

American Journal of Public Policy and Administration (AJPPA)



Resource Allocation Practice and Devolved Administrative Structures in Selected Semi-Arid Counties in Kenya

*Jumanne Andrew Shangarai, Dr. Jane Njoroge, and Dr. Edna
Jemutai Moi*



Resource Allocation Practice and Devolved Administrative Structures in Selected Semi-Arid Counties in Kenya

Jumanne Andrew Shangarai¹, Dr. Jane Njoroge², and Dr. Edna Jemutai Moi²

¹Ph.D Candidate (Public Administration), Department of Public Policy and Administration
Kenyatta University, Kenya.

²Lecturer, Department of Public Policy and Administration, Kenyatta University, Kenya.

Emails: kakaasjumanne@gmail.com, njoroge.jane@ku.ac.ke, moi.edna@ku.ac.ke

Abstract

Purpose: Since the inception of devolution in Kenya, proper operationalization of devolved administrative structures ought to be in place. The problem lies in the operationalization of devolved administrative structures that has led to poor service delivery. This study intended to bridge the gap by investigating the effect of resources allocation practices on the devolved administrative structures.

Methodology: The study adopted a descriptive research design with an objective to determine who, what, where, when, and how much. It was considered appropriate because it sought to generate accurate profiles for factors, events and circumstances. The study incorporated transformational leadership theory that was poled as the creation of positive changes within an organization.

Findings: This study found that, an epitomized rise in strategic leadership practices leads to enhanced operationalization of the devolved administrative structures, and institutionalization that stood to be helpful on devolved administrative structures operations, ensuring information movement should be done continuously and efficiently. As such, significant effect of resources allocation practices on the devolved administrative structures were found to exist.

Recommendation: The research recommends that top leadership in Counties must lucidify the stratagems that project ideas which are persuasive and create improvement of devolved administrative structures that give persuasive transformation.

Keywords: *Resource allocation, devolved administrative structures, semi-arid, counties, Kenya*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Service delivery has been enhanced due to innovative strategies that has been emanating from devolved administrative structures. Most administrative structures were found to utilize coproduction methods to enhance the delivery of services that were related to maintenance and repairs of roads (Sudhipongpracha & Wongpredee, 2016). Strategic leadership was discovered to greatly rely upon the vocational education collages in Malaysia (Bin & Zulkipli, 2019). In Africa, Jooste and Hamani (2017) suggested that the effectiveness inherent in strategic resource allocation in South Africa firms was influenced by strategic leadership actions, emphasis on ethical norms, initiations of strategic direction, putting in place organizational controls, prudent firm portfolio resource management and ensuring over time a better organizational culture.

In Tanzania, according to Sirili et al. (2018) sub-national governments have been identified to replacing bureaucratic decision-making red tapes, propagating bottom-up planning approach and fostering the independence of resource mobilization and utilization. The researchers were of the opinion that, despite good devolved administrative structures being seen, it encompasses numerous challenges that mostly entail inadequate and incompetent personnel, untimely disbursement of funds from the national government, giving citizen participation a blind eye, political intrusion and inadequate financial allocations. The laws place responsibilities in the hands of County governors to ensure in place the proper functioning of administrative structures.

In Kenya, after twelve years into devolution, counties are deemed to have their respective administrative structures operational. Recently, the health workers in Tana River County did strike, complaining about delayed salaries, denied promotion and unconducive working environment that is riskier for their health and the same was replicated in Nairobi County plus other Counties issuing notices of strikes. Additionally, constant wrangles between the County members of assembly and their respective governors on issues of governance, accountability, public participation, and transparency has been part of their new normal in counties of Taita Taveta, Kirinyaga, Nairobi, Bomet and Laikipia. The leadership of governors has been under challenge, which is a benefit of devolution (Cheeseman, Lynch & Willis, 2016), but when the two factions consistently flex their muscles. It is the devolved administrative units that are hardly hit by that conflict (Steeves, 2015). Lack of leadership in resource distribution mobilization has also been attributed to poor governance strategies (Jumanne & Njoroge, 2018; Mutungi, Njoroge & Minja, 2019).

The operationalization of the strategic plans by the county governments was described by the researchers as weak and faced with numerous challenges. Nevertheless, some counties like Bomet, Makueni and Kakamega have fully operationalized and implemented up to between 70% and 90% the devolved administrative units like village units as capsulated in the 2010 Kenyan Constitution. Other legislation are at the national and county levels while other counties are yet to fully operationalize and implement them. The above studies did not link resource and devolved administrative structures. This study examined the effects of resource allocation practices and decentralized administrative structures in the Kenyan counties of Taita Taveta and Makueni.

In the recent past, Taita Taveta County has had countless incidences of mismanagement reports emanating from the members of the County assembly and successive impeachment motions against the governor (Gathumbi, 2018). In 2018 to 2019 fiscal year, a dysfunctional and almost paralyzed County executive was left at the mercies of the County assembly who vehemently

were declining to pass any expenditure bill on the floor of their assembly (Mberi, Sevilla, Olukuru, Mutegi & Weru, 2017). This conflicting execution of powers almost tainted the image of the good willed 2010 constitution (Kimathi, 2017). In light of the unending tension between the office of the governor and the County assembly of Taita Taveta, one is left pondering as to whether resource allocation have a pivotal influence for good progression or worse retrogression of devolved administrative structures in County governments.

Contrastingly, Makueni County, which neighbours Taita Taveta County as the focus of this study, has progressively had a non-strained cooperation and coordination between the County executive and the County assembly members between 2017 to date. One outstanding success in that County is the successful implementation of the universal Health Coverage (UHC) programme piloted by the national government where part of its implementation plan was to be met by County government resources (Barasa, Rogo, Mwaura & Chuma, 2018). In addition, the County has occasionally recorded a positive rating on proper utilization of public resources and public image. With a case example during 2017/2018 fiscal year, together with Nyandarua County, was ranked as the best in the utilization of public funds (Njeru, 2019).

With regards to average potential just before devolution, one will more likely suggest that Taita Taveta County as compared to Makueni County was at a better level to achieve prosperity before 10-year lapse of devolution. 5,879 km² of the 17,083.9 km² in Taita Taveta is habitable and therefore under the direct exercise of the County roles as compared to 8,008.9 km² in Makueni County that is under Devolution. The population size is also considerably lower than that of Makueni at 340,671 persons, 20 persons per square kilometre, as compared to 987,653 persons, 120 persons per square kilometre, in Makueni County (Census, 2019). Therefore, why the big disparity in developmental achievement when having the same geographical location and by extension the same social cultural challenges and strengths? Thus, an interest to investigate whether strategic leadership practices have an effect on the performance of devolved administrative structures in the two counties shaped the formulation of this study.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW 2.1 Devolved Administrative Structures

In the current research study, devolution was reviewed in light of de-concentration of authority from the centre to the peripheral units of administration. Consequently, the problem of decentralization of control versus the de-concentration of power from the national level of government to the other levels of government necessitated that, coordination be pursued to prevent needless power squabbles and disputes among the levels of governments. Devolved administrative structures, therefore in the wake of tensions, conflicts and challenges brought by a given model of devolution, bold the intergovernmental coordination to surmount the same. Dupas, Basurto and Robinson (2017) viewed devolution as the process through which the national government bestows part of her powers to authorities at the periphery solely to spur rural development and as a way of transitioning to democracy.

2.2 Resource Allocation Practices and Devolved Administrative Structures

Atienza (2018) in her study on experiences of a devolved setup-the politics of health devolution, realized that politization in management of public health resources (like medicine procurement), constraints in improvement and construction of health facilities and a lack of health personnel/facilities were the common problems facing local government units in Philippines. Atienza (2018) further concluded that, the lack of exhaustive deliberations, poor design and hast implementation of health devolution partially were the causes of those

problems. This current study intends to focus on the influence of budgetary process, plans formulation and policies execution on performance of devolved administrative structures which in the study was narrowed to only the health sector.

An investigation on the association between decentralization and equity of health resource allocation was conducted in Chile and Colombia (Bossert et al., 2016). Their findings indicated that, increased levels of funding were directly translating to increased service utilization and devolution aided and maintained an equitable allocation of health resources in different devolved units with different levels of income. Therefore, the current study deviated from equitable health resource sharing among devolved units to resources allocation in terms of allocation process, plans formulation and execution in devolved administrative structures. Bossert et al. (2016) while investigating resource allocation and District Performance Decentralization in Zambia, found out that the allocation formula that was based on population size and hospital beds, allocated almost equal per capita expenditure on different districts.

In addition, decentralization allowed autonomy in internal resources allocation and expenditure in each district. However, disparities were evident in revenue generation as wealthier district were able to meet their targets while poorer districts fell way short of their targets despite exceedingly using their maximum allocations. This current study did not investigate revenue generation but resource allocation in devolved administrative structures. Moindi (2014) while studying resource distribution methods under devolved systems of government in selected counties in Kenya, it was shown that even when the resources are available, counties confront a number of difficulties in mobilizing and implementing resource allocation plans. In his bid to unmask the resource allocation strategies in Kiambu, Nairobi, Kajiado, Machakos and Nakuru counties, optimization was applied in maximizing efficiency for the uniquely set objectives in each county so as to address their changing environment and need.

On the question of how resource allocation planning influenced public procurement in Kenya, Danis and Kilonzo (2014) in light of the public procurement Act (2005) and Regulations (2006) and revised (2010) found out that resource allocation affected procurement performance. The Public Procurement Oversight Authority specified that procurement performance begins from purchasing efficiency and effectiveness so as to attain the set performance levels in public institutions (Public Procurement Oversight Authority, 2007). The above study was on public procurement whereas this study was on devolved administrative structures. Tsofa, Goodman, Gilson and Molyneux (2017) while investigating Devolution and its impacts on commodities management and health workforce, identified political interference and discrimination during the award of contracts or recruitment of staff in county government of Kilifi.

Further, Ngigi and Busolo (2019) found out that the chief inhibitor towards the institutionalization of devolved governance strategy by county governments in Kenya was inadequate resource allocation. However, the Tsofa et al. (2017) concentrated more on the department of health in Kilifi County, while Ngigi et al. (2019) gave a generalized view of county resource allocation state. This study was specific for Public Procurement Oversight Counties where resource allocation was investigated based on formulation plans, policies and regulation execution, and allocation process/budget.

2.3 Theoretical Review

2.3.1 Transformational Leadership Theory

Transformational leadership theory as discussed by Sun and Wang (2017) views leadership as the creation of a positive change within an organization, where care for one another's interest is key towards the realization of group goals (Manzoor, et al., 2019). It aims at boosting morale that will directly impact each employee's performance in a way that they are better equipped to align their self-worth and identity towards the organization's collective identity (Orabi, 2016). Transformational leaders have been viewed as sensitive to interpersonal associations, high performers and more effective leading to higher chances of getting promotions (Ribeiro, Yücel & Gomes, 2018). In light of Eichelberger (2017), this study adopted the theory in establishing the impact of resource allocation on devolved administrative structures in Kenya.

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 3.1 Research Design

The study adopted a descriptive research design. The objective of descriptive study design is to determine who, what, where, when, and how much. It was considered appropriate because it sought to generate an accurate profile for factors, events and circumstances (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). The design sought to answer the phenomenon's question on what, where, and when it occurs. Situations are examined with the view of establishing what is the norm, that is, what may be anticipated to occur under the same conditions. Also mixed-methods of research which advocated for adoption of both quantitative and qualitative analytical methods was used since it is deemed to be prudent for social research (Morgan, 2014).

3.2 Variables (Units of Analysis)

The unit of analysis was resource allocation and devolved administrative structures in Kenya as inferred from the two selected Counties. In addition, this study drew its unit of observation from two Counties which are semi arid and included the following; Governors, Deputy Governors, Speakers of County Assembly, Members of County Assemblies, County Executive Committee Members, Chief Officers, the County Public Service Board Members, Directors/Managers, Sub County Administrators, Ward Administrators and the Village Administrators.

3.3 Location of the Study (Site)

The location of the research is Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties in the Coast and Eastern regions which are the former Coast and Eastern Provinces respectively. Taita Taveta County as a study site of this research is located in Coastal region which is the former Coast Province and its about 17, 083.9 km². While Makueni County as a study site is located in the Eastern region which is the former Eastern Province and its approximately 8,008.9 km².

3.4 Target Population

The target population was 500 derived from Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties. Encompassing the target population was the top leadership that was purposively sampled from the two county governments whose findings were generalized to the rest of 45 County Governments.

3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

3.5.1 Sampling Techniques

The research employed purposive and random sampling to draw from the target population of 500, a sample size of 223 in the leadership of the two semi-arid counties. These were the Governor's, Deputy Governors, Speakers of County Assembly, Members of County Assemblies, County Executive Committee Members, Chief Officers, County Public Service Board Members, Directors/Managers, Sub County Administrators, Ward Administrators and the Village Administrators who made a representation of 223 respondents. Therefore, Purposive sampling was utilized to sample the top leadership who are mandated to oversee functions in the devolved administrative setup; the Governor's, Deputy Governors, Speakers of County Assembly and Clerks of County Assembly.

Further, random sampling was utilized specifically to the Members of County Assemblies, County Executive Committee Members, Chief Officers, County Public Service Board Members, Directors/Managers, Sub County Administrators, Ward Administrators and Village Administrators who are in leadership capacities in Taita Taveta and Makueni County governments. **3.5.2 Sample Size**

The sample size was calculated using Yamane (1967) formula;

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e^2)}$$

Whereby;

n - Represented the computed sample size,

e - Represented 0.05, which was the margin of error allowed and N

- Represented the size of the population.

The study's sample size was;

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e^2)} = \frac{500}{1 + 500(0.05^2)} = 222.2 \approx 223.$$

Further, using Cochran's (1977) formula for proportional allocation of the sampled respondents, Table 3.2 was generated. The formula is as illustrated below.

$$n_i = \left(\frac{n}{N}\right)N_i$$

Where;

n_i Is the expected sampled individuals in stratum i ,

n Is the computed sample size,

N Is the Target population of the study and, N_i

Is the population in stratum i .

3.6 Pilot Study (Pre-Testing)

Kajiado County was identified and used for the pilot study. This endeavour is crucial in unravelling the challenges the research was likely to experience in conducting actual data collection, cost estimate of the data collection process and approximate time required for the

entire data gathering process. It provided an insight on how the respondent understands the items in the research instrument, the duration the respondents used to finish filling the questionnaire and effectiveness of the data collecting instrument in the field. In this study, 20 respondents were selected for piloting and they were from the same organization and were uniquely marked to avoid inclusion of redundancy of respondents in the research. The outcome revealed that, the administered questionnaires were complex for the respondents to reply, consequently forcing their revision for purposes of enabling respondents to comprehensively respond to questionnaires promptly. **3.7 Validity of Research Instruments**

Validity of the study was realized through necessary adjustments on the data collection instruments based on the outcome of the pilot research in order to ensure the research instruments measure the intended measurements (Saunders et al., 2016). Key also to be avoided through the post-pilot study adjustments are the ambiguous responses. The research instruments were inspected in comparison to the study objectives so as to guarantee relevance on the constructs under study. Concurrently, the researcher's supervisor provided expert opinion in assessing the validity of the research instruments. This validity of the study tool was evaluated using researchers' subjective evaluation of the tool in relation to the study objectives, the operationalization of terms, review of theoretical and empirical literature, and the opinion from the Supervisors and experts' consultation. Items in the research tool that were not in tandem with the research objectives, conflicting with operationalization of terms and Supervisors and Experts evaluation recommended editing, were restructured again before being deployed in the actual data collection process.

3.8 Reliability of Research Instruments

In order to ascertain the reliability of research tools, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was employed to test the questionnaires and the interview schedules. Field (2017), Cooper and Schindler (2014) were of the same opinion that a value of greater or equal to 0.7 Cronbach's alpha is adequate to measure the accepted reliability of an instrument. Consequently, additional questions, modification and any recurrence that were in the questions would have their corrections done at this stage.

3.9 Data Collection (Procedure) Techniques

Questionnaires and Interviews were administered. The questionnaires were distributed through a drop-off and pick-up method, and respondents were allowed one month to complete the questions. The study held face-to-face interviews with the sampled interviewees and also drop questionnaires to respondents for later picking so that respondents had ample time to fill them.

3.10 Data Analysis and Presentation

Since the data collected were both quantitative and qualitative in nature, the quantitative data was sorted, edited and coded into SPSS version 26 then analysed in STATA version 12. The analysis of quantitative data involved both descriptive and inferential statistics. Multiple linear regression presented a linear relationship between the strategic leadership practice – resource allocation and devolved administrative structures, quantified the extent of the effect and direction of association, whether direct or inverse association. These direct or inverse association provided the individual contribution of each independent variable on performance of devolved administrative structures (Zhang, 2017). The significance and proportion of variation on response variable explained by the multiple linear regression model, were derived

from goodness of fit statistic (R-squared statistics). In addition, composite index for the variables of the study were computed by harmonic mean formula (Wilson, 2019).

3.11 Empirical Model

According to Field (2017), different models can be adopted in analysing quantitative data, among them are; Probit, Logit and Regression models (Njoroge, Muathe & Bulla, 2015). This study utilized multiple linear regression analysis to assess the effect of dependent variable on the across the independent variables as shown by the models below:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_{11}Ra + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots \text{equation 1}$$

Where,

Y = Devolved Administrative Structures **β_0**

= Constant

β_{11} = Regression coefficient (The Slope)

Ra = Resource allocation practices **ε** =

Error Term

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

The study targeted 500 respondents in top leadership levels drawn from Taita Taveta County in Coastal region and Makueni County in Eastern region. The respondents were made up of top leadership purposively sampled from the two County Governments. The top leadership from the two County Governments comprised of the leaders at the strategic level, functional level and operational level. The top leaders from strategic levels were; Governor, Deputy Governor, Speaker of County Assembly, Member of County Assembly, County Executive Committee Members, Chief Officers and Clerk of County Assembly. The leaders from functional level were; County Service Board Members, Directors and Managers while the leaders from operational level were Sub-County Administrators, Ward Administrators and Village Administrators.

Table 1: Response rate

Research Instrument	Duly filled	Unfilled	Expected Count
Questionnaire	182 (81.61%)	19 (8.52%)	201 (90.13%)
Key Informant Interviews	18 (8.07%)	4 (1.79%)	22 (9.87%)
Total	200 (89.69%)	23 (10.31%)	223 (100%)

Source: Researcher (2021)

Out of the 500 individuals targeted, the study computed a sample size of 223 individuals. However, from the 223 anticipated respondents, 200 respondents fully filled the issued questionnaire and returned them, giving a response rate of 89.69% which the study deemed adequate for further analysis. Only 10.31% of the sampled respondents did not fully fill the issued questionnaires or did not consent to fill the research tool due to tight schedules, away from office on special assignment, misplacing the questionnaires and not seeing the essence of filling the questionnaires. Table 1 illustrates the proportion of the research tool issued that were dully filled and those that were unfilled.

4.1 Quantitative Analysis

4.1.1 Resource Allocation Practices

Respondents were requested to identify the degree to which Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties implemented resource allocation practices.

Table 2: Resource allocation practices

County government's resources practices		Strongly agree (1)	(2)	(3)	Neutral (4)	Disagree	Strongly disagree (5)	Mean	STD
B 1	To what extent does the county government strategy, applied recruiting human resource?	0	6	32	54	8		3.64	.716
B 2	County government strategies are used to tap potential from the county personnel in order to realize intended outcomes.	0	1.5	25	65.5	8		3.8	.593
B 3	To what extent does the County Government develop processes through implementing plans to support change?	0	1	20.5	68	10.5		3.88	.581
B 4	Given the opportunity, to what extent has leaders in your County Government strategically allocated resources to the stakeholders?	10.5	22	46.5	12	9		2.87	1.053
B 5	To what extent does the vision of the County Government directly influence the development of strategic planning process with allocated resources?	15.5	26.5	37.5	14.5	6		2.69	1.086
B 6	To what extent, in your County Government scenario, has planning been used to generate various imagined outcomes, based on allocated resources?	13	30.5	37.5	12	7		2.695	1.067
B 7	To what extent does leaders in your County Government develop specific action plans guided by well established procedures on allocating resources strategically?	3	15	31.5	32.5	18		3.475	1.046
Aggregate value for County Government's Resources Allocation Practices								<u>3.29</u>	<u>.366</u>

Source: Researcher (2021)

On whether County government strategies are used to tap potential from the county personnel in order to realize intended outcomes, majority (65.5%) of the respondents indicated that County government strategies are used to tap potential from the county personnel in order to realize intended outcomes to a large extent. It followed that 25% of the participants indicated that County government strategies are used to tap potential from the county personnel in order to realize intended outcomes to a moderate extent. Then 8% and 1.5% of the participants showed that County government strategies are used to tap potential from the county personnel in order to realize intended outcome to a very large extent and to a small extent respectively. The mean of 3.8 and standard deviation of 0.593 imply that respondents generally were of the opinion that County government strategies are used to tap potential from the county personnel in order to realize intended outcomes to a large extent.

In addition, on whether County Government developed processes through implementing plans to support change, majority (68%) of the respondents indicated that County Government developed processes through implementing plans to support change to a large extent. 20.5% of the participants showed that County Government developed processes through implementing plans to support change to a moderate extent. 10% and 1% of the participants indicated that County Government developed processes through implementing plans to support change to a very large extent and to a small extent respectively. The mean of 3.88 and reflected standard deviation of 0.581 imply that, respondents generally were of the opinion that the County Government had developed processes through implementing plans to support change to a large extent.

Further, on whether leaders, given the opportunity in the County Government, would strategically allocate resources to the stakeholders, 46.5% of the respondents showed that leaders, given the opportunity in the County Government, would strategically allocate resources to the stakeholders to a moderate extent. 22% of the participants indicated that leaders, given the opportunity in the County Government, would strategically allocate resources to the stakeholders to a small extent. 12%, 10.5% and 9% of the participants indicated that leaders, given the opportunity in the County Government, would strategically allocate resources to the stakeholders to a large extent, to no extent and to a very large extent respectively. The mean of 2.87 and standard deviation of 0.053 imply that respondents generally were of the opinion that leaders, given the opportunity in the County Government, would strategically allocate resources to the stakeholders to a moderate extent.

The revealing of the study was in tandem with Bossert et al., (2016) that increased levels of funding were directly translating to increased service utilization and devolution aided and maintained an equitable allocation of health resources in different devolved units with different levels of income. In terms of the vision of the County Government and its effect on development of strategic planning processes, 37.5% of the participants indicated that the vision of the County Government directly influences the development of strategic planning process with allocated resources to a moderate extent. 26.5% of the participants indicated that the vision of the County Government directly influences the development of strategic planning process with the allocated resources that which are of a moderate extent. The mean of 2.69 and standard deviation of 1.086 imply that respondents generally were of the opinion that the vision of the County Government directly influences the development of strategic planning process with allocated resources to a moderate extent.

The above findings agreements being below average, converge with those of Moindi (2014) that counties face a lot of challenges during the mobilization and utilization of resource allocation strategies even when the resources are accessible to them. Furthermore, on whether County Government planning has been used to generate various imagined outcomes, based on allocated resources, 37.5% of the participants indicated that County Government planning scenario has been used to generate various imagined outcomes, based on allocated resources to a moderate extent. 30.5% of the respondents indicated that County Government planning scenario has been used purposely to generate various imagined outcomes, based on practice of resources allocated within a small extent. 13%, 12% and 7% of the respondents indicated that the County Government planning scenario has been used to generate various imagined outcomes, which are based on allocated resources to no extent, to a large extent and to a very large extent respectively.

These results are contrary to those of Ngigi and Busolo (2019) who found that the chief inhibitor towards institutionalization of devolved governance strategy by county governments in Kenya was inadequate resource allocation. On the whether the leaders in County Governments have developed specific action plans guided by well established procedures on allocating resources strategically, 32.5% of the respondents indicated that the leaders in County Governments have developed specific action plans guided by well established procedures on allocating resources strategically to a large extent. 31.5% of the participants indicated that the leaders in County Governments have developed specific action plans guided by well established procedures on allocating resources strategically to a moderate extent. 18%, 15% and 3% of the respondents indicated that the leaders in County Governments have developed specific action plans guided by well established procedures on allocating resources strategically to a very large extent, to a small extent and to no extent respectively.

The mean of 3.475 and standard deviation of 1.46 imply that respondents generally were of the opinion that the leaders in County Governments have developed specific action plans guided by well established procedures on allocating resources strategically to a moderate extent. Overly, the respondents from Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties were of the opinion that resource allocation practices, to a moderate extent has been exercise in both Counties, as indicated by the mean of 3.29 and standard deviation of 0.366 from the computed aggregate value for County Government's Resources Allocation Practices in the table above.

4.1.3 Devolved Administrative Structures

In assessing devolved administrative structures, respondents were required to show the extent to which they agree with the postulated statements on devolved administrative structures in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties has been.

Table 3: Devolved administrative structures

Devolved Administrative Structures	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Mean	STD
G There are acceptable levels of administrative structures in your County government.	32.5	50.5	13	4	0	1.89	.778

G The devolved administrative 2 structures in your County government have been responsive to public concerns and complaints	10.5	20.5	8.5	43	17.5	3.37	1.277
G Do strategic leadership 4 influence administrative initiatives in your County?	7.5	15.5	10	43	24	3.61	1.219
G The Administrative structures 5 in the County has contributed to the achievement of the desired goals of Leadership.	17	21	45	17	0	2.62	.959
G Devolved administrative 6 structures have successfully been operationalized in your County in the last 8 years.	15.5	28	47.5	9	0	2.50	.862
G Devolved administrative 7 structures performance is influenced by effective leadership.	23	75	2	0	0	1.79	.455
G Formulation of unique 8 strategies that foster performance of the devolved administrative structures is the preserve of the top leadership.	18.5	30	51.5	0	0	2.33	.771
G The devolved administrative 9 structures in your County government have been efficient in the delivery of County services	9	16	45.5	26	3.5	2.99	.962
G The leadership implements 1 administrative structures in 0 line with the legal processes and procedures.	9	13.5	46.5	23.5	7.5	3.07	1.015
G The devolved administrative 1 structures in your County 1 government have been effective in the delivery of County services	7	35	27	23.5	7.5	2.9	1.077
<u>Aggregate Value for Devolved Administrative Structures</u>						<u>2.71</u>	<u>.310</u>

Source: Researcher (2021)

As indicated in table 3, more than half (50.5%) of the participants agree that there are acceptable levels of Administrative Structures in your County Government. 32.5% of the respondents were strongly agreeing that are acceptable levels of Administrative Structures in your County Government. 13% of the respondents were neutral that there are acceptable levels of

Administrative Structures in your County Government. 4% disagreed that there are acceptable levels of Administrative Structures in your County Government. The mean of 1.89 and standard deviation of 0.778 imply that respondents generally were agreeing that there are acceptable levels of Administrative Structures in your County Government. These findings support the arguments by Glaser (2017) that the success of devolution hinges on proper developed and implemented structures, policies of institutional nature, structures of administration and strategies spurring, encouraging, and enlisting local community into active participation.

On whether the devolved administrative structures in the County government have been responsive to public concerns and complaints, a substantial proportion (43%) of the respondents disagreed that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been responsive to public concerns and complaints. Also, 17.5% of the respondents were strongly disagreeing that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been responsive to public concerns and complaints. 20.5% of the respondents were agreeing that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been responsive to public concerns and complaints. Further, 10.5% of the respondents were strongly agreeing that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been responsive to public concerns and complaints. However, 8.5% of the respondents were neutral that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been responsive to public concerns and complaints. The mean of 3.37 and standard deviation of 1.277 imply that respondents generally were neutral that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been responsive to public concerns and complaints.

In terms of the devolved administrative structures' contribution to the achievement of most desired objectives of the Leadership, with proportionate size (45%) of the respondents were neutral that administrative structures in the County has contributed to the achievement of desired objectives of every emerging Leadership. 21% of the respondents agreed that the devolved administrative structures in the County has made contribution to the achievement of the desired goals. In addition, 17% of the respondents were strongly agreeing that devolved administrative structures in the County has contributed to the achievement of the desired objectives of Leadership. However, 17% of the respondents were in disagreement that devolved administrative structures in the County Governments has made contributions to the achievement of the desired objectives of Leadership. The mean of 2.62 and standard deviation of 0.959 implies that the respondents were neutral in general and that the devolved administrative structures in the County has made contributions to the realization of the desired achievements and objectives of Leadership.

The findings are in line with the revelations that devolved administrative structures are paramount in establishing small segments that enhance fair political competition whereby the minorities who were previously aggrieved are handed an opportunity to control local government hence bringing about stability in the political environment and scaling down any chances of power abuse through the transfer of considerable number of functions from the central government to the grass root (Faguet, 2017). Further, on devolved administrative structures success in the last 8 years, a substantial proportion (47.5%) of the respondents were neutral that devolved administrative structures have successfully been operationalized in the County in the last 8 years. 28% of the respondents were agreeing that devolved administrative structures have successfully been operationalized in the County in the last 8 years.

In addition, 15.5% of the respondents strongly agreed that devolved administrative structures have successfully been operationalized in the County in the last 8 years. In contrast, 9% of the respondents were disagreeing that devolved administrative structures have successfully been operationalized in the County in the last 8 years. The mean of 2.50 and standard deviation of 0.862 imply that respondents generally were neutral that devolved administrative structures have successfully been operationalized in the County in the last 8 years. These findings march the evidence from the commonwealth of independent states that participation mobilization, development of human resources and, legislative framework and process were behind the success of devolution in those jurisdictions (Florian & Becirevic, 2014). Furthermore, majority (75%) of the respondents were agreeing that devolved administrative structures' performance is influenced by effective leadership. 23% of the respondents were strongly agreeing that devolved administrative structures' performance is influenced by effective leadership. However, only 2% of the respondents were neutral that devolved administrative structures' performance is influenced by effective leadership. The mean of 1.79 and standard deviation of 0.455 imply that respondents generally were agreeing that devolved administrative structures' performance is influenced by effective leadership. The findings above prove right arguments of Hitt, Ireland and Hoskisson (2016) that concepts of strategic leadership among them; maintaining flexibility, envisioning, thinking strategically, anticipating and encouraging employees to be innovative result to organizational transformation that positively impact organization performance. More than half (51.5%) of the respondents were neutral that formulation of unique strategies that foster performance of the devolved administrative structures is the preserve of the top leadership. 30% of the respondents were agreeing that formulation of unique strategies that foster performance of the devolved administrative structures is the preserve of the top leadership. Further, 18.5% of the respondents strongly agreed that formulation of unique strategies that foster performance of the devolved administrative structures is the preserve of the top leadership.

However, none of the respondents were disagreeing that formulation of unique strategies that foster performance of the devolved administrative structures is the preserve of the top leadership. The mean of 2.33 and standard deviation of 0.771 imply that respondents generally were agreeing that formulation of unique strategies that foster performance of the devolved administrative structures is the preserve of the top leadership. Furthermore, 45.5% of the respondents were neutral that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been efficient in the delivery of County services. 26% of the respondents were disagreeing that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been efficient in the delivery of County services.

Further, 16% of the respondents agreed that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been efficient in the delivery of County services. Also, 9% of the respondents strongly agreed that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been efficient in the delivery of County services. However, 26% of the respondents were disagreeing that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been efficient in the delivery of County services. Also, 3.5% of the respondents were strongly disagreeing that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been efficient in the delivery of County services. The mean of 2.99 and standard deviation of 0.962 imply that respondents generally were neutral that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been efficient in the delivery of County services.

On leadership implementations, administrative structures, legal processes and procedures, 45.5% of the respondents were neutral that leadership implements administrative structures in line with the legal processes and procedures. 23.5% of the respondents were disagreeing that leadership implements administrative structures in line with the legal processes and procedures. Further, 7.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed that leadership implements administrative structures in line with the legal processes and procedures. Contrastingly, 13.5% of the respondents agreed that leadership implements administrative structures in line with the legal processes and procedures. Further, 9% of the respondents were strongly agreeing that leadership implements administrative structures in line with the legal processes and procedures. The mean of 3.07 and standard deviation of 1.015 imply that respondents generally were neutral that leadership implements administrative structures in line with the legal processes and procedures.

Lastly, on the question of devolved structures' effectiveness in delivery of County service, a substantial proportion (35%) of the respondents were agreeing that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been effective in the delivery of County services. 27% of the respondents were neutral on whether devolved administrative structures in the County government have been effective in the delivery of County services or not. However, 23.5% of the respondents were disagreeing that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been effective in the delivery of County services. Also, 7.5% of the respondents were strongly disagreeing that devolved administrative structures in the County government have been effective in the delivery of County services. Thus, the respondents from Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties were neutral on the Legal factors, as exercised in both Counties, as indicated by the mean of 2.71 and standard deviation of 0.31 from the computed aggregate value for devolved administrative structures in the table above.

4.2 Inferential Analysis

4.2.1 Effect of Resource Allocation on Devolved Administrative Practices

The study computed composite indices for resources allocation practices and Devolved Administrative structures in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties. Then, the coefficient of determinants (R^2) was generated to describe the proportion of variation in Devolved Administrative Practices that has been accounted for by resources allocation practices, which was the regressor. The regression model summary, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and model coefficients' outputs generated.

Table 4: Model summary for strategic leadership practices on devolved administrative practices

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.118 ^a	.014	.009	.3085366

a. Predictors: (Constant), Aggregate value for Resource allocation practices

Source: Research data (2021)

From the model summary in table 4, the coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .014$) indicates that 1.4 percent of the variation in Devolved Administrative Practices in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties was accounted for by resources allocation practices. This shows that resource allocation practices accounted for a significant variation in Devolved Administrative Practices

in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties. In terms of the overall significance of the regression equation, table 5 presents the F _ statistic and P _value used to test the null hypothesis.

Table 5: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Model			df	Mean Square	F-Statistics	Sig.
		<u>Sum of Squares</u>				
1	Regression	.266	1	.266	6.799	.006 ^b
	<u>Residual</u>	<u>7.746</u>	198	.039		
Total		8.012	199			

a. Dependent Variable: Aggregate value for performance of devolved administrative structures

b. Predictors: (Constant), Aggregate value for Resource allocation practices

Source: Research data (2021)

From table 5, the *F-statistic* was 6.799 and the associated *P_value* = 0.006. Since the calculated *P-value* was less than $\alpha = 0.05$, there is evidence against the null hypothesis, that there is no significant statistical effect of resource allocation practices on the Devolved Administrative Practices in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties. As such, the rejection of the null hypothesis implies that resource allocation practices had a significant effect on Devolved Administrative Practices in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties. The eventual regression model was generated from model coefficients output in table 6.

Table 6: Regression results for resource allocation practices (model of coefficients)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t-statistics		Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta				
	(Constant)	2.376	.198			11.996		.000
1	Aggregate value for Resource allocation practices	.677	.060	.618	11.283	.006		

a. Dependent Variable: Aggregate Value for Devolved Administrative Structures

Source: Research data (2021)

From table 6, the regression equation is as presented as shown;

$$Y = 2.376 + 0.677Ra \dots \dots \dots \text{equation 2}$$

Where;

Y - Represents Devolved Administrative Practices in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties.
Ra – Represents Resource Allocation Practices.

Resource allocation practices were significantly affecting the Devolved Administrative structures in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties at $P_{value} = 0.005 < 0.05$). Further, a $\beta = .667$ means that a 1% improvement in resource allocation practices leads to a 66.7% increase in the Devolved Administrative structures in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties. Overly, the results provide evidence that resource allocation practices had a significant effect on Devolved Administrative structures in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties, hence supports the rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0).

4.3 Qualitative Analysis

In addition to the study issuing questionnaires to respondents who were randomly sampled, the study also administered interview to the respondents who were purposively sampled and they included top leadership; the Governor's, Deputy Governors, Speakers of County Assembly and Clerks of County Assembly. Their responses were captured and presented in the active voice (verbatim) as presented below.

Table 7: Qualitative data analysis

Themes adopted	Narrative description
Strategic Leadership	State of strategic leadership in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties has been progressive although self interests kept coming up and hindered the positive progress on County development, it has enhanced service delivery through the devolved units by reaching more people at the grassroots hence meeting them at their point of need.
Resource Allocation and Devolved Administrative Structures	With the responses given, the respondents were asked to affirm whether practice of resource allocation enhanced the devolved administrative structures of the county. All affirmed that practice of resource allocation indeed enhanced the devolved administrative structures of the counties of Taita Taveta and Makueni.

4.3.1 Resource Allocation and Devolved Administrative Structures in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties

With the responses given above, the respondents were asked to affirm whether practice of resource allocation enhanced the devolved administrative structures of the county. All (100%) affirm that practice of resource allocation indeed enhanced the devolved administrative structures of the counties of Taita Taveta and Makueni. In addition, 80% of the respondents affirmed that the practice of public accountability had enhanced devolved administrative structures of the counties. While 20% did not affirmed that the practice of public accountability had enhanced devolved administrative structures of the counties. Contrastingly, all (100%) the respondents indicated that the County government had not been timely in responding to the public and stakeholders' concerns and complaints.

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of Findings

The study aimed at examining the effect of resource allocation practices and devolved administrative structures in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties, Kenya. The findings from correlation analysis shows that resource allocation practices were positively correlated to devolved administrative structures in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties. On the effects of resources allocation on performance of devolved administrative structures in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties, the decision was that, the null hypothesis be rejected. As such, there was a significant effects of the resource allocation practices on the devolved administrative structures in both Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties.

From the qualitative analysis, strategic leadership has enhanced service delivery though the devolved units by reaching more people at the grassroots and meeting them at their point of need. Nevertheless, politicized resource allocation, especially to the regions that supported the current county government, and a lack of skills in strategic leadership i.e., barrier to highquality training were the stumbling blocks to the practice of strategic leadership in their respective counties (Taita Taveta and Makueni) on devolved administrative structures operations. The citizens are able to access services from the county government though the overlap from the national government, untimely dispersal of county funds and underfunding causes conflict.

5.2 Conclusion

Research concludes that resource allocation practices had a significant impact on devolved administrative structures in Taita Taveta and Makueni Counties. From the qualitative analysis, Strategic leadership practices have enhanced service delivery though the devolved units by reaching more people at the grassroots and meeting them at their point of need. The citizens are able to access services from the county government though the overlap from the national government, untimely dispersal of county funds and underfunding causes conflict.

5.3 Recommendations for Policy Implication

The findings found that, rise in strategic leadership practices leads to enhanced operationalization of devolved administrative structures. Henceforth, strategic leaders should set up structures that care for executional inventiveness and guarantee that responsibilities to be executed should as well be connected to the policies, additionally ensuring information movement should be done continuously and efficiently. On strategic leadership practices, which stood to be significant in operationalization of devolved administrative structures, County Government top Leadership must distinguish and recompenses improvement of operationalization of devolved administrative structures. The administration and policy makers must consequently originate programmes which guarantee judicious and sensible consents that top leadership makes wherever probable experts and professionals in particular fields might need for delivery of service. In addition, administrators must have significant independence extended to them to determine how resources are allocated for purposes of actualizing the service delivery in devolved structures.

REFERENCES

- Alonso-Garbayo, A., Raven, J., Theobald, S., Ssengooba, F., Nattimba, M., & Martineau, T. (2017). Decision space for health workforce management in decentralized settings: *A case study in Uganda. Health Policy and Planning*.

- Anderson, B. R. (2016). Improving healthcare by embracing systems theory. *The Journal of thoracic and cardiovascular surgery*, 152(2), 593.
- Andersen, J. A. (2018). Servant leadership and transformational leadership: From comparisons to farewells. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.
- Asencio, H., & Mujkic, E. (2016). Leadership behaviours and trust in leaders: Evidence from the US federal government. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 156-179. Assessment of public sector of Malaysia. *Asian Journal of Scientific Research*, 8(2), 225
- Atienza, M. E. L. (2004). The politics of health devolution in the Philippines: Experiences of municipalities in a devolved set-up. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 25(48), 25–54.
- Bossert, T., Chitah, M. B., & Bowser, D. (2016). Decentralization in Zambia: Resource allocation and district performance. *Health Policy and Planning*, 18(4), 357–369.
- Bossert, T. J., Larrañaga, O., Giedion, U., Arbelaez, J. J., & Bowser, D. M. (2016). Decentralization and equity of resource allocation: Evidence from Colombia and Chile. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 81, 95–100.
<https://doi.org/10.1590/S0042-96862003000200005>
- Cattaneo, M. D., Jansson, M., & Newey, W. K. (2018). Inference in linear regression models with many covariates and heteroscedasticity. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523), 1350–1361.
- Cochran, W. A. G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques*, John Wiley & Sons Inc. New York, 135.
- Cannon, B. J., & Ali, J. H. (2018). Devolution in Kenya Four Years On: A Review of Implementation and Effects in Mandera County. *African Conflict and Peace building Review*, 8(1), 1-28.
- Chan, C. W. (2018). Leading today's kindergartens: Practices of strategic leadership in Hong Kong's early childhood education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(4), 679-691.
- Chigwata, T., de Visser, J., & Ayele, Z. (2021). Real or Imagined Local Autonomy: Experiences from Local Government in Ethiopia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. In *Beyond Autonomy* (pp. 189-216).
- Constitution of Kenya (2010), Republic of Kenya: Government Printer.
- Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2014). *Business Research Methods* (12th Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin
- County government Act (2012) Republic of Kenya: Government Printer.
- Danis, O., & Kilonzo, J. M. (2014). Resource allocation Planning: Impact on Public Sector Procurement Performance in Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(7), 1.
- Das, K. R., & Imon, A. (2016). A brief review of tests for normality. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 5–12.
- Eichelberger, H. S. (2017). Case Story of Transformational Teachers in an All-Girls School [PhD Thesis]. University of La Verne.

- Engert, S., & Baumgartner, R. J. (2016). Corporate sustainability strategy—bridging the gap between formulation and implementation. *Journal of cleaner production*, 113, 822-834.
- Faguet, J. P. (2017). Transformation from below in Bangladesh: Decentralization, local governance, and systemic change. *Modern Asian Studies*, 51(6), 1668-1694.
- Field, A. P. (2017). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*, North American Edition.
- Finkelstein, S., Hambrick, D. C., & Cannella, A. A. (2009). *Strategic leadership: Theory and research on executives, top management teams, and boards*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Fisher, M. J., & Marshall, A. P. (2009). Understanding descriptive statistics. *Australian Critical Care*, 22(2), 93-97.
- Florian, L., & Becirevic, M. (2014). Challenges for teachers' professional learning for inclusive education in Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States. *Prospects*, 41(3), 371.
- Forrer, J., Kee, J. E., Newcomer, K. E., & Boyer, E. (2010). Public-Private Partnerships and the Public Accountability Question. *Public Administration Review*, 70(3), 475–484. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02161.x>
- Gooden, S. T., & Berry-James, R. (2018). *Why Research Methods Matter*. Melvin & Leigh, Publishers.
- Hair, J.F., Jr., R.E., Anderson, R.L.T. & Black, W.C. (2010). *Multivariate data Analysis*.
- Harrison, J. S., Hall Jr, E. H., & Nargundkar, R. (2017). Resource allocation as an outcropping of strategic consistency: Performance implications. *Academy of Management Journal*.
- Hitt, M. A., Carnes, C. M., & Xu, K. (2016). A current view of resource-based theory in operations management: A response to Bromiley and Rau. *Journal of Operations Management*, 41(10), 107-109.
- Hu, J., Erdogan, B., Jiang, K., Bauer, T. N., & Liu, S. (2018). Leader humility and team creativity: The role of team information sharing, psychological safety, and power distance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(3), 313.
- Ibietan, J. (2017). Corruption and public accountability in the Nigerian public sector: Interrogating the omission. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(15), 41–48.
- Jaleha, A. A., & Machuki, V. N. (2018). Strategic leadership and organizational performance: A critical review of literature. *European Scientific Journal*, 14(35), 124–149.
- Jooste, K., & Hamani, M. (2017). The motivational needs of primary health care nurses to acquire power as leaders in a mine clinic setting. *Health SA Gesondheid*, 22, 43-51.
- Juma, M. O. (2018). *Analysis of pragmatic strategies for improving chemistry performance in secondary schools in Migori County, Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Juma, T. O., Rotich, J. K., & Mulongo, L. S. (2014). Devolution and governance conflicts in Africa: Kenyan scenario. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 4(6), 1-10.

- Jumanne, A. S & Njoroge, J.G., (2018), Leadership Change Management and Employee Performance in the Parliamentary Service Commission of Kenya, American Journal of Leadership and Governance, ISSN 2519-0857 (online), Vol.3, Issue 1 No.3, pp 62 - 77, 2018.
- Kahiga, M. (2017). Influence of Strategic Leadership Practices on Competitive Advantage of National Bank of Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Kangu, J. M. (2015). Constitutional law of Kenya on devolution (p. 24). Strathmore University Press.
- Kaushik, V., & Walsh, C. A. (2019). Pragmatism as a research paradigm and its implications for social work research. *Social Sciences*, 8(9), 255.
- Khaunya, M. F., Wawire, B.P., & Chepng'eno, (2015), Devolved Governance in Kenya, "Is it a False Start in Democratic Decentralization for Development?" *International Journal of Economics, Finance, and Management*, 4(1), 1-20
- Kimathi, L. (2017). Challenges of the devolved health sector in Kenya: teething problems or systemic contradictions? *Africa Development*, 42(1), 55-77.
- Kobusingye, B. E. R. N. A. D. E. T. T. E., Mungatu, J. K., & Mulyungi, P. (2017). Influence of stakeholder's involvement on project outcomes. A case of water, sanitation, and hygiene (wash) project in Rwanda. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 6(6), 195-206.
- Kothari, S. K. (2009). *Research Methodology*, New Delhi: New Age International Publishers
- MacKinnon, D. P., & Pirlott, A. G. (2015). Statistical approaches for enhancing causal interpretation of the M to Y relation in mediation analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 19(1), 30-43.
- Kim, H., & Lee, T. H. (2018). Strategic CSR communication: A moderating role of transparency in trust building. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 12(2), 107–124.
- Lammers, J. C., & Garcia, M. A. (2017). Institutional theory approaches. *The International Encyclopedia of Organizational Communication*, 1–10.
- Manzoor, F., Wei, L., Nurunnabi, M., Subhan, Q. A., Shah, S. I. A., & Fallatah, S. (2019). The impact of transformational leadership on job performance and CSR as mediator in SMEs. *Sustainability*, 11(2), 436.
- Masungu, T. W., Marangu, W. N., Obunga, C. A., & Lilungu, D. (2015). Effect of strategic leadership on the performance of devolved government system in Kakamega County, Kenya. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(13), 327-338.
- Mberi, T., Sevilla, J., Olukuru, J., Mutegi, L., & Weru, T. (2017, May). Challenges to the successful implementation of e-governance systems in Africa: A case of Taita Taveta County, Kenya. In *2017 IST-Africa Week Conference (IST-Africa)* (pp. 1-8). IEEE.
- Minja, D. M. (2017). Rethinking ethical leadership in Kenya: Adopting a new paradigm. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*, 10(1), 5.

- Moindi, J. M. (2014). Resource allocation strategies in devolved system of governance in selected counties in Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Morgan, D. L. (2014). Pragmatism as a paradigm for social research. *Qualitative inquiry*, 20(8), 1045-1053.
- Mule, J. (2015) Advocacy & Legal Advisory Centre: Retrieved from. <http://www.kenya.org>
- Muli, J. N. (2014). The challenges of implementation of devolution strategy at the Nairobi City County Government in Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Munzhedzi, P. (2017). The Role of Separation of Powers in Ensuring Public Accountability in South Africa: Policy Versus Practice. 7.
- Muriithi, S. M., Louw, L., & Radloff, S. E. (2018). The relationship between strategic thinking and leadership effectiveness in Kenyan indigenous banks. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 21(1), 1-11.
- Mutungi, M. M., Njoroge, G. G., & Minja, D. (2019). Moderating effect of Organizational Culture on the factors affecting Transformation of the Kenya Police Service.
- Ndunge, W. E. (2014). Strategic leadership and change management practices at the Kenya wildlife service (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Ngcobo-Mthembu, N. (2017). The relationship between transformational leadership, power and the social identity of employees [PhD Thesis]. University of Pretoria.
- Ngigi, S., & Busolo, D. N. (2019). Devolution in Kenya: the good, the bad and the ugly. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 9(6), 9-21.
- Njeru, B. (2019). An assessment of elements influencing implementation of universal health coverage among counties in Kenya: A case of Makueni County (Doctoral dissertation, St Paul's University).
- Njoroge, J. G., Muathe, S. M., & Bula, H. (2015). Organizational resources and performance of mobile phone companies in Kenya. Published PhD Thesis.
- Nyangau, J. O. (2014). Public engagement and the success of strategy implementation at the ministry of devolution and planning in Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Obiga, S.D. (2014). Challenges of Implementation of Strategic Plans at the Nairobi County Government. MBA Unpublished Project, University of Nairobi
- Obong'o, I. O. (2017). Influence of public procurement process on completion of road construction projects in Kenya: a case of Nairobi County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Ofori, D., & Atiogbe, E. (2014). Strategic Planning in Public Universities: A Developing Country Perspective. *Journal of Management and strategy*, 3(1), 67.
- Ogaja, C. K., & Kimiti, G. K. (2016). Influence of strategic leadership on implementation of tactical decisions in public universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 5(1), 681-689.
- Ogechi, R. N. (2016). The effect of strategic leadership on the performance of small and medium enterprises in Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Opano, J.O., Shisia, A., Sang, w., & Josee, V.M. (2015) Strategic Planning and

- Implementation Practices at the Kisii County Government in Kenya: *International Journal of Economics commerce, and Management*, 111, 5-12.
- Orabi, T. G. A. (2016). The impact of transformational leadership style on organizational performance: Evidence from Jordan. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 6(2), 89-102.
- Otieno, T., (2015). Kenya best governor named in national poll, Retrieved from <http://www.nation.co.ke>.
- Özer, F., & Tinaztepe, C. (2014). Effect of strategic leadership styles on firm performance: A study in a Turkish SME. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150, 778-784.
- Rahi, S. (2017). Research design and methods: A systematic review of research paradigms, sampling issues and instruments development. *International Journal of Economics & Management Sciences*, 6(2), 1–5.
- Resnick, D. (2017). Democracy, decentralization, and district proliferation: The case of Ghana. *Political Geography*, 59, 47-60.
- Resnick, D., Siame, G., Mulambia, P., Ndhlovu, D., Shicilenge, B., & Sivasubramanian, B. (2019). Deepening decentralization in Zambia: Political economy constraints and opportunities for reform (Vol. 1893). *Intl Food Policy Res Inst*.
- Ribeiro, N., Yücel, İ., & Gomes, D. (2018). How transformational leadership predicts employees' affective commitment and performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*.
- Rigii, G. P., Ogutu, M., Awino, Z. B., & Kitiabi, R. (2019). Strategic Leadership and Service Delivery: Evidence from Devolved Governments in Kenya. *DBA Africa Management Review*, 9(3).
- Sadeghifar, J., Tofighi, S., Roshani, M., Toulideh, Z., Mohsenpour, S., & Jafari, M. (2017). An assessment of implementation and evaluation phases of strategic plans in Iranian hospitals. *SAGE Open Medicine*, 5, 2050312117736227.
- Saito, F. (2012). *Decentralization and development partnership: lessons from Uganda*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2016). *Research methods for business students (Seventh)*. Nueva York: Pearson Education.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research Methods for business: A skill Building Approach(5th Ed.)*. Haddington: John Wiley & Sons Publishers.
- Serfontein, R., Kruger, H., & Drevin, L. (2019). The impact of strategic leadership on the operational strategy and performance of business organisations in South Africa (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch).
- Sirili, N., Frumence, G., Kiwara, A., Mwangi, M., Anaeli, A., Nyamhanga, T., ... & Hurtig, A. K. (2018). Retention of medical doctors at the district level: a qualitative study of experiences from Tanzania. *BMC health services research*, 18(1), 260.
- Smoke, P. (2015). Rethinking decentralization: Assessing challenges to a popular public sector reform. *Public Administration and Development*, 35(2), 97-112.

- Sun, R., & Wang, W. (2017). Transformational leadership, employee turnover intention, and actual voluntary turnover in public organizations. *Public Management Review*, 19(8), 1124-1141.
- Thompson, C. G., Kim, R. S., Aloe, A. M., & Becker, B. J. (2017). Extracting the variance inflation factor and other multicollinearity diagnostics from typical regression results. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 39(2), 81-90.
- Tsofa, B., Goodman, C., Gilson, L., & Molyneux, S. (2017). Devolution and its effects on health workforce and commodities management—early implementation experiences in Kilifi County, Kenya. *International journal for equity in health*, 16(1), 169.
- Tykkyläinen, S. (2019). Why social enterprises pursue growth? Analysis of threats and opportunities. *Social Enterprise Journal*.
- Urban Areas and Cities (Amended Act. 2019), Republic of Kenya: Government Printer.
- Urban Areas and Cities Act. (2011), Republic of Kenya: Government Printer.
- van Gestel, R., & van Lochem, P. (2020). Private standards as a replacement for public lawmaking? In *The Role of the EU in Transnational Legal Ordering*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Wa Githinji, M., & Holmquist, F. (2016). Reform and political impunity in Kenya: transparency without accountability. *African Studies Review*, 53-74.
- Walliman, N. (2017). *Research methods: The basics*. Routledge.
- Wang, J., Zhang, Z., & Jia, M. (2017). Understanding how leader humility enhances employee creativity: The roles of perspective taking and cognitive reappraisal. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 53(1), 5-31.
- Warner, R. M. (2008). *Applied Statistics: From Bivariate through Multivariate Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wilson, D. J. (2019). The harmonic mean p-value for combining dependent tests. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(4), 1195-1200.
- Wooldridge, K. (2000). *data Analysis for linear regression*. 7th Ed. New Jersey. Prentice-Hall International. Inc.
- Yamane T. (1967). *Statistics, An Introductory Analysis*, 2nd Ed., New York: Harper and Row, pp 886.
- Zhang, D. (2017). A coefficient of determination for generalized linear models. *The American Statistician*, 71(4), 310–316.
- Zungura, M. (2014). Understanding New Public Management within the Context of Zimbabwe. *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 6(2), 246-253