

# Perception of University Managers on the Influence of Organizational Structure on Quality of Management in Public and Private Universities in Kenya

Stellah J Kereto Prof. Mwangi Ndirangu Prof. Anthony K Sang  
Department of Curriculum and Instructional Management, Egerton University  
P.O. Box 536-20115 Egerton, Kenya

## Abstract

Quality of institutional management is arguably a major determinant of organizational performance. The role of managers and the activities and tasks they perform as aided by the organizational structure could lead to the effective and efficient implementation of organizational objectives and goals. This study was undertaken to establish the perception of university managers on the influence of organizational structure on the quality of institutional management of universities in Kenya. The study design was descriptive research. Purposive sampling procedure was used in selecting the universities. Random stratification sampling was used to administer the questionnaire to the managers in the universities. Positive responses were received from 137 managers from a target of 263 giving a 62.6% response rate. The response from university managers showed an average positive response rate at 60%. There was a statistically significant difference at ( $p < 0.05$ ) on the perception of managers in the public and private universities on the influence of organizational structure on the dimension of customer satisfaction. The organizational structures in the private universities were found to be more customer centric than those of public universities. Private universities management practices emphasized concern for customer needs. This translated into provision of quality services and products in order to meet customers' expectations for their satisfaction and retention.

**Keywords:** Organizational Structures, Quality of Management, Customer satisfaction, Structural Flexibility, Decision making, Teamwork

**DOI:** 10.7176/EJBM/13-20-06

**Publication date:** October 31<sup>st</sup> 2021

## 1. Introduction

Universities all over the world play a major role in the socio-economic development of their countries. They are responsible for the production of highly skilled manpower, research, and dissemination of new knowledge. Higher educational institutions worldwide arose from common traditions, and more often, face issues with similar characteristics (Altbach & Perterson, 1999). Just like all other organizations today, universities operate under increasing demands for change and reform. The rate of change has become more intensive due to globalization, increasing competition, technological development and a customer-driven market demands (Eckel & King, 2013).

Kenyan universities have been influenced by global trends which has seen it shift to massification of university education. Some of the challenges being faced by universities in Kenya include rapid growth in higher education sector especially from the early 1990's. The demand for higher education enrolment levels increased on a scale not experienced before (Boit & Kipkoech, 2012). Odhiambo (2018), observed that the rapid growth has created financial deficits for the universities. Managing the operations of the universities with such challenges require management practices that are flexible and proactive towards environmental challenges. The growth and expansion has triggered questions on quality at observed by Mulinge, Arasa & Wawire (2017), who noted that the growth has raised questions about the quality of management of universities in Kenya.

Yego, (2016), likewise acknowledged that quality of higher education was under scrutiny where customers were questioning their value for money. Continuous improvement on quality was recommended as the findings pointed out lack of managerial accountability in the running of some of their academic programmes. Organizational structure and quality of management is a field that has scarcely been investigated except for investigations on principles of quality management such as Total Quality Management (TQM), Waswa, Migosi & Metet (2013).

### 1.1 Statement of the Problem

Universities play a key role of creating and disseminating knowledge for the socio-economic advancement of a country. The success or failure of these institutions depends on their efficient management to maintain high standards of performance for the attainment of their objectives. The emergence of borderless universities has created a global and liberalized market for education to the extent that education is now an international commodity. Advancement in information technology has enabled foreign universities to offer degrees anywhere, opening doors to higher education on an unprecedented scale. Universities in Kenya are facing enormous challenges as a result

of rapid expansion, reduced government financial support, high demand for education, inadequate up take of educational technologies, globalization occasioned by rapid advancement in information technology and competition from both local, and foreign universities. The rapid expansion in the university sector, has brought about challenges of how to manage and sustain quality with insufficient resources. The extent to which the management of universities at both public and private universities have organized the tasks and activities to respond to the changing environmental and market conditions, is not clear. No study has specifically delved into this area in Kenya. This study sought to establish the perception of university managers on the influence of organizational structures on the quality dimensions in the public and private universities, and how they influence the quality of management.

## **2.0 Literature Review**

### **2.1 Organizational Structure and Quality of Management**

Organizational structures provide the link that creates a relationships between components of an organizational whole. The components consist of tasks that have been divided into assignments and duties and how they are coordinated and performed (Ahmady, Mehrpour & Nikooravesh, 2016). In most organizations including universities, the organizational structure is the framework that is used to create activities of work factors or tasks that also control the behavior of members of the organizations. Other definitions describe organizational structures as a system of tasks, reporting and authority relationships within which the work of the organization is done and how the different parts fit together to achieve organizational goals (Bivir, 2003). All organizations big or small, therefore have one form of structure or another in which tasks are classified, clarified and clustered for the purpose of achieving organizational goals, (Nelson & Quick, 2011; Quangyen & Yezhuang 2013).

Organizational structure provides an element of integration and order that helps managers in an organization to channel human resource efforts towards the achievement of set goals (Dissanayake & Takahashi, 2006). The organizational structure is a tool that can be used by managers to order and coordinate the actions of employees through set performance standards that can define the level of quality of management in an organization (Daft, 2014). The successful achievement of the set targets in any organization, can be attributed to the quality of management aided by the type of organizational structure in the organization. The management practices determine how the managers direct the operations of the organizations and subsequently the extent to which an organization achieves its set goals. (Chokeli, 2015) observes that one of the reasons for failure of an organization has been attributed to failure to choose the right organizational structure.

Maduenyi, Oke and Fadeyi (2015), have further argued that the organizational structure of an institution provides the fulcrum on which managers can successfully execute the organizations purpose in the business environment. The organizational structures contributes to the success or failure of an organizations because it determines the manner in which people are organized and their tasks and responsibilities are divided and coordinated to achieve organizational goals. The awareness by managers of the central role the organizational structure contributes to the quality of management of their institutions is important for the successful performance of any organization.

A number of scholars have also argued that a supportive organizational structure is crucial if an organization has to enhance the of quality of management (Jorge, Pertusa-Ortega, Tari, Lopez-Garnero & Molina-Azorin, 2016). Zhang, Song and Song (2014), argue that the organizational structure determines the quality of management through the responsibilities, procedures, processes and resources at the disposal of the management function. This determines and enforces the quality principles which then defines what people do, how it should be done, execution of strategic plans and effective policy implementation in a consistent manner.

Managers in organizations stand to gain by embracing quality in their management practice but the success in this requires an appropriate organizational structure (Zhang, et., al., 2014). An organizational structure that can enable the managers to constantly pursue excellence through the operations of its functions can make it possible for that organization to provide superior value through of its products, services, processes and work environment to meet or exceed their customers' expectations (Goetsch & Davis, 2010). Attributes associated with appropriate organizational structures include characteristics such as quick decision making, customer care, teamwork, delegation of authority, open channels of communication and structural flexibility all of which were subject of this study.

Quality concept is important for the success of any organization when embraced by management (Purwihartutu, Sule, Hilmimiana & Zusnita, 2016). Quality of management has been described as the state of excellence in both the organization of activities within the organizational structure that creates a strong and positive compatibility between customer expectations and the services and products offered by the organization. Quality of Management is enhanced through the institutions management philosophy and the guiding management principles and practices. The organizational structure serves as a tools that determines the management approaches that should be continuously adjusting and improving its activities and processes to meet its goals and objectives (Wawak, 2014). An organization can achieve excellence in performance as a result of a flexible organizational

structure that support management practices in the organization.

Quality of management practices instigates affirmative action on the management operational endeavors through its programs, processes and services. The institutions philosophy with regard to the management practices constitutes an important qualitative dimension of management of products and service flows. In the universities the core business is dissemination of knowledge and research which is largely a service industry. Wawak (2014) notes that it is not very easy to define specific objectives in educational institutions like universities just as one could do for commercial enterprises. This is because teaching and learning are based on personal relationships and experience. The students who graduate from the universities will be a testimony to the quality of products through the provision of skills and expertise they will demonstrate in the organizations where they will be employed and in leadership capacities they will provide to society. The successful and timely completion of training of students by the universities is another indicator of quality of management in the universities. The competitiveness and attractiveness of the courses being offered provides another indicator of quality products and services by the universities to the country in terms of manpower development. The end products provides evidence of the various quality dimensions that guide management practices that indicates a level of the quality of management of an institution.

Excellent service and high quality products not only increases customer satisfaction but increases and maintains organization productivity and competitiveness that boosts profits and achievement of organizational growth (Wawak, 2014).

## **2.2 Organizational Structures and Quality of Management in Universities**

Like any other organization, universities are formal institutions that consist of coordinated efforts by groups of individuals set up to realize specific goals (Fincher, 1991). Universities are however very distinct organizations compared to other business organizations and government agencies. The nature of their activities and the coordination of their goals and objectives is the creation and dissemination of knowledge through teaching and research and responding to the needs of communities they serve internally and externally (Clark, 1983).

Universities have been described as complex organizations that constitute a large industrial sector that is quite unique in the way they operate compared to other organizations (Mainardes, Alves & Raposo, 2010). Over the past few years, they have undergone tremendous changes as a result of changes in technology that has brought about a globalization process. The globalization process has subsequently opened up the institutions of higher learning and removed their insulation from the surrounding environment. They have been put under scrutiny by the world outside their boundaries with demands for quality from their clients. Universities have been operating in a stable environment a situation that has now been affected by ever changing environmental condition. Most of the universities have been affected by globalization, inter university competition, advancement in information technology and introduction of knowledge based economy. The new challenges have created the need to assess the organizational structures with regard to their core mandate (Hernaus, Aleksic & Klindzic, 2013).

According to Musselin (2006), the importance of organizational structures in the management of Universities all over the world began especially since the beginning of 1980's. The pressure to transform began in the universities in the United States of America (USA) and Europe where management processes operated on traditional collegial models of organizational structures. Collegial models of management still operate to varying degrees in major universities today even in our local universities. Martin (2016), further notes that in the United Kingdom (UK) and in most parts of Europe and Austral-Asia, universities exhibited bureaucratic characteristics in their organizational structure.

## **2.3 Determinants of Quality Management**

Quality of management has been defined as a philosophy of management or an approach to management that is made up of a set of mutually reinforcing principles, each of which is supported by a set of management practices and techniques that is aimed at achieving excellence in products and services (Dean & Bowen 1994). Many organizations recognize quality of management as a demonstration of successful achievement of organizational goals (Nair, 2006).

Generally, it has been argued that there is no one specific or universal practice or strategy that has been agreed upon that falls under quality of management. The concept of quality is described from various disciplines which include philosophy, economics, marketing and operational management (Garvin, 1986). Management practices of an organization that performs and provides services at an acceptable price or service at a high quality demonstrates quality of management.

The definition of quality of management in this study is based on measurable attributes based on perception of service excellence as understood by management and its consumers. The customers learn and perceive services offered by an organization through experience and interaction with the institutions. This interaction takes place within a given environmental context and characteristics of the organizational structure that influence the actions and procedures that an organization undertakes to ensure the delivery of quality service and products to the delight

and satisfaction of its clients (Barros, Sampaio & Saraiva, 2014).

Wawak (2014), points out that quality of management represents an integral part of the management of any organization including universities that involves the suitable and successful fulfillment of the role of managers and their activities associated with the tasks and the organizational behavior that leads to the effective and efficient implementation of organizational objectives and goals. He further argues that, success in such activities cannot be measured in terms of levels of sales, profits or dividends.

Keczer (2014) points out that an organization that is conscious of customer requirements and ensures that the provision of the same is constantly and reliably made is one whose organizational structure is designed to boost excellence in provision of services and products. The structure of an organization that gives attention to its quality of management focuses totally on work performance that exhibit certain characteristics. One of the management practices is decision making.

Decision making has been acknowledged as critical in organizational performance and subsequent outcomes (Akdere, 2011). Organizational structures that foster quick decision making contribute to highly effective performance, efficiency and effectiveness, systematic realignment between the environment and the organizations objectives (Kande, Namusonye & Mugambi, 2017). Effective decision making has also been associated with flatter and flexible structures as opposed to those that are hierarchical. Flatter structures enable decisions made to reach the point of action faster. It also encourages involvement of the employees in the process of changes that are initiated by management in the organization.

Secondly, an organizational management that focuses on customer satisfaction creates superior value and quality in its processes and products (Kuria & Juma, 2017). An effective customer focused organization is based on a corporate strategy and a management philosophy where customer welfare and delight takes top priority. This can place an organization in a leading position among its competitors (Vandemerwe, 2004).

A third determinant of quality of management is a management philosophy that embraces teamwork and the structures enhances shared values an ethics amongst its employees. Prabhakar, (2008) observes that teamwork involves the subordination of personal prominence and self-interest for the good of the whole group which leads to improved organizational output and quality of work. He notes that it is a symbiotic process which leads to a much better result that is greater than the integration of individual performance. It is noted that teamwork further enhances work attributes and behavioural characteristics amongst employees such as trust, accountability, commitment, positive interpersonal relationships rather than individual pursuit of goals (Mustafa, Glavee-Geo & Rice, 2017).

The fourth determinant of quality of management is delegation of authority where an organization allows decision making authority to flow to lower levels of management. Daft (2014), notes that when authority and responsibility flows downwards to other employees it positively impacts on emergence of a more agile and responsive organization that enhances overall performance on the organization. It actually connotes a decentralized organizational structure where participative decision making is a major component. In this situation employees are involved in the decision making process that involves resource allocation (Eugwu, Okoronji & Chukwu, 2018) Participative role offered to employees is likely to promote job satisfaction, positivity in self-actualization and reduces delays in work processes.

Communication is another essential management action that is used to convey pertinent matters in the organization to its employees whether face-to-face, written, verbal or non-verbal. Open channels of communication therefore contribute a great deal in developing a common understanding rallying organizational members and coordinating organizational activities, (Mohamedi & Ariffin, 2017). As a determinant of quality of management a breakdown in communication is pointer towards an ineffective communication hence failure in development of common understanding amongst organizational actors which is important for smooth flow of activities. Feedback mechanisms in form of written document or conversations which constitutes exchange of communication that are not open can cause impediments to effective change of information. Open channels of communication also puts a check to informal channels of communication that have potential of misleading members of the organization on important matters. With open channels of communication a unity of purpose is achieved.

The last determinant of quality of management that was considered in the study was structural flexibility. Structural flexibility is regarded as the outcome of the interaction between the type of management practices that determines the organizational responsiveness and adaptive ability to its environmental dynamics (Volberda, Van der Weerd, Verwaal & Verdu, 2012). Structural flexibility enables the strategic positioning of an organization which enhances and promotes dynamic capabilities that modify organizations routines in to respond to its external environment (Sull, 2009). Structural flexibility connotes continuous improvement for the organization to align itself with the situational context. With heightened competition and the need to survive, adaptation by organizations to their environmental context strengths their ability to be creative and competitive (Rosinka-Bukowska, 2013).

Quality of management practices have significant advantages when introduced and practiced in an



organization. Managers need to be aware of changing circumstances and develop adapting mechanisms continuously as situation demands. The study sought to find out how the managers in the university perceived the dimensions of quality of management in their institutions and whether there was any difference in the perception between public and private universities. The next section provides the research question and the hypotheses of the research study.

### 3. Research Questions

In order to achieve the above research objective, the research addressed itself to the following questions:

- (a) What is the perceptions of university managers on the dimensions of quality of management on the influence of organizational structures the private and public universities in Kenya?

#### 3.1 Hypotheses of the Study

The following null hypotheses were tested at 0.05, alpha level of significance.

H<sub>0</sub>1: There is no statistically significant difference in the perception of managers in public and private universities on the influence of organizational structure on decision making.

H<sub>0</sub>2: There is no statistically significant difference in the perception of managers in public and private universities on the influence of organizational structure on customer satisfaction.

H<sub>0</sub>3: There is no statistically significant difference in the perception of university managers in public and private universities on the influence of organizational structure on team work.

H<sub>0</sub>4: There is no statistically significant difference in the perception of managers in public and private universities on the influence of organizational structure on delegation of authority.

H<sub>0</sub>5: There is no statistically significant difference in perception of managers in public and private universities on the influence of organizational structure on the channels of communication.

H<sub>0</sub>6: There is no statistically significant difference in the perception of the managers in public and private universities on the influence of organizational structure on flexibility of organizational structures

### 4 Methodology

This study used a descriptive survey research design. A descriptive research design investigates characteristics of a population and an existing phenomenon. It studies a prevailing situation, problem or attitude of a population to obtain opinion or attitude regarding a situation or phenomenon (Kumar, 2005). The descriptive survey method assumes that what is observed at one particular time can be observed in the future given the same circumstances. The observations made in the survey describes possible behavior, attitudes, values and characteristics observed in the subjects under the study in their natural environment without influencing them in any way (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). It is also suitable for conducting comparisons between different groups and how they respond or act in certain situations or respond to certain phenomenon. Data collected from respondents about their experiences and opinions concerning a particular topic under study are analyzed and described using percentages, means, medians and descriptive analysis (Kothari 2004). The design begins by establishing the existing forms of organizational structures in this case public and private universities. The observations made in the survey will describe behavior, attitudes, values and characteristics observed in the subjects under study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The study captured insights into the prevailing situations through the opinion expressed by the managers in the universities.

#### 4.1 Measurement of the Variables

Following extensive review of the literature, the questionnaire to collect data for the study was developed. The attributes associated with quality of management were investigated using statements that described the aspects associated with the attributes by obtaining opinions from the university managers on the prevailing conditions. The six quality indicators were analyzed using descriptive statistics in order to determine the percentages of the overall perception of managers in the public and private universities. The indicators of each dimension were measured on a five-point likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 (Where 1 = strongly disagree - SD, 2 = disagree - D, 3 = not sure - NS, 4 = agree - A and 5 = strongly agree - SA). The perceptions were categorized as positive, neutral and negative. A perception was considered positive when a manager agreed with the majority of the items that were used to measure his/her view on a dimension of quality management. Perception was deemed negative when the participant disagreed with the majority of the items, and was categorized as neutral when he/she neither agreed nor disagreed with majority of the items.

In order to determine the difference in perception of university managers by university type chi-square test of independence was undertaken. This test is among those recommended for comparing categorical data across 2 or more groups by Hall and Richardson (2016). The procedure involved cross tabulating type of university with university managers perceptions on influence of organization structures on the six dimensions of quality of management investigated in the study.

## 5.0 Results

### 5.1 Overall Percentage Score on Perception of University Managers on the Dimensions of Quality of Management

Table 1 presents the overall percentage score that showed the perception of the university managers on the dimensions of quality of management in public and private universities. Six characteristics were used to describe the quality dimensions as practiced by management that positively influenced the quality of management in the universities. The components that were investigated were quick decision making, customer care, teamwork, delegation of authority, channels of communication and structural flexibility.

**Table 1. Organizational Structure on Quality of Management.**

<b>Public Universities</b>		<b>Response (%)</b>				
<b>Indicators of Quality of Management</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>NS</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SA</b>	
Quick decision making	2.4	24.1	14.6	46.9	11.9	
Customer Relationship Management	5.7	19.0	11.6	47.6	13.6	
Team Work	0.9	14.0	10.0	57.8	17.1	
Delegation of Authority	2.0	19.0	13.6	51.1	14.2	
Open Channels of Communication	5.1	21.8	9.9	47.7	15.3	
Flexibility of Organizational Structures	2.9	18.9	15.3	51.2	11.5	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>50.3</b>	<b>13.9</b>	
<b>Private Universities</b>		<b>Response (%)</b>				
<b>Indicators of Quality of Management</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>NS</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SA</b>	
Quick decision making	13.0	19.2	5.9	45.5	16.2	
Customer Relationship Management	11.1	18.9	7.8	49.9	12.2	
Team Work	6.3	12.8	3.3	62.2	15.2	
Delegation of Authority	8.6	18.6	6.7	48.9	17.2	
Open Channels of Communication	10.2	20.3	4.8	49.2	16.6	
Flexibility of Organizational Structures	10.9	21.4	6.9	48.8	12.0	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>50.7</b>	<b>14.9</b>	

The overall percentage score indicated that all statements were positive at 65.6% in private universities and 64.2% public universities. This is a moderately high score. For excellent levels of quality management the score should be much higher than this indicating that the quality of management levels are not as high as they should be. The proportion of those who agreed that there was quality of management practice was slightly higher in the private universities than in public universities. The dimension that had the highest score was teamwork 77.4% in private universities and 74.9% in the public universities. Decision making had the lowest score at 58.8% in public universities and 61.7% in private universities while flexibility of organizational structure had lowest score in private universities compared to 62.7% in the public universities.

### 5.2 The Difference in the Perception of Public and Private University Managers on the Dimensions of Quality of Management

The study sought to determine difference in perception of the university managers on the influence of organization structures on dimensions of quality management between managers in public and private universities in Kenya. The difference in perception by university type was determined using the chi-square test of independence. The procedure involved cross tabulating type of university with university managers perceptions on influence of organization structures on decision making. The results are shown in Table 2 Pearson Chi-square Test of Independence on Perception of Managers on the Influence of Organizational Structure on Quality of Management.

**Table 2: Pearson Chi-square Test of Independence on Perception of Managers on the Influence of Organizational Structure on Quality of Management.**

		Managers Perception on Quality of management			
		Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
<b>Public</b>	Count	112 <sub>a</sub>	7 <sub>b</sub>	18 <sub>c</sub>	137
	Expected Count	108.4	4.3	24.4	137.0
	% within Institution type	81.8%	5.1%	13.1%	100.0%
	% within Managers quality management perception	62.9%	100.0%	45.0%	60.9%
<b>Private</b>	Count	66 <sub>a</sub>	0 <sub>b</sub>	22 <sub>c</sub>	88
	Expected Count	69.6	2.7	15.6	88.0
	% within Institution type	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	% within Managers quality management perception	37.1%	0.0%	55.0%	39.1%
<b>Total</b>	Count	178	7	40	225
	Expected Count	178.0	7.0	40.0	225.0
	% within Institution type	79.1%	3.1%	17.8%	100.0%
	% within Managers quality management perception	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The results on Table 2 show that the perception of managers in public and private universities was not similar. The results indicate that 81.8% of managers in public universities had positive perception compared to 79.1% in private universities. Those who had negative perception were slightly higher in private universities at 17.8% compared with 13.1% in public universities. In total 79.1% of managers were of positive perception in both public and private universities. Perception of the influence of quality of organizational structure between the public and private universities was not the same.

The perceptions of the managers on the influence of the organization structures on the quality of management in the public and private universities in Kenya showed that majority of the managers agreed that organizational structures influenced the quality of management of their institutions. Organizational structures therefore had an impact on managerial activities such as control and coordination of employ work performance that affect organizational performance. The awareness of the importance of organizational structure in the achievement of high standards of excellence in service provision was not in doubt for the managers in the institutions of higher learning.

### 5.3 Chi-Square Test on Perceptions of Managers in Public and Private Universities

It was important to establish whether there a statistically significant difference in the perception of managers in the public and private universities on the effects of organizational structure on the quality of management in those institutions. To calculate the difference, the perception was categorized into three levels of those who had a positive perception, those who were neutral and those who had negative perceptions. This was necessary because an examination of the results showed that there was a marked difference in the distribution of perception categories between managers in public and private universities.

**Table 3: Results of Chi-Square Test**

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
<b>Pearson Chi-Square</b>	<b>9.046<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>2</b>	<b>.011</b>
Likelihood Ratio	11.371	2	.003
Linear-by-Linear	3.118	1	.077

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.74.

$$2 = 9.046 \quad df = 1 \quad p = .011$$

The statistical difference in the perceptions of university managers in private and public universities was further supported by Chi-Square value, since  $P = (.011) < 0.5$  level of significance indicating that there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions of managers in public and private universities. The lack of homogeneity showed that it was not obvious to the university managers that organizational structure is a critical determinant of quality of management practices in their institutions. Such a situation may be the source of hindrance to universities efforts in putting their institutions in strategic positions at a time when there is a lot of competition between institutions and environmental challenges. It might be affecting service provision negatively. University clients might not be getting value for their money. The products from the institutions of higher learning be they in form of products or services may not be excellent because the organizational structure inhibits best management practices. It might not be possible to introduce those management practices that could enhance the quality of management because of the lack of insight on the part of the managers.

## 6.0 Conclusion

The findings from the study conclude that quality of management practices in both public and private universities was positive. Both public and private universities practice quality management practices such as quick decision making, concern for customer satisfaction, teamwork, delegation of authority, communication channels and structural flexibility. This implies that regardless of the fact that the organizational structures were found to be mechanistic, the managerial practices that enhance quality of management were being practiced by the university managers.

The study concluded that management practices with regard to customer satisfaction was not the same in public and private universities. The private universities had a higher perception on the customer satisfaction aspect than the public universities. This could be attributed to the fact that private universities depended on their clients for sustainability and could have developed higher standards of dealing with their clients. For the public universities who are supported financially by the government, this aspect might not be a central focus to them as they do not depend on their own effort for survival.

Public universities have not established strong customer centric organizational structures. The management activities seem not to have made their customer needs as a priority. In this regard their customers' needs and requirements are not satisfied. Consequently, value for money for the clients is not guaranteed, public universities are not competitive because quality of services and products are likely to be compromised. Feedback from customers is critical to any organization that desires to be a preferred choice of many.

## References

- Akdere, M. (2011). An analysis of Decision Making Process in Organizations: Implications for Quality Management and Systematic Practices. *TQM and Business Excellence*, 22 (12), 1317-1330.
- Altbach, G. P., & Davis, T. (1999). Global Challenges and National Response: Note for an International Dialogue on Higher Education. *International Higher Education* (14) <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.1999.14.6471>
- Altbach G., P., & Petersen, P M. (1999). Higher Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Global Challenges and National Response. IIE Research Report No. 29. Institute of International Education, New York.
- Barros, S. Sampaio, P & Saraiva, P. (2014). *Quality Management Principles and Practices Impact on the Companies Quality Performance*. ICQ'14, Tokyo, Japan.
- Boit, J.M. & Kipkoeh, L. C. (2012). Liberalization of Higher Education in Kenya; Challenges and Prospects. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 1(2).
- Clark, R. E. (1983). Reconsidering Research on Learning from Media. *Review of Educational Research*, 53 (4), 445-459.
- Chokeli, E. (2015). The Role of the Organization Design in the Company's Success. *European Scientific Journal*, 11(10). [http://doi.org/10.19044.esj.2015.v11n10.p%0p](http://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2015.v11n10.p%0p).
- Daft, R. L. (2014). *Organization Theory and Design*. 12<sup>th</sup> Edition. Cengage Learning. United States.
- Dean, J. W. & Bowen, D. E. (1994). Management Theory and Total Quality: Improving Research and Practice through Theory and Development. *Academy of Management Review*, 19 (3), 392-418.
- Dissanayake K & Takahashi, M. (2006). The Construction of Organizational Structure: Connections with Autopoietic Systems Theory. *Journal of Contemporary Management Research*, 2 (2), 105-116.
- Eckel, D. P. & King, J.E. (2013) An overview of Higher Education in the US: Diversity, Access and the Role of the Market Place. *American Council on Education*. Springer. <http://www.Springer online. Com>.
- Eugwu, K, E., Okoroji, L, I. & Chukwu, E, O. (2018). Participative Decision Making and Employee Performance in the Hospitality Industry: A Study of Selected Hotels in Owerri Metropolis. Imo State. *Management Studies and Economic Systems (MSES)*, 4(1), 57-70.
- Garvin. D. A. (1984). Quality on Line. *Harvard Business Review*. 61, 65-73.
- Goetsh, D. L. & Davis, S. (2010). *Quality Management for Organizational Excellence: Introduction to Total Quality*. Pearson Education Limited. UK.
- Hall, M. & Richardson, T. (2016). Basic Statistics of Comparing Categorical Data From 2 or More Groups. *Hospital Pediatrics*, 6,(6) 2016, <http://hospes.aappublications.org/at Kenya: AAP Sponsored on August 10, 2019>.
- Hernaus, T., Alecsic, A., & Klindzic, M. (2013). Organizing for competitiveness – Structural and Process Characteristics of Organizational Design. *Contemporary Economic*. 7. (4), 41-56.
- Jorge, P.M., Pertusa-Ortega, E.M., Tari J.J., Lopez-Garnero, M. D., & Molina-Azorin, J. F. (2016). Organizational Design, Quality Management and Competitive Advantage in Hotels. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(4).
- Kande, A. Namusonye G. S. & Mugambi F. (2017). The Role of Strategic Management Practices on Growth of Private Universities in Kenya. *The International Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (4).
- Keczer G. (2014) Management and Organizational Characteristics of Educational Institutions. *Journal of Education Practice and Innovation*, 1. (2).



- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology. Methods and Techniques*. New Age International (P) Limited, Publishers. New Delhi.
- Kumar, R. (2005). *Research Methodology: A step-by-Step Guide for Beginners*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). SAGE Publications. New Delhi.
- Kuria, W, P. & Juma, D. (2017). Influence of Strategic Management Practices on the Performance of Private Universities in Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management*, 4 (4). 629-658.
- Maduenyi, S., Oke, O, A., Fadeyi, O, & Ajagbe, A, M. (2015). *Impact of Organizational Structure on Organizational Performance*. International Conference on African Development Issues (CU\_ICAD): Social and Economic Models for Development Track.
- Mainerdes, W, E. & Raposo, A, H. (2011). The Process of Change in University `Management: From `Ivory Tower to Entrepreneurism`. *Review of Administrative Sciences*, 124–149.
- Mohamedi, M. & Arifin, M, Y, M. (2017). Importance of Communication Channels between Managers and Employees in Managerial Communication. *The Social Sciences*.12.(9), 1541-1552.
- Mugenda, O, M. & Mugenda, A, G. (2003). *Research Methods. Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi. Kenya. African Centre for Technology Studies Press.
- Mulinge, M. M., Arasa, N, J, & Wawire, V. (2007). The Growth of University Education in Kenya. *Council for Development of Social Research in Africa*. Dakar.
- Musselin, C. (2006). *Are Universities Specific Organizations? Towards a Multiversity? Universities between Global Trends and National Traditions*. Bielefeld, Transcripts Verlag, 63-84.
- Mustafa, G., Glavee-Geo, R. & Rice, P. M. Team Work Orientation and Personal Learning: The Role of Individual Cultural Values and Value Congruence. *Journal of Industrial Psychology/SA.TydskrifvirBedryfsielKunde*,43(0).a1446. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v43i0.1446>.
- Nair, A. (2006). Meta-analysis of the Relationship between Quality Management Practices and Firm Performance – Implications for Quality Management Theory Development. *Journal of Operations Management*, 24, (6). 948-975.
- Nelson, D., & Quick, J. (2011). *Understanding organizational behavior*. Mason. OH: South Western Cengage Learning
- Odhiambo, G. (2018). The Role of Kenyan Universities in National Development. *Forum for International Research in Education*, 4, (3). 191-209.
- Prabhakar, G, P. (2008). Teams and Projects: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 3, (10).
- Purwihartuti, K., Sule, E. T., Hilminiana, & Zusnita W. O. (2016). Quality Management Systems and Performance of Organizations. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, IV, (11). 600-611.
- Quangyen, T. & Yezhuang, T. (2013). Organization Structure: Influencing Factors and Impact on a Firm. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 3, 229-236.
- Reeves C. A. & Bednar D, A. (1994). Defining Quality: Alternatives and Implications. *Academy of Management Science Review*, 19, (3). 419-445.
- Rosinka-Bukowska, M. (2013). Adjustment of Corporate Organization Structure to the Demands of Competition in Fast Changing Global Economy. *International Business and Global Economy*, 32, 175-186.
- Sull, D. (2009). The Only Way is Up. *Business Strategy Review*. London Business School, 30 (3), 64-69.
- Volberda, W, H., Van der Weerd, N., Verwaal, E., & Verdu, J, A,. (2012). Contingency Fit, Institutional Fit, and Firm Performance: A Metafit Approach to Organization-Environment Relationship. *Organization Science*, 23 (4), 1040–1054.
- Waswa, W. F., Ombuki, C., Mogosi, J, & Metet, J. (2013). Assessment of Corporate Management Practices in Public Universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 5 (2), 22–32.
- Wawak S. (2014). *The Concept of the Quality of Management Evaluation*. 8th International Quality Conference. Cracow University of Economics. Poland.
- Quangyen, T. & Yezhuang, T. (2013). Organization Structure: Influencing Factors and Impact on a Firm. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 3, 229-236.
- Yego. H. J. C. (2016). Challenges Facing Higher Education in Management of Privately Sponsored Student Programmes PSSP in Kenya. *British Journal of Education*, 4 (8), 52-62. [www.ejournal.org](http://www.ejournal.org)
- Vandermerwe, S. (2004). Achieving Deep Customer Focus. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 45(3), 26-34.
- Volberda, W, H., Weerd der van, N., Verwaal, E., Stienstra, M., & Verdu, J, A,. (2012). Contingency Fit, Institutional Fit, and Firm Performance: A Metafit Approach to Organization-Environment Relationship. *Organization Science*, 23(4), 1040 –1054.
- Zang, Z., Song, T. & Song, J. (2014). *Analysis of Relationship between Quality Management system and Design Assurance System*. Science Direct. Procedia Engineering, 80,565-572.