

**EFFECT OF HIGH-PERFORMANCE ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK ON
PERFORMANCE OF CHARTERED PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES AT THE KENYAN
COAST**

KANENO ALI WARRAKAH

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS IN THE
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTERS DEGREE IN
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT) OF THE
TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF MOMBASA**

2023

DECLARATION

This thesis is my original work and has not been presented for academic award in any other university.

Signature:.....**Date:**.....

Kaneno Ali Warrakah

Reg. No.: MBA/1994/2015

This thesis has been submitted with our approval as University Supervisors.

Signature:**Date:**

Peter S. Sasaka, PhD.

TUM, Kenya.

Signature:**Date:**

Jean M. Uzel, PhD

TUM, Kenya

DEDICATION

This thesis is a dedication to My Family: Late Parents, Wife and Children

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First, I would like to thank Technical University of Mombasa for giving me the opportunity to pursue Postgraduate Studies. Secondly, I would like to thank Dr. Sasaka and Dr. Uzel for their support and guidance as my supervisors towards the development of this research project. I would also like to thank my lecturers at Technical University of Mombasa for introducing me to the rigours of academic work at the postgraduate level. Above all, I thank the Almighty Allah for everything in achieving my dream of getting my MBA degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	x
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	xi
DEFINITION OF TERMS	xiii
ABSTRACT.....	xv
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background Information.....	1
1.1.1 Global Perspective of High Performance Organization Framework.....	3
1.1.2 Regional Perspective of High Performance Organization Framework.....	3
1.1.3 Kenyan Perspective of High Performance Organization Framework.....	4
1.1.4 Profile of Chartered Public Universities in Kenyan Coast.....	4
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	7
1.3 Objectives of the Study.....	9
1.3.1 General Objective.....	9
1.3.2 Specific Objectives.....	9
1.4 Research Hypothesis	10
1.5. Significance of Study	10
1.5.1 University Management.....	10
1.5.2 Government and Policy Makers.....	11
1.5.3 Education Partners and Stakeholders.....	12
1.6 Scope of Study.....	12
1.7 Limitations of the Study.....	13
CHAPTER TWO.....	14
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	14
2.1 Introduction.....	14
2.2 Theoretical Framework	14

2.2.1 Scenario Planning Theory	14
2.2.2 Deming Cycle Theory	15
2.2.4 Kaizen Theory	16
2.2.3 Goal- Setting Theory.....	18
2.2.4 Administrative Management Theory	19
2.2.5 Herzberg Two- Factor Theory	20
2.3 Conceptual Framework.....	20
2.4 Review of Literature of Study Variables.....	22
2.4.1 Management Quality	22
2.4.2 Openness and Action Orientation	23
2.4.3 Long-term Orientation	24
2.4.4 Continuous Improvement and Renewal.....	25
2.4.5 Workforce Quality	26
2.4.6 Measurement of University Performance.....	27
2.5 Empirical Review.....	28
2.6. Critique of Relevant Literature	29
2.7 Research Gaps	30
2.8 Summary.....	32
CHAPTER THREE	33
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	33
3.1 Introduction.....	33
3.2 Research Design.....	33
3.3 Target Population	34
3.4 Sampling Frame	34
3.5 Sample and Sampling Technique.....	35
3.5.1 Sampling Technique	35
3.5.2 Sample Size.....	36
3.6 Data Collection Instruments.....	37
3.6.1 Primary Data Collection Tool.....	37
3.7 Data Collection Procedures	37
3.8 Pilot Study	37

3.8.1 Reliability	38
3.8.2 Validity	38
3.9 Data Processing, Analysis and Presentation.....	39
CHAPTER FOUR	41
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	41
4.1 Introduction.....	41
4.2 Results	41
4.2.1 Response Rate.....	41
4.2.2 Reliability Test.....	42
4.2.3 Demographic Results	43
4.2.4 Descriptive Results	44
i. Descriptive Results for Management Quality	45
ii. Descriptive Results for Continuous Improvement.....	46
iii. Descriptive Results for Long-term Orientation	47
iv. Descriptive Results for Openness and Action Orientation.....	49
v. Descriptive Results for Workforce Quality.....	50
vi. University Performance.....	50
4.2.5 Pearson’s Correlation Results.....	52
4.2.6 Regression Results	54
i. Model Summary	54
ii. Analysis of Variance.....	55
iii. Regression Coefficients.....	56
4.3 Discussions	58
CHAPTER FIVE	63
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	63
5.1 Introduction.....	63
5.2 Summary of the Findings.....	63
5.2.1 Management Quality on University Performance.....	64
5.2.2 Openness and Action Orientation on University Performance.....	64
5.2.3 Long-term Orientation on University Performance.....	64
5.2.4 Continuous Improvement and Renewal on University Performance.....	64

5.2.5 Workforce Quality on University Performance	65
5.3 Conclusions	65
5.3.1 Management Quality on University Performance.....	65
5.3.2 Openness and Action Orientation on University Performance.....	65
5.3.3 Long-term Orientation on University Performance.....	66
5.3.4 Continuous Improvement and Renewal on University Performance	66
5.3.5 Workforce Quality on University Performance	66
5.4 Recommendations.....	66
5.5 Further Research.....	67
REFERENCES.....	68
APPENDICES.....	74
Appendix I:.....	74
Letter of Introduction to Respondents	74
Appendix II:	75
Questionnaire.....	75
Appendix III:	85
TUM Ethical Review Approval.....	85
Appendix IV:.....	86
TTU Data Collection Acceptance.....	86
Appendix V:	87
PU Data Collection Acceptance	87
Appendix VI:.....	88
NACOSTI Research Licence	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Population size.....	34
Table 3.2: Sample size.....	36
Table 4.1: Response rate.....	41
Table 4.2: Reliability results.....	41
Table 4.3: TUM and TTU age groups in current positions.....	42
Table 4.4: TUM and TTU duration served in current position.....	43
Table 4.5: Descriptive results for management quality.....	44
Table 4.6: Descriptive results for continuous improvement.....	45
Table 4.7: Descriptive results for long-term	46
Table 4.8 Descriptive Results for Openness and Action Orientation.....	47
Table 4.9 Descriptive Results for Workforce Quality.....	48
Table 4.10 Descriptive Results for University Performance.....	49
Table 4.11: Variables mean scores and percentages vs overall universities Performance.....	50
Table 4.12: Pearson Correlations Matrix.....	51
Table 4.13: Regression Model Summary	52
Table 4.14: Analysis of Variance.....	53
Table 4.15: Regression Coefficient.....	54
Table 4.16 Hypothesis Results.....	55

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework.....	21
---------------------------------------	----

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AFP	Administration Finance and Planning
ARE	Academic Research and Extension
CHE	Commission for Higher Education
CUE	Commission for University Education
CIR	Continuous Improvement and Renewal
COD	Chairman of Department
DVC	Deputy Vice Chancellor
HPO	High Performance Organization
HRM	Human Resource Management
ICT	Information Communication Technology
LO	Long-term Orientation
MOE	Ministry of Education
MQ	Management Quality
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OAO	Openness and Action Orientation
PDSA	Plan Do Study Act
PU	Pwani University
SGS	School of Graduate Studies
SME	Small Medium Enterprise
SOE	State Owned Enterprises
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Scientists
TTU	Taita Taveta University
TUM	Technical University of Mombasa

UAE United Arab Emirates

VC Vice Chancellor

WB World Bank

WQ Workforce Quality

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Continuous Improvement and Renewal- involves reimbursing failing strategies by renovating them and making them unique, and constantly refining, streamlining processes and modernizing organization's goods and services (de Waal & Mulimbika (2017)

High Performance Organization Framework- a conceptual, scientifically validated structure that managers can use for deciding what to focus on in order to improve organizational performance and make it sustainable (De Waal, 2018-a).

High Performance Organization- An organization that combines findings acquired (end), not in monetary expressions only but in addition to success in the social and environmental perspectives and the steps in achieving the results (means), that include preserving the social and economic environment in firms undertakings. (Amah & Oyetunde, 2019)

Long-term Orientation- it involves concentrating related to effect of the historical, current, plus upcoming. (Brigham et al, 2014)

Management Quality- quality of managers who should poses integrity, display commitment, passion and reverence, and have an influential action- focused decision-making character (de Waal & Wang, 2017).

Openness and Action Orientation- how administrators and workers share discussion, information and skill, open to change, incurably curious and mistakes allowed to learn from them. (Schreurs & Meingast, 2015).

Workforce Quality- Workforce having the following qualities; is varied, employees supplement each other in strength and weakness, take charge of the outcome (both positive and negative), inspired to achieve better results and push a little harder to get the best out of themselves and the organization (Schreurs & Meingast, 2015).

ABSTRACT

Curiosity in building high performance organizations (HPOs) has been mounting at the Kenyan Coast and administrators are considering ways that can assist in elevating organizational performance. These organisations include Universities. Due to the changes and challenges that face the entire education system in the world, the quality of university education is a high profile issue. This research examined the effect of the high performance organizational framework in a Kenyan Coast context, particularly in the chartered public universities based at Kenyan Coast. The purpose of the research was to assess if this framework is applicable in the Kenyan Coast setting and hence elevate performance of these universities. This study had five specific objectives, based on five main factors of high performance organizational framework. These factors are Management Quality, Openness and Action Orientation, Long-term Orientation, Continuous Improvement and Renewal, and Workforce Quality. The study based at Technical University of Mombasa, Pwani University and Taita Taveta University. Theories that applied in this research were scenario planning theory, Deming Cycle theory, goal- setting theory, Kaizen theory, administrative management theory and Herzberg two- factor theory. A quantitative research design adopted for a study population of 70. Stratified random sampling technique applied and Slovin's formula used to arrive to the desired sample size of 60. The study covered two levels of employees; senior level managers and middle level managers on permanent employment. The research instrument used in data collection was a questionnaire, given to a sampled population of the two levels of workers. The data was analysed quantitatively using descriptive statistics aided by statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 20. All variables under study were significant, leading to rejection of null hypothesis. Overall HPO score was 67.2%, which was below the recommended 85% for a HPO rank. The universities should improve on variables of the study objectives in order to raise HPO score. Future studies should include more number of respondents and more government owned service providers based in the same region.

