

**APPLICATION OF ANSOFF'S PRODUCT/MARKET GROWTH STRATEGIES  
IN COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS IN KISUMU EAST DISTRICT,  
KENYA**

**BY**

**BENSON MBITHI MAWEU**

**A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL  
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,  
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI.**

**NOVEMBER, 2012**

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this project is my original work and has not been presented in its entirety in part at any other University for the award of a degree.

id' \* Ne\J£Mbev<sub>f</sub> 3012

Benson Mbithi Maweu

Date

D61/63473/2010

This research project has been submitted for examination with my approval as the university supervisor.



Dr. Vincent Machuki,

Lecturer

Department of Business Administration

School of Business

University of Nairobi

## **DEDICATION**

Dedicated to my beloved wife Ruth, lovely daughters Deborah and Darlene for their patience and support.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The successful completion of this research would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of others. I sincerely thank all who made a contribution to this study. In particular, I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following.

Dr. Vincent Machuki, my Supervisor, for the unique way in which he led this study. Without his constructive research guidance, immense insight, valuable input, and constant support and encouragement during the duration of this study, it would not have been such a rewarding experience. His passion inspires me. Secondly, The respondents for their voluntary participation. Finally, To my friends for their sincere interest and continuous emotional support throughout the period of study.

## **ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this study was to establish the extent to which CBOs in Kisumu East District apply Ansoff's Product Market Growth Strategy. In this context the study examined the four Ansoff's growth Strategies namely: Market Penetration, Market Development, Product Development and Diversification Strategies. The study was descriptive in nature. The population of interest consisted of Community Based Organizations in Kisumu East District which numbered 223 CBOs. Given the large number of CBOs, a sample size was targeted and random sampling conducted. Primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire administered to the respondents through drop and pick later method. Out of a targeted sample of 69 CBOs, 59 of them responded giving 85% response rate while data was analyzed using mean scores, standard deviation and t-tests. Findings showed that CBOs apply all the four growth strategies with market penetration being the most widely applied. The respondents stated relevance in services/products offering as the most influencing factor to their strategic choice while attracting donor funding remained the least. On views on how to improve on the capacities and growth of local CBOs, majority respondents expressed improved funding, improved community mobilization and improved method of service/products delivery as most applicable. Study findings present market penetration strategy as the most preferred through free added services. This is an indication of what heads of CBOs should pursue in order to achieve their organizational growth. Pursuit of Relevance in service offerings and competition are leading factors influencing choice of strategy. While the study served to fill a knowledge gap, it has well opened more areas like exploring levels of competition within CBOs by scholars. The fact that there is growth in CBOs should inform the Government and other nongovernmental organizations that CBOs have a role to play in achieving millennium goals. Thus, handling of CBOs operational limitations like lack secure and permanent facilities are crucial dimensions for their growth.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DECLARATION.....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>DEDICATION.....»</b>	
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.1.1 Ansoff's Product/Market Growth Strategy.....	3
1.1.2 Community Based Organizations in Kenya.....	3
1.1.3 Community Based Organizations in Kisumu East District.....	5
1.2 Research Problem.....	6
1.3 Research Objective.....	7
1.4 Value of the Study.....	8
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Introduction.....	10
2.2 The Concept of Strategy.....	10
2.3 Strategy Choice.....	11
2.4 Models for Strategy Choice.....	14
2.5 Ansoff Product/Market growth Strategy.....	16

<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	21
3.2 Research Design _____	21
3.3 Population of the Study_____	21
3.4 Sampling.....	22
3.5 Data Collection .....	23
3.6 Data Analysis.....	23
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS , FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS</b>	<b>24</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	24
4.2 Organizational Demographics.....	24
4.3 Organizations Growth Strategies Choices_____	26
4.4 Factors Influencing Strategic Growth Choice_____	31
4.5 Discussion.....	32
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION.....</b>	<b>34</b>
5.1 Introduction.....	34
<b>5.2 Summary of findings.....</b>	<b>34</b>
5.3 Conclusion_____	36
5.4 Recommendations.....	37
5.5 Limitations of the study. ....	38
5.6 Suggestions for further research.....	39

<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>48</b>
Appendix i: Letter of Introduction.....	48
Appendix ii: Questionnaire.....	49
Appendix iii: List of CBOs in Kisumu East District.....	53



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1a: Organization Demographics	
Table 1b: Description of Organizational Products and Services__	
Table 2: Application of lower prices and free added services offerings within CBOs.	
Table 3: Application of converting non-users to users and extending to new regions by the CBOs.....	28
Table 4: Application of new versions, improved procedures and bundled services by CBOs.	
Table 5: Application of offering related and unrelated products/services on CBOs	
Table 6: Factors influencing Strategic Growth Choice__	

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>BCG:</b>	Boston Consulting Group
<b>CBOs:</b>	Community Based Organizations
<b>GE:</b>	General Electric
<b>ICT:</b>	Internet Communication Technology
<b>IGA:</b>	Income Generation Activity
<b>MDG:</b>	Millennium Development Goals
<b>SBU:</b>	Strategic Business Unit
<b>SME:</b>	Small Medium Enterprises

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

All organizations are environmentally sensitive. Strategic management is about firms internal focus which includes its strategic position, resources and skills and external focus involving environmental opportunities and threats (Pearce and Robinson, 1984). The need for strategic management arises from the assumption that sound strategic thinking can explain a good deal of success (Mintzberg, 1987). Mintzberg further says the objective of having a strategy as to achieve more in less and that strategy tells how to get them more effectively. Rumelt (1979) notes that the primary function of strategy is to provide a consistent set of objectives and policies that restructure an ambiguous reality into a set of organizationally solvable problems. The goal of strategy is to achieve a superior long-term return on investment. In contrast, the essence of strategy is choosing a unique and valuable position rooted in systems of activities that are much more difficult to match.

The concept of strategy can be described out of contributions of a number of scholars. While Drucker (1954), Reilly (1955) and Kline (1955) are among the earliest authors to apply the term "strategy" to the idea of comprehensive business plan, with Drucker (1954) relating an organization without clear objectives as a ship without a rudder, the first well articulated descriptions of strategy as a mechanism of adapting an organization to its environment were those of Selznick (1957), Chandler (1962), Tilles (1963), Learned et al. (1965) and Ansoff (1965). Chandler (1962) recognized the importance of coordinating various aspects of management to give company structure and direction. Ansoff (1965) built on Chandlers work by adding a range

of strategic concepts to systematically prepare a firm for future opportunities and challenges. Contemporary studies are in agreement with the earlier ones where Pearce and Robinson (1986) strategy upholds strategy as activities identifying firms strategic position, its relevant opportunities and threats, its important resources and skills and strategic issues it must address. Johnson and Scholes (1989) confirms Pearce and Robinson (1986) argument on strategy as the direction and scope of an organization over the long term which achieves advantage for the organization through its configuration of resources within challenging environment, to meet the needs of markets and to fulfill stakeholders' expectations. Porter (2001) sums up strategy as deliberately choosing a set of activities to deliver a unique mix of value.

The choice of strategy is determined by the level at which decisions are made, size and nature of the organization. Multi business organization's choice of strategy is different from single business organization choice. Corporate level decisions are about the entire organizational direction while business decisions focus on organizational business competitiveness. Corporate level strategies include BCG growth model whose main approach is analysis of organizations' business units or product lines in terms of relative market share and market growth rate (Pearce and Robinson, 1997). GE/Mckinsey model, is an improvement of BCG matrix model through the use of nine cells to address business unit strength and industry attractiveness. Business level strategies include Porter's generic strategies which focus on how a firm can establish competitive advantage. The model further shows how an organization competes in a specific business or industry through low cost, differentiation and focus (Porter, 1980, 1985, 2001). Ansoff product/market growth model, a business level strategy seeks to discover growth opportunities and modifying the core offering (Ansoff, 1965, 1987). It is therefore clear that single business

organization will opt for a business level strategy either Porter's generic strategies (Porter, 2001) or Ansoff's product market growths strategy (Ansoff, 1987). Porter's generic strategies (Porter, 2001) emphasis is on competitive advantage while Ansoff product market growth model establishes growth options making it an ideal strategic choice for a single business organization.

Community based organizations are non-profits within a single local community (Odindo, 2009). CBOs in Kenya are constituted under Social Service Department, Ministry of Gender, Children and Social development. Wide ranging issues have been associated with CBOs geared to develop communities they are located. Kisumu East is a District that forms a host for CBOs according to Kisumu East Annual District Report (2010). Kisumu East CBOs therefore forms a potential area of study.

### **1.1.1 Ansoffs Product/Market Growth Strategy**

Ansoff (1965) explained the concept of strategy as the common thread among the organizations' activities and product markets that defines the essential nature of business that the organization was or planned to be in future. The definition stressed on the commonality of approach that exists in diverse organizational behavior. Organizations and businesses are built around products and services that define their value offerings. Ansoffs product/market grid explores two key dimensions, the product and the market while combinations of these two dimensions result in four growth strategies. These include market penetration, market development, product development and diversification strategies.

Market penetration strategy seeks to achieve growth with existing products in their current market segments, aiming to increase its market share. Markets development seeks growth of a firm by targeting its existing products to new market segments. Product development develops new products targeted to its existing market segments and in diversification the firm grows by diversifying into new businesses by developing new products for new markets (Ansoff, 1987).

### **1.1.2 Community Based Organizations in Kenya**

A CBO has been defined by Mulwa and Mala (2000) as an organizational entity made up of people whose membership is defined by a specific common bond and who voluntarily come together to work for a common goal. Community-Based Organizations are further described by Odindo (2009) as civil society non-profit groups that operate within a single local community to tackle issues that are pertinent to that community. In Kenya CBOs are subset of Non Governmental organizations falling under the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social development while the National Council of Community-based Organizations is the umbrella body of CBOs that are formed or constituted under the Social Service Department.

National Council of Community-based Organizations has a membership of over 15,000 community-groups spread across 59 constituencies in Kenya according to the ministry's website ([www.gender.go.ke](http://www.gender.go.ke)). Information sourced from the same website shows that the main objective of the national council of community based organizations is to build the capacity of grassroots organizations to enable them to become focus-based development units that are effectively implementing grassroots aspirations for self-reliance, social-economic development and poverty reduction mechanisms in line with vision 2030 and the MDGs ([www.vision2030.go.ke](http://www.vision2030.go.ke)).

In Kenya studies on community-based organizations have been done to examine a wide range of issues including the role CBOs involving women participation in development as a strategy for poverty eradication in Kenya (Mutongu, 1998). Other studies have pointed out on the role of community based organizations in household ability on health care in Kilifi district, Kenya (Moluneux et. al, 1997). Adoption of sustainable growth strategies to strengthen CBOs in Kenya, improve upon their service delivery standards and place them in a position to tap available opportunities to develop the communities they are located in becomes inevitable. CBOs fight for development of their services and delivery guarantees the superior offers to succeed in winning over the communities.

### **1.1.3 Community Based Organizations in Kisumu East District**

Kisumu East district is a home of a wide range of CBOs with around 223 registered CBOs by January 2012 according to the district officer incharge of gender and social services. Broadly, CBO's in Kisumu East can be divided into welfare groups, whose interest is to improve the standard of living of their members, and Income Generation Activity (IGA) groups whose main agenda is to engage in some form of economic enterprise for the purpose of wealth creation for their members (Kisumu East Annual District Report, 2010). A previous study has majored on CBOs capacity building initiative and barriers affecting access to global funds in Kisumu Nyanza (Odindo, 2009).

A large number of Kisumu East District CBOs are engaged in enterprise activity while others have been set up to implement programs in health, agriculture, environmental conservation at

community level. Their activities range from social-economic empowerment, childcare and safe parenthood, youth and women empowerment, vulnerable and persons with disability projects, Orphans and widows support programs, environmental conservation, sanitation and pollution control projects, better health care and solutions, welfare and compassionate initiatives, family support and peace advocacy support groups, fight against crime programs, agricultural and Juakali sectors support activities(Kisumu East Annual District Report, 2010).

A view of CBOs in Kisumu East District shows elements of competition in their service offerings in order to prove their relevance and survival. The need to access donor funds has played a key on the CBOs in trying to outdo each other especially in cases where there is similarity of service offerings. As Odindo (2009) found out in his studies on barriers affecting CBOs access to global funds. Therefore with reasons ranging from competition, need for relevance and survival it is imperative the CBOs in Kisumu East District will find need to adopt a strategy.

## **1.2 Research Problem**

The strategy choice is determined majorly by the level at which decisions are made. Strategy choices are principally done at the corporate and business levels. Strategy choice has been used to describe the process of setting key product-market aims of the organization, and allocating priorities between functional and operating units (Cole, 1997). The ultimate purpose of such activities is the optimum fulfillment of the organization objectives. A key aspect of corporate level choice of strategy is to set overall direction of the organization and spell out the extent, pace or timing of growth (Markides, 1997). Corporate level choice of strategy which includes



adoption of BCG or GE/Mckinsey growth strategy models has been found crucial for multi business organizations. Business level choice of strategy has attempted to create value offering while maintaining cost effectiveness for single business organizations. Business level strategies have been achieved through such strategy models as Porter's generic (Porter, 2001) or Ansoff (Ansoff, 1987) product-market growth strategies. While Porter's generic strategies (Porter, 2001) have been found to pursue the competitive dimension, Ansoff product-market growth strategies (Ansoff, 1987) have explored the growth dimension within organizations and hence more applicable to the objective of the study..

Kisumu East District is a home of wide range of community based organizations which offer diverse services to the community in a dynamic environment. Elements of competition, pursuit of donor funding, efforts to remain relevant and generally fight for survival are some of the challenges facing CBOs in Kisumu East District. It is out of this background that has prompted the need to explore the extent to which Ansoff's Product-market growth strategies has been applied.

A study by Wanyande (2009) explored the extent at which Ansoff product-market growth strategies were applied within internet service providers in Kenya. Murigi (2010) looked into product-market growth strategies application by top 100 SMEs in ICT in Kenya. A study by Mutongu (1998) focused on women participation in CBOs as a strategy for poverty eradication in Kenya. Molyneux et. al (1997) study focused on the role of community based organizations in household ability on health care in Kilifi District. The studies above indicate that application of Ansoff product market growth strategy in other areas of context other than a CBO. Further, other

studies show areas of context other than Kisumu East district. It is evident that previous studies on CBOs have not researched on Ansoff's product market growth strategy as a concept. This study therefore addresses one main question. To what extent do CBOs in Kisumu East District apply Ansoff's product-market growth strategies?

### **1.3 Research Objective**

The objective of this study was to establish the extent to which CBOs in Kisumu East District apply Ansoff's product/market growth strategy.

### **1.4 Value of the Study**

The study provides ways to exercise diligence while understanding dimensions of growth among CBOs that will lead to excellence in their management. Local communities and entrepreneurs will find value in the knowledge of what practices would impede or promote growth among CBOs. According to the findings of the study, it is clear CBOs highly applied growth dimension is market penetration through free added services. This should serve as a pointer to the heads of CBOs in what direction to pursue to enhance growth.

The study is a step in filling existing knowledge gap. Previous studies have applied Ansoff product-market growth strategy in different contexts, while other study concepts have been applied on CBOs as a context. Therefore this study will be an addition in theory building and academic fraternity will find it useful in identifying possible gap for further studies. The findings show CBOs apply growth strategies, while relevance and competition are leading factors

influencing choice of strategy. The levels of competition within CBOs could form a knowledge gap worth filling.

Information on CBOs in Kisumu East District may be crucial to the government and other donors in terms of consideration in levels of funding, CBO operations statistics in comparison with other districts and the level of community participation in grassroots activities. Study findings have exposed the limitations of CBOs in terms resources, facilities, capacity and the need for community mobilization. Government planning and other stakeholders including nongovernmental organizations could explore possibilities of narrowing the limitations experienced by the CBOs.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

The chapter reviews previous studies relating to the topic under study. The literature review brings out the body of knowledge on the theory concept of strategy, strategy choice, models of strategy and Ansoff's product market growth strategy.

#### **2.2 The Concept of Strategy**

The concept of strategy has been defined in different ways by different authors. One of the earliest scholars on the concept of strategy was Drucker (1954) who discussed the importance of strategic planning and business policy. Chandler (1962); Schendel and Hatten (1972) have considered strategy as a means of establishing the organizational purpose, in terms of its long term objectives, actions programs and resource allocation priorities. Learned, Christensen, Andrews and Guth (1965), have advanced strategy in the context of the competitive domain of the firm. In this dimension strategy has been long been recognized as a central concern in defining the businesses of the firm is in or to be in.

Strategy has also been seen as a coherent, unifying, and integrative blueprint of the organization as a whole advanced by Gluek (1976). In another perspective strategy is a response to external and internal forces that affect the organization. Argyris (1985) supports the view that strategy responds to external opportunities and threats, and internal strengths and weaknesses. Steiner and Miner (1977) concur that strategy is achieved by forging of company missions, setting objectives for the organization in light of external and internal forces. Mintzberg (1979) upholds



the same view by looking at strategy as a mediating force between the organization and its environment, consistent patterns of streams of organizational decisions to deal with the environment.

Porter (1980, 1985) looked strategy as a central vehicle for achieving competitive advantage when he championed the quest for competitive advantage. He defines a framework for assessing the attractiveness of an industry. Andrews (1980) and Chaffee (1985) have advanced the concept of strategy as a frame of reference that allows the organization and its environment to be understood by organizational stakeholders. A more unified definition of strategy as a multi dimensional concept that embraces all the critical aspects of a firm, providing it with a sense of unity, direction and purpose as well as facilitating the changes induced by environment has been focused by Hax and Majluf, (1988).

Contemporary studies by Pearce and Robinson (2005) have described strategy as a set of decisions and actions that result in the formulation and implementation of plans designed to achieve company's objectives. Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2005) viewed strategy as the direction and scope of an organization over a long term which achieves advantage in a changing environment through its configuration of resources and competences with the aim of fulfilling stakeholder expectations.

### **2.3 Strategy Choice**

Strategy choice comes as a result of understanding that organizations are groups of different businesses and functional units each having its own set of goals which are not necessarily the

same (Porter, 1987). Different levels for organizations are recognized based on the focus of the strategy and which level of the organization creates it. Strategy in organizations is viewed from three levels; corporate, business and functional levels. Operational level which synonymously seen as functional level exists in some organizations. Corporate levels Strategy deal with overreaching matters that do not always include strictly business while business level and functional strategies of the firm are formulated to synchronize with the corporate strategy to enable it to desired objectives (Lacoma, 2011).

Corporate level strategy is a strategy choice commonly applied by multi business organizations. Corporate level strategy fundamentally is concerned with the selection of business in which the company should compete. Decisions at this strategy level define the reach of issues that are corporate responsibilities, the competitive contact in the firm the competition is localized and finally managing activities and business relationships and management practices (Mintzberg et. al, 1998). Corporate level strategy is more value oriented, more conceptual and less concrete than decision at the other levels. The choice of corporate level strategy involves models like BCG and GE/Mckinsey.

Business level strategy refers to the strategies of a single business firm or a strategic business unit (SBU) in a diversified corporation. The choice has to be made between various strategy options such as that the company's competitive position will be enhanced. Strategic analysis at this level is concerned with identifying and generating strategies that can help the business to develop a solid and sustainable competitive advantage. Business level Strategies can be developed with the help of models, depending on the strategic objectives to be achieved.

According to Porter (1980, 1985, 2001) a firm must formulate a business level strategy that incorporates cost leadership, differentiation or focus to achieve competitive advantage and long term success.

A business level strategy is a guiding principle and planned objective followed by an autonomous division of a company. A separate business unit strategy for each division will often be prepared and used by larger companies that have considerably different objectives among their various divisions. Business level strategy has been used to describe the process of setting the key product-market aims of the organization and allocating funding priorities between functional and operating units. Ansoff (1965, 1987) developed product-market growth strategy also a business level choice of strategy focusing on developing a portfolio of products and markets where competencies are depicted in form broad objectives.

Functional level strategy is concerned with fulfilling business-level strategy. It is related to business processes and the value chain, and involves development and coordination of resources through which business level strategies can be executed efficiently and effectively. A functional level strategy addresses individual function or department within the organization and improves on the way a firm uses its economic resources (Porter 1980, 1985, 2001).

Functional level strategy provides inputs into the business unit and corporate levels such as information on resources and capabilities on which higher strategies can be based. Once the higher levels are developed, the functional level strategy translates it into discrete action plans that each department or division must accomplish. Functional level strategy not only

consolidates, the functional requirements demanded by the corporate and business strategies, but also constitutes the depositories of the ultimate capabilities needed to develop unique competencies (Vitez, 2011).

## **2.4 Models of Strategy choice**

Business portfolio models are techniques for categorizing businesses and ranking them on the basis of attractiveness. Portfolio analysis enables the organization to identify the strategic options that can help in strengthening its business in order to enhance performance. Models of strategy choice exist at both organizational corporate and business levels. At corporate level strategy choices include BCG and GE/Mckinsey models while Porter's generic and Ansoff product-market growth models are strategy choices at business level.

Corporate level strategy models focuses on effectiveness or performance of the organization as whole (Cole, 1997). Boston consulting group (BCG) is a model that guides resource allocation decisions on basis of market share and growth rate of strategic business unit (Collis, Campbell and Goold, 1977). Egelhoff (1988) says BCG model is developed and based on classification of products into four categories based on combinations of market growth and market share relative to the largest competitor. BCG strategy model compares a diversified company's businesses on the basis of two criteria; market growth which is an index of attractiveness and relative market share an index of strength in the market. Market growth or industry attractiveness refers to the rate at which industry sales are growing while relative market share refers to the of the company's market share to the biggest rival.



The logic behind GE/Mckinsey model in its applications is similar to those of the BCG model. The GE/Mckinsey model maps strategic business units on a grid of the industry and the SBU's position in the industry. The GE model is based on industry attractiveness on one hand and business unit strength on the other (Egelhoff, 1988). Unlike BCG model market growth and business strength dimensions of GE model is a product of many factors. GE strategy is mapped on a 3 by 3 matrix which produces a more refined analysis than BCG 2 by 2 matrix.

Business level strategy models are concerned with how organizations achieve competitive advantages. Porter (1980, 1985) generic strategy models for competitive advantage involved low cost, differentiation, focus. These strategies he argued are applied at the business level and are not firm or industry dependant. Strategic analysis at this level is concerned with identifying and generating strategies that can help the business to develop a solid and sustainable competitive advantage. Strategies can be developed with the help of models, the relevant models depending on the strategic objective to be achieved.

Porter (1980, 1985) Generic strategy model sought to achieve competitive advantages by differentiating the products and services from those of competitors and through low cost a firm can target their products by a broad light, thereby lowering most of the market price or focus on a narrow target in the market. Ansoff (1965, 1987) product-market growth model was built on products and markets. The model identified fourth growth strategies as market penetration, market development, product development and diversification strategies. Ansoff product-market strategy model is made to identify possible preferred strategic options. The model helps to

evaluate the opportunities that are promising by identifying product market key success factors (Ansoff, 1965).

Strategic choice is the simultaneous selection of long range objectives and grand strategies. Pearce and Robinson (2005) grand strategies provide basic direction for strategic actions. Grand strategies indicate the time period over which long range objectives are to be achieved. According Pearce and Robinson (2005) the fourteen strategies include; concentrated growth, market development, product development, innovation, horizontal integration, vertical integration, concentric diversification, conglomerate diversification, turn around, divestiture, liquidation, joint ventures, strategic alliances and consortia. Any of the grand strategies could serve as the basis for achieving the major long term objectives of a single business firm, while a multi business firm combines several of the strategies.

## **2.5 Ansoff Product/Market Growth Strategy**

Ansoff product-market growth strategies present a strategic grid that can assist a firm to identify their future strategic growth direction. Ansoff (1965, 1987) itemizes four basic ways in which a firm can develop its portfolio of products and markets. Ansoff presented a matrix that focused on the firm's present areas where competences and generic strategies can be depicted in 4 broad alternatives; market penetration, market development, product development and diversification strategies as presented in figure 1 below;

**Figure 2:1 Ansoff Product/Market Growth Strategy Matrix**

	<b>Existing Products</b>	<b>New Products</b>
<b>Existing Markets</b>	Market Penetration	Product Development
<b>New Markets</b>	Market Development	Diversification

Source: Ansoff, I. (1987). *Corporate Strategy*. New York: McGraw-Hill. pp. 110

### **2.5.1 Market Penetration**

According to Ansoff (1965, 1987) a firm pursues marketing penetration approach when aggressively exploiting its current products and current markets. The strategy has been used to improve on sales without drifting from the original products and markets. Lancaster (1988) explains market penetration as a growth strategy involving same services and products being pushed into the same larger consumer group. Kotler (2000) advanced market penetration as where the products remains unchanged and no new segments are pursued instead the firm concentrates on enhancing its existing internal competences. McCarthy (2000) confers that market penetration tries to increase sales of a firm present produce in its markets through a more marketing mix.

Eyk (2010) in his study on game ranching in South Africa found application of market penetration as adaption of trained guides, knowledgeable staff to increase market share while game viewing as a way of increasing product usage. A study by Murigi (2010) found market

penetration to be achieved through aggressive marketing of the existing products in ICT SME firms in Kenya. Further study on marketing penetration for emerging economies, Meyer and Tran (2006) concluded that foreign investors may position themselves in the mass market for long term market position supported by a combination of global brands and operational capabilities for the specific local context. Wanyande (2009) on application of Ansoff growth strategies on internet providers in Kenya found market penetration being the most widely used.

### **2.5.2 Product Development**

Ansoff (1965, 1987) defined product development as the focus on the needs of the current customers and the wider customer markets. Kotler (2000) says in product development a firm remains in its present markets but develops new products for these markets. According to McCarthy (2000) product development allows a broader definition of the business while the danger lies in its exposure to one type of customer so the business must actively scan the economic environment. Although a firm operates in familiar markets, product development carries more risk since there is interest risks normally associated with new product development.

A study done on product development found that ICT SME firms in Kenya have adopted the strategy through modifying versions of ICT products (Murigi 2010). Empirical research by Eyk (2010) found introduction of picnic sites and game viewing in a ranching environment to be pursuing product development strategy.

### **2.5.3 Market Development**

Ansoff (1965, 1987) defines market development as taking current products and finding new markets achieved through opening up previously excluded market segments, new marketing and distribution channels and entering new geographic markets. Lancaster (1988) confirms that development of new markets for the product as a strategy if the firm's core competences are related to specific market segment. McCarthy (2000) developed two possible methods of implementing market development strategy as moving the present product into new geographical areas and expanding sales by attracting new market segments.

Murigi (2010) found conversion of non users in SME ICT firms to be practiced by majority compared to expansion into new regions of the sector. A study in a South African ranching farm found promotion of offerings of the game ranch to local, national, international users and offering unique hunting package for women and disabled people as strong market development strategy (Eykhart 2010).

### **2.5.4 Diversification**

Ansoff (1965, 1987) presents diversification in three levels. The levels include related markets where customers and markets are new, unrelated markets using existing resources and capabilities where customers and markets are different and unrelated markets which require new resources and capabilities. Kleinschmidt (1986) presents diversification as the most challenging of the four growth strategies since it involves new markets and products. The riskiness of the strategy is further pointed out by Doyle (1994) in the sense that it requires both product and market development and may operate outside the core competencies of the firm. Strickland

(2000) found diversification to be an attractive strategy when a company runs out of profitable growth opportunities in the present business.

A study by Klein and Lien (2009) on diversification found that firms diversify when they have valuable and difficult to imitate resources that are valuable across industries and when they have effective internal resource allocation mechanisms. Adoption of diversification strategy into related businesses was found to be preferred by majority of SME ICT firms in Kenya due to its inherent risks and less exposure (Murigi, 2010). Production of healthcare products using nature ingredients in a ranching environment was found to be unrelated diversification strategy while eco-tourism or entering the international market for trophy hunting to be related diversification (Eyk 2010).

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This study presents the research methodology that was adopted in carrying out the research. It presented the research design, population of the study, sampling, data collection and data analysis. It generally addressed questions to do with the study, which data are relevant, what data to collect, and how to analyze the results.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

The study employed a descriptive cross-sectional survey. According to Babbie (1973), a cross-sectional survey is aimed at determining the frequency (or level) of a particular attribute, such as a specific exposure in a defined population at a particular point in time.

The researcher considered this design as appropriate because of the purpose of the study, scope, researcher involvement and nature of data that were to be collected and the type of analysis to be performed (Copper & Schindler, 2003). A cross-sectional survey offered the opportunity to collect data across different organizations and test their relationship. Further cross-sectional survey was appropriate because the study involved descriptive data that were accorded statistical analysis.

#### **3.3 Population of the study**

The target population for the study was drawn from active and registered Community Based Organizations in Kisumu East District, Kenya. In total the population of study will comprise of 223 registered CBOs as at January 2012 (Appendix iii).

### 3.4 Sampling

Given the large number of CBOs forming the population of interest, there was need to determine a sample size. Random sampling was important in this study because it was possible to gather data from all the relevant members within the population.

In this study a sample was drawn to represent CBOs in Kisumu East district which will allow make accurate estimates of the larger CBOs population. Yamane (1967) provides a simplified formula to calculate sample sizes in cases where census is not applicable. A 5% level of precision at 95% confidence level and 50% (0.5) degree variability due to the heterogeneous nature of CBOs in Kisumu East District (District Annual Reports, 2010) a sample size was calculated using the formula by Yamane (1967).

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

$$N = 223$$

$$e = 10\% (0.1)$$

$$n = \frac{223}{1 + 223(0.1)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{223}{3.23}$$

$$\mathbf{n = 69 \text{ CBOs}}$$

n = Sample size

N = Population Size

e = Level of Precision



### **3.5 Data collection**

The study used primary data. Primary data covered organizational demographics, organizations growth strategy choices and factors influencing strategic growth choice. Primary data were collected using a semi-structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into four parts. These parts comprised organizational profile, organization growth strategy and factors influencing strategic growth choice.

Organizational profile part was designed to collect basic information about the target organizations. Organization growth strategy section focused on the probable growth choices that an organization adopted. The last section determined on possible factors influencing strategic growth choice.

Target respondents were heads of the targeted Community Based Organizations. At least one respondent was targeted in the targeted organizations to fill questionnaire. To enhance voluntary cooperation from the respondents, the researcher presented a letter of introduction to each organization stipulating the intent of the study.

### **3.6 Data analysis**

Data analysis involved a number of operations performed with the purpose of summarizing the collected data and organizing these in a manner to meet study objectives. Data have been analyzed through a combination of both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to provide a profile of organizational demographics. In this respect, basic statistical measures like frequencies and percentages were used.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DATA ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter lays focus on the data analysis, the presentation, explanation and interpretation of the study findings as well as the discussion of the findings. These are presented in line with the objective of the study, which is to establish the extent of adoption of Ansoff's product/market growth strategy by the CBOs in Kisumu East District. To achieve this objective, a cross-section of CBOs were sampled and data gathered from them using a structured questionnaire. Out of the 69 CBOs that were targeted, 59 were able to fill and return the questionnaires, hence attaining 85% response rate, which considered adequate for analysis.

#### **4.2 Organizational Demographics**

Different aspects to describe targeted organizations were used. These include organization name, year of inception (age), nature of offerings (product/services) and scope of operation. Each one of these aspects has implications on the way organizations conduct their business. The name of organization for example has an indication of identity. Age indicates organization's experience, nature of offerings and scope of operation define organization type of activity and development. In order to achieve the results, frequencies and percentages were presented (Table 1 a and 1b).

**Table 1a: Organization Demographics**

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentages</b>
<b>Age (Yr. of Inception)</b>	Before 2007	27	45.8%
	Between 2007 & 2010	26	44.1%
	After 2010	6	10.2%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Number of products/Services at inception</b>	One product/service	38	64.4%
	Two products/services	18	30.5%
	Three products/services	1	1.7%
	Four products/services	2	3.4%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Number of products/Services at present</b>	One product/service	9	15.3%
	Two products/services	14	23.7%
	Three products/services	20	33.9%
	Four products/services	8	13.6%
	Five products/services	6	10.2%
	Six products/services	1	1.7%
	Above six products/services	1	1.7%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Number of outlets at inception</b>	One outlet	51	86.4%
	Two outlets	5	8.5%
	Three outlets	2	3.4%
	Four outlets	1	1.7%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Number of outlets at present</b>	One outlet	20	33.9%
	Two outlets	13	22%
	Three outlets	7	11.9%
	Four outlets	7	11.9%
	Five outlets	9	15.3%
	More than five outlets	3	5.1%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Research data

The results show that majority of CBOs (45.8%) in operation are over four years old. The least number of CBOs (6%) operating in Kisumu East District are less than two years old. With regard to organizations' offerings, majority offered one product or service at inception (64.4%) while at the time of the study 33.9% CBOs offered three products or services. With regard to the organizational scope of operation, CBOs operating under one outlet were the majority (86.5%) both at inception and present (33.9%).

Lastly, concerning the nature of organizations offerings, respondents were asked to describe the organization products or services offered. The answers were classified into broad categories of product and services. The results show a higher number of organizations (14.2%) offer services in welfare and environmental conservation services categories (Table 1b).

**Table 1b: Description of Organizational Products and Services**

	<b>% Frequency at Present</b>
Poultry keeping	3.8%
Welfare/Table banking/Merry go round/loaning services	14.2%
Peace building, Justice & Cohesion	3.8%
Capacity building/ Civic Education / community mobilization	10.4%
Urban Agriculture/Farm inputs/Refrigeration and selling of fish	12.3%
Hand Crafts (Papyrus, Wire, Paper Products)	6.6%
Spiritual/Social networking	3.8%
Pottery (Clay products)	0.9%
Orphanage(Raising Orphaned children/physically challenged)/ECD	7.5%
Community Health Initiatives/Nutrition/Counseling/HIV & AIDS	12.3%
Public Amenities(cafeteria, storage, toilets, water & sanitation, hiring out of tables / chairs)	8.5%
Environmental Conservation/Garbage Collection/Eco tourism/Landscaping	14.2%
Tour guiding, Boat riding Entertainment & Drama, Sports	1.9%

Source: Research data

### **4.3 Organizations Growth Strategic Choices**

Organization growth strategic choice was assessed through the four Ansoffs product market growth strategies. The strategies are market penetration, market development, product development and diversification strategies. The results on choice of strategy are presented using mean scores and t-values. The t-values were derived from one sample t-tests. One sample t-test was appropriate because the responses were obtained from one sample which was assumed to be homogeneous.

This test was done to assess whether there were any significant differences within the sample regarding the ranking of the various aspects of each strategy. Since a 5-point likert scale was used in the study, the tests were carried out at a test-value of 3 with 95% confidence (p=0.05). this is because the value 3 is the average of the values in the 5-point likert scale assuming normal distribution.

### 4.3.1 Market Penetration Strategy

Market penetration strategy was assessed through offering of lower prices and offering free added services. The results on whether the two variables are similar or different are presented in all the sampled 59 CBOs (Table 2).

**Table 2: Application of lower prices and free added services offerings within CBOs.**

Strategy		Frequency	Percent	N	Mean	Sample test t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
<b>Offering Lower Prices</b>	Not at all	12	20%	<b>59</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>-8.443</b>	<b>.000</b>
	To a les Extent	23	39%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	20	34%				
	To a large Extent	2	3%				
	To a very large extent	2	3%				
<b>Offering free added Services</b>	Not at all	9	15%	<b>59</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>0.02</b>
	To a les Extent	11	19%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	15	25%				
	To a large Extent	8	14%				
	To a very large extent	16	27%				

Source: Research Data

The results in Table 2 show that offering free added services received high ranking (mean scores = 3.49) and therefore more applied by the CBOs. Offering lower prices received lower ranking (mean scores = 2.0) and therefore less applied.

However, there were statistically significant differences across the respondent organizations on the application of the offering lower prices. Statistically significant differences are reported on offering lower prices (t-value = 8.443,  $p < 0.05$ ). This means there was a high variance across CBOs on extent to which offering lower prices was applied.

### 4.3.2 Market Development Strategy

Market Development strategy was assessed through converting non-users to users and extending to new regions. Respondents were asked to indicate the level at which they applied the two variables. The study results on choice of the 59 CBOs are presented (Table 3).

**Table 3: Application of converting non-users to users and extending to new regions by the CBOs.**

Strategy		Frequency	Percent	N	Mean	Sample test t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
Converting non-users to users	Not at all	9	15%	59	2.831	-1.166	0.248
	To a les Extent	11	19%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	24	41%				
	To a large Extent	11	19%				
	To a very large extent	4	7%				
Extending to new regions	Not at all	17	29%	59	2.458	-3.296	0.002
	To a les Extent	17	29%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	9	15%				
	To a large Extent	13	22%				
	To a very large extent	3	5%				

Source: Research Data

The results in Table 3 show that converting non-users to users was highly ranked (mean scores = 2.8). This means that adoption of converting non users to users was more compared to extending to new regions. However, there are significant statistical differences across CBOs on extending to new regions (t-value = -3.296,  $p < 0.05$ ). This means that both converting non-users to users

and extending to new regions showed disparity across organizations meaning presence of other factors determining their choice of strategy.

### 4.3.3 Product Development Strategy

Product Development strategy was studied through three variables. The variables included offering new versions of services, improved procedures and bundled services/products. Respondents were asked to indicate the level at which they applied the three variables. The study results on choice of the 59 CBOs are presented (Table 4).

**Table 4: Application of new versions, improved procedures and bundled services by CBOs.**

Strategy		Frequency	Percent	N	Mean	Sample test t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
<b>Offering new versions of services</b>	Not at all	6	10%	<b>59</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>-2.335</b>	<b>0.23</b>
	To a les Extent	18	31%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	23	39%				
	To a large Extent	11	19%				
	To a very large extent	1	2%				
<b>Offering Improved procedures for services</b>	Not at all	1	2%	<b>59</b>	<b>3.203</b>	<b>1.803</b>	<b>0.077</b>
	To a les Extent	9	15%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	31	53%				
	To a large Extent	13	22%				
	To a very large extent	5	8%				
<b>Offering bundled services/products</b>	Not at all	26	44%	<b>59</b>	<b>1.881</b>	<b>-8.580</b>	<b>0.000</b>
	To a les Extent	18	31%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	11	19%				
	To a large Extent	3	5%				
	To a very large extent	1	2%				

Source: Research Data

The results (Table 4) show that three variables under product development strategy rank differently across the CBOs. Offering improved procedures received high ranking (mean scores = 3.203) an indication that it was more applied. Offering bundled services received the lowest

ranking (mean scores = 1.881) though it showed the greatest statistical significance difference (t-value = -8.580,  $p < 0.05$ ) than the rest.

#### 4.3.4 Diversification Strategy

Diversification strategy was assessed through related and unrelated products/services in respect to the core activity of the organization. Respondents were asked to indicate the level at which they applied the two aspects of diversification strategy. The study results on choice of the 59 CBOs are presented (Table 5).

**Table 5: Application of offering related and unrelated products/services on CBOs**

Strategy		Frequency	Percent	N	Mean	Sample test t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
<b>Offering other related products/services</b>	Not at all	4	7%	<b>59</b>	<b>2.881</b>	<b>-0.880</b>	<b>0.382</b>
	To a les Extent	20	34%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	17	29%				
	To a large Extent	15	25%				
	To a very large extent	3	5%				
<b>Offering products/services that are not related to core activity</b>	Not at all	20	34%	<b>59</b>	<b>2.085</b>	<b>-7.384</b>	<b>0.000</b>
	To a les Extent	18	31%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	17	29%				
	To a large Extent	4	7%				
	To a very large extent	0	0%				

Source: Research Data

The results in Table 5 show offering related products and services was highly ranked (mean scores = 2.881). This means that in diversification, the level at which offering related products/services is more compared to unrelated products/services. However significant differences are reported across organizations on the extent to which offering unrelated services/products were predictable (t-values = -7.384,  $p < 0.05$ ).



#### 4.4 Factors Influencing Strategic Growth Choice

In addition to determining organization growth strategy choices, further insight was sought on the factors influencing the choices. The factors included competitive choices, survival, donor funding and relevance in service offering. On a 5-point likert scale respondents were required to indicate the extent to which each of the factors influenced their organizations. The results of the 59 sampled CBOs are presented (Table 6).

**Table 6: Factors influencing Strategic Growth Choice**

Strategy		Frequency	Percent	N	Mean	Sample test t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
<b>Offering new versions of services</b>	Not at all	4	7%	<b>59</b>	<b>3.203</b>	<b>1.427</b>	<b>0.159</b>
	To a les Extent	11	19%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	20	34%				
	To a large Extent	17	29%				
	To a very large extent	7	12%				
<b>Offering Improved procedures for services</b>	Not at all	1	2%	<b>59</b>	<b>3.271</b>	<b>2.207</b>	<b>0.031</b>
	To a les Extent	10	17%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	27	46%				
	To a large Extent	14	24%				
	To a very large extent	7	12%				
<b>Offering bundled services/products</b>	Not at all	12	20%	<b>59</b>	<b>2.458</b>	<b>-3.624</b>	<b>0.001</b>
	To a les Extent	24	41%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	10	17%				
	To a large Extent	10	17%				
	To a very large extent	3	5%				
<b>Relevance in service offerings</b>	Not at all	0	0%	<b>59</b>	<b>3.627</b>	<b>4.825</b>	<b>0.000</b>
	To a les Extent	8	14%				
	To a Fairly large Extent	20	34%				
	To a large Extent	18	31%				
	To a very large extent	13	22%				

Source: Research Data

The results in Table 6 show high ranking for relevance in service offerings (mean scores = 3.627), survival factors and competitive forces (mean scores = 3.207, 3.203 respectively). However, statistically significant differences are reported for relevant in service offerings and

donor funding (t-value =4.825,  $p<0.05$ ; t-value=-3.624,  $p<0.05$  respectively). This implies that even though the two factors relevance in service offering and donor funding where both high and low in ranking there were variations across organizations.

#### **4.5 Discussion**

Ansoff product/market growth strategy has been associated with corporate organizations. Previous studies like Wanyande (2009) explored on the extent to which Ansoff product/market growth strategies applied in internet service providers in Kenya. Murigi (2010), tested the same strategies on ICT SMEs in Kenya. This study tested the extent to which Community Based Organizations in Kisumu East District have adopted the Ansoff product/market growth strategy.

The results revealed that CBOs have adopted the four Ansoff growth strategies. Market penetration, market development, product development and diversification strategies (mean scores 3.49, 2.83, 3.2, 2.88 respectively). There is an overall statistical significance (high t-values,  $p<0.05$ ) reported. The results are reported on the ranking of growth strategies level of adoption by the CBOs. CBOs were found to adopt the four growth strategies at different rankings.

The findings are supportive of similar studies done on corporate organizations on the basis of market penetration being the highly ranked while diversification the lowest. While most studies that focused on profit making organizations (Wanyande, 2009; Murigi, 2010; Eyk, 2010), this study has explored CBOs. The results conform to the attributions that CBOs take the same

pattern in adoption of growth strategies as the corporate organizations though at different ranking.

The results are fairly comparable to other empirical studies that have found market penetration as most applicable by other organizations. Related studies confirm the findings of Eyk (2010) in her study on game ranching in South Africa, market penetration was found as most the adaptable. The study is further in agreement with the findings by Murigi (2010) on market penetration as the most achieved in ICT SME firms in Kenya.

The results compare well with Kleinschmidt (1986) assertion that diversification as the most challenging of the four growth strategies since it involves new markets and products. The writings of Doyle (1994) in the sense that diversification strategy requires is a risk venture proves the low ranking achieved of this study. On the factors influencing the choice of strategy, far from the expectation of the researcher that competitive forces would rank highly, relevance in service offering was found to be the major factor.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter is dedicated to the summary of the research findings, the conclusion and the recommendations of the study. The summary focuses on the key findings as well as the discussion of findings. The recommendations are based on the key findings and they include both for policy and managerial practice. The chapter also presents the limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

#### **5.2 Summary of Findings**

The main objective of this study was to establish the extent in which CBOs in Kisumu East District applied Ansoff product market growth strategy. A summary of the findings will be presented based on the objective of the study.

From the findings, CBOs cover a wide range of activities for sustenance, support, empowerment, livelihood among others. The findings of part one show majority of CBOs where operating on one or two products/services (64.4%, 30.5% respectively) initially. The findings show a current status of one, two, three products/services (15.3%, 23.7%, 33.9% respectively) broadly indicating growth products/services offerings.

In describing the choice of growth strategy, market penetration highly ranked (mean scores = 3.49) achieved through free services/products offerings. Market development (mean scores=2.831), was achieved more through conversion of non-users to users than exploring new

regions. Targeting non-users was found easily achievable through community mobilizations, sharing of experiences by the users resulting to growth in market share. Product development in CBOs was applied through improved procedures in delivery of services (mean scores = 3.203) and products. Improvement of the procedures proved to be time saving and less costly and therefore preferred by most CBOs. Bundling was found to be less favorable with many CBO due to less services and products offered to form an appealing package. On diversification, getting into related businesses (mean scores= 2.881) is preferred by majority of CBOs than engaging in unrelated activities. This is largely influenced by the inherent risks associated with engaging into unrelated products and services. Experience in related businesses also contributes greatly to ease challenges of diversification.

Relevance in service/product offering (mean scores = 3.627) has to a large extent influenced the choice of growth strategic choices for most CBOs in Kisumu East District. CBOs survival (3.271) and competitive forces (3.203) followed closely on a large extent as potential reasons in adoption of growth strategies. Seeking donor funding was the least factor in consideration which applies to CBOs to a less extent. This could have resulted from the fact most CBOs have adopted self sustaining approach through diversifying incoming generating projects.

Improved funding was found to play the highest role in enhancing the success and growth of CBOs. In understanding the roles of CBOs in the society, community mobilization was favourable in bringing enlightenment. Improved methods of service will achieved through training, capacity building and civic education. In order to enhance success in improving capacities and

growth of CBOs majorly benefit from capacity building and training, while others ways will include seminars, workshops, awareness initiatives, dialogue forums.

### **5.3 Conclusion**

The study's objective was to determine the extent to which CBOs in Kisumu East district adopted Ansoff's product/market growth strategy. To achieve this objective we tested CBOs' offerings in terms of products and services. We tested the adoption of growth strategies by CBOs through respective strategy variables. Further, we tested the statistical significance on each growth strategy adopted by the CBOs. Finally we tested the factors determining the choice of growth strategy.

It was established that use of the growth strategies was statistically significant. The study provided indication on the level at which growth strategy is applied by the organizations. It was established that majority of CBOs (90%) operating in Kisumu East District are less than five years old. This could have some significant effect on the level of growth as explained by organizations operations (Tablela). It could therefore be assumed that longer periods of organizational could realize growth. The overall effect of adoption of growth strategy was statistically significant though it was also established that there were wide variations in the organizations application of growth strategies. This meant that other factors could be contributing to the strategy choice.

Lastly it established that relevance in service offerings is the highest ranking factor that determines the choice of strategy. This meant that since CBO operations are community based,

its need to address the immediate environment needs was most key factor growth strategy choice. The study provides evidence that there are elements of competition within CBOs though not the highest ranked factor for strategy adoption.

#### **5.4 Recommendations**

Out of the results of tests of the study and discussions, there are implications that have emerged. These implications could touch on the theory, methodology, and management practice. Further to reporting varying levels of growth strategy applications, the current study's overall results showed statistical significance. Therefore, the results lead to observations that are indicative of theoretical implications.

It was established that all the four growth strategies were adopted significantly in community based organizations. The findings of this study imply that growth strategies are critical components in determining growth in organizations. The findings contribute to the general body of knowledge as well as providing basis for further development of theory and research particularly on other forms strategies other than growth by organizations. The study reported variations on growth strategy applications. These findings provide evidence of other factors in determination of particular growth strategies. The study, therefore provides a basis for advancing the frontiers of knowledge in the exploration of other possible determinants growth strategy choices.

The fact that the results of this study provided statistically significant support for all tests does not rule out methodological implications. Though the focus of this study was on the extent of

growth strategy adoption, the tool of data collection (questionnaire) was rather repetitive in some cases. Therefore, choice of questionnaire questions could otherwise be more summarized and this could have implications on the duration involved in seeking respondents views.

The study findings show dynamism in activities of Community Based organizations in their wide ranging offerings both products and service aimed at raising standards of living. From the findings it emerged that funding is not always the major driving factor success in organizations.

The study produced findings which enable coordinators of organizations generally on the role strategy in organizational operations. It further signifies relevance in activities of organizations to be factor worth considering. The findings have critical managerial implications in terms of assessing and adopting particular growth strategy. This puts management of organizations to be a position to ensure effectiveness in the choice of strategies.

### **5.5 Limitations of the study**

The findings of this study should be interpreted and understood within the confines of inherent limitations. First, the study did not achieve 100% response rate. This is because of some cases of non response occasioned by some organizations' reluctance to return back questionnaires. Further, lack of formal offices by majority of CBOs led to failure to trace respondents in subsequent follow ups. Therefore, the results could have been improved if more data were obtained for analysis.

The study used likert scale which have inherent limitations though it was the dominant measurement scale. Though care was taken to minimize the effects of the limitations, we submit



that some shortcomings are expected to be inherent in the conclusions of the study. Further, in collection of data, a target sample consisted of a fraction of the population. Whereas this is acceptable, considering the duration available, a more thorough outcome would have been achieved from the whole population.

Finally, the study used a cross-sectional research design in which averages adoption of strategy by Community Based Organizations. The results of this study are therefore limited to cross-sectional data without the possibility of unearthing the effect of time period between which growth strategy adoption decisions were made and their effects on organizational growth.

#### **5.6 Suggestions for further Research**

Arising from some of the implications and limitations of the study, some recommendations for further research are indicated. The study majorly relied on Ansoff product/market growth strategy concept. This was best suited for testing growth dimension on Community Based Organizations. More research is required to explore the extent of use of other strategies other growth strategies in the same context of Community Based Organizations. Results from this study have showed some elements of competition within the CBOs and therefore further studies could explore the level of competition.

The study had the limitation of context from which the surveyed companies were picked from. Given the limitation, a similar study is necessary in other types of organizations (eg. Faith Based Organizations, NGOs, etc) in order to validate and/or enhance this study's findings. Further, this study was confined in Kisumu East District which may not necessarily reflect the situation in

other parts of the country. Though this does not invalidate the outcome the study further studies could focus on other districts, counties or preferably the entire country.

As it was pointed out earlier, this study was purely cross-sectional in nature whose inherent limitations have been pointed out. Therefore, a similar study that will adopt a longitudinal or case study research design is recommended in order to provide for a longer time frame and unearth underlying issues.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, K. R. and Guth, W. D. (1965). *Business policy. Text and cases*, Irwin, Homewood.
- Andrews, K. R. (1980). Directors' responsibility for corporate strategy, *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 30<sup>^</sup>-2.
- Ansoff, I. (1965). *Corporate strategy*, New York, McGraw Hill.
- Ansoff, I. 1987. *Corporate Strategy*. London: London: Penguin.
- Argyris, C. (1985). *Strategy change and defensive routines*. Pitman publishing, Marshfield, Massachusetts.
- Babbie, E. R. (1973). *Survey Research Methods*. Belmont, C.A: Wadsworth Pub. Co.
- Chafee, E. (1985). Three models of strategy. *Academy of management Review*, vol. 10, pp.54-56.
- Chandler, A., Jr. (1962). *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of American Industrial Enterprise*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Cole, G.A. (1997). *Strategic management*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Letts Educational, London

Collis, D. J., Campbell, A., Goold, M. (1977). Harvard Business Review on Corporate Strategy.

*Harvard Business Review Paperback Series*. Hedley ,p12

Cooper, R.D. and Schindler, S. P. (2003). *Business Research Methods*. 8<sup>th</sup> Edition. Boston: Irwin McGraw. Hill.

Doyle, T.W. (1994). Sonic distance device improves field sampling efficiency and accuracy.

*National Biological Survey Research Information Bulletin* 79. 3 pp. 16

Drucker, P. (1954). *The Practice of Management*, Harper and Row, New York.

Egelhoff, W. G., (1988). 'Strategy and Structure in Multinational Corporations: a Revision of the Stopford and Wells Model', *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 9 , pp. 1-14.

Eyk, M.V. (2010). Analysis Processes as Antecedents For Decision-Making Related To Growth Strategies of South African Game Ranchers. *Unpublished Doctoral thesis*, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

Gluek, W. (1976). *Business policy, strategy formation and management action*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition), McGraw-Hill, New York.

Government of Kenya. (2007). *Kenya Vision 2030: A Globally Competitive and Prosperous Kenya*. Retrieved on 5<sup>th</sup> May 2012 from <http://www.vision2030.go.ke>

Government of Kenya. (2010). *Kisumu East District Annual Report*. Retrieved on February 2012 from Office of Social Development, Kisumu East District.

Government of Kenya. (2007). *Gender and Social Development in Kenya*. Retrieved on May 2012 from <http://www.gender.go.ke>

Hax, A.C., and N.S. Majluf. (1988). *Concept of strategy formation process*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Johnson, G.; Scholes, K. (1989). *Exploring Corporate Strategy*, Test and Cases Business and Economics. Prentice Hall.

Johnson, G.; Scholes, K.; Whittington, R. (2005). *Exploring Corporate Strategy*, 8th Edition, FT Prentice Hall, Essex, 2008, ISBN 978-0-273-71192-6

Klein, P.G. and Lien, L . B. (2009). Diversification, Industry structure, and firm strategy; An organizational Economics perspective. *Advances in strategic management*. Vol.26 Emerald group publishing limited.

Kleinschmidt, J. (1986). *An Investigation into the New Product Process: Steps, Deficiencies, and Impact Product Innovative Management*. Elsevier Science Publishing Co., Inc.

Kline, C.H. (1955). The strategy of Product policy. *Havard Business Review*, July — August.

Kotler (2000). *Marketing Management*, Millennium Edition, New Jersey; Prentice Hall.

Lacoma, T. (2011). *Business level strategy versus corporate level strategy*. Retrieved from <http://www.ehow.com>

Lancaster, G. and Massingham, L. (1988), *Essentials of Marketing*, London: McGraw-Hill.

Learned, E. P.; Christensen, C. R.; Andrews, K. R.; and Guth, W.D. (1965), *Business Policy: Text and Cases*, Homewood, Illinois.

Markides, C. (1997). Strategic innovation. *Sloan Management Review*, 38(3): pages 9-23.

McCarthy, J. (2000). *Approximate objects and approximate theories*, pages 519-526. Morgan-Kaufman.

Meyer, K. E. and Tran, Y. T. (2006). Market Penetration and Acquisition Strategies for emerging Economies, *Long range planning*, page 39 no. 2

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1987). Crafting Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, July/August.

Mintzberg, H. Ahlstrand, B. and Lampel, J.(1998). *Strategy Safari: A Guided Tour Through the*

*Wilds of Strategic Management*, The Free Press, New York.

Molyneux, C. S. et. al (1997). *The role of community based organizations in household ability to pay for health care in Kilifi District*. *Social Science & Medicine*, 61, 1463-1473.

Mulwa, F. W. and Mala, S. (2000). *Management of Community Based Organizations*. Nairobi: Premese Olivex Publishers.

Murigi, N.N. (2010). Growth Strategies adopted by top 100 SMEs in ICT in Kenya. *Unpublished MBA project*. School of Business, University of Nairobi.

Mutongu, Z.B. (1998). "Women's Participation in Community-Based Organizations Development as a Strategy for Poverty Eradication in Kenya." *Journal of Constructive Theology*.

Odindo, M. (2009). *Capacity needs of community based organizations in Kenya to apply for Global fund grants*; Colgne.

Pearce, J. & Robinson, R. (1984). Research thrusts in small firm strategic planning. *Academy of Management Review*, 9: 128-137.

Pearce, J.A., & Robinson, R.B.(1986). "The Tenuous Link Between Formal Strategic Planning and Financial Performance." *Academy of Management Review* 12: 658-675.

- Pearce J. A. (II) and Robinson R. B. (Jr), (1997): *Strategic Management: Formulation, Implementation, and Control*, 6th Ed., Irwin McGraw-Hill, Boston, USA.
- Pearce, J. A., and Robinson, R. B., Jr. (2005). *Strategic Management: Strategy Formulation, Implementation and Control*, 10<sup>th</sup> edition, Chicago, IL: R. D. Irwin, Inc.
- Porter, M. (1980). *Competitive Advantage of Nations*, Mac Millan Press Ltd., Londra.
- Porter, M.E. (1985) *Competitive Advantage*, Free Press, New York.
- Porter, M. (1987). Response to letters to the editor. *Harvard Business Review* 72(2): 162- 163.
- Porter, M. (2001) *Competitive Advantage*, Free Press
- Reilley, E.W. (1955). Planning the future strategy of the Business. *Advanced management*.
- Rumelt, R.P (1979). Evaluation of strategy: Theory and Models. *Strategic management a view of business policy and planning*. Little brown, pages 196-212
- Schendel, D., & Hatten, K. J. (1972). Business policy or strategic management: A broader view for an emerging discipline. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 99-102.



Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in Administration*. New York: Harper and Row.

Steiner, G.A. and Miner, J. B. (1977). *Management policy and strategy*. Macmillan, New York.

Strickland, A. J. (2000). *Crafting and Executing Strategy: The Quest for Competitive Advantage: Concepts and Cases*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Tilles, S. (1963). How to Evaluate Corporate Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August

Vitez, O. (2011). *Corporate business and functional level strategies*. Retrieved from  
<http://www.ehow.com>

Wanyande, J.B. (2009). Application of Ansoff's Growth strategies by internet service providers in Kenya. *Unpublished MBA project*, School of Business, University of Nairobi.

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics; An introductory Analysis*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition; New York: Harper and Row.



**APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE**

**PART A (ORGANIZATION PROFILE)**

1. Name of Organization: .....

2. Year of Inception:.....

3. Nature of Activity:.....

4. How many Products or Services does your organization offer?....

5. In how many outlets does your organization operate its programs?.....

6. What have been the successes in implementing your Activity(s) and growth? (Please tick only if mentioned)

- a) Introduction of more products or Services [ ]
- b) Opening of more outlets or branches [ ]
- c) Improvement of the current products and Services [ ]
- d) Introduction of other projects of different kind (Name some examples) [ ]
- e) Other area of success

7. Describe the organization Products/Services Offered

Products/Services offered at Inception	Products/Services offered at Present

8. Describe the geographical scope of your organization

Regions covered at Inception	Regions covered at Present

**PART B: ORGANIZATION'S GROWTH STRATEGY**

9. Listed below are the probable growth strategic choices that your organization has adopted. To what extent has your organization made such choices? Please rank them using the key guideline below.

- (1) -Not at all
- (2) - To a less extent
- (3) -To a fairly large extent
- (4) — To a large extent
- (5) — To a very large extent

(a) Growing current services and the current market (Market Penetration strategy)

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>1 (Not at all)</b>	<b>2 (To a less extent)</b>	<b>3 (To a fairly large Extent)</b>	<b>4 (To a large Extent)</b>	<b>5 (To a very large Extent)</b>
Offering lower prices					
Offering free added services					
Others					

(b) Moving beyond immediate customer base to new ones (Market Development strategy)

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>1 (Not at all)</b>	<b>2 (To a less extent)</b>	<b>3 (To a fairly large Extent)</b>	<b>4 (To a large Extent)</b>	<b>5 (To a very large Extent)</b>
Converting non-users to users					
Extending to new regions					
others					

(c) Developing new services catering the same market (Product Development strategy)

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>1 (Not at all)</b>	<b>2 (To a less extent)</b>	<b>3 (To a fairly large Extent)</b>	<b>4 (To a large Extent)</b>	<b>5 (To a very large Extent)</b>
Offer new versions of Services					
Offer improved procedures for services					
Offer bundled services/products					
Others					

(d) Moving out of current services and markets into new ones (Diversification strategy)

<b>Strategy</b>	<b>1 (Not at all)</b>	<b>2 (To a less extent)</b>	<b>3 (To a fairly large Extent)</b>	<b>4 (To a large Extent)</b>	<b>5 (To a very large Extent)</b>
Offer other related products and services					
Offer products and services that are not related to core Activity					

**PART C: FACTORS INFLUENCING STRATEGIC GROWTH CHOICE**

10. Listed below are the probable factors determining growth strategic choices that your organization has adopted. Please rank them using the key guideline below.

- (1) - Not at all
- (2) - To a less extent
- (3) —To a fairly large extent
- (4) - To a large extent
- (5) — To a very large extent

<b>Influencing Factors</b>	<b>1 (Not at all)</b>	<b>2 (To a less extent)</b>	<b>3 (To a fairly large Extent)</b>	<b>4 (To a large Extent)</b>	<b>5 (To a very large Extent)</b>
Competitive forces					
Survival					
Attracting of Donor funding					
Relevance in Service offering					
Others					

11. What would you like to be put in place to enhance your success in implementing your activities? (Please tick only if mentioned)

- a) Improved method of service delivery [ ]
- b) Improved community mobilization [ ]
- c) Increased area of coverage [ ]

d) Venturing in other types of services and products [ ]

e) Improved funding [ ]

f) Other (Specify)

[ ]

12. In your view, what can be done to improve on the capacities and growth of local CBOs?

Other area of success

### APPENDIX III: LIST OF CBOS IN KISUMU EAST DISTRICT

No.	Date of Registration	Name of the CBO	Division	Registration Serial No.
1	19 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2010	Tuungane Pillars of Hope Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/176/2010
2	19 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2010	Octagon Hadassah Development	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/177/2010
3	21 <sup>st</sup> Jan 2010	DAGO Community Water Management CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/178/2010
4	16 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2010	Lake Victoria tour guide CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/179/2010
5	27 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2010	Childlink Project kisumu	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/180/2010
6	29 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2010	Beyond Disabilities action Network CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/181/2010
7	1 <sup>st</sup> Feb 2010	Kibuye Great Hope CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/182/2010
8	4 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Kisumu pikipiki network	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/183/2010
9	5 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Jamii ya Tumaini CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/184/2010
10	5 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Beach for Christ Development CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/185/2010
11	5 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Songo village CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/186/2010
12	5 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Winam safe parenthood initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/187/2010
13	8 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	The young Elite CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/188/2010
14	10 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Penjo Osiko CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/189/2010
15	15 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Intergrated Reproductive Health Solutions	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/191/2010
16	15 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Noah Ark CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/192/2010
17	16 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Tegemeo Muungano CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/193/2010
18	19 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Grassroot Development Initiative	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/196/2010
19	23 <sup>rd</sup> Feb 2010	St. Francis family Helper Project CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/197/2010
20	26 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Osiri for Development CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/198/2010
21	26 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2010	Happy life for Development CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/199/2010
22	5 <sup>th</sup> March 2010	Kisumu Agricultural Stakeholders CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/200/2010
23	11 <sup>th</sup> March 2010	Awakening Comm. of Social-Economic Dev. CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/202/2010
24	16 <sup>th</sup> March 2010	Friends of Sustainable Economic Stability	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/203/2010
25	23 <sup>rd</sup> March 2010	Juakali Resource Development Project	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/205/2010
26	23 <sup>rd</sup> March 2010	Kakodam CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/206/2010
27	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2010	St. Dominic Kanja CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/207/2010
28	7 <sup>th</sup> April 2010	Wonders CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/208/2010
29	13 <sup>th</sup> April 2010	Youths for Sustainable Peace and Emp. Gp CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/209/2010
30	5 <sup>th</sup> April 2010	Kibuye CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/210/2010
31	21 <sup>st</sup> April 2010	Smart Ladies Youth Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/211/2010
32	21 <sup>st</sup> April 2010	2 <sup>nd</sup> Change for the Vul. and Disability Project CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/212/2010
33	21 <sup>st</sup> April 2010	Towers of Hope CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/213/2010
34	28 <sup>th</sup> April 2010	Nyalenda "A" CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/214/2010
35	7 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	Kanyakwar Elders CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/215/2010
36	10 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	Kisumu Necks Women CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/216/2010
37	10 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	Women Empowerment Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/217/2010
38	11 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	Matarajio mpya Kimaendeleo CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/218/2010
39	11 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	Kisumu Against Crime CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/219/2010
40	17 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	Wigot Mamaids CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/220/2010
41	17 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	Kadibo Orphans and Widows Support CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/221/2010
42	17 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	Kajulu and Kirembe CBO	Kisumu E	KsmEast/CBO/222/2010
43	24 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	Green World CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/223/2010
44	26 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	Lake Victoria Green Forest Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/224/2010
45	27 <sup>th</sup> May 2010	Kisumu Urban Farmers CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/225/2010
46	31 <sup>st</sup> May 2010	Kisumu Youth Development Group CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/226/2010
47	3 <sup>rd</sup> June 2010	Kiwanis Development Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/227/2010
48	4 <sup>th</sup> June 2010	Family Support for Sustainable Dev. CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/228/2010

49	8 <sup>th</sup> June 2010	Grassroots Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/229/2010
50	24 <sup>th</sup> June 2010	Peace Integrated CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/230/2010
51	28 <sup>th</sup> June 2010	Altaqwa CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/231/2010
52	30 <sup>th</sup> June 2010	Vision Alive Comm. Integrated Init. Charity CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/232/2010
53	30 <sup>th</sup> June 2010	Kidi Luanda CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/233/2010
54	1 <sup>st</sup> July 2010	Public Sector Positive Network Fighting	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/234/2010
55	2 <sup>nd</sup> July 2010	Reading Gap Community Interest Project	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/235/2010
56	5 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	Kuongana Tunaweza CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/236/2010
57	6 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	United Families' Neighbours CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/237/2010
58	7 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	Usodho Community CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/238/2010
59	7 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	Wikad Farming Resource Persons CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/239/2010
60	8 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	Community Health Education Initiative	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/240/2010
61	12 <sup>h</sup> July 2010	Central Body Bicycle Transporters CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/241/2010
62	13 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	Kibos Ong'wano Market CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/242/2010
63	27 <sup>th</sup> July 2010	Omollo G. Comm. Bridges & Rds Proj. CBO	Winam	Ksm East/CBO/243/2010
64	3 <sup>rd</sup> Aug. 2010	Kawino Comm. Watersupply Project CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/244/2010
65	3 <sup>rd</sup> Aug. 2010	Kisumu Multi purpose CBO	Kajulu west	KsmEast/CBO/245/2010
66	6 <sup>th</sup> Aug. 2010	Fresh Fish Market CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/246/2010
67	9 <sup>th</sup> Aug. 2010	Efforts Against Poverty CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/247/2010
68	10 <sup>th</sup> Aug. 2010	Ksm. Med. Friends of Orphans and Vul. CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/248/2010
69	10 <sup>th</sup> Aug. 2010	Omollo Goro Development Group CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/249/2010
70	11 <sup>th</sup> Aug. 2010	PAGE CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/250/2010
71	11 <sup>th</sup> Aug. 2010	Bunde Orph. and Persons with Disabilities Gp CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/251/2010
72	30 <sup>th</sup> Aug. 2010	Make me Smile CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/252/2010
73	3 <sup>rd</sup> Sept. 2010	Girls & Women Development Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/253/2010
74	3 <sup>rd</sup> Sept. 2010	Kisumu Victoria Transporters CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/254/2010
75	8 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2010	Nyalenda 'B' Initiative Dev. Group CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/255/2010
76	13 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2010	Machibu Integrated Projects CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/256/2010
77	13 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2010	Mayenya CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/257/2010
78	14 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2010	THEPTHEP CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/258/2010
79	15 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2010	Kadimirobu CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/259/2010
80	24 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2010	Kapiyo Integrated CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/260/2010
81	30 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2010	Shepherd of Hope CBO	Winam	Ksm East/CBO/261 /2010
82	1 <sup>st</sup> Oct. 2010	Janet Orphans & needy Family Dev. CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/262/2010
83	5 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2010	Dream Again CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/263/2010
84	7 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2010	Dunga women Integrated CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/264/2010
85	11 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2010	Franciscan Development CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/265/2010
86	12 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2010	Jog Development Project CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/266/2010
87	12 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2010	Let God be told in us CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/267/2010
88	14 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2010	Kochieng' East OVC Support CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/268/2010
89	14 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2010	Winam Prevention or Child Labour CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/269/2010
90	22 <sup>nd</sup> Oct. 2010	Lake Victoria Basin Wetland CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/271/2010
91	9 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2010	RIWO Fruit Growing CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/272/2010
92	9 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2010	Integrated Community of Help CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/272/2010
93	11 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2010	Kisumu Town East Sports CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/273/2010
94	12 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2010	Blessed Overcomers CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/274/2010
95	16 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2010	St. Anne's Mwangaza CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/275/2010
96	17 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2010	Kamiera Development Group CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/276/2010
97	19 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2010	Minnesota Orphans & Vul. Children CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/277/2010
98	19 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2010	Kisumu Town East Env.Conservation CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/278/2010
99	24 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2010	MAMANDEF CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/279/2010
	10 <sup>th</sup> Dec. 2010	Fish Alumni CBO	Winam	Ksm East/C BO/280/2010
	15 <sup>th</sup> Dec. 2010	Jiamulie CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/281 /2010



102	16 <sup>th</sup> Dec. 2010	Youths for Sustainable Development CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/282/2010
103	17 <sup>th</sup> Dec. 2010	Nyawita CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/283/2010
104	24 <sup>th</sup> Dec. 2010	ImaraCBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/284/2010
105	7 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2011	Comm. Health Participatory Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/285/2011
106	7 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2011	Watoto Rescue Services CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/286/2011
107	13 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2011	Odiero Community Based and Initiative	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/287/2011
108	18 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2011	Foccas CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/288/2011
109	20 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2011	Kimima Development CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/289/2011
110	20 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2011	Pebbledot CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/290/2011
111	21 <sup>st</sup> Jan. 2011	St. Ignatius Good Samaritan Ojola CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/291/2011
112	24 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2011	Give Initiative For Village Emp.CBO	Kanyawegi	KsmEast/CBO/292/2011
113	24 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2011	The Brook CBO	Kaloleni	KsmEast/CBO/293/2011
114	2 f Jan. 2011	Nyahera Now Integrated Group CBO	Nyahera	KsmEast/CBO/294/2011
115	27 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2011	DIMO CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/295/2011
116	8 <sup>th</sup> Feb. 2011	Alego CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/296/2011
117	15 <sup>th</sup> Feb. 2011	Bwanda Namthoi CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/297/2011
118	15 <sup>th</sup> Feb. 2011	Nyamang'ura Small Water Irrigation CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/298/2011
119	16 <sup>th</sup> Feb. 2011	Access Wind CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/299/2011
120	17 <sup>th</sup> Feb. 2011	Nyamasaria Wayside CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/300/2011
121	23 <sup>rd</sup> Feb. 2011	Hifadhi Environmental CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/301/2011
122	25 Feb. 2011	Eneza Imani CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/302/2011
123	25 <sup>th</sup> Feb. 2011	Minelink CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/303/2011
124	2 <sup>nd</sup> March. 2011	Our Lord Cometh CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/304/2011
125	4 <sup>th</sup> March. 2011	Hug for Better Life CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/305/2011
126	4 <sup>th</sup> March. 2011	Kisumu Indoor air Pollution Network CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/306/2011
127	10 <sup>th</sup> March. 2011	Kibos Market Traders CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/307/2011
128	14 <sup>th</sup> March. 2011	Pambazuko Letu CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/308/2011
129	15 <sup>th</sup> March. 2011	Nyalenda TukTuk Operators CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/309/2011
130	16 <sup>th</sup> March. 2011	Life is Good Compassion CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/310/2011
131	18 <sup>th</sup> March. 2011	Victory in Comm.Support for the needy CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/311/2011
132	18 <sup>th</sup> March. 2011	JolerCBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/312/2011
133	22 <sup>nd</sup> Marc. 2011	Prints ofhope Now CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/313/2011
134	24 <sup>th</sup> March. 2011	Nyaori Integrated CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/314/2011
135	31 <sup>st</sup> March. 2011	Four star Nyalenda 'A' CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/315/2011
136	5 <sup>th</sup> April. 2011	Ijvvezo Empowerment CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/316/2011
137	6 <sup>th</sup> April. 2011	Arise Development CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/317/2011
138	7 <sup>th</sup> April. 2011	Kibuye Meteewo CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/318/2011
139	8 <sup>th</sup> April. 2011	Nyota CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/319/2011
140	8 <sup>th</sup> April. 2011	PASU CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/320/2011
141	18 <sup>th</sup> April. 2011	Bamato Env.and Sanitation Project CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/321/2011
142	18 <sup>th</sup> April. 2011	Community Initiative Kisumu CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/322/2011
143	27 <sup>th</sup> April. 2011	Sulwe Integrated CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/323/2011
144	28 <sup>th</sup> April. 2011	Community Care Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/324/2011
145	4 <sup>th</sup> May. 2011	Kajulu Discordant Couples CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/325/2011
146	9 <sup>th</sup> May. 2011	Waskanya CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/326/2011
147	17 <sup>th</sup> May. 2011	Better Living CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/327/2011
148	18 <sup>th</sup> May. 2011	Wastahili CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/328/2011
149	25 <sup>th</sup> May. 2011	Obunga Bio-Tower CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/329/2011
150	26 <sup>th</sup> May. 2011	Nanga Parents CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/330/2011
151	26 <sup>th</sup> May. 2011	Rakon CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/331/2011
152	8 <sup>th</sup> June. 2011	Tumaini Youth Development CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/332/2011
153	16 <sup>th</sup> June. 2011	Taqwa Women & Youth CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/333/2011
154	17 <sup>th</sup> June. 2011	Touching Integrated CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/334/2011

155	17 <sup>th</sup> June. 2011	Springs Ministries CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/335/2011
156	20 <sup>th</sup> June. 2011	Kisumu Juakali Women Dev. CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/336/2011
157	20 <sup>th</sup> June. 2011	Chiga Comm. Health & Dev.Group CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/337/2011
158	21 <sup>st</sup> June. 2011	Animal Welf. for Public Health Kisumu CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/338/2011
159	29 <sup>th</sup> June. 2011	Ragumo CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/339/2011
160	30 <sup>th</sup> June. 2011	Dograt Orphans' Support CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/340/2011
161	1 <sup>st</sup> July. 2011	Life Centre CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/341/2011
162	1 <sup>st</sup> July. 2011	New Kolal CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/342/2011
164	5 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Tich Kouma CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/343/2011
165	6 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Smart Girls youth Group CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/344/2011
166	6 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Johari CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/345/2011
167	7 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Happy Gallery CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/346/2011
168	8 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Agape Compassionate Eye Care CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/347/2011
169	8 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Intreach CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/348/2011
170	11 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Hodari Leny CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/349/2011
171	15 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Rubaga Youth Reponse Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/350/2011
172	19 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Zarephath CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/351/2011
173	20 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Livelihoods for Hope Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/352/2011
174	22 <sup>nd</sup> July. 2011	Jamii Tosha CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/353/2011
175	22 <sup>nd</sup> July. 2011	Women Working with Women CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/354/2011
176	25 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Diakonia Compassionate Ministry CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/355/2011
177	26 <sup>th</sup> July. 2011	Winam Comm.y Settlements Initiative CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/356/2011
178	1 <sup>st</sup> August. 2011	Supporting Girls Education CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/357/2011
179	1 <sup>st</sup> August. 2011	Fabian CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/358/2011
180	2 <sup>nd</sup> August. 2011	Jawabu CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/359/2011
181	4 <sup>th</sup> August. 2011	MakasemboEstate Integrated CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/360/2011
182	22 <sup>nd</sup> Aug. 2011	Miradi CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/361/2011
183	23 <sup>rd</sup> Aug. 2011	Kisumu Initiative Dev. Oriented CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/362/2011
184	24 <sup>th</sup> Aug. 2011	Kisumu Shiness CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/363/2011
185	2 <sup>nd</sup> Sept. 2011	Chwoyom Nyamonge CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/364/2011
186	6 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2011	Kilo Health Actors CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/365/2011
187	21 <sup>st</sup> Sept. 2011	HESAO Integrated Fish Farmers CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/366/2011
188	9 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2011	Creative Voices of Abila CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/367/2011
189	13 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2011	Kochieng Health Unit CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/368/2011
190	15 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2011	Nyalenda 'A' Tujiamini CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/369/2011
191	15 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2011	Ufanisi CBO	Manyata 'A' <sup>1</sup>	KsmEast/CBO/370/2011
192	16 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2011	Railways Comm. Health Committee CBO	L/Railways	KsmEast/CBO/371/2011
193	19 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2011	Omanya PGH Community Strategy Unit CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/372/2011
194	20 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2011	Kajulu Community Empowerment Programme	East Kajulu	KsmEast/CBO/373/2011
195	21 <sup>st</sup> Sept. 2011	HESAO Integrated Fish Farmers CBO	Nyalenda	KsmEast/CBO/366/2011
196	22 <sup>nd</sup> Sept. 2011	Takawiri Initiative CBO	Migosi	KsmEast/CBO/374/2011
197	26 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2011	Kaloleni Integrated Anti AIDS CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/375/2011
198	26 <sup>th</sup> Sept. 2011	Friends in Partnership CBO	Nyawita	KsmEast/CBO/376/2011
199	3 <sup>rd</sup> Oct. 2011	Arise Development CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/377/2011
200	5 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2011	Kisumu Veteran for Peace CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/378/2011
201	13 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2011	Obwolo CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/379/2011
202	14 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2011	Puppet Interview Programme CBO	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/380/2011
203	18 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2011	Jireh Outreach Project CBO	Kadibo	KsmEast/CBO/381/2011
204	24 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2011	Awuoth & Widows Orphans CBO	C/Kolwa	KsmEast/CBO/382/2011
205	26 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2011	Gator-Fest empowerment Network CBO	Town	KsmEast/CBO/383/2011
206	27 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2011	Shelby Rinkle Orphans & Vul.Children CBO	C/Kawino	KsmEast/CBO/384/2011
207	28 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2011	West Kajulu Focal Area Dev.Committee	W/Kajulu	KsmEast/CBO/385/2011
208	2 <sup>nd</sup> Nov. 2011	Upendo Women Empowerment Initiative	Winam	KsmEast/CBO/386/2011

1(T Nov. 2011	Green Seed Development Initiative CBO	Kondele	KsmEast/CBO/387/2011
11 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2011	Christian Family Community CBO	W/Kajulu	Ksm East/C BO/388/2011
11 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2011	Kadibo Integrated Community CBO	Nyamware	KsmEast/CBO/389/2011
11 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2011	Rameny Rae CBO	C/Kolwa	KsmEast/C B0/390/2011
14 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2011	Kisumu City Madiwangi Initiative CBO	Town	KsmEast/CBO/391/2011
18 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2011	Sensational alabasta CBO	Town	KsmEast/CBO/392/2011
29 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2011	Piny Sudo CBO	E/Kajulu	KsmEast/CBO/393/2011
29 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2011	Hippo Star Integrated CBO	W/Kolwa	KsmEast/CBO/394/2011
30 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2011	Glory Disabled CBO	E/Kolwa	KsmEast/CBO/395/2011
6 <sup>th</sup> Dec. 2011	Kisumu Motor cycle Transporters Umb. Body	Town	KsmEast/CBO/396/2011
4 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2012	Kisumu Multipurpose CBO	S No. A2526	KsmEast/CBO/245/010
9 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2012	Animal Welfare and Public Health CBO	S No. A2527	KsmEast/CBO/245/OI 0
12 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2012	Four ways CBO	S No. A2528	KsmEast/CBO/397/012
18 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2012	Helping Hands CBO	S No. A2529	KsmEast/CBO/388/012
27 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2012	St. Dorcas Sunrise Orphans and Vulnerable Children's Hope CBO	S No. A2530	KsmEast/CBO/399/012

*Source: Department of Gender & Social Services Kisumu East CBOs' Register, 2012*