



**MODERATING ROLE OF REGULATORY FRAMEWORK ON
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP PRACTICES
AND PERFORMANCE OF CHARTERED UNIVERSITIES IN
KENYA**

Dr. Deogratias Rubera, Ph.D.

Email of the corresponding author: rdeo2012@gmail.com

Graduate, Management University of Africa, School of Management & Leadership

Publication Date: December 2022

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study: The purpose of the study was to determine the moderating effect of the regulatory framework in the relationship between leadership practices and performance of chartered universities in Kenya.

Problem statement: The university's regulatory framework defines how universities perform different functions and provides guidance to accredited and informal universities. However, in the twenty first century, universities in Kenya have faced challenges which include lowering the enrollment rate of college students, low salary, lack of promotion opportunities, unsatisfactory leader behavior, student discipline problems, uncooperative colleagues and unconducive working environment, lack of effective and efficient quality service delivery to clients, inadequate quality manpower, inadequate research, staff turnover, followed by student anxiety and increased faculty strikes. Such challenges have been attributed to weak leadership practices of university leaders who have neglected regulatory framework as one of the key mechanisms by which strategic leaders lead their organizations to sustainability and which consequently has led to the underperforming of most of universities for many years.

Research methodology: The study used quantitative research approach. The sample size was 245 and included 49 chartered universities operating in Kenya. Data was collected from academic registrars, persons in charge of human resources, finance, quality assurance and student chairpersons. A self-administered, semi-structured questionnaire was used to collect the data. Obtained data was analyzed using descriptive statistics.

Findings: The study results showed that the correlation results indicated that the regulatory framework is positively and significantly associated with performance ($r=.599$, $p=000$). The study thus rejected the null hypothesis and adopted the alternative hypothesis. Thus, the study established a moderating effect of the regulatory framework in the relationship between leadership practices and the performance of chartered universities in Kenya.

Conclusion: The regulatory framework is positively and significantly associated with performance. Further, the study concluded that a significant and positive moderating effect of the regulatory framework exists on the relationship between leadership practices and the performance of chartered universities in Kenya.

Recommendations: Based on the study's findings, it is recommended that quality education, quality assurance, learning environment, quality of learning facilities, and academic freedom be emphasized by regulatory bodies such as the Commission for University Education. Further, it is recommended that universities must adhere to the requirements and standards of academic excellence set by the Commission for University Education.

Keywords: *Regulatory framework, Leadership practices, performance, Chartered Universities, Kenya*

INTRODUCTION

Universities in the world exist in order to create and communicate knowledge, mainly through research and teaching. University education contributes to the economic and social development. It trains a highly skilled workforce, as well as people with vast knowledge and enriched culture. University education is the engine that drives the economy, creates opportunity, and gives people a place to learn more, dream more, and pursue their dreams to do more and become more. Ghosh (2017) argues that the higher education affects every area of national development and deserves requisite attention. Therefore, university education is a main factor in the competitiveness of nations and rises the competition and innovation in the internal market. In Africa, Akomolafe and Ibijola (2014) portray university education as a cornerstone for development that is useful in any country. Universities are critical in preparing a country to gain a competitive advantage in the global marketplace. As a result, they are expected to produce graduates who have the necessary knowledge and skills required in the global labor market. With a well-educated society, university education is expected to make good contribution and useful for the development of the nation. Every society is expected to achieve the highest level of education. To build a good academic culture in a university, one of the conditions required to achieve this is good performance practice.

In Kenya, studies on university performance have generated varied results. Both public and private universities are viewed as an instrument for national development and social change (Mbithi et al, 2016). Mwiria and Ng'ethe (2006) highlight that university education plays an important role in facilitating technological progress and empowering countries with important source of new ideas, and necessary human capital for economic development. Mulili (2014) reported that the implementation of good leadership practices in universities is crucial to determine and influence good performance. Therefore, effective leadership practices are crucial to organizational survival in the present highly competitive and continuously evolving business

environments to strengthen the habit of operating in a way of harmonizing supervision, external quality assurance, setting standards for operation and monitoring high performance in universities.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The regulatory framework is designed to provide universities with the flexibility they need to respond to changing industry and societal demands, as well as student needs while also ensuring that appropriate criteria, requirements, and procedures for the establishment and maintenance of quality and academic standards are established and followed. In Kenya, accreditation of academic programs is one of the quality assurance mechanisms initiated by the Commission for University Education (CUE) to ensure that at least the minimum academic standards of quality education in chartered universities are regulated, attained, maintained, and enhanced. However, the decreasing quality of university education in chartered universities in Kenya has become a matter of great concern to the nation, and the CUE suggests paying more attention to the quality education, quality assurance, and learning environment (CUE, 2018). Such great concern to the nation has been attributed to weak leadership practices of university leaders who have neglected regulatory framework as one of the key mechanisms by which strategic leaders lead their organizations to sustainability and which consequently has led to the underperforming of most of universities for a long time (Clune & Zehnder, 2018). Consequently, in Kenya, as Aondo et al. (2020) asserted, both private and public chartered universities are recruiting the teaching staff neither permanently nor on a contract basis, casting uncertainty on their commitment to research and knowledge development. As a result, whether the accreditation exercise achieves its goal of improving the quality of university education in Kenya's chartered universities has become a major source of concern for the country (CUE, 2018). Therefore, there is a huge need to explore ways of reversing and addressing the above challenges through sound responses, to apply the best regulatory framework policies for universities to remain widely acknowledged to effectively compete and boost their performance.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

To examine the moderating influence of regulatory framework on the relationship between leadership practices and performance of chartered universities in Kenya.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

H₀₁: There is no significant moderating effect of the regulatory framework in the relationship between leadership practices and performance of chartered universities in Kenya.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is grounded on institutional theory. According to institutional theorists, an organization's legitimacy explains its survival. A school is successful if everyone agrees it is a school; it is unsuccessful if no one believes it is a school, regardless of its success in instruction or socialization (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Institutional theory contributes to our understanding of the pressures that cause institutions to become more similar, thereby reducing institutional diversity.

Organizations strive to conform to easily recognizable and acceptable standards within their organizational field, which contributes to the legitimacy of the organization. Institutional theory describes how intentional and unintentional choices cause institutions to reflect organizational norms, values, and ideologies. As a result, organizations that exhibit the expected characteristics of the environment gain legitimacy and demonstrate that they are deserving of resources from society and the broader environment. According to Toma et al. (2005), institutional theory emphasizes the normative impact of the environment on organizational activity. Colleges and universities are in an institutional environment in which external stakeholders influence organizational behaviour and practices in part. As a result, institutional theory contends that the environment determines organizational options and limits campus leaders' discretion in making decisions. The range of decisions available to institutions is driven by external pressure for conformity.

Scott (2014) distinguishes three institutional pillars: regulatory, normative, and cultural cognitive. The regulatory pillar focuses on the use of rules, laws, and sanctions as a means of enforcement, with expediency serving as the basis for compliance. According to Preuss (2007), the normative pillar refers to norms (how things should be done) and values (the preferred or desirable), with social obligation serving as the foundation for compliance. The cultural-cognitive pillar is founded on mutual comprehension (common beliefs, symbols, shared understanding). According to Morphew and Huisman (2002), when institutions operate within the guidelines and accepted notions, external constituents see the college as a legitimate actor in the field of higher education. The environment then rewards legitimacy with additional funding, quality faculty, and interested students. As a result, the larger environment of normative expectations provides both positive and negative reinforcement, shaping institutional behaviour. As a result, in terms of universities' policy regulatory framework, many policies and restructuring have been implemented in order to control and dominate university education processes in order to improve transparency and accountability. Therefore, the institutional theory is relevant and forms a crucial basis for this study.

EMPIRICAL REVIEW

According to Heiss and Kelley (2017), organizations must always adhere to the local regulatory environment in order for them to pursue their missions. The performance of Chartered Universities in Kenya in satisfying public expectations is influenced by a variety of factors, all of which can be elevated or diminished by the legal frameworks that shape institutional capabilities to respond to, adapt to, and maintain flexibility in the face of change. The value of these legal frameworks for university education is frequently recognized in practice rather than theory. According to Pedo et al. (2018), the regulatory framework in Kenya critically reviews the history of the university in order to understand its purposes and policy development. Furthermore, it examines the role of government and its approach toward the university in historical regulatory arrangements. According to Republic of Kenya (1964), educational policies in Kenya are based on various policies and statutory documents established in independent Kenya. They constitute the legal framework of the country's education system.

According to Owino et al. (2014), in 1964, the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) was established and was entrusted with the organization of the curriculum and other teaching methodology. In 1964, the Kenya Education Commission was appointed to look into the existing

education system in Kenya. It was also to provide advice to the government on the development and implementation of national education policies. The commission abolished the segregation of schools along racial lines and established a standardized national curriculum for all. It localized the curriculum and the medium of instruction. It placed emphasis on secondary and higher education for the production of middle and high-level manpower training required for development. Concerning university education in Kenya, the Universities Act of 2016 was enacted to provide for the advancement of university education in Kenya. It established the Commission for Higher Education (CHE), a body corporate responsible for the advancement of university education and to regulate University education in Kenya. In addition, in 2012, an Act of Parliament, Universities Act, No. 42 of 2012, established the Commission for University Education (CUE).

Dobbins and Knill (2014) indicate that the Regulatory Framework of universities states how the university intends to perform its various functions and provides guidance for both chartered and non-chartered universities operating in Kenya. The Regulatory Framework is designed to provide universities with the flexibility they need to respond to changing industry and societal demands, as well as student needs, while also ensuring that appropriate criteria, requirements, and procedures for the establishment and maintenance of quality and academic standards are established and followed. In Kenya, universities have to adhere to the regulatory framework of the Commission of University Education (CUE).

The mission of the CUE is to regulate and ensure quality university education by setting standards and monitoring compliance. The CUE's mandate is to promote the goals of university education by regulating and accrediting universities and programs, among other things. The Commission is committed to increasing access to high-quality university education and training through planning, coordination, resource mobilization, quality assurance enhancement, and information services. To achieve this goal, the chartered universities need to carry out quality students' intake, quality teaching, quality research and provide quality infrastructural facilities, services and resources. They need to provide quality and adequate students' support services to enhance quality learning outcomes. One way of stimulating authorities of universities to provide these services is through accreditation because no university wants to be denied accreditation (CUE, 2018).

According to Obadara and Alaka (2013), accreditation is a process that assists institutions in developing and sustaining effective educational programs, creating a conducive learning environment, and assuring the educational community, the general public, and other organizations that the accredited institution has met high quality and effectiveness standards. Hence, it is a measure of quality of academic programs and it is aimed at strengthening academic programs for quality assurance and quality improvement. However, Segismundo (2017) concluded in a study titled *Measuring Accreditation Experience: Impact on the Quality of Education* that accreditation has little effect on improving educational quality.

In Kenya, accreditation of academic programs is one of the quality assurance mechanisms initiated by the CUE to ensure that at least the minimum academic standards of quality education in chartered universities are regulated, attained, maintained and enhanced. However, the decreasing quality of university education in chartered universities in Kenya has become a matter

of great concern to the nation, and the CUE suggests paying more attention on the quality education, quality assurance and learning environment (CUE, 2018).

According to Neumann and Guthrie (2006), universities have competing priorities that must be reconciled in order to achieve multiple goals at the same time. As a result, university performance is multidimensional. According to Warning (2007), an appropriate performance measure is how well an institution transforms its inputs into outputs. Worthington and Lee (2008) used teaching quality or teaching performance and research quality or research performance as performance measures for universities. In addition to the measures mentioned above, financial performance, as measured by university financial viability, was used as a performance metric in this study (Jenatabadi, 2015).

Obadara and Alaka (2013) suggested that the CUE, as a regulatory oversight, needs to be strengthened and given enough financial resources to harness its technical and human resources for effective monitoring and quality education enforcement. It cannot, however, carry out its responsibilities on its own. Internal university quality assurance units and professional associations must also be involved. In this study, the regulatory framework constructs such as quality education, quality assurance and learning environment were used to measure the moderating effect of regulatory framework in the relationship between leadership practices and performance of chartered universities in Kenya.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A cross-sectional survey research design was used in conjunction with a positivistic philosophy approach which posits that to empirically establish the relationships between variables of a study, hypotheses are formulated and through the observed effects they are verified or refuted. The design of this study was a descriptive survey as it helps to answer questions concerning the current status of the subjects under study (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2013). Accordingly, the study used quantitative research approach in testing the moderating influence of regulatory framework on the relationship between independent variable, leadership practices and dependent variable, performance. Furthermore, the study embraced descriptive correlational survey design to examine the relationship. In terms of quantitative approach, the research utilized survey research, which offered numeric descriptions using questionnaires for data collection (Creswell, W. & Creswell, 2017). The questionnaires were administered to function managers and student council presidents of universities, within a sample of the population for providing generalized conclusions.

The target population for this study focused on forty-nine (49) chartered universities authorized to operate in Kenya by the Government of Kenya. The universities were divided into two strata namely public and private universities. The total population of chartered universities in Kenya is forty-nine (49) universities (31 public universities and 18 private universities) that offer their own degree programs as of 2018. The respondents included all the university Academic registrars, In charge of Human Resource, In charge of Finance, In charge of Quality Assurance and Student Council Chairs of all chartered universities in Kenya. This resulted in a total number of 245 respondents who took part in the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Practices

The descriptive statistics for leadership practices are presented below. The description of each of the measures of leadership practices is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Leadership practices

Leadership practices	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Coefficient of Variation
Modeling the way				
In this university leaders effectively model the behaviour they expect from others.	203	3.80	0.68	0.18
In this university, leaders demonstrate by words and actions their own values and those that are equally important to the organization.	203	3.98	0.83	0.21
Leaders in this university practice what they preach. Their words and deeds are consistently aligned.	203	3.72	0.74	0.20
Average		3.83	0.75	0.20
Inspiring a shared vision				
In this university leaders engage others in tying their personal dreams to the aspirations of the group to create a shared vision	203	4.04	0.57	0.14
In this university leaders boldly and creatively communicate their hopes and future dreams.	203	4.17	0.58	0.14
In this university leaders seek input, and engage everyone in shaping the vision of how to achieve a collective goal.	203	3.67	0.80	0.22
Average		3.96	0.65	0.17
Challenging the Process				
In this university leaders are pioneers at taking the initiative in searching for innovative ways to improve their own work and that of their teams.	203	4.14	0.58	0.14
Leaders in this university give people challenging tasks, to experiment and take risks, to continually learn from experience.	203	3.97	0.74	0.19
Leaders in this university create a climate in which employees feel safe and supported in challenging the status quo.	203	4.00	0.71	0.18
Average		4.04	0.68	0.17
Enabling others to act				
In this university leaders involve employees in decision making and goal setting.	203	3.63	0.71	0.20

In this university leaders treats others with respect.	203	4.33	0.60	0.14
In this university leaders create atmosphere of trust.	203	4.35	0.91	0.25
Average		4.10	0.75	0.19
Encouraging the heart				
In this university leaders celebrate others' accomplishments in personal and meaningful ways.	203	3.97	0.59	0.15
In this university, leaders recognize others' contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence.	203	4.00	0.49	0.12
In this university, leaders give praise for a job well done.	203	3.92	0.59	0.15
Average		3.96	0.56	0.14

Based on the study results presented in Table 1, the average mean score of the survey questions under modeling the way was 3.83, with a standard deviation of 1.10 and a coefficient of variation of 0.20. The coefficient of variation measures the dispersion of data points around the mean. This signified that the majority of the respondents agreed that university leaders effectively model the behaviour they expect from others, demonstrate by words and actions their values and those that are equally important to the organization, practice what they preach, and their words and deeds are consistently aligned.

Moreover, it was established that the mean score of the survey question under inspiring a shared vision was 3.96 with a standard deviation of 0.65 and a coefficient of variation of 0.17. This indicated majority of the respondents agreed that university leaders engage others in tying their dreams to the aspirations of the group to create a shared vision, leaders boldly and creatively communicate their hopes and future dreams, seek input, and engage everyone in shaping the vision of how to achieve a collective goal. In addition, it was found that the mean score of the survey question under challenging the process was 4.04 with a standard deviation of 0.68 and a coefficient of variation of 0.17. This signified that the majority of the respondents agreed the university leaders are pioneers at taking the initiative in searching for innovative ways to improve their work and that of their teams, give people challenging tasks, experiment and take risks, continually learn from experience and create a climate in which employees feel safe and supported in challenging the status quo.

Further, it was noted that the mean score of the statements under enabling others to act was 4.10 with a standard deviation of 0.75 and a coefficient of variation of 0.19. This signified that most of the respondents agreed that university leaders involve employees in decision-making and goal setting, treat others with respect, and create an atmosphere of trust. In addition, it was noted that the mean score under the survey questions of encouraging the heart was 3.96 with a standard deviation of 0.56 and a coefficient of variation of 0.14. This meant that most of the respondents agreed that university leaders celebrate others' accomplishments in personal and meaningful ways, recognize others' contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence and praise a job well done.

Descriptive Statistics for Regulatory Framework

The descriptive statistics for the regulatory framework are demonstrated in Table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Regulatory Framework

Regulatory Framework	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Coefficient of Variation
Quality education				
The Commission of University Education is directly involved in the quality improvement of these university programs.	203	4.81	0.40	0.08
This university meets the requirements and standards of academic excellence set by the Commission of University Education.	203	4.49	0.58	0.13
This university conducts continual quality checks of its academic programs for quality and efficiency, in the preparation for teaching, delivery of content, and assessment.	203	4.24	0.62	0.15
Average		4.51	0.53	0.12
Quality assurance				
The Commission of University Education issues from time to time guidelines on quality and quality assurance of human and teaching facilities of this university	203	4.69	0.49	0.10
The Commission of University Education facilitates external quality assurance of these university programmes.	203	4.63	0.54	0.12
This university strengthens internal Quality Assurance mechanisms and promotes good governance.	203	3.96	0.74	0.19
Average		4.43	0.59	0.14
Learning environment				
Facilities used in this university meet the standards of physical resources of the Commission of University Education.	203	3.79	0.68	0.18
This university has facilities that are in an environment that is conducive to learning	203	3.77	0.75	0.20
This university is managed for the better protection of the interests of the students and staff of the university	203	4.58	0.52	0.11
Average		4.05	0.65	0.16

Quality of learning facilities				
In this university, the quality of the library meets quality measures of adequacy.	203	3.49	0.84	0.24
In this university, the quality of online resources is good enough to meet the needs of the students and teaching staff members.	203	3.36	1.15	0.34
The lecture facilities provided by this university are sufficient to meet quality measures of adequacy	203	3.78	0.69	0.18
Average		3.54	0.89	0.25
Academic freedom				
I feel satisfied that this university offers the right of its scholars to pursue their research, teach, and publish without control or restraint.	203	4.17	0.58	0.14
In this university students feel free to interact with their teachers inside and outside the classroom.	203	4.26	0.72	0.17
In this university, its scholars can afford to research that they are supposedly free to do and can exchange and communicate research ideas and findings without interference.	203	4.25	0.68	0.16
Average		4.23	0.66	0.16

The study results presented in Table 2 indicate the mean score of the statements under quality education was 4.51 with a standard deviation of 0.53 and a coefficient of variation of 0.12. This signified that most of the respondents agreed the commission of university education is directly involved in the quality improvement of the university programs. The universities meet the requirements and standards of academic excellence set by the Commission of University Education. They conduct continual quality checks of their academic programs for quality and efficiency in preparation for teaching, delivery of content, and assessment. Moreover, the mean score of the survey statements under the quality assurance was 4.43 with a standard deviation of 0.59 and a coefficient of variation of 0.14. This meant that the majority of the respondents agreed that the Commission of University Education issues from time to time guidelines on quality and quality assurance of human and teaching facilities of the universities. The Commission of University Education facilitates external quality assurance of the university programmes and universities, strengthens internal Quality Assurance mechanisms, and promotes good governance.

The study showed that the mean score of the survey questions under the learning environment was 4.05 with a standard deviation of 0.65 and a coefficient of variation of 0.16. This implied that most of the respondents agreed that facilities used in the universities meet the standards of physical resources of the Commission of University Education. The universities facilities an environment conducive to learning and universities are managed for the better protection of the interests of the students and staff of the university. In addition, the study established that the mean score of the survey questions under the quality of learning facilities was 3.54 with a standard deviation of 0.89 and a coefficient of variation of 0.25. This implied that the majority of the respondents agreed the quality of the library within the universities meets quality measures of

adequacy. Further, the quality of online resources is good enough to meet the needs of the students and teaching staff members and the lecture facilities provided in universities are sufficient to meet quality measures of adequacy. Moreover, the study found that the mean score of the survey questions under academic freedom was 4.23 with a standard deviation of 0.66 and a coefficient of variation of 0.16. This implied that most of the respondents agreed they feel satisfied that universities offer the right of their scholars to pursue their research, teach, and publish without control or restraint. The students feel free to interact with their teachers inside and outside the classroom and scholars can exchange and communicate research ideas and findings without interference.

Descriptive Statistics for Performance

The dependent variable in the study was performance. The descriptive statistics for performance based on the findings from the respondents are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Performance

Performance	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Coefficient of Variation
Teaching quality				
In this university, lecturers are competent in the planning, preparation, and delivery of lectures.	203	4.49	0.62	0.14
This university has an adequate highly qualified teaching staff.	203	4.34	0.88	0.20
The teaching quality that this university is giving its students gives them a high level of competition in the labour and employment market.	203	4.03	0.72	0.18
Average		4.29	0.74	0.17
Research quality				
This university has invested in research and innovation and has a high number of successful research-granted applications.	203	3.38	0.90	0.26
In this university, faculty members have published academic books and journal articles with well-respected international publishers.	203	3.89	0.74	0.19
This university engages the industry and other key stakeholders (owners, employers, employees, parents, customers, and community) in developing a curriculum for degree courses that meet the labour market demands.	203	3.41	0.71	0.21
Average		3.56	0.78	0.22

Financial viability				
This university has experienced an adequate continuous increase in cash flow for the last five years.	203	3.58	0.73	0.20
This university pays its employees and suppliers regularly and fairly.	203	3.45	0.93	0.27
This university has experienced adequate continuous revenue growth for the last five years.	203	3.83	0.94	0.25
Average		3.62	0.87	0.24
Student success				
In this university, students graduate in a given time period and I feel satisfied with the percentage of students who graduate and the amount of time it takes them.	203	4.19	0.44	0.11
In this university, graduate students finish their research degrees in a given time period and I feel satisfied with the degree completion rates of students.	203	4.16	0.42	0.10
This university keeps track of students after graduation to see where their education takes them.	203	2.93	1.16	0.40
Average		3.76	0.68	0.20
Employee satisfaction				
This university offers employees adequate and continuous personal opportunities for growth.	203	3.32	0.62	0.19
The leadership of this university regularly provides constructive feedback to each employee and recognizes them for achieving the proposed objectives.	203	3.51	0.83	0.24
In this university, overall employees are satisfied with their jobs.	203	3.79	0.79	0.21
Average		3.54	0.75	0.21

The results presented in Table 3 indicate that the mean score of survey questions under teaching quality was 4.29 with a standard deviation of 0.74 and a coefficient of variation of 0.17. This implied that most respondents agreed that lecturers are competent in planning, preparing, and delivering lectures. Universities have adequate, highly qualified teaching staff and teaching quality to students, giving them a high level of competition in the labour and employment market. The study found that the mean score of the survey questions under research quality was 3.56 with a standard deviation of 0.78 and a coefficient of variation of 0.22. This signified that most respondents agreed that universities have invested in research and innovation and have a high number of successful research granted applications. Faculty members have published academic books and journal articles with well-respected international publishers. The

universities engage the industry and other key stakeholders (owners, employers, employees, parents, customers, and community) in developing curriculum for degree courses that meet the labour market demands.

The study revealed that the mean score of the survey questions under financial viability was 3.62, with a standard deviation of 0.87 and a coefficient of variation of 0.24. The study results signified that the majority of the respondents agreed that universities have experienced an adequate continuous increase in cash flow for the last five years, and the university pays its employees and suppliers regularly and fairly. The university has experienced adequate continuous revenue growth over the previous five years. In addition, the mean score of the survey questions under student success was found to be 3.76 with standard deviation of 0.68 and a coefficient of variation of 0.20. This implied that the majority of the respondents agreed that students graduate in a given time period and feel satisfied with the percentage of students who graduate and the amount of time it takes them, graduate students finish their research degrees in a given time period and I feel satisfied with degree completion rates of students and the university keeps track of students after graduation to see where their education takes them.

The study further noted that the mean score of the survey questions under employee satisfaction was 3.54 with a standard deviation of 0.75 and a coefficient of variation of 0.2. This implied that the majority of the respondents agreed that the universities offer employees adequate and continuous personal opportunities for growth, the leadership of the universities regularly provides constructive feedback to each employee and recognizes them for achieving the proposed objectives, and overall, employees are satisfied with their jobs.

Correlation Analysis

Table 4 below presents the results of the correlation analysis.

Table 4: Correlation Matrix

Variables		Performance	Leadership practices	Regulatory Framework
Performance	Pearson Correlation	1.000		
	Sig. (2-tailed)			
Leadership practices	Pearson Correlation	.855**	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000		
Regulatory Framework	Pearson Correlation	.599**	.353**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	

The study results of the correlation analysis in Table 4 indicate that a positive and significant association exists between leadership practices and performance ($r=.855$, $p=.000$). Further, it was established that a positive and significant association exists between regulatory framework and performance ($r=.599$, $p=0.000$). This also implied that since regulatory framework had a positive

and significant effect, thus, its increase will lead to improvement in Performance in Chartered Universities.

Hypothesis Testing

The objective of the study was to establish the moderating effect of regulatory framework in the relationship between leadership practices and performance of chartered universities in Kenya. The hypothesis stated in the null form as follows:

H₀₁: There is no significant moderating effect of regulatory framework in the relationship between leadership practices and performance of chartered universities in Kenya.

The moderating effect was analyzed in three steps as shown below:

$$P = \beta_0 + \beta_1 LP + \epsilon$$

$$P = \beta_0 + \beta_1 LP + \beta_2 RF + \epsilon$$

$$P = \beta_0 + \beta_1 LP + \beta_2 RF + \beta_3 LP * RF + \epsilon$$

The coefficient of determination (R squared) for the three steps is presented below in Table 5. The models presented are based on the study results from the SPSS.

Step 1: A regression analysis with LP predicting P

$$P = \beta_0 + \beta_1 LP + \epsilon$$

Step 2: A regression analysis with LP predicting RF

$$P = \beta_0 + \beta_1 LP + \beta_2 RF + \epsilon$$

Step 3: A regression analysis with RF predicting P

$$P = \beta_0 + \beta_1 LP + \beta_2 RF + \beta_3 LP * RF + \epsilon$$

Where; P=Performance of Chartered Universities; LP= Composite of Modelling the way, inspiring a shared vision, Challenging the process, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart.

Table 5: R Squared for Leadership Practices, Regulatory Framework and Performance

Model	R Square
1	0.732
2	0.760
3	0.788

The study results in Table 5 indicate that regressing leadership practices against performance had an R square of 73.2%, in the first step. In step 2, leadership practices and regulatory framework is regressed against performance and the R square obtained is 76%. The third step regressed leadership practices and regulatory framework and the interaction term $\beta LP*RF$ against performance and the R square is 78.8%. The results show that the R squared varied in the three models and increased. Due to interactive term, the percentage of change was 0.788 minus 0.732 and the results are 0.056. Thus, it can be established that 5.6% increase in performance are related to regulatory framework. Therefore, there is enhancing moderating effect of regulatory framework on the relationship between leadership practices and performance. Thus, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and settles on the alternative hypothesis that there is enhancing moderating effect of regulatory framework on the relationship between leadership practices and performance of chartered universities in Kenya. Moreover, the study results of the analysis of variance are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: ANOVA for Leadership Practices, Regulatory Framework and Performance

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	22.155	1	22.155	548.228	.000b
	Residual	8.123	201	0.04		
	Total	30.278	202			
2	Regression	23.004	2	11.502	316.272	.000b
	Residual	7.274	200	0.036		
	Total	30.278	202			
3	Regression	23.867	3	7.956	246.97	.000b
	Residual	6.41	199	0.032		
	Total	30.278	202			

The ANOVA results presented in Table 6 show that all three models were significant at $0.000 < 0.05$. The F-Statistic for model one was ($F=548.228$, $p = 0.000 < 0.05$), the F-Statistic for Model two was ($F=316.272$, $p = 0.000 < 0.05$), the F-Statistic for model three was $F=246.97$, $P = 0.000 < 0.05$. The importance of conducting the ANOVA was to show whether the models are significant in explaining the performance. The ANOVA test is a way to find out if survey results are significant. Further, the regression of coefficients for leadership practices, regulatory framework, and performance are presented in Table 7

Table 7: Regression Coefficients for Leadership Practices, Regulatory Framework and Performance

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.130	0.155		0.836	0.404
	Leadership Practices	0.766	0.033	0.855	23.414	0.000
2	(Constant)	-0.345	0.177		-1.952	0.052
	Leadership Practices	0.671	0.037	0.749	18.272	0.000
	Regulatory Framework	0.224	0.046	0.198	4.832	0.000
3	(Constant)	-0.319	0.178		-1.796	0.074
	Leadership Practices	0.058	0.176		-0.330	0.016
	Regulatory Framework	0.538	0.043	0.600	12.465	0.000
	Leadership Practices * Regulatory Framework	0.112	0.049	0.099	2.291	0.023

The fitted models were:

$$P = 0.130 + 0.766LP$$

$$P = -0.345 + \beta_1 LP + 0.224RF$$

$$P = -0.319 + -0.058LP + 0.538RF + 0.112LP * RF$$

The regression of coefficients results presented in Table 7 depicts that in step one, the regression model of leadership practices on performance is positively and significantly related ($\beta=0.766$, $p=0.000$). In step two, the results show that the regression model of leadership practices and regulatory framework on performance is positively and significantly related ($\beta=0.671$, $p=0.000$; $\beta=0.224$, $p=0.000$). In step three, the results show that the regression model of leadership practices, regulatory framework, and interaction between leadership practices and regulatory framework on performance is positively and significantly related with $\beta=0.058$, $p=0.016$; $\beta=0.538$, $p=0.000$; $\beta=0.112$, $p=0.023$) respectively. The study findings concur with the results of Dobbins and Knill (2014), who indicated that the regulatory framework of universities states how the university intends to perform its various functions and provides guidance for both chartered and non-chartered universities operating in Kenya. The Regulatory Framework is designed to provide universities with the flexibility to respond to changing industry and societal demands and student needs while also ensuring that appropriate criteria, requirements, and

procedures for establishing and maintaining quality and academic standards are established and followed. In addition, the study findings of Obadara and Alaka (2013) showed that the regulatory framework influences the performance of universities. The regulatory framework can be based on emphasising quality education, quality assurance and a learning environment.

CONCLUSION

it is concluded that regulatory framework is positively and significantly related to performance. The study demonstrated that there is a significant effect of regulatory framework and performance of chartered Universities in Kenya. The study established that if leadership practices is not significant when regulatory framework is controlled, then there is full moderation, and if both leadership practices and regulatory framework significantly predict performance, then there is partial moderation. The null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, regulatory framework has significant moderating role on the relationship between leadership practices and performance of chartered Universities in Kenya.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends that quality education, quality assurance, learning environment, quality of learning facilities and academic freedom be emphasized by regulatory bodies such as the Commission for University Education. The Commission for University Education in Kenya be directly involved in the quality improvement of the university programs. Further, the universities should adhere to the requirements and standards of academic excellence set by the Commission for University Education. Furthermore, because the higher education sector is so competitive, appropriate regulatory framework is critical for enhancing effective leadership practices that are required for better performance. The Commission for University Education, as regulatory oversight, be strengthened and given enough financial resources to harness its technical and human resources for effective monitoring and quality education enforcement.

REFERENCES

- Akomolafe, C., & Ibijola, E. (2014). Employee and Students' Perception of Students' Participation in University Governance in Ekiti and Ondo States, Nigeria. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 4(2), 73-81.
- Aondo R, M., Ngui T., & Okeyo W. (2020), The Relationship between Transformational Leadership Style and Performance of Chartered Universities in Kenya. *Journal of Human Resource & Leadership*, 4(4), 59-75.
- Ben, E.U., & Agu. O. A. (2012). Impact of Transformational and Transactional Leadership on Organizational Performance. *International Journal of Current Research*, 4(20), 1-7.
- Clune, W. H., & Zehnder, A. J. (2018). The three pillars of sustainability framework: approaches for laws and governance. *Journal of Environmental Protection*, 9(3), 211-240.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Sage publications.

- CUE. (2018). *State of University Education in Kenya*. Government Printers.
- Dobbins, M., & Knill, C. (2014). *Higher education governance and policy change in Western Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Edinburgh, G. (2003). *Sustainable Construction and the Regulatory Framework Summary Report*. University of Dundee.
- Erçetin, S.S. (2018). *Chaos, Complexity and Leadership*. Springer International Publishing.
- Ghosh, S. K. (2017). The direct and interactive effects of job insecurity and job embeddedness on unethical pro-organizational behavior: An empirical examination. *Personnel. Rev.*, 46, 1182–1198. doi: 10.1108/PR-05-2015-0126
- Gupta, H. (2018). Assessing organizations performance on the basis of GHRM practices using BWM and Fuzzy TOPSIS. *Journal of environmental management*, 226, 201-216.
- Heiss, A., & Kelley, J. (2017). Between a rock and a hard place: International NGOs and the dual pressures of donors and host governments. *The Journal of Politics*, 79(2), 732-741.
- Jenatabadi, H.S. (2015). *An Overview of Organizational Performance Index: Definitions and Measurements*. University of Malaya. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.4298.3849
- Mbithi, A. M., K'Obonyo, P., & Awino, Z. (2016). Transformational Leadership, Employee Outcomes, and Performance of Universities in Kenya. *DBA Africa Management Review*, 6(2), 1-20.
- Meyer, J.W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutional Organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
- Morphew, C. C., & Huisman, J. (2002). Using institutional theory to reframe research on academic drift. *Higher Education in Europe*, 27(4), 492–506.
- Mugenda, O.M., & Mugenda, A.G. (2013). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Acts Press.
- Muli, B.S. (2018). Motivation as A Catalyst for Employee Performance: Case of Civil Aviation Authority in Kenya. *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, 46, 11-16.
- Mulili, B. M. (2014). Corporate Governance in Kenya's Public Universities. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 6(2), 342–357. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-022013-0008>
- Mwiria, K., & Ng'ethe, N. (2006). *Public University Reform in Kenya: Mapping the Key Changes of the Last Decade*. East Africa Educational Publishers.

- Mwiria, K., Ng'ethe, N., Ngome, C., Ouma-Odero, O., Wawire, V., & Wesonga, D. (2007). *Public and Private Universities in Kenya: New Challenges, Issues and Achievements*. East African Educational Publishers.
- Neumann, R.T., & Guthrie, J. (2006). Performance Indicators in Australian Universities: Establishment, Development and Issues. Presented to the EIASM 2nd Workshop on the Process of Reform of University Systems, 4-6 May 2006, Venice, Italy, Available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1361320>
- Obadara, O. E. & Alaka, A. A. (2013). Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Nigerian Universities. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(8), 34-41. <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/5184/5302>
- Owino, E., Kibera, F., Munyoki, J., & Wainaina, G. (2014). Service Quality in Kenyan Universities: Dimensionality and Contextual Analysis. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(11), 180-194. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262375618>
- Pedo, M. O., Kabare, K., & Makori, M. (2018, April). Effect of regulatory framework on performance of public private partnerships road projects in Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 5(2), 850 – 868.
- Preuss, L. (2007). Buying into our Future: Sustainability Initiatives in Local Government Procurement. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 16(5), 354-365.
- Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities*. Sage Publications.
- Segismundo, M.C.D. (2017). Measuring Accreditation Experience: Impact on the Quality of Education of Selected ASAS Member-Schools In Luzon and the NCR. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 5(7), 289-300. *Students* (6th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Toma, J. D., Dubrow, G., & Hartley, M. (2005). The uses of institutional culture: Strengthening identification and building brand equity in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 31(2).
- Tschirley, D., Poulton, C., & Labaste, P. (2009). *Organization and performance of cotton sectors in Africa: Learning from reform experience*. The World Bank.
- Warning, S. (2007). *The Economic Analysis of Universities: Strategic Groups and Positioning*. Edward Elgar Publishing Company.
- World Bank. (2018). *World Development Report 2018: Education*. World Bank.
- Worthington, A.C., & Lee, B.L. (2008). Efficiency, Technology and Productivity Change in Australian Universities, 1998-2003. *Economics of Education Review*, 27(3), 285-98.