

**THE COMBINED EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP PRACTICES,
EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION AND REGULATORY
FRAMEWORK ON THE PERFORMANCE OF CHARTERED
UNIVERSITIES IN KENYA**

Dr. Deogratias Rubera, Ph.D.

Email of the corresponding author: rdeo2012@gmail.com

School of Management & Leadership, The Management University of Africa

Publication Date: January 2023

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study: This study aimed at establishing whether the combined effects of leadership practices, employee motivation and regulatory framework on performance of chartered universities in Kenya are significantly different from their separate effect.

Statement of the problem: Studies show that many 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. This formed the basis of the current study.

Research methodology: The study adopted a positivist research philosophy and a cross-sectional design. The target population was 49 chartered universities operating in Kenya. Data was collected from academic registrars, persons in charge of human resources, finance, quality assurance and student chairpersons. Primary data was collected using a survey questionnaire combining closed-ended and open-ended questions distributed to 4 employees from the university management and 1 student chair as respondents. Data were analyzed using descriptive and regression analysis.

Results of the study: the P-value of the collective interaction term (leadership practices* employee motivation* regulatory framework) is $0.013 < 0.05$. and the R squared increased from 66.4% to 84.3% at the joint model. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted. Hence, a strong and statistically significant combined effect of leadership practices, employee motivation, regulatory framework on performance of chartered universities in Kenya exists.

Conclusion: The findings are useful to the leadership of Kenyan universities in the formulation of strategies and policies for improving performance. The results of this study may serve as a basis for university leaders to assess their leadership strengths and weaknesses and would use the findings to become more effective university leaders.

Recommendations: The study recommends that chartered universities in Kenya should take into account all the various dimensions of leadership practices, employee motivation, regulatory framework and performance for a better and continual performance.

Keywords: *Combined effect, Leadership practices, employee motivation, Regulatory framework, 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

Universities around the world have been established to provide the professional manpower required for national development. In Africa, and particularly in Nigeria, universities play a big role in providing effective service delivery and promoting economic development (Akomolafe & Ibijola, 2014). In Kenya, universities play an innovative role in economic development and contribute to the achievement of Vision 2030, tackling the problems of underdevelopment, and have continued to play a significant role in the training of manpower to meet the demands of industry (Otieno, 2013). Therefore, the need for university education in Kenya has provided a good market for both public and private universities in Kenya (King'oo et al., 2020). While there is agreement that the contribution of university education to the sustainable development of society has become one of the most important activities of higher education institutions, human capital flight, on the other hand, has long been a source of concern for academics and development practitioners (Odhiambo, 2013).

According to the World Bank Report (2018), 23,000 qualified academic staff were emigrating from Africa each year in search of better working conditions and this has posed serious challenges to African higher education. Earlier, in another study, Odhiambo (2013) examined the migration and brain drain in public higher education institutions in Kenya and its Implications. The findings showed that About 30% of Africa's university-trained professionals and up to 50,000 Africans with PhDs lived and worked outside the continent and the problem is particularly acute in sub-Saharan Africa and consequently the migration of academics from African universities to universities in Europe and the United States of America (USA) is harming the continents' higher education. Other studies show that management of human resources in chartered universities in Kenya is wanting especially regarding remuneration, and the inability of these universities to offer good salaries has led to an exodus of lecturers to other countries and to Kenyan private sectors which have attractive remuneration packages. This is due to the failure

of the implementation of well-thought-out good leadership and performance practices (Ogaja & Kimiti, 2016).

Therefore, there are still significant gaps in the literature on leadership studies in chartered universities, particularly in Kenya. This study addressed these gaps by introducing employee motivation and regulatory framework as mediating and moderating variables respectively to examine whether leadership practices influence on performance of chartered universities in Kenya can be improved by adopting efficient employee motivation practices and effective regulatory framework. This study therefore sought to investigate if leadership practices, employee motivation and regulatory framework affect performance of chartered universities in Kenya.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The objective of the study was to establish whether the combined effect of leadership practices, employee motivation and regulatory framework on performance of chartered universities in Kenya is significantly greater from their separate effect.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

H₀₁: The combined effect of leadership practices, employee motivation and regulatory framework on performance of chartered universities in Kenya is not significantly greater from their individual separate effects.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study was grounded on transactional leadership theory, transformational leadership theory, Herzberg's Two Factor Theory, and Institutional theory. Commenting on transactional leadership theory, Fischer et al. (2017) indicated that more companies are adopting transactional leadership to increase the performance of their employees. When a transactional leader assigns work to a follower, they are accountable for it, regardless of whether they have the resources or capability to complete it. When things go wrong, the follower is held personally responsible and is punished for their failure, just as they are rewarded when things go well. According to Ben and Agu (2012), transactional leadership provides subordinates with the necessary explanations about how they achieve their work goals and the internal and external rewards they receive when they reach their goals. Transactional leadership is identified as a way to help organizations achieve their current goals more efficiently by linking job performance to valuable compensation and securing the resources employees need to perform their jobs (Avolio, 1999; Bass & Avolio,

1993). In addition, some researchers claim that transactional leadership is detrimental to organizational performance (Behery, 2008; Emery & Barker, 2007).

Commenting on transformational leadership theory, Bass (1985) argued that transformational leadership seeks to develop knowledge and the potential of employees and can improve performance. This type of leader provides followers with the opportunity and self-confidence to perform work following his mindset to achieve organizational goals, and they pay more attention to the mission and vision, provide motivation, and open up new avenues for effective work. According to Effelsberg et al. (2014), transformational leaders serve as role models for their followers, which improves organizational performance. Simply put, a transformational leader motivates and inspires followers to achieve extraordinary results. Robbins and Coulter (2020) discovered that transformational leadership theory consists of four major components. They argued that overall, the most effective transformational leaders are leaders with genuine idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration components, whom people can rely on to do the right thing and are deeply respected by employees who normally place high trust in them. These are leaders that employees can trust and respect to make the right decisions for their organization.

Bhatti et al. (2013) asserted that transformative leadership presupposes that a leader and follower are in the process of motivating and uplifting each other. However, some scholars say that transformational leadership lacks the control and balance of competing interests, influence, and power to help avoid minority dictatorship and majority oppression (Slack, 2008). Commenting on Herzberg's two factor theory, Herzberg (1959) argued that motivators are intrinsic motivators such as challenging work, recognition, and responsibility. And hygiene factors, like status, job security, and salary, are extrinsic motivators. Motivating factors can lead to satisfaction when present and hygiene factors can lead to dissatisfaction when absent, but the two factors cannot be treated as opposites. Amabile (1993) makes a clear distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivations and asserted that intrinsic motivated person is essentially motivated when people seek joy, interest, curiosity satisfaction, self-expression, or personal challenges at work. In other words, the essential motivation is the fundamental force from within the person who creates the drive.

In addition, individuals are extrinsically motivated when engaging in work to achieve goals that are separate from the work itself. According to Story et al. (2009), people who are intrinsically

motivated prefer challenging cognitive tasks and can self-regulate their behavior, so offering rewards, setting external goals, or deadlines will have little effect on them unless they are also extrinsically motivated. Keijzers (2010) argued that motivating factors can lead to satisfaction when present. However, the absence of extrinsic motivators in the organization can lead to employee demotivation, but the two factors cannot be treated as diametrically opposed. Asghar and Oino (2018) established that intrinsic and extrinsic constructs are determinant of employee's job satisfaction. Although the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is clear, researchers contend that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation interacts with one another. Amabile (1993) opined that while extrinsic motivation can work against intrinsic motivation, it can also have a reinforcing effect.

Commenting on institutional theory, major institutional theorists, Meyer and Rowan (1977), asserted that the environment in any institution highly influences the formal structure development even more than market pressures. According to Scott (2004), institutional theory investigates the processes by which structures, such as systems, procedures, rules, norms, and routines, come to be accepted as authoritative guidelines for social behavior. Simply put, institutional theory emphasizes the organization's environment as a factor influencing the shape of the organizational structure and the company's actions. According to Nair and Prajogo (2009), institutional theory can influence international standards and practices. They also claimed that processes, structures, plans, rules, norms, and routines establish authoritative guidelines for social behavior, which have an impact on organizational performance.

EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Alhadid (2016) examined the relationship between leadership practices and organizational performance in the Jordanian commercial banks where team-building, supporting, mentoring, rewarding, and consulting were the constructs for leadership practices, while organizational performance was measured by dimensions such as financial and non-financial performance. The study adopted a descriptive survey design and a correlational survey research design. Primary data was gathered by the use of a questionnaire and document review. Through testing, the study findings revealed that team building and supporting, rewarding, and consulting are most affecting on organizational performance and there is no effect from mentoring. The Hawthorne studies revealed that employees were more productive in their jobs when employers showed an interest in their well-being and observed their behaviors (Brannigan & Zwerman, 2001). Further,

Farooq and Hanif (2013) argued that intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors play a critical role in developing long-term relationships with employees. Therefore, employee motivation plays a critical role in all organizations' success or failure, including universities whether private or public.

Haessler (2020) conducted research on strategic decisions between short-term profit and sustainability and found out that regulatory framework has either no influence or only minor influence on the sustainability of a company although implementation of sustainability strategies requires a favorable regulatory framework. 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 in theory.

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. 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.

Lee and Raschke (2016) examined employee motivation and organizational performance. According to empirical evidence, motivated employees are associated with better organizational performance. According to Thomas (2012), students' sense of belonging is critical for a positive student experience and academic engagement. He concluded that interventions to improve students' sense of belonging are frequently intertwined with institutional efforts to foster a sense of collective identity. Therefore, universities that view students as an internal constituency or stakeholder are more likely to support organized student interests and establish formal channels for involving student representatives in institutional quality processes. Based on the literature review, there is no single study done on the combined effects of leadership practices, employee motivation and regulatory framework on the performance of organizations. Consequently, the

current study sought to close the gap and establish if the relationship between leadership practices, employee motivation and regulatory framework affects performance.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a cross-sectional survey research design aimed at collecting large number of quantitative data at a point in time to establish patterns of value addition in the Kenyan higher education sector. The target population constituted 49 chartered universities. The universities were divided into two strata namely public and private universities. The total population of chartered universities in Kenya was forty-nine (49) universities (31 public universities and 18 private universities) according to the Commission for University Education 2018 data. The study applied a census study method and questionnaires were used to collect the data. The study’s respondents were drawn from all the 245 respondents including academic registrars, persons in charge of human resources, finance, quality assurance, and student chairpersons from the chartered universities in Kenya. Primary data was obtained using self-administered questionnaires. The questionnaire was mainly made up of closed questions relating to the study’s objectives.

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 Employee Motivation

The summary of the descriptive statistics for employee motivation is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Employee Motivation

Employee Motivation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Coefficient of Variation
Monetary factors				
This university offers a competitive salary to motivate employees.	203	3.68	0.91	0.25
This university offers a competitive package of medical allowances to motivate employees.	203	3.92	0.85	0.22
In this university, employees get promotions and financial incentives.	203	3.83	0.45	0.12
Average		3.81	0.74	0.19
Job design				
In this university, employees feel exceptionally good about their jobs thus motivating them to perform better.	203	3.66	0.57	0.16
In this university, employees know what is expected of them and believe their job is important to the university.	203	4.25	0.57	0.13
In this university, employees find their jobs satisfying due to the increased level of responsibility and the sense of freedom, autonomy, and opportunity to decide what and how they perform their jobs.	203	3.71	0.61	0.16
Average		3.87	0.58	0.15
Training and development				
In this university, employees feel they are well trained.	203	4.23	0.68	0.16
In this university adequate training is provided to enable employees to do their jobs effectively and efficiently.	203	3.97	0.77	0.19
Training in this university has enhanced employee performance	203	4.14	0.74	0.18
Average		4.11	0.73	0.18
Working environment				
In this university, relationship between co-workers is excellent	203	4.12	0.67	0.16
This university organizes frequent effective staff meetings that allow opportunities for discussion and interaction	203	3.84	0.70	0.18
This university has a safe and non-threatening comfortable working environment and friendly spaces for social interaction.	203	4.56	0.58	0.13

Employee Motivation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Coefficient of Variation
Average		4.17	0.65	0.16
Non-monitory factors				
This university makes adequate use of non-monetary rewards such as recognition, and flexible working hours to motivate employees	203	3.69	0.76	0.21
This university has a fair and equitable career advancement program that motivates an employee to perform better	203	3.64	0.66	0.18
This university treats employees with respect and provides equal opportunity for personal growth	203	4.04	0.76	0.19
Average		3.79	0.73	0.19

The results presented in Table 2 indicate the mean score of the survey questions under monetary factors was 3.81 with a standard deviation of 0.74 and a coefficient of variation of 0.19. The coefficient of variation measures the scattering of data points around the mean. This signified that the majority of the respondents agreed that the university offers competitive salaries to motivate employees, offers a competitive package of medical allowances to motivate employees and employees get promotions and financial incentives. Moreover, it was established that the mean score of the survey question under job design was 3.87 with a standard deviation of 0.58 and a coefficient of variation of 0.15. This implied that the majority of the respondents agreed that employees feel exceptionally good about their jobs, thus motivating them to perform better. The employees know what is expected of them and believe their job is important to the university. Also, the employees find their jobs satisfying due to the increased level of responsibility and the sense of freedom, autonomy, and opportunity to decide what and how they perform their jobs.

Likewise, the study found that the mean score of the survey question under training and development was 4.11 with a standard deviation of 0.73 and a coefficient of variation of 0.18. This signified that most of the respondents agreed that employees feel they are well trained, adequate training is provided to enable employees to do their jobs effectively and efficiently and training in the universities has enhanced employee performance. The study showed that the mean score of the survey questions under the working environment was 4.17 with a standard deviation of 0.65 and a coefficient of variation of 0.16. This implied that most of the respondents agreed that the relationship between co-workers is excellent. Universities organize frequent effective staff meetings that allow opportunities for discussion and interaction. The universities have a safe and non-threatening, comfortable working environment and friendly spaces for social interaction.

The study findings indicated that the mean score of the survey questions under non-monetary factors was 3.79, with a standard deviation of 0.73 and a coefficient of variation of 0.19. This implied that the majority of the respondents agreed that universities make adequate use of non-monetary rewards such as recognition and flexible working hours to motivate employees, universities have a fair and equitable career advancement program that motivates the employee to perform better, and the universities treat employees with respect and provides equal opportunity for personal growth.

Descriptive Statistics for Regulatory Framework

The descriptive statistics for the regulatory framework are demonstrated in Table 3.

Table 3: 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 3 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 4.

Table 4: 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 4 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. 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 5 below presents the results of the correlation analysis.

Table 5: Correlation Analysis

Variables		Performance	Leadership practices	Employee motivation	Regulatory Framework
Performance	Pearson Correlation	1.000			
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
Leadership practices	Pearson Correlation	.488**	1.000		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000			
Employee motivation	Pearson Correlation	.863**	.455**	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000		
Regulatory Framework	Pearson Correlation	.599**	.353**	.351**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	

The study results of the correlation analysis in Table 5 indicate that a positive and significant association exists between leadership practices and performance ($r=.488$, $p=.000$). Also, a positive and significant association exists between employee motivation and performance ($r=.863$, $p=.000$). Further, the regulatory framework is positively and significantly associated with performance ($r=.599$, $p=.000$).

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing confirms if the estimated regression coefficients bear any statistical significance. The hypothesis tested included;

H₀₁: The combined effect of leadership practices, employee motivation and regulatory framework on performance of chartered universities in Kenya is not significantly greater from their individual separate effects.

The combined effect of leadership practices, employee motivation and regulatory framework on performance was analyzed in 4 steps as stated below;

$$P=B_0+B_1LP+ \epsilon$$

$$P=B_0+B_2EM+ \varepsilon$$

$$P=B_0+B_1RF+ \varepsilon$$

$$P=B_0+B_1LP+B_2EM+B_3RF$$

$$+B_4LP*EM+ B_5LP*RF+ B_6EM*RF+B_7 LP*EM*RF+ \varepsilon$$

The coefficient of determination (R squared) for the four steps is presented in Table 6.

Table 6: R Squared for Leadership Practices, Employee Motivation, Regulatory Framework and Performance

Model	R Square
1	0.664
2	0.566
3	0.359
4	0.843

The results depicted in Table 6 show that the R squared for the first model for regressing leadership practices against performance is 66.4%, while the second step of regressing employee motivation against performance had an R square of 56.6%. The third step, in which the regulatory framework was regressed against performance, had an R square of 35.9%. In the last step, the R square is 84.3%. The ANOVA for leadership practices, employee motivation, regulatory framework, and performance as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: ANOVA for Leadership Practices, Employee Motivation, 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	17.125	1	17.125	261.699	.000b
	Residual	13.153	201	0.065		
	Total	30.278	202			
3	Regression	10.863	1	10.863	112.458	.000b
	Residual	19.415	201	0.097		
	Total	30.278	202			
4	Regression	25.533	7	3.648	149.905	.000b
	Residual	4.745	195	0.024		
	Total	30.278	202			

The ANOVA results in Table 7 indicated that all four 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 ($F=261.699$, $p = 0.000 < 0.05$), the F-Statistic for model three was $F=112.458$, $P = 0.000 < 0.05$. Finally, the F-Statistic for the joint model four was $F=149.905$, $P = 0.000 < 0.05$.

Moreover, Table 7 presents the regression coefficients for leadership practices, employee motivation, regulatory framework, and performance.

Table 8: Regression Coefficients for leadership practices, employee motivation, regulatory framework and performance

Model		Unstandardized	Standardized		T	Sig.
		Coefficients 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)	1.161	0.161		7.216	0.000
	Employee Motivation	0.682	0.042	0.752	16.177	0.000
3	(Constant)	0.957	0.264		3.624	0.000
	Regulatory Framework	0.678	0.064	0.599	10.605	0.000
4	(Constant)	1.244	0.739		1.684	0.094
	Leadership Practices	0.176	0.206	0.196	0.855	0.394
	Employee Motivation	0.457	0.203	0.504	2.254	0.025
	Regulatory Framework	0.468	0.229	-0.414	-2.046	0.042
	Leadership Practices * Employee Motivation	0.206	0.078	1.338	2.647	0.009
	Leadership Practices * Regulatory Framework	-0.045	0.019	1.847	2.341	0.020
	Employee Motivation * Regulatory Framework	0.038	0.006	0.281	6.496	0.000
	Leadership Practices* Employee motivation* Regulatory Framework	0.029	0.012	1.347	2.507	0.013

The fitted models are:

$$P=0.130+0.766LP$$

$$P=1.161+0.682EM$$

$$P=0.957+0.678RF$$

$$P=1.244+0.176LP+0.457EM+0.468RF+0.206LP*EM-0.045LP*RF+0.038EM*RF+0.029LP*EM*RF$$

Where P= Performance, LP= Leadership practices, EM=Employee Motivation, RF=Regulatory framework.

Based on the last model/step 4 in Table 8, it was established that considering the P-value of the collective interaction term (leadership practices* employee motivation* regulatory framework) is $0.013 < 0.05$, and the R squared increased from 66.4% to 56.6% and 35.9% to 84.3% at the joint model; thus, we conclude that joint effect of leadership practices, employee motivation, and regulatory framework on the performance of chartered universities in Kenya is significantly different from their separate effects.

CONCLUSION

The study results showed that p-value 0.013 is less than 0.05. This implies that leadership practices, employee motivation, regulatory framework are significantly predictors at explaining the performance of chartered universities in Kenya. Thus, null hypothesis was rejected, and alternative hypothesis was adopted. Hence, combined effect of leadership practices, employee motivation and regulatory framework on performance of chartered universities in Kenya is significantly greater from their separate effect. The study concluded there is a positive significant correlation between the combined effect of leadership practices, employee motivation, and regulatory framework on the performance of chartered universities in Kenya. The study established that the combined effect of leadership practices, employee motivation, and regulatory framework on the performance of chartered universities in Kenya is significantly greater than their separate effects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends that leadership practices should adopt and complement the strategy implementation approach that embraces and communicates effectively to every staff in the organization as this will positively impact organization performance, employee satisfaction, and stakeholders' fulfillment. Further, policymakers in the universities should focus on policies that enhance employee recognition and growth as well as competitive salaries. Moreover, it is recommended that university should conduct continual quality checks of its academic programs for quality and efficiency in preparation for teaching, content delivery, assessment, and research. Additionally, it is recommended that the Commission of University Education be directly involved in the quality improvement of the university programs, issuing guidelines on quality and quality assurance of human and teaching facilities of the universities as well as ensuring that the lecture facilities provided within the universities are sufficient to meet quality measures of adequacy. Lastly, 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.
- Amabile, T. M. (1993). Motivational synergy: toward new conceptualizations of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the workplace. *Human resource management*.
- Asghar, S., & Oino, I. (2018). Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction. *Market Forces*, 13(1), 1-13.
- Avolio, B.J. (1999) *Full Leadership Development: Building the Vital Forces in Organizations*. Sage.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A Response to Critiques. In M. M. Chemers., & R. Ayman, *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and directions*. Academic Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
- 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.
- Bhatti, M.A., Battour, M.M., & Ismail, A.R. (2013). Expatriates' adjustment and job performance: An examination of individual and organizational factors. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 62(7), 694-717. DOI 10.1108/IJPPM-12-2012-0132
- Behery, M. H., & Paton, R. A. (2008). Performance appraisal-cultural fit and organizational outcomes within the U.A.E. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 13(1), 166-177. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 1(3), 211–22.
- CUE. (2018). *State of University Education in Kenya*. Government Printers.
- Effelsberg, D., Solga, M., & Gurt, J. (2014). Getting followers to transcend their self-interest for the benefit of their company: Testing a core assumption of transformational leadership theory. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29(1), 131-143. <https://doi.org/10.1101/02641400818855940>.
- Emery, C. R., & Barker, K. J. (2007). The Effect of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Styles on the Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction of Customer Contact personnel. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict*, 11(1), 77-90.
- Fischer, T., Dietz, J., & Antonakis, J. (2017). Leadership process models: A review and Synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1726-53.
- Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley.
- Herzberg, B. (2010). Employee motivation related to employee performance in the organization. *Academia*, 1-31. <https://www.academia.edu>.
- King'oo, R.N., Kimencu, L., & Kinyua, G. (2020). Empirical analysis of effect of information technology capability on performance of private universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)*, 8(11),52-61. <https://doi.org/10.20431/2349-0349.0811008>
- Lee, M.T., & Raschke, R.L. (2016). Understanding employee motivation and organizational performance. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 1, 162-169.

- Meyer, J.W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutional Organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
- Nair, A., & Prajogo, D. (2009). Internalisation of ISO 9000 standards: The antecedent role of functionalist and institutionalist drivers and performance implications. *International Journal of Production Research*, 47(16), 4545-4568.
- Odhiambo, G.O. (2013). Academic Brain Drain: Impact and implications for public higher education quality in Kenya. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 8(4), 510-522.
- Ogaja, C. K., & Kimiti, G. K. (2016). Influence of Strategic Leadership on Implementation of Tactical Decisions in Public Universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 5(1), 681-889. DOI:[10.21275/v5i1.novi52760](https://doi.org/10.21275/v5i1.novi52760)
- Otieno, D. (2013). The Role of Universities in Attaining Kenya Vision 2030. *Elixir Edu. Tech.* 64, 19156-19158
- Robbins, S., & Coulter, M. (2020). *Management* (15th Edition). Pearson.
- Sandbakken, D.A. (2006). Leadership Practices and Organizational Performance - a Norwegian study. *EDAMBA Journal*, 1-16.
- Scott, W. R. (2004). Institutional theory in *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*, George Ritzer, ed. Sage.
- Slack, E. G. (2008). Follower Behavior and Organizational Performance: The Impact of Transformational Leaders. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*. 3, 123–127.
- Staw, B.M. 1976. *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation*. General Learning Press.
- Story, P. A., Hart, J. W., Stasson, M. F., & Mahoney, J. M. (2008). Using a two-factor theory of achievement motivation to examine performance-based outcomes and self-regulatory processes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 391-395.
- World Bank. (2018). *World Development Report 2018: Education*. World Bank.