost leadership strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya.
1.4.2 The role of differentiation strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya.
1.4.3 The role of focus strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya.

1.5 Significance of the Study
The study may be of benefit to policy makers, the government and other researchers and scholars in the following ways:

1.5.1 Kenyatta University Management
Kenyatta University (KU) is the focus of this study, and the findings of the study would be beneficial to the management of KU since it may inform them on how generic strategies adopted by the university is influencing their growth, thus facilitate better decision-making.

1.5.2 Public Universities
Public universities as the target population of the study would benefit with the findings of this study as it would be enlightened on the various generic strategies the universities may adopt to improve their growth. Information gathered through this
study would help the universities to formulate policies beneficial in the best competitive strategies in the various universities in Kenya.

1.5.3 Policy Makers
This study would be important to the policy makers in the public universities as they would be able to know for certain that Porters’ generic strategies; focus, differentiation and cost leadership play a major role in shaping their operations and how they affect organization growth and at the same time they would know which generic strategies to use in order to remain competitive.

1.5.4 Future Scholars
The results of this study would also be valuable to researchers and scholars, as it would form a basis of further research. The students and academicians would use this study as a basis for discussions on competitive strategies. This study would be a source of reference material for future researchers on other related topics; it would also help other academicians who undertake the same topic in their studies.

1.6 Scope of the Study
The study was restricted to public universities. To achieve the objectives, the study took a descriptive research design in which data was collected from a population sample consisting of management, faculty departmental heads and staff. Questionnaires and interviews were used as a data collection instruments. This study was limited to the employees of KU in Nairobi County due to time and financial constraint. The study took place from February 2018 – March 2018.

1.7 Definitions of Terms
1.7.1 Competitive Strategy
Competitive strategy is defined as the long term plan of a particular company in order to gain competitive advantage over its competitors in the industry. It is aimed at creating defensive position in an industry and generating a superior Return on Investment (ROI) (Johnson, 2012)
1.7.2 Cost Leadership
Cost leadership strategy focuses on gaining competitive edge by adopting the lowest cost in the industry (Thompson, 2013). In order to reach the target of a low-cost leadership, an organization must have a low-cost leadership advantage, low-cost operations, and a united and committed workforce to the low-cost strategy (Thompson, 2013).

1.7.3 Differentiation Strategy
According to Hammond (2013) differentiation strategy is one in which a product is different from that of one or more competitors in a way that is valued by the customers or in some way affects customer’s choice. A successful differentiation strategy allows firm to earn above the average returns.

1.8 Chapter Summary
This chapter has established the background information on Kenyan public Universities. The chapter has shown, in the problem statement, the challenges facing public universities due to lack of competitive strategies to keep them in the industry. In this chapter, background of the study, problem statement, scope and limitations of the study have been explored. Chapter two analyzes literature review. Chapter three covers research methodology in terms of the research design, population and sampling design, data collection methods and analysis. Chapter four covers the results findings in terms of the study objectives, and chapter five covers the study discussions, conclusions and recommendations, based on the findings.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter covers both speculative and observational written work for the study. It uncovers basic issues which outline the establishment of this study. The chapter assists in achieve the general objective of the study by discussing in detail the specific objectives of the study, that sought to determine the role of cost leadership strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, to examine the role of differentiation strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, and to determine the role of focus strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya.

2.2 Role of Cost Leadership Strategies on the Growth of Public Universities

From a research based view of the firm, public universities, it is of high significance to analyze the inner association of an organization and its assets keeping in mind the end goal to see how competitive advantage is resolved inside firms (Wernerfelt, 2015). As such, the focal start of Resource-Based View (RBV) locations the principal question of why firms are distinctive and how firms accomplish and manage competitive advantage by sending their assets (Kostopoulos, 2012). The resource based point of view of firms depends on the idea of financial lease and the thought of an association as an accumulation of capacities (Kay, 2010). While customary strategy models concentrate on the organization’s outside competitive environment, the RBV emphasizes the requirement for a fit between the outer market setting in which a firm works and its inward abilities. From this point of view the inward environment of an association, regarding its assets and capacities, is the basic element for the assurance of key activity (Hint, 2014).

The first thought of survey a firm as a heap of assets can be followed back to Penrose (2011), who contends that it is the heterogeneity, not the homogeneity, of the gainful leaderships accessible from its assets that give every organization it’s one of a kind character. The perspective of the firm’s assets heterogeneity is the premise of the RBV and was progressed by Wernerfelt (2015), recommending that the assessment of organizations as far as their expendable assets could prompt to various bits of knowledge from customary points of view that view competitive advantage as a somewhat outer worldview and contend that the arrangement of a firm to its outside surroundings is the principle deciding element for a firm’s gainfulness (Gregson, 2015).
According to Porter's Generic Competitive Strategies, cost leadership, a firm embarks to wind up distinctly the minimal effort maker in its industry. The sources of cost preferred standpoint are differed and rely on upon the structure of the business. They may include the quest for economies of scale, exclusive innovation, and particular access to raw materials and different elements (Peteraf, 2013). A minimal low producer must discover and endeavor all sources of cost advantage.

2.2.1 High Resource Turn Over

The objective of cost leadership strategy is to share products and services at the most minimal cost in the business (Amit and Zott, 2011). The test of this strategy is to acquire a reasonable benefit for the organization, as opposed to working at a loss and draining gainfulness out of all market players (Kotler and Armstrong, 2010). Organizations, for example, Walmart prevail with this strategy by including low costs on key things on which customers are cost mindful, while sharing other stock at less forceful rebates. Products are to be made at the most reduced cost in the business (Amit and Zott, 2011). A case is to utilize space in stores for deals and not for putting away overabundance product.

This strategy includes the firm winning piece of the overall industry by speaking to cost-cognizant or value delicate customers. This is accomplished by having the most reduced costs in the objective market section, or possibly the least cost to esteem proportion (value contrasted with what consumers get). To prevail at sharing the most minimal cost while as yet accomplishing productivity and an exceptional output on venture, the firm should have the capacity to work at a lower cost than its adversaries. There are three primary approaches to accomplish this (Kotler and Armstrong 2010).

The principal approach is accomplishing a high resource turnover. In public universities in Kenya for instance, this may mean an eatery that turns tables around rapidly, or an aircraft that pivots flights quick. In assembling, it will include generation of high volumes of output. These strategies mean settled cost are spread over a bigger number of units of the product or leadership, bringing about a lower unit cost, the firm would like to exploit economies of scale and experience bend impacts (Chesbrough, 2012). For modern firms, large scale manufacturing gets to be distinctly both a technique and an end in itself. More elevated amounts of output both require and result in high piece of the pie, and make a
section obstruction to potential contenders, who might be not able accomplish the scale important to coordinate the organizations' low cost and costs.

2.2.2 Investment in Efficient Based Facilities

The second dimension is achieving low direct and indirect operating costs. This is achieved by sharing high volumes of standardized services or products sharing basic no-frills products and limiting customization and personalization of service. Production costs are kept low by using fewer components, using standard components, and limiting the number of models produced to ensure larger production runs (Gregson, 2015). Overheads are kept low by paying low wages, locating premises in low rent areas, establishing a cost effective culture, etc. Maintaining this strategy requires a continuous search for cost reductions in all aspects of the business (Brooks, 2010). Gregson (2015) observes that, this will include outsourcing, controlling production costs, increasing asset capacity utilization, and minimizing other costs including distribution, Research and Development (R&D) and marketing.

Cost leadership depends on lower general cost than contenders. Public universities that accomplish minimal effort initiative for the most part make ease in respect to contenders the subject of their 16 business strategy. The public university opens up a feasible cost advantage over contenders and utilisations that lower cost as a basis for either under evaluating the contenders and picking up a bigger piece of the pie to their detriment or procuring a higher net revenue by sharing at the going cost. A minimal effort leader’s basis for competitive advantage is lower general cost than contenders. This requires the public university to: be superior to anything competitors on proficiency and cost control and consistently look for imaginative and creative methods for cutting cost.

Public universities frequently drive their cost bring down through interests in proficient scale offices, tight cost and overhead control, and cost minimizations in such regions as leadership, sharing and publicizing (Poddar, 2015). It is in this way obvious that the universities are augmenting on limit use and watching economies of scale. They are likewise framing linkages with expert organizations, providers and other supplementary establishments. The public universities go into long haul association with their offices and utilize numerous providers to fence on cost abuse (David, 2011). In addition, the public
universities give a considerable measure of consideration regarding people who need to be created and outsource dissemination and a few leaderships to cut on operation cost.

2.2.3 Better Level of Innovations
A minimal effort or cost leadership methodology is viably actualized when the business plans, delivers, and markets practically identical leaderships and creates more effectively than its competitors. The public university may have admittance to shoddy materials or better restrictive innovation which helps than lower costs. Public universities don't need to output income to be the cost pioneer since high income is accomplished through acquiring an extensive piece of the pie (Poddar, 2015). Bring down costs prompt to higher request and, in this way, to a bigger piece of the pie. As a minimal effort pioneer, public universities can introduce boundaries against new market contestants who might require a lot of cash-flow to enter the market. The pioneer then is to some degree protected from industry wide value decreases (Malburg, 2012).

Some researchers accept that cost leadership strategies are suitable for substantial firms with the chance to appreciate economies of scale and vast generation volumes; this takes a restricted mechanical perspective of technique. Independent ventures can likewise be cost pioneers in the event that they appreciate any points of interest helpful for low costs. For instance, a neighborhood eatery in a low lease area can draw in value touchy customers in the event that it shares a restricted menu, quick table turnover and utilizes staff on the lowest pay permitted by law. Benefit of products or strategy may likewise empower a startup or little organization to share a less expensive product or leadership where officeholders' cost and costs have turned out to be too high (Monroe, 2014). A case is the accomplishment of ease spending aircrafts who regardless of having less planes than the significant carriers, could accomplish piece of the pie development by sharing modest, no nonsense leaderships at costs much less expensive than those of the bigger officeholders.

The focuser’s basis for competitive advantage is either lower costs than contenders serving that market fragment or a capacity to share specialty individuals something else from contenders (Poddar, 2015). Focusing is based on selecting a market specialty where purchasers have unmistakable inclinations. The specialty is defined by land uniqueness, particular necessities in using the leaderships in light of specific physiological viewpoints
or by exceptional credits that interest to individuals from a specific social class (Stone, 2015). An emphasis methodology in view of ease relies on upon there being a purchaser section whose necessities are less expensive to fulfill than whatever remains of the market in light of their pay levels.

Public universities can concentrate on a select client gathering, leaderships and items extend, land range, or leadership line (Stone, 2012). Concentrate additionally depends on receiving a thin competitive degree inside an industry. Focus goes for developing piece of the overall industry through working in a specialty market or in business sectors either not alluring to, or neglected by, bigger contenders. These specialties emerge from various variables including topography, purchaser attributes, and leaderships and items particulars or prerequisites. An effective concentration technique Hyatt (2011), relies on an industry section sufficiently extensive to have great development potential yet not of key significance to other real contenders. Market differentiation or market improvement can be a critical concentration methodology. Moderate size and expansive public universities utilize focus based methodologies yet just in conjunction with differentiation or cost initiative nonexclusive strategies. Yet, focus methodologies are best when shoppers have unmistakable inclinations and when the specialty has not been sought after by opponent public universities.

2.3 Role of Differentiation Strategy on Growth of Public Universities
Differentiation strategy is a methodology used by organizations to build a strong in a specific market (Peteraf, 2013). Differentiation strategy is a marketing method used by a public university to build up solid personality in a particular market. Here the public university will present diverse assortments of a similar essential leadership and item under a similar name into a specific leaderships and items classification and therefore cover the scope of leaderships and items accessible in that class (Prescott, 2011). Differentiation technique can likewise be defined as situating a brand so as to separate it from the opposition and build up a picture that is one of a kind (Davison, 2011).

Differentiation methodology is an approach under which a public university means to create and market one of a kind leaderships and items for various client sections. Typically used where the public university has clear upper hands, and can manage a costly publicizing effort. It is one of three nonexclusive promoting strategies that can be
embraced by any public university. To keep up this strategy the public university ought to have: solid innovative work skills, solid leaderships and items designing abilities, solid imagination abilities, great collaboration with dispersion channels, solid marketing skills, and impetuses construct generally in light of subjective measures, have the capacity to convey the significance of the separating leaderships and items attributes, stretch consistent change and benefit and draw in very gifted, inventive staff. Examine inside leadership segment (Prescott, 2011), presumes that leaderships and item differentiation is a typical method for separating the public university's sheerings from those of its competitors.

Universities can differentiate their services in various ways such as: having responsive customer service, technological innovations and engineering design and performance are examples of approaches to differentiation (Porter, 1980). When using differentiation, universities should invest more in and develop services that customers will perceive and unique. The main factor of differentiation is to come up with and maintain creativity, innovativeness and organizational learning within the organization (Hitt, Ireland, Camp and Sexton, 2001). Product or services that are unique provides customer loyalty (Porter, 1980) since it meets customer needs and objectives by tailoring the product or service to the customer. Kotler (2001) argues that anything an organization can do to improve on customer value represents a potential basis for differentiation. Improving on customer value involves building the value and creating service attributes at the least cost.

As per the, neo-institutional theory explains heterogeneity and differentiation (Oliver, 1996). Through institutional embeddedness and interconnection has competitive advantage is created as it has an impact on the behavior of a firm leading it to seek social and economic fit (Murphy, 2013). Differentiation supports firm growth and sustains competitive advantage through heterogeneity in resources and capabilities. Little attention has been paid to the analysis of the effects of conformity on firm performance and competitive advantage (Lounsbury, 1998).

Differentiation strategy seems to lower the degree of competition, improving on creating competitive advantages, thereby improving on organization growth. According to Ogbonna and Harris (2003) the strategy of differentiation create benefits and dominant positions that will last until rival firms copy a firm’s key resources, and will be restored
through building of opportunities that result in a new competitive advantage and new entry barriers.

2.3.1 Development of Services
Murphy (2013) expressed that effective differentiation has three perspectives: summoning an exceptional cost for a product, expanding deals due to extra purchasers won over by the separating highlights and picking up purchaser faithfulness to its image. As per the creator, product is separated if customers see it to have properties, which make it unmistakable from adversary products or leaderships and in a perfect world extraordinary in some specific way and hard to copy (Davison, 2011). At the point when taking a gander at product differentiation, it is right to express that it is not given by nature. The primary experts behind the presentation of product differentiation are the business firms themselves. There are times that organizations are compelled to lessen the degree of product differentiation which likewise influences the overall revenue of the business firms (Grant, 2012). Firms attempt to present same elements like their competitors in the event that they find that purchasers like some specific element in the product they share with a point of boosting their deals. By firms managing products with same elements, the degree of product differentiation may come up short since it would be a more noteworthy test to separate the same (Murphy, 2013).

A differentiation methodology requires the improvement of an leaderships and items or leadership that shares special traits that are esteemed by clients and that clients see to be superior to or unique in relation to the leaderships and results of the opposition (Prescott, 2011). The esteem included by the uniqueness of the leaderships and items may permit the public university to charge an excellent cost for it (Davison, 2011). The public university trusts that the higher cost will more than take care of the additional costs brought about in sharing the interesting leaderships and items. In light of the leaderships and items' remarkable characteristics, if providers increment their costs the public university might have the capacity to go along the cost to its clients who cannot discover substitute leaderships and items effectively (Poddar, 2011). Public universities that prevail in a differentiation technique regularly have admittance to driving logical research, profoundly gifted and imaginative leaderships and items benefit group, solid deals group with the capacity to effectively convey the apparent qualities of the
leaderships and items and corporate notoriety for quality and development (Prescott, 2011).

2.3.2 Unique Value of Educational Services

Effective differentiation depends on an analysis of purchasers from better places needs and conduct keeping in mind the end goal to realize what they consider essential and significant. The coveted components are then joined into the leaderships and items to empower purchaser inclination for the leaderships and items (Hyatt, 2011). The basis for competitive advantage is a leaderships and items whose traits contrast altogether from competitors’ leaderships and items. Endeavors to separate regularly bring about higher cost (Poddar, 2011). Gainful differentiation is accomplished by either keeping the cost of differentiation beneath the value premium that the separating highlights order, or by balancing the lower overall revenues through more deals volumes (Grant, 2012).

With the differentiation strategy, the public university seeking after differentiation looks to be one of a kind in its industry along some measurement that is esteemed by clients, which implies putting resources into leaderships and items, R&D and promoting (Poddar, 1980). It is the capacity to share its separated leaderships and items at a value that surpasses what was spent to make it that permits the public university to beat its opponents and acquire better than expected returns (Dess and Davis, 2014).

Leadership and an item can be separated in different ways. Strange elements, responsive client benefit, quick leaderships and items developments and mechanical authority, saw renown and status, diverse tastes, and building plan and performance are cases of ways to deal with differentiation (Poddar, 1998). Instead of cost lessening, a public university using the differentiation strategy needs to focus on putting resources into and growing such things that are discernable and clients will see (Davidson, 2011).

It is prudent to note that the fundamental achievement consider of differentiation terms of strategy performance is to create and look after ingenuity, inventiveness, and authoritative learning inside a public university (Prescott, 2011). Hyatt (2011) demands that anything that a public university can do to make purchaser esteem speaks to a potential basis for differentiation. When it finds a decent wellspring of purchaser esteem, it must form the esteem, making traits into its leaderships and items at an adequate cost. These qualities
may raise the leaderships and products’ performance or make it more efficient to utilize. Differentiation potential outcomes can become out of conceivable outcomes performed anyplace in the action cost chain (Prescott, 2011).

There is serious competition in local and global markets, there is a crop of a more demanding, more assertive customers, combined with the progression of innovation that has set awesome weight on business organizations which has tried to look for approaches to accomplish a managed upper hand (Grant, 2012). Product differentiation in organizations happens when products sold inside a similar industry have some little, and some of the time vast, contrasts. Product differentiation happens inside the products sold by a solitary dealer and between the products sold by various venders (Dess and Davis, 2014). The seed business however demonstrates to require a more strategic approach with regards to product differentiation because of the homogeneous way of products, that is, the seeds, managed inside the business (Grant, 2012).

Davidson (2011) expressed that set up providers develop dedication with customers who relate to their specific product. This differentiation sets aside an impressive interest in opportunity (to demonstrate the unwavering quality and nature of a product) and cash (on marking, publicizing, bundling) and along these lines speaks to a critical boundary for any new contestant to overcome. He additionally expresses that organizations have endeavored to defeat this boundary to section by using the devotion to the brand name of a product in one market to enter an alternate market. To accomplish competitive advantage in the market, it is essential that organizations seek after strategies, which are troublesome for contenders to duplicate (Hyatt, 2011). Product differentiation gives firms in the seed business with the chance to make them more competitive and gainful (Grant, 2012).

2.3.3 Develop a Better Competitive Edge
Watchman (1998) placed that a public university may get a competitive advantage by making a higher esteem for its clients than the cost of making it, either by receiving a differentiation strategy or an effectiveness strategy. Public university’s seeking after a differentiation technique endeavor to separate themselves from their adversaries using an assortment of shares, promoting and other related leaderships or item and innovation benefits (Prescott, 2011). Differentiation identifies with how much a leaderships and
items and its improvements are seen as one of a kind. A public university receiving a differentiation strategy order above-market costs made conceivable by the customers’ impression of the leaderships and items being unique somehow (Davison, 2011). Oak geographical (2011) noticed that there are no less than two unique sorts of differentiation strategy: those in light of leaderships and items development and those in view of serious marketing and picture leadership.

2.4 Role of Focus Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities
Firms that prevail in a focus strategies regularly have entry to driving logical research, profoundly talented and inventive product improvement group, solid deals group with the capacity to effectively convey the apparent qualities of the product and corporate notoriety for quality and benefit (Baum and Oliver, 2012). Fruitful differentiation depends on an analysis of purchasers' needs and conduct to realize what they consider critical and significant. The craved elements are then fused into the product to empower purchaser inclination for the product. The basis for competitive advantage is a product whose characteristics vary altogether from opponents' products. Endeavors to separate frequently bring about higher cost. Beneficial differentiation is accomplished by either keeping the cost of differentiation beneath the value premium that the separating highlights order, or by balancing the lower overall revenues through more deals volumes (Grant, 2012).

With the focus strategy, then again, the exceptional traits or view of uniqueness and qualities of an association's product other than cost give esteem to clients. The public universities seeking focus strategy differentiation looks to be exceptional in its industry along some measurement that is esteemed by clients, which implies putting resources into product R&D and marketing (Poddar, 2014). It is the capacity to share its separated product at a value that surpasses what was spent to make it that permits the firm to outflank its opponents and gain better than expected returns, (Dess and Davis, 2014).

A product can be separated in different ways. Irregular components, responsive client benefit, quick product benefits and innovative initiative, saw glory and status distinctive tastes, and building plan and performance are cases of ways to deal with differentiation (Poddar, 2014). Instead of cost lessening, a firm using the differentiation needs to focus on putting resources into and growing such things that are discernable and clients will see
In general, the basic achievement consider of differentiation terms of strategy performance is to create and look after imaginativeness, innovativeness, and authoritative learning inside a firm (Ireland 2011; Poddar, 2015). Kotler (2011) demands that anything a firm can do to make purchaser esteem speaks to a potential basis for differentiation. When it finds a decent wellspring of purchaser esteem, it must form the esteem, making qualities into its products at a satisfactory cost. These qualities may raise the product's performance or make it more sparing to utilize. Differentiation potential outcomes can become out of conceivable outcomes performed anyplace in the movement cost chain (Dess and Davis, 2014).

Doorman (2014, 2015) set that a firm may acquire an competitive advantage by making a higher esteem for its clients than the cost of making it, either by receiving a differentiation strategy or a proficiency technique. Firms seeking after a differentiation strategy endeavor to separate themselves from their opponents using an assortment of shares, marketing and other related activities or product and innovation developments. Focus strategy identifies with how much a product and its improvements are seen as extraordinary. A firm receiving a differentiation strategy order above-market costs made conceivable by the clients' view of the product being exceptional somehow (Berman et. al., 2012). Mill (2013) noticed that there are no less than two distinct sorts of differentiation strategy: those in view of product benefit and those in view of escalated marketing and picture leadership. The key achievement variables which add to the productivity of a differentiator include inventive energy, solid fundamental research and product designing (Kotha and Vadlamani, 2013; Poddar, 2014).

2.4.1 Growth of Market Share
The focuser’s basis for competitive advantage is either lower costs than competitors serving that market segment or an ability to share niche members something different from competitors. Focusing is based on selecting a market niche where buyers have distinctive preferences. The niche is defined by geographical uniqueness, specialized requirements in using the product or by special attributes that appeal to members (Stone, 2013).

A focus strategy based on low cost depends on there being a buyer segment whose needs are less costly to satisfy than the rest of the market. On the other hand, a focus strategy
based on differentiation depends on there being a buyer segment that demands unique product attributes (Poddar, 2014). In the focus strategy, a firm targets a specific segment of the market (Poddar, 2016). The firm can choose to focus on a select customer group, product range, geographical area, or service line (Martin, 2012). For example, some service firms focus solely on the service customers (Stone, 2013). Focus also is based on adopting a narrow competitive scope within an industry.

Focus strategy aims at growing market share through operating in a niche market or in markets either not attractive to, or overlooked by, larger competitors. These niches arise from a number of factors including geography, buyer characteristics, and product specifications or requirements. A successful focus strategy (Poddar, 2014) depends upon an industry segment large enough to have good growth potential but not of key importance to other major competitors. Market penetration or market development can be an important focus strategy. Public universities use focus-based strategies but only in conjunction with differentiation or cost leadership generic strategies. But, focus strategies are most effective when consumers have distinct preferences and when the niche has not been pursued by competitor firms (David, 2012).

2.4.2 Effective Response to Students’ Needs

A market-focused business looks outside the company for the input and data necessary to make strategic and tactical decisions. Market focus means understanding your customers. It means knowing your competitors, and anticipating their next strategy or tactic. Market focus means knowing the overall dynamics and forces in the marketplace, and understanding how those forces might impact the business (David, 2012).

Market focus seeks to identify opportunities and then capitalize on them. Product focus identifies improvements that will lead to competitive advantages. Both areas of focus are necessary. The challenges with a product-dominated focus is discovering critical information too late and falling behind in the competitive race (Raelin, 2013). Growth slows because there is a delayed response to the dynamics of the marketplace. A market-focus perspective shares the best pathway to sustainable and profitable growth. Market focus is all about opportunity. Where are there needs? Where do customers spend money? Once you know that, then you focus on products to satisfy those needs (Barrat and Whitehead, 2014).
A product-focused business looks at their sharing’s, and strives to continually improve them. There is zeal to make a product or service better, and the strategy of the business revolves around differentiation tied to product superiority (Bossert, 2015). Market focus entails responding to situations, when appropriate. Being outwardly focused, investing in marketing, and being driven by market information outputs decision points. If customers’ needs change, what is the appropriate response? If a new competitor enters the arena, how should they be dealt with? If new channels and connections with customers are available, should they be used? For a market-focused business these decision points are connection points with customers and potential moments of change (Mulling and Grant, 2015). Think of these decisions as opportunities to challenge assumptions, assess priorities, and decide if a change is warranted.

According to the Bossert,(2015); Barrat and Whitehead (2014) performance checking and evaluation of outsider expert organizations is a capacity that is focus to a University and in truth an essential to related activities, for example, supplies is a key part of agreement leadership. Buying experts ought to see performance checking as a two way strategy and be interested in input and proposals for development from expert organizations. The expanding employments of outsourcing game plans, and additionally the new multifaceted nature, recommend that there is have to know more about how to adequately use this technique (Lau and Hurley, 2015). Subsequently more data is expected to see effectively outsourcing and issues experienced in outsourcing activities and its consequences for general University performance (Mulling and Grant, 2015).

University performance includes different activities that assistance in building up the objectives of the University, and screen the advance towards the objective. It is used to make changes in accordance with finish objectives all the more proficiently and adequately (Raelin, 2013). These days business scorecards are one of the strategies whereby the activities of a University are measured against its dreams and mission. Different techniques include time leadership overseeing time and controlling targets and due dates a University will develop and make benefits. University performance can be accomplished by using best practices, quality circles and Process control can likewise be used to accomplish comparable objectives (Raelin, 2013).


2.4.3 Improved Service Delivery

University performance involves the actual output (objectives and goals). Experts in many fields are worried with University performance including vital organizers, operations, and fund, legitimate and authoritative improvement (Lau and Hurley, 2015). Lately many public universities are using the adjust scorecard strategy where performance in followed and measured in various measurements, for example, Financial performance (e.g. shareholders return) worker stewardship performance change is the idea of measuring the output of a specific strategy, then altering the strategy so as to build the output, proficiency or viability of the strategy or strategy (Ramarapu, and Lado 2013).

Performance change is the idea of the hierarchical change in which the administrators and overseeing body of the University set up and deal with a program which measures the present level of performance of the University and afterward produces thoughts for altering University practices and institution which are established so as to accomplish a superior level of output (Barrat and Whitehead, 2014). The essential objectives of University change are to enhance University adequacy and University effectiveness keeping in mind the end goal to enhance the capacity of the 21 University to convey its leaderships and flourish in the commercial focuses in which the University contends (Ramarapu, and Lado 2013).

The third territory of change which is now and then focused for development is the University adequacy at the University level, performance change as a rule includes gentler types of estimation, for example, consumer loyalty overviews which are used to get subjective data about performance from the view purpose of clients.

Barrat and Whitehead, (2014) performance checking and appraisal of outsider expert organizations is a capacity that is focus to a University and in actuality an essential to related activities, for example, supplies is a crucial part of agreement leadership. Buying experts ought to see performance observing as a two-way handle and be interested in criticism and recommendations for development from expert co-ops.

The expanding employments of outsourcing courses of action, and in addition the new intricacy, recommend that there is have to know more about how to viably use this strategy (Lau and Hurley, 2014). Therefore more data is expected to see effectively
outsourcing and issues experienced in outsourcing activities and its consequences for general University performance (Mulling and Grant, 2011).

2.5 Chapter Summary
This provides an overview of literature related to the specific objectives of the study highlighted in Chapter one. The literature review shows the significance and need for conducting research on the topic of the study. The next section of this study clarifies the research strategy that will be used as a part of this study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section begins by addressing the research design of the study. Later, the chapter goes ahead to discuss about the population, sample size and design. The research procedure is likewise discussed. In the research procedures, the section audits the strategy for pre-testing to be embraced. The chapter additionally examines the data collection techniques and data analysis to be used. An outline of the section is given toward the end.

3.2 Research Design

This study used a descriptive survey that endeavored to distinguish and clarify factors that exist in a particular circumstance and to clearly show the relationship that exists between these factors so as to give an idea of the general phenomenon (Cooper and Schindler, 2013). Descriptive research is thought to be proper on the grounds that subjects are regularly seen in their normal set up which can bring about precise and solid data (Britt, 2016). The descriptive study research helped in portraying phenomenon or describing how different practices and occasions happen. Along these lines it was helpful in building up the influence of competitive strategies on the growth of public universities in Kenya.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

Barney (2012) defines a population as any entire group with no less than one trademark in like manner. Population may comprise of, however are not restricted to, people, creatures, organizations, structures, engine vehicles, ranches, articles or occasions. Population is not simply restricted to people. According to Glasser and Strauss (2015), the elements or persons that qualify to be observed in a study are the ones referred to as the population. In Kenya we have a total of twenty two (22) chartered public universities (CUE, 2016). However, due to time factor and wide geographical coverage of by the universities, the study sought to focus on one public university in Nairobi County and in particular KU, whose total number of staff was 5486.
3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sample Frame
A sampling frame is defined as a source of the entire set of people, places, and/or materials where a research sample is selected (Barney, 2012). The objective of the sample frame is to guide the researcher in identifying the source of respondents that would be best placed to participate in a survey (Cooper and Schindler, 2013). Glasser and Strauss (2015) states that an ideal sample frame needs to be precise, comprehensive and updated. The sample frame for this study was acquired from KU’s human resource department. The sample frame included the official list of employees that worked at KU as at 2018.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique
The sampling technique that was used in this study was stratified sampling technique. Stratified sampling technique is a probability sampling technique whereby a researcher splits his/her complete population into different subdivisions also known as strata, and then proceeds to unsystematically hand-pick the ultimate subjects proportionately from the different study strata (Britt, 2016). The population was divided between academic staff and administrative staff, this selection was preferred since it ensured that all staff members were captured in the study.

Stratified sampling technique is not a stand-alone technique, and thus, the researcher employed the use of a Simple Random Sampling (SRS) technique to select the preferred samples from the population based on the categorized strata. SRS is a probability sampling technique where a subcategory of entities known as a sample, are selected from a broader set of entities known as a population (Cooper and Schindler, 2013). Each entity is selected indiscriminately and completely by chance, such that every entity has the same likelihood of being selected at any phase throughout the sampling process, and every entity has the same (equal) chance of being picked (Barney, 2012).

3.3.2.3 Sample Size
Sample size is defined as the computation of singular samples within a statistical setting which may include, but not limited to a technical research or a public survey (Cooper and Schindler, 2013). Sample size determination refers to the methodology of selecting the number of elements or samples to comprise a statistical sample, and it is a vital piece of feature in any pragmatic study whose goal is to find and make inferences about a specific
population (Barney, 2012). Since there were limitations for the researcher to conduct a census, a descriptive sample of the total population was sampled and respondents were selected using SRS.

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) stipulate that a sample size which is between 5% and 10% of the total population or above is acceptable in any descriptive study as long as it is a true representative of the study’s population, and as long as it displays homogenous characteristics and traits. Thus, the total sample size of the study constituted of 5% of the total population between the academic staff and administrative staff of KU bringing the sample size to 274 respondents, and were distributed as shown in Table 3.1.

### Table 3.1 Sample Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cadre</th>
<th>Sample Size Distribution</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,486</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>274</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Data Collection Method

The research utilized primary information gathering. The essential information accumulation strategy was completed by the utilization of questionnaires. Glasser and Strauss (2015) clarifies that questionnaires are an imperative instrument for research study. The utilization of questionnaires was justified on the grounds that they are a compelling method for gathering data from an extensive educated example in a short term ability to focus time and at a decreased cost than different strategies. Furthermore, questionnaires encouraged less demanding coding and analysis of information collected.

The questionnaires used both open and close ended questions. Section A of the questionnaire covered questions on respondents’ demographic information. Section B covered the role of cost leadership strategy on the growth of public universities. Section C covered differentiation strategy on the growth of public universities, and Section D covered the role of focus strategy on growth of public universities.
3.5 Research Procedure
In the research procedure, the researcher conducted sampling and identified the various public universities that had been listed to be the best in terms of better performance and job absorption. This was analyzed for the last 3 years. A pilot test was conducted to evaluate the completeness, precision, accuracy and clarity of the questionnaires. The Cronbach Alpha test on Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to test the reliability. A sample of 10 respondents that were not included in the final sample size were used to conduct the test. This ensured the reliability of the data collection instruments that were used. The questionnaires were therefore administered to the management staff of the public universities taken as the case studies.

The Cronbach Alpha test was used to test the reliability of the questionnaires. Cooper and Schindler (2013) observe that the Cronbach’s alpha is a measure that is used to gauge the internal consistency (reliability), of a questionnaire or a set of scale or test items. In other words, the reliability of any given measurement refers to the extent to which it is a consistent measure of a concept, and Cronbach’s alpha is one way of measuring the strength of that consistency. Glasser and Strauss (2015) further observe that the scale of $0.7 > a \geq 0.6$ means the instrument is questionable, $0.8 > a \geq 0.7$ means the instrument is acceptable, $0.9 > a \geq 0.8$ means the instrument is good, and $a \geq 0.9$ means the instrument is excellent. The study used the coefficient alpha of $\geq 0.7$ as the threshold, since this indicated that the study’s instrument was acceptable.

3.6 Data Analysis
Data gathered was analyzed through descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. The researcher used SPSS to analyze the data. All correspondences were coded and entered into the SPSS software for analysis. Descriptive statistics indexes such as frequency tables and percentages were used. Afterwards, the results of the study was presented using tables and figures. Inferential statistics involved the use of regression model. The dependent variable was organization growth of the public universities whereas the independent variables were the Porters’ generic strategies. The model of this study was as follows:

$Y=\alpha+\beta_1X_1+\beta_2X_2+\beta_3X_3 + \varepsilon$

Where: $Y =$ Dependent variable (Organization Growth)
$X_1, X_2, \text{ and } X_3 =$ Independent Variables
\[ X_1 = \text{Cost Leadership Strategy} \]
\[ X_2 = \text{Differentiation Strategy} \]
\[ X_3 = \text{Focus Strategy} \]
\[ \alpha = \text{Constant} \]
\[ \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, = \text{Regression coefficients or change included in Y by each X value} \]
\[ \epsilon = \text{error term} \]

### 3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presents the various methods and procedures the researcher adopted in conducting the study in order to answer the research questions raised in the first chapter. The chapter is organized in the following ways: the research design, population and sample, data collection methods, sampling design and sample size, research procedures and data analysis. The next chapter presents the study results and findings.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results and findings for the specific objectives of the study, that sought to determine the role of cost leadership strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, to examine the role of differentiation strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, and to determine the role of focus strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya.

4.2 Response Rate and Reliability Results

4.2.1 Response Rate

The study had targeted 274 respondents from KU. The researcher and her assistants managed to circulate all the questionnaires, however only 235 respondents had completed their questionnaires adequately. This gave the study a response rate of 85.7% which was above the required threshold.
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Figure 4.1 Response Rate

4.2.2 Reliability Results

When conducting a reliability test, the coefficient threshold for acceptable questions is always $\geq 0.7$. Table 4.1 shows that Cost Leadership Questions, Differentiation Strategy Questions, and Focus Strategy Questions had Alpha coefficients of 0.899, 0.864, and 0.740 respectively, which were above the requisite threshold, which was representative of the questionnaire being reliable.
Table 4.1 Reliability Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>No. of Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Alpha Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Leadership Questions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation Strategy Questions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Strategy Questions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Demographic Information

4.3.1 Gender

Figure 4.2 shows that 62.6% of the respondents were male, and 37.4% were female, showing that male respondents were more than females.

![Figure 4.2 Gender](image)

4.3.2 Age

Figure 4.3 shows that 28.5% were aged between 46-55 years, 27.7% were aged between 36-45 years, 25.1% were aged between 26-55 years, 13.2% were aged 56 years and above, and 5.5% were aged between 18-25 years, suggesting that majority of the respondents were above the age of 36 years.
4.3.3 Education Level

Figure 4.4 shows that 32.3% of the respondents had postgraduate degrees, 26.4% had PhDs, 23% had degrees, 15.7% had doctorates, and 2.6% had certificates/ diplomas, showing that all respondents understood the questionnaire.

Figure 4.4 Education Level
4.3.4 Cadre
Figure 4.5 shows that 71.1% of the respondents were administrative staff and 28.9% were academic staff which shows that all staff levels were sufficiently represented in the study as targeted.

![Figure 4.5 Cadre](image)

4.3.5 Years Worked in the University
Figure 4.6 indicates that 56.1% had worked in KU for 11-15 years, 34.9% had worked for 16 years and above, 6% had worked for 6-10 years, 3% had worked for 1-5 years, and none had worked for less than 12 months, meaning that all respondents were fit to participate in the study.

![Figure 4.6 Years Worked in the University](image)
4.4 Role of Cost Leadership Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities

4.4.1 Cost Leadership Strategy Rating on the Growth of Public Universities

Table 4.2 shows that analysis of internal association of KU and its assets in view of the end goal is significant to its competitive advantage as agreed by 86% while 14% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.14 and standard deviation of 0.637. The institution operates within a great fit between itself and its outer market setting and its inner abilities/capabilities as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.46 and standard deviation of 0.499. Sources of cost favored standpoint for the institution are differed and are relied upon by the university’s structure as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.40 and standard deviation of 0.491. The cost leadership strategy of the university is to provide learning services at the most minimal cost as agreed by 72.3% while 27.7% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.02 and standard deviation of 0.759.

The institution has the capacity to work at a lower cost compared to other public institutions as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.46 and standard deviation of 0.499. The institution ensures its overheads are low through establishment of a cost effective culture as agreed by 94.9% while 5.1% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.39 and standard deviation of 0.585. The institution has formed partnerships with expert organizations, and other providers to fence on cost abuse as agreed by 79.1% while 20.9% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.13 and standard deviation of 0.731.

The institution introduces boundaries for new entrants in the market to reduce contestants as agreed by 73.2%, 14.9% were neutral, and 11.9% of the respondents disagreed with a mean of 3.91 and standard deviation of 0.961. The institution has selected a market specialty where its students/customers have unmistakable inclinations as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.53 and standard deviation of 0.500. The institution’s industry is sufficiently extensive to facilitate great development potential that is not of key significance to competitors as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.63 and standard deviation of 0.483.
Table 4.2 Cost Leadership Strategy Rating on the Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of internal association of KU and its assets in view of the end goal is significant to our competitive advantage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution operates within a great fit between itself and its outer market setting and its inner abilities/capabilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of cost favored standpoint for the institution are differed and are relied upon by the university’s structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost leadership strategy of the university is to provide learning services at the most minimal cost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has the capacity to work at a lower cost compared to other public institutions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution ensures its overheads are low through establishment of a cost effective culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has formed partnerships with expert organizations, and other providers to fence on cost abuse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution introduces boundaries for new entrants in the market to reduce contestants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has selected a market specialty where its students/customers have unmistakable inclinations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution’s industry is sufficiently extensive to facilitate great development potential that is not of key significance to competitors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2 Cost Leadership Strategy Correlations on the Growth of Public Universities

Table 4.3 shows that high resource turnover was significant to cost leadership strategy as indicated by the r value of 0.630 and the p value < 0.01. Investment in efficient based facilities was significant to cost leadership strategy as indicated by the r value of 0.778 and the p value < 0.01. Better level of innovations was significant to cost leadership strategy as indicated by the r value of 0.599 and the p value < 0.01.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost Leadership</th>
<th>High Resource Turnover</th>
<th>Efficient Based Facilities</th>
<th>Better Level Innovations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Resource Turnover</td>
<td>.630**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient Based Facilities</td>
<td>.778**</td>
<td>.519**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Level Innovations</td>
<td>.599**</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.620**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlations is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

4.4.3 Cost Leadership Strategy Regressions on the Growth of Public Universities

Table 4.4 indicates that high resource turnover, efficient based facilities, and better level innovations influence cost leadership strategy by 0.672 or 67.2% which signifies their significance in cost leadership strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.23578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), High Resource Turnover, Efficient Based Facilities, and Better Level Innovations
Table 4.5 presents the regression coefficients for high resource turnover, efficient based facilities, and better level innovations and their influence on cost leadership strategy, providing the regression equation of:

\[
\text{Cost Leadership Strategy} = 1.825 + 0.233 \times \text{High Resource Turnover} + 0.337 \times \text{Efficient Based Facilities} + 0.033 \times \text{Better Level Innovations}
\]

The table shows that high resource turnover was significant to cost leadership strategy since its p value was <0.01 and that with every increase in high resource turnover, cost leadership would be increased by 23.3%. Efficient based facilities was significant to cost leadership strategy since its p value was <0.01 and that with every increase in efficient based facilities, cost leadership would be increased by 33.7%. Better level innovations was insignificant to cost leadership strategy since its p value was >0.01 and that with every increase in better level innovations, cost leadership would be increased by 3.3%.

Table 4.5 Cost Leadership Strategy Regression Coefficients and Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>9.851</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Resource Turnover</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>5.856</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient Based Facilities</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>12.465</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Level Innovations</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Cost Leadership Strategy

4.5 Role of Differentiation Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities

4.5.1 Differentiation Strategy Rating on the Growth of Public Universities

Table 4.6 shows that the institution has built a solid personality or brand that separates it from its competitors within the same market as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.60 and standard deviation of 0.492.
Table 4.6 Differentiation Strategy Rating on the Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution has built a solid personality or brand that separates it from its competitors within the same market</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has a solid innovative work skills and leadership capabilities that facilitate its capacity to create differentiation within the market</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university differentiates its services through having a responsive customer service, technological innovations and engineering design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution continually improves its customer value to increase it basis of differentiation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution’s embeddedness and interconnection provides its competitive advantage since it impacts its behavior in seeking a social and economic fit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are times when the institution is compelled to lessen its degree of differentiation which influences its overall revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution uses differentiation strategy by focusing on putting resources into growth strategies and things that are discernable for clients to see</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution considers differentiation in terms of creating ingenuity, inventiveness, and authoritative learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution seeks after strategies that are troublesome for its contenders and competitors to duplicate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution provides differentiation through cost leadership and through serious marketing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The institution has a solid innovative work skills and leadership capabilities that facilitate its capacity to create differentiation within the market as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.28 and standard deviation of 0.448. The university differentiates its services through having a responsive customer service, technological innovations and engineering design as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.58 and standard deviation of 0.494. The institution continually improves its customer value to increase it basis of differentiation as agreed by 98.3% while 1.7% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.37 and standard deviation of 0.519.

The institution’s embeddedness and interconnection provides its competitive advantage since it impacts its behavior in seeking a social and economic fit as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.34 and standard deviation of 0.475. There are times when the institution is compelled to lessen its degree of differentiation which influences its overall revenue as agreed by 90.6% while 9.4% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.03 and standard deviation of 0.470. The institution uses differentiation strategy by focusing on putting resources into growth strategies and things that are discernable for clients to see as agreed by 98.3% while 1.7% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.53 and standard deviation of 0.533.

The institution considers differentiation in terms of creating ingenuity, inventiveness, and authoritative learning as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.40 and standard deviation of 0.492. The institution seeks after strategies that are troublesome for its contenders and competitors to duplicate as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.68 and standard deviation of 0.467. The institution provides differentiation through cost leadership and through serious marketing as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.48 and standard deviation of 0.501.

4.5.2 Differentiation Strategy Correlations on the Growth of Public Universities

Table 4.7 shows that development of service was significant to differentiation strategy as indicated by the r value of 0.446 and the p value < 0.01. Unique value of educational services was significant to differentiation strategy as indicated by the r value of 0.834 and the p value < 0.01. Better competitive edge development was significant to differentiation strategy as indicated by the r value of 0.228 and the p value < 0.01.
Table 4.7 Differentiation Strategy Correlations on the Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differentiation Strategy</th>
<th>Development of Service</th>
<th>Unique Value of Educational Services</th>
<th>Better Competitive Edge Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation Strategy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Service</td>
<td>.446**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Value of Educational Services</td>
<td>.834**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.410**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Competitive Edge Development</td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.241**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlations is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlations is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

4.5.3 Differentiation Strategy Regressions on the Growth of Public Universities

Table 4.8 indicates that development of service, unique value of educational services, and better competitive edge development influence differentiation strategy by 0.734 or 73.4% which signifies their significance in differentiation strategy.

Table 4.8 Model Summary of Differentiation Strategy and Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.16461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Development of Service, Unique Value of Educational Services, and Better Competitive Edge Development

Table 4.9 presents the regression coefficients for development of service, unique value of educational services, and better competitive edge development and their influence on differentiation strategy, providing the regression equation of:
Differentiation Strategy = 1.551 + 0.145 Development of Service + 0.654 Unique Value of Educational Services – 0.132 Better Competitive Edge Development

The table shows that development of service was significant to differentiation strategy since its p value was <0.01 and that with every increase in development of service, differentiation strategy would be increased by 14.5%. Unique value of educational services was significant to differentiation strategy since its p value was <0.01 and that with every increase in unique value of educational services, differentiation strategy would be increased by 65.4%. Better competitive edge development was significant to differentiation strategy since its p value was <0.01 and that with every increase in better competitive edge development; differentiation strategy would be decreased by 13.2%, since they were inversely correlated.

Table 4.9 Differentiation Strategy Regression Coefficients and Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>8.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Service</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>4.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Value of Educational Services</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>19.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Competitive Edge Development</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Differentiation Strategy

4.6 Role of Focus Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities

4.6.1 Focus Strategy Rating on the Growth of Public Universities

Table 4.10 shows that the institution utilizes differentiation strategy in view of product benefit to customers as agreed by 99.1% while 0.9% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.81 and standard deviation of 0.412. The institution has selected a market niche where its customers have distinctive preferences for services provided as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.74 and standard deviation of 0.439. The university’s focus strategy differentiation depends on its buyer segment demanding unique service
attributes as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.46 and standard deviation of 0.499. The institution looks outside the organization for input and data that facilitate its strategic and tactical decisions as agreed by 98.3% while 1.7% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.38 and standard deviation of 0.520.

The institution knows the overall dynamics and forces in its marketplace, and understand how these forces impact its business as agreed by 81.3% while 18.7% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.14 and standard deviation of 0.703. The university has the zeal to make its service better, and its strategy revolves around differentiation tied to product superiority as agreed by all the respondents with a mean of 4.25 and standard deviation of 0.432. The institution’s decision points are connected with customers’ needs that provide potential moments of change for the university as agreed by 98.3% while 1.7% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.65 and standard deviation of 0.513.

The university performance involves the actual output (objectives and goals) achieved by the institution as agreed by 84.3% while 13.6% were neutral, and 2.1% of the respondents disagreed with a mean of 3.97 and standard deviation of 0.605. The essential objectives of institutional change in the university, enhances its adequacy and effectiveness while keeping in mind its end goal as agreed by 90.2% while 5.1% disagreed, and 4.7% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.16 and standard deviation of 0.733. The institution employs performance appraisal using outsourced experts to measure its capacity that is essential to its related activities as agreed by 99.1% while 0.9% of the respondents were neutral with a mean of 4.44 and standard deviation of 0.514.
Table 4.10 Focus Strategy Rating on the Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution utilizes differentiation strategy in view of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>product benefit to customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has selected a market niche where its</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>customers have distinctive preferences for services provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university’s focus strategy differentiation depends on its</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buyer segment demanding unique service attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution looks outside the organization for input and</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data that facilitate its strategic and tactical decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution knows the overall dynamics and forces in its</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketplace, and understand how these forces impact its</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university has the zeal to make its service better, and its</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy revolves around differentiation tied to product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superiority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution’s decision points are connected with customers’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs that provide potential moments of change for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university performance involves the actual output</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(objectives and goals) achieved by the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The essential objectives of institutional change in the</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university, enhances its adequacy and effectiveness while</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keeping in mind its end goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution employs performance appraisal using outsourced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experts to measure its capacity that is essential to its</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6.2 Focus Strategy Correlations on the Growth of Public Universities

Table 4.11 shows that growth of market share was significant to focus strategy as indicated by the r value of 0.214 and the p value < 0.01. Effective response to students’ needs was significant to focus strategy as indicated by the r value of 0.616 and the p value < 0.01. Improved service delivery was significant to focus strategy as indicated by the r value of 0.410 and the p value < 0.01.

Table 4.11 Focus Strategy Correlations on the Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Strategy</th>
<th>Growth of Market Share</th>
<th>Effective Response to Students’ Needs</th>
<th>Improved Service Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Strategy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of Market Share</td>
<td>.214**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Response to Students’ Needs</td>
<td>.616** .001</td>
<td>.232** .000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Service Delivery</td>
<td>.410** .000</td>
<td>.354** .000</td>
<td>.304** .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlations is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

4.6.3 Focus Strategy Regressions on the Growth of Public Universities

Table 4.12 indicates that growth of market share, effective response to students’ needs, and improved service delivery influence focus strategy by 0.427 or 42.7% which signifies their significance in focus strategy.

Table 4.12 Model Summary of Focus Strategy and Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.25916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Growth of Market Share, Effective Response to Students’ Needs, and Improved Service Delivery
Table 4.13 presents the regression coefficients for growth of market share, effective response to students’ needs, and improved service delivery and their influence on focus strategy, providing the regression equation of:

Focus Strategy = 2.040 + 0.002 Growth of Market Share + 0.446 Effective Response to Students’ Needs + 0.164 Improved Service Delivery

The table shows that growth of market share was insignificant to focus strategy since its p value was >0.01 and that with every increase in growth market share, focus strategy would be increased by 0.2%. Effective response to students’ needs was significant to focus strategy since its p value was <0.01 and that, with every increase in effective response to students’ needs, focus strategy would be increased by 44.6%. Improved service delivery was significant to focus strategy since its p value was <0.01 and that, with every increase in improved service delivery, focus strategy would be increased by 16.4%.

Table 4.13 Focus Strategy Regression Coefficients and Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.040</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>8.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of Market Share</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Response to Students’ Needs</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>10.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Service Delivery</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>4.498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Focus Strategy

4.6.4 Porter’s Generic Strategies Regression on the Growth of Public Universities

Table 4.14 indicates that cost leadership strategies, differentiation strategies, and focus strategies influence public university’s growth by 0.919 or 91.9% which signifies their significance in public university’s growth.
Table 4.14 Model Summary of Porter’s Generic Strategies and Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.07268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Cost Leadership Strategies, Differentiation Strategies, and Focus Strategies

Table 4.15 presents the regression coefficients for cost leadership strategies, differentiation strategies, and focus strategies and their influence on public university’s growth, providing the regression equation of:

Public University’s Growth = 0.513 + 0.394 Cost Leadership Strategies + 0.239 Differentiation Strategies + 0.259 Focus Strategies

The table shows that cost leadership strategies were significant to public university’s growth since its p value was <0.01 and that, with every increase in cost leadership strategies, public university growth would be increased by 39.4%. Differentiation strategies were significant to public university’s growth since its p value was <0.01 and that, with every increase in differentiation strategies, public university growth would be increased by 23.9%. Focus strategies were significant to public university’s growth since its p value was <0.01 and that, with every increase in focus strategies, public university growth would be increased by 25.9%.

Table 4.15 Porter’s Generic Strategies Regression Coefficients and Growth of Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>5.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Leadership Strategies</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>28.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation Strategies</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>14.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Strategies</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>16.218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Public University’s Growth
4.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the results and findings for the specific objectives of the study, that sought to determine the role of cost leadership strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, to examine the role of differentiation strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, and to determine the role of focus strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya. Presentations were done using figures and tables, and reviews of the results have also been presented. The next chapter provides the study’s discussions, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter has presented the results and findings for the specific objectives of the study, that sought to determine the role of cost leadership strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, to examine the role of differentiation strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, and to determine the role of focus strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya. This chapter provides the study’s discussions, conclusions, and recommendations, as per the findings.

5.2 Summary of the Study
The purpose of this study was to establish the role of Porters’ strategies on the growth of public universities in Kenya. The study sought to determine the role of cost leadership strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, to examine the role of differentiation strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya, and to determine the role of focus strategy on the growth of public universities in Kenya.

This study used a descriptive survey that endeavored to show the relationship that exists between study factors. The population of the study consisted of KU employees who were 5486. The sample frame for this study was acquired from KU’s human resource department and the population was divided between academic staff and administrative staff. Simple Random Sampling (SRS) technique was used to select respondents, the sample size of the study constituted of 5% of the total population between the academic staff and administrative staff of KU bringing the sample size to 274 respondents. The research utilized primary information gathering. The utilization of questionnaires was justified on the grounds that they are a compelling method for gathering data from an extensive educated sample. Data gathered was analyzed through descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. The researcher used Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze the data. Results of the study were presented using tables and figures. Inferential statistics involved the use of regression model. The dependent variable was organization growth of the public universities whereas the independent variables were the Porters’ generis strategies.
The study showed that analysis of internal association of KU and its assets in view of its end goal was significant to its competitive advantage, and the university operates within a great fit between itself and its outer market setting and its inner abilities/capabilities. The cost leadership strategy of the university is to provide learning services at the most minimal cost and the institution has the capacity to work at a lower cost compared to other public institutions. The study revealed that the institution has the ability to ensure its overheads are low through establishment of a cost effective culture, formed partnerships with expert organizations, and other providers in order to fence on cost abuse.

The study showed that the institution has built a solid personality or brand that separates it from its competitors within the same market, and it has a solid innovative work skills and leadership capabilities that facilitate its capacity to create differentiation within the market. The university differentiates its services through having a responsive customer service, technological innovations and engineering design, and it has continually improved its customer value to increase it basis of differentiation. The study revealed that the institution’s embeddedness and interconnection provides its competitive advantage since it impacts its behavior in seeking a social and economic fit, and at times, it is compelled to lessen its degree of differentiation which influences its overall revenue. The study showed that the institution uses differentiation strategy by focusing on putting resources into growth strategies and things that are discernable for clients to see.

The study showed that the institution utilizes differentiation strategy in view of product benefit to customers, and it has selected a market niche where its customers have distinctive preferences for services provided. The university’s focus strategy differentiation depends on its buyer segment demanding unique service attributes and the institution looks outside the organization for input and data that facilitate its strategic and tactical decisions. The study revealed that the institution knows the overall dynamics and forces in its marketplace, and understands how these forces impact its business, and it has the zeal to make its service better, and its strategy revolves around differentiation tied to product superiority, and its decision points are connected with customers’ needs that provide potential moments of change for the university.
5.3 Discussions

5.3.1 Role of Cost Leadership Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities

Analysis of internal association of KU and its assets in view of the end goal is significant to our competitive advantage. These results are in agreement with Wernerfelt (2015) who state that, organizations analyze the inner association of an organization and its assets keeping in mind the end goal to see how competitive advantage is resolved inside firms. The institution operates within a great fit between itself and its outer market setting and its inner abilities/ capabilities. This is in tandem with Hint (2014) who observed that, while customary strategy models concentrate on the organization’s outside competitive environment, the RBV emphasizes the requirement for a fit between the outer market setting in which a firm works and its inward abilities.

Sources of cost favored standpoint for the institution are differed and are relied upon by the university’s structure. This is consistent with Peteraf (2013) who states that, according to Porter's Generic Competitive Strategies, cost leadership, a firm embarks to wind up distinctly the minimal effort maker in its industry, and the sources of cost preferred standpoint are differed and rely on upon the structure of the business. The cost leadership strategy of the university is to provide learning services at the most minimal cost. These results are in agreement with Amit and Zott (2011) who state that, the objective of cost leadership strategy is to share products and services at the most minimal cost in the business.

The institution has the capacity to work at a lower cost compared to other public institutions. This is in tandem with Kotler and Armstrong (2010) who observe that, to prevail at sharing the most minimal cost while as yet accomplishing productivity and an exceptional output on venture, the firm should have the capacity to work at a lower cost than its adversaries. The institution ensures its overheads are low through establishment of a cost effective culture. This is in agreement with Brooks (2010) who state that, overheads are kept low by paying low wages, locating premises in low rent areas, establishing a cost effective culture. Maintaining this strategy requires a continuous search for cost reductions in all aspects of the business.
The institution has formed partnerships with expert organizations, and other providers to fence on cost abuse. This is in agreement with David (2011) who states that, universities are framing linkages with expert organizations, providers and other supplementary establishments. The public universities go into long haul association with their offices and utilize numerous providers to fence on cost abuse. The institution introduces boundaries for new entrants in the market to reduce contestants. This is in tandem with Malburg (2012) who states that, as a minimal effort pioneer, public universities can introduce boundaries against new market contestants who might require a lot of cash-flow to enter the market. The pioneer then is to some degree protected from industry wide value decreases.

The institution has selected a market specialty where its students/ customers have unmistakable inclinations. This is in agreement with Stone (2015) who observes that, focusing is based on selecting a market specialty where purchasers have unmistakable inclinations. The institution’s industry is sufficiently extensive to facilitate great development potential that is not of key significance to competitors. This is in agreement with Hyatt (2011) who notes that, an effective concentration technique, relies on an industry section sufficiently extensive to have great development potential yet not of key significance to other real contenders.

5.3.2 Role of Differentiation Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities

The institution has built a solid personality or brand that separates it from its competitors within the same market. This is in tandem with Prescott (2011) who states that, differentiation strategy is a marketing method used by a public university to build up solid personality in a particular market. The institution has a solid innovative work skills and leadership capabilities that facilitate its capacity to create differentiation within the market. This is in tandem with Prescott (2011) who states that, to keep up this strategy the public university ought to have: solid innovative work skills, and have the capacity to convey the significance of the separating leaderships and items attributes.

The university differentiates its services through having a responsive customer service, technological innovations and engineering design. This concurs with Porter (1980) who observed that, universities can differentiate their services in various ways such as: having responsive customer service, technological innovations and engineering design and
performance are examples of approaches to differentiation. The institution continually improves its customer value to increase its basis of differentiation. This concurs with Kotler (2001) argues that anything an organization can do to improve on customer value represents a potential basis for differentiation. Improving on customer value involves building the value and creating service attributes at the least cost.

The institution’s embeddedness and interconnection provides its competitive advantage since it impacts its behavior in seeking a social and economic fit. This agrees with Murphy (2013) who states that, through institutional embeddedness and interconnection has competitive advantage is created as it has an impact on the behavior of a firm leading it to seek social and economic fit. There are times when the institution is compelled to lessen its degree of differentiation which influences its overall revenue. This is in tandem with Grant (2012) who states that, there are times that organizations are compelled to lessen the degree of product differentiation which likewise influences the overall revenue of the business firms.

The institution uses differentiation strategy by focusing on putting resources into growth strategies and things that are discernable for clients to see. This is in agreement with Davidson (2011) who observed that, instead of cost lessening, a public university using the differentiation strategy needs to focus on putting resources into and growing such things that are discernable and clients will see. The institution considers differentiation in terms of creating ingenuity, inventiveness, and authoritative learning. This is in tandem with Prescott (2011) who observed that, it is prudent to note that the fundamental achievement consider of differentiation terms of strategy performance is to create and look after ingenuity, inventiveness, and authoritative learning inside a public university.

The institution seeks after strategies that are troublesome for its contenders and competitors to duplicate. This is consistent with Hyatt (2011) who states that, to accomplish competitive advantage in the market, it is essential that organizations seek after strategies, which are troublesome for contenders to duplicate. The institution provides differentiation through cost leadership and through serious marketing. This is in tandem with Oak geographical (2011) who noticed that, there are no less than two unique sorts of differentiation strategy: those in light of leaderships and items development and those in view of serious marketing and picture leadership.
5.3.3 Role of Focus Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities

The institution utilizes differentiation strategy in view of product benefit to customers. This is in tandem with Mill (2013) who noticed that there are no less than two distinct sorts of differentiation strategy: those in view of product benefit and those in view of escalated marketing and picture leadership. The institution has selected a market niche where its customers have distinctive preferences for services provided. This concurs with Stone (2013) who states that, focusing is based on selecting a market niche where buyers have distinctive preferences. The niche is defined by geographical uniqueness, specialized requirements in using the product or by special attributes that appeal to members.

The university’s focus strategy differentiation depends on its buyer segment demanding unique service attributes. This is in agreement with Poddar (2014) who states that, a focus strategy based on low cost depends on there being a buyer segment whose needs are less costly to satisfy than the rest of the market. On the other hand, a focus strategy based on differentiation depends on there being a buyer segment that demands unique product attributes. The institution looks outside the organization for input and data that facilitate its strategic and tactical decisions. This is in agreement with David (2012) who observed that, a market-focused business looks outside the company for the input and data necessary to make strategic and tactical decisions, and that, market focus means understanding your customers.

The institution knows the overall dynamics and forces in its marketplace, and understand how these forces impact its business. This is in agreement with David (2012) who observed that, market focus means knowing the overall dynamics and forces in the marketplace, and understanding how those forces might impact the business. The university has the zeal to make its service better, and its strategy revolves around differentiation tied to product superiority. This concurs with Bossert (2015) who observed that, there is zeal to make a product or service better, and the strategy of the business revolves around differentiation tied to product superiority.

The institution’s decision points are connected with customers’ needs that provide potential moments of change for the university. This concurs with Mulling and Grant (2015) who state that, for a market-focused business these decision points are connection points with customers and potential moments of change. The university performance
involves the actual output (objectives and goals) achieved by the institution. This concurs with Lau and Hurley (2015) who note that, university performance involves the actual output (objectives and goals). Experts in many fields are worried with university performance including vital organizers, operations, and fund, legitimate and authoritative improvement.

The essential objectives of institutional change in the university, enhances its adequacy and effectiveness while keeping in mind its end goal. This is in agreement with Ramarapu, and Lado (2013) who state that, the essential objectives of university change are to enhance university adequacy and effectiveness keeping in mind the end goal to enhance the capacity of the 21st university to convey its leaderships and flourish in the commercial focuses in which the University contends. The institution employs performance appraisal using outsourced experts to measure its capacity that is essential to its related activities. This concurs with Barrat and Whitehead (2014) who observe that, performance checking and appraisal of outsider expert organizations is a capacity that is focus to a University and in actuality an essential to related activities, for example, supplies is a crucial part of agreement leadership.

5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Role of Cost Leadership Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities
The study concludes that analysis of internal association of KU and its assets in view of its end goal was significant to its competitive advantage, and the university operates within a great fit between itself and its outer market setting and its inner abilities/capabilities. The cost leadership strategy of the university is to provide learning services at the most minimal cost and the institution has the capacity to work at a lower cost compared to other public institutions. The study concludes that the institution has the ability to ensure its overheads are low through establishment of a cost effective culture, formed partnerships with expert organizations, and other providers in order to fence on cost abuse.

5.4.2 Role of Differentiation Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities
The study concludes that the institution has built a solid personality or brand that separates it from its competitors within the same market, and it has a solid innovative work skills and leadership capabilities that facilitate its capacity to create differentiation
within the market. The university differentiates its services through having a responsive customer service, technological innovations and engineering design, and it has continually improved its customer value to increase its basis of differentiation. The study concludes that the institution’s embeddedness and interconnection provides its competitive advantage since it impacts its behavior in seeking a social and economic fit, and at times, it is compelled to lessen its degree of differentiation which influences its overall revenue.

5.4.3 Role of Focus Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities
The study concludes that the institution utilizes differentiation strategy in view of product benefit to customers, and it has selected a market niche where its customers have distinctive preferences for services provided. The university’s focus strategy differentiation depends on its buyer segment demanding unique service attributes and the institution looks outside the organization for input and data that facilitate its strategic and tactical decisions. The study concludes that the institution knows the overall dynamics and forces in its marketplace, and understands how these forces impact its business, and it has the zeal to make its service better, and its strategy revolves around differentiation tied to product superiority, and its decision points are connected with customers’ needs that provide potential moments of change for the university.

5.5 Recommendations
5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement
5.5.1.1 Role of Cost Leadership Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities
The study recommends KU’s management to capitalize on cost leadership strategies through the formation of links with key service providers, and complementary institutions to facilitate their achievement of a competitive edge when compared to their counterparts. This will facilitate their ability to respond promptly to environmental changes that continuously occur due to competition.

5.5.1.2 Role of Differentiation Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities
The study recommends KU’s management to understand that the vital key to differentiation is having a workforce that cannot be replicated. Thus, for KU to enhance its performance, its managers need to invest greatly in differentiating its employees
through constant training, and providing differentiated services. This will facilitate the institution’s uniqueness and facilitate its innovativeness in conducting its business.

5.5.1.3 Role of Focus Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities
The study recommends KU’s management to comprehensively understand its capability to ensure that it adopts viable focus strategies. The management should understand that, as its market becomes vigorous and vibrant, it will need the university to position itself to effectively and efficiently satisfy these needs.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies
The study was restricted to public universities and particularly KU due to time and financial constraint. As a result, the study recommends that similar studies be conducted in other public universities within Nairobi County, and nationwide. Other methodologies that involve secondary data analysis need to be implemented in other studies so as to provide policy makers with a comprehensive study.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Monday 1st March 2018

Dear respondent,

I am a student at United States International University - Africa (USIU-A) pursuing a Masters of Business Administration program. My concentration being Strategic Management. In partial fulfillment of my course work, I would like to conduct a research project to assess The Role of Porter’s Generic Strategies in the Growth of Public Universities in Kenya.

Kindly therefore, complete the attached questionnaire with accurate information that will be used entirely for this research while observing utmost confidentiality.

Your assistance is highly valued. Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

MARGARET NJERI MUCHERU.
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

Kindly respond to the following questions by ticking on the appropriate box (✓) or filling the answers in the blank spaces. (Finish Sampling Technique in Chapter 3)

Section 1: Demographic Information

1. Gender?
   Male: [ ]          Female: [ ]

2. Age?
   18-25 Years [ ]  26-35 Years [ ]  36-45 Years [ ]  46-55 Years [ ]
   56 Years and above [ ]

3. Highest level of education?
   Certificate/Diploma [ ]  Degree [ ]  Postgraduate [ ]  PhD [ ]

4. What is your cadre in the university?
   Academic Staff [ ]  Administrative Staff [ ]

5. Number of years worked in this university?
   Less than 12 Months [ ]  1-5 Years [ ]  6-10 Years [ ]  11-15 Years [ ]
   16 Years and above [ ]
**Section B: Role of Cost Leadership Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities**

Indicate your rating of the following statements on cost leadership and its effect on the growth of your university by placing a check mark in the appropriate square bracket using the scale: 1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, and 5-Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of internal association of KU and its assets in view of the end goal is significant to our competitive advantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution operates within a great fit between itself and its outer market setting and its inner abilities/ capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of cost favored standpoint for the institution are differed and are relied upon by the university’s structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost leadership strategy of the university is to provide learning services at the most minimal cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has the capacity to work at a lower cost compared to other public institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution ensures its overheads are low through establishment of a cost effective culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has formed partnerships with expert organizations, and other providers to fence on cost abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution introduces boundaries for new entrants in the market to reduce contestants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has selected a market specialty where its students/customers have unmistakable inclinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution’s industry is sufficiently extensive to facilitate great development potential that is not of key significance to competitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C: Role of Differentiation Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities

6. Indicate your rating of the following statements on differentiation strategy and its effect on the growth of your university by placing a check mark in the appropriate square bracket using the scale: 1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, and 5-Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution has built a solid personality or brand that separates it from its competitors within the same market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has a solid innovative work skills and leadership capabilities that facilitate its capacity to create differentiation within the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university differentiates its services through having a responsive customer service, technological innovations and engineering design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution continually improves its customer value to increase its basis of differentiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution’s embeddedness and interconnection provides its competitive advantage since it impacts its behavior in seeking a social and economic fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are times when the institution is compelled to lessen its degree of differentiation which influences its overall revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution uses differentiation strategy by focusing on putting resources into growth strategies and things that are discernable for clients to see</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution considers differentiation in terms of creating ingenuity, inventiveness, and authoritative learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution seeks after strategies that are troublesome for its contenders and competitors to duplicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution provides differentiation through cost leadership and through serious marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section D: Role of Focus Strategy on the Growth of Public Universities

7. Indicate your rating of the following statements on focus strategy and its effect on the growth of your university by placing a check mark in the appropriate square bracket using the scale: 1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, and 5-Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution utilizes differentiation strategy in view of product benefit to customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has selected a market niche where its customers have distinctive preferences for services provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university’s focus strategy differentiation depends on its buyer segment demanding unique service attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution looks outside the organization for input and data that facilitate its strategic and tactical decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution knows the overall dynamics and forces in its marketplace, and understand how these forces impact its business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university has the zeal to make its service better, and its strategy revolves around differentiation tied to product superiority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution’s decision points are connected with customers’ needs that provide potential moments of change for the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university performance involves the actual output (objectives and goals) achieved by the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The essential objectives of institutional change in the university, enhances its adequacy and effectiveness while keeping in mind its end goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution employs performance appraisal using outsourced experts to measure its capacity that is essential to its related activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU