MODERATING EFFECT OF WORKING ENVIRONMENT ON GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN STATE OWNED ENTERPRISES IN THE ENERGY SECTOR IN KENYA

Chewa, J., Minja, D., & Njoroge, J. G.

MODERATING EFFECT OF WORKING ENVIRONMENT ON GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN STATE OWNED ENTERPRISES IN THE ENERGY SECTOR IN KENYA

[1] Chewa, J., [2] Minja, D., & [3] Njoroge, J. G.

[1] Student, Department of Public Policy, School of Law, Arts and Humanities, Kenyatta University, Kenya
[2] Professor, Department of Public Policy, School of Law, Arts and Humanities, Kenyatta University, Kenya
[3] Lecturer, Department of Public Policy, School of Law, Arts and Humanities, Kenyatta University, Kenya

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigated the effect of government bureaucracy on service delivery in state-owned enterprises within the energy sector in Kenya. It particularly aimed at establishing the influence of leadership hierarchy, Actors' interest, policy compliance and political environment on service delivery in State-owned enterprises. Further, the thesis analysed the moderating role of working environment on the effect of government bureaucracy on delivery of services. The target population was 124 suppliers, 5,107 end-user consumers, 1,817 employees in KPLC plus 480 employees in REREC and 30 employees in the Energy regulator (EPRA). A sample of 380 individuals/households was selected using a two-stage random sampling procedure comprising of proportionate stratified and simple random sampling techniques. Empirical data were gathered using semi-structured questionnaire. The findings of thesis demonstrated that leadership hierarchy, actor's interest, policy compliance and political environment positively affect delivery of services. Additionally, the study found out that working environment moderates the effect of government bureaucracy on delivery of services. Management of state owned enterprises should enact policies to reinforce practices on aspects of leadership power, leadership motivation and leadership delegation. It was recommended that a policy framework be formulated for promoting activities relating actors' participation, decision making and efficient flow of information in state owned enterprises. Audit divisions in state owned enterprises should strengthen the existing policy framework to sufficiently embed practices that foster culture of compliance with rules and regulations, work instructions and personnel selection. The board of management of the state-owned enterprises within the energy sector should initiate mechanisms for cushioning from disruptive interference of interest groups with potential to erode operational efficiency and ability to actualize service delivery outcomes. The human resource divisions of state owned enterprises ought to enact policy the buttress mutual trust, team spirit, sharing of information, openness, and sense of belonging. In addition, sufficient resources should be availed for strengthening information and communication infrastructure as one of the critical support system for enhancing the processes of value creation and delivery.

Key Words: Working Environment, Government Bureaucracy, Service Delivery

INTRODUCTION

Public service by the government helps in determining the quality of life, which cannot be tangibly measured by per capital income. Service delivery can be classified into three modes. The first one is based on where the end-user consumers can receive information, advice or make enquiries on an agency desk. The second mode is through written request by an end-user consumer through an email or a document to relay the message and once processed the end-user consumer is contacted. For instance, registration for power connectivity then finally, the third mode is a full service where the end-user consumer can receive a complete service based on their requests (Kuye & Akinwale, 2020).

Service delivery is usually linked to the performance of an organization through fulfilled organizational objectives and goals, addressing the needs of the client and other stakeholders. Globally, organizations strive to remain competitive by focusing on service delivery. Service delivery by the government involves providing the clients of the government with services (Puolokaineni & Jansoo, 2019). In essence, government exists to ensure life is worth living through the provision of services to its citizens (Writer, 2019).

Delivery of services is expected to occur in a friendly atmosphere that is devoid of hindrances, interruptions or obstructions and further that service delivery should have attributes of consultation, information sharing, openness, accountability, participation, availability, accessibility, convenience, transparency, and timeliness (OECD, 2013). Despite, like many other countries in the world, concerns have been raised regarding the Public service in Kenya in relation to commitment, accountability, trust, transparency, and increasing desperation among the members of general public.

Working environment is a fundamental factor for facilitating efficient and effective functioning of institutions that has however not been given sufficient attention by both practitioners and researchers (Aiken, Clarke & Sloane, 2002;

Foldspang, *et al.*, 2014; Taheri, Miah & Kamaruzzaman, 2020). In the views of Massoudi and Hamdi (2017), the quality of working environment has a bearing on the degree of employee's motivation and subsequent productivity. Oludeyi (2015) avers that working environment encompasses the situations, settings, circumstances and conditions in which members of an institution operate as they undertake the principal task of generating and delivering value. Furthermore, Al-Omari and Okasheh (2017) consider working environment as anything that exists around the employees and has potential to favor or hinder their ability to perform institutional tasks.

Notably, working environment plays a facilitative role in employees' creativity, engagement, and delivery of services (Chandrasekar, 2011; Palwasha, Ashfaq & Majid, 2016; Qadri, *et al.,* 2022). As has been observed by a stream of scholars, an effective workplace is an embodiment of environment where institutional outcomes and results can be achieved as anticipated by management (Shikdar, 2002, Mike, 2010). Working environment may be viewed as the aggregation of the inter-relationship that subsists between employees and the employers and essentially comprises of human, technical and the organizational environment (Opperman, 2002; Metiboba, 2012). Workplace environment draws from three broad areas including people, culture and physical aspects of the workspace which existing body of literature has shown to buttress realization of institutional outcomes and objectives (Mccoy, 2005; Sayiner, 2015; Kegel, 2018; Alemu, 2022). Indeed, working environment is considered as highly instrumental to unleashing and optimizing potential of employees in a competitive business landscape.

A substantial body of literature contends that good working environment contribute to the well-being of workers and the success of enterprises in both public and private sectors (Massoud, 2017; Sunarsi, 2019; Yusefzadeh, 2020). Moreover, working environment is a key factor in employees' level of

productivity and the quality of work. The extent to which working environment is engaging stimulates the desire of employee to learn skills and as well enhances the level of motivation for executing institutional tasks (Suwati, Minarsih & Gagah, 2016; Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017).

State-owned enterprise (SOEs) or State Corporation is an institution established under section 3 of State Corporation Acts Cap 446, with the government controlling majority of the shares, established mainly to improve service delivery to the public. Board of directors oversee the operations of the SOEs with general supervision of Ministries. The President appoints the board of directors and the Cabinet Secretaries for the Ministries.

The Ministry of Energy Kenya, whose SOEs are the focus of this current study, derive its core functions from the Executive Order No.1 of 2008 of the President (Revised June, 2018), that outline Thermal Power Development, National Energy Policy Development and management, Rural Electrification Programme, Security and Conservation, Energy Regulation, Geothermal Exploration, Hydropower Development and Development and Promotion of Renewable Energy as its core functions. In addition, under the Ministry of Energy, there are six Semi-Autonomous Agencies (SAGAs) namely, Kenya Power and Lightning Company Limited (KPLC), Kenya Electricity Transmission Company (KETRACO), Rural Electrification and Renewable Energy Corporation (REREC), Kenya Electricity Generating Company (KENGEN), Geothermal Development Company (GDC), Energy and Petroleum Regulatory Authority (EPRA), and the Energy Tribunal.

The focus of the study was KPLC and REREC within the Ministry of Energy as their functions is to extend distribution networks to cover more end-user consumers both in urban slum areas and rural setups. KPLC traces its origin back in the 1920s when East African Power and Lighting Company was incorporated to generate and distribute electricity in Kenya. Later, the name was changed to KPLC through a special resolution sitting by shareholders

in 1983. In 1997, electricity generation function of KPLC was split from transmission and distribution, giving birth to Kenya Electricity Generating Company (KENGEN). Later, in 2007 and 2008, with the intention to speed up the implementation pace of rural electrification programme, the government established the Rural Electrification Authority (REA), currently REREC. Equally, the Kenya Electricity Transmission Company was established alongside Geothermal Development Company, to accelerate transmission infrastructure development and develop steam fields to reduce development risks, promoting development of geothermal electric power (KPLC Annual Report, 2010).

Despite the existence of several loan schemes, Stima loan under last mile project and slum subsidized connectivity, electricity connectivity continues to attract high connection payments under rural electrification program (Abdullah & Markandya, 2012; Were, 2016) . Engaging all Actors in the matter eases future challenges that may arise and helps in ownership of the projects (Were, 2016). This is however, expected to change with provisions of Energy Act (2019), which eases the process and cost of connectivity. Excessive bureaucracy is evidenced in payment of bribes to facilitate the process to acquire electricity, wastage of time and long queues. For instance, the employees of KPLC have been termed rude, incompetent and absentees with one having to pay for bribes to facilitate acquiring electricity thus unable to deliver high quality services to the citizens (Munoru, 2015). Despite the work instructions, already in place rules and regulations, the employees still engage in unethical practices which hinder service delivery.

In the past, the state enterprises has faced constitutional and structural reforms with the aim of enhancing efficiency of operation on market principles reducing the financial burden on the public and improve delivery of services to the public as part of the wider reforms in the public service (Mwongozo, 2015). KPLC adopted an action plan that sought to upgrade the quality of services

offered and address the complaints by the public by setting up clinic to address end-user consumer's complaints that would facilitate the improvement of service delivery (KPLC, 2018). Despite the measures, cases of dissatisfactions in service delivery are still high.

Kenya's energy sector is a major foundation upon which social, economic and political development strategies have been conceived for realization of vision 2030. Its role on development of this country is paramount. To achieve the maximum output in the energy sector, it is a prerequisite to address the challenges of service delivery, which requires a transformational mind-set while conducting business to achieve vision 2030 (PTPRs, 2015). Therefore, this study provided an empirical analysis of the effect of government bureaucracy on delivery of services by state corporations in the energy sector.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Empirical Review

Working Environment and Service Delivery

Working environment, as described by Raziq and Maulabakhsh (2015), incorporate jobs carried out, activities in training sessions, control on employee's job activities, employee's sense of work-related achievement, and the unseen value of work tasks. Working environment also implies the surrounding circumstances that supports innovation through research and development withheld values, beliefs and the ways in which institutions operate (Njoroge, 2015).

A study by Raziq and Maulabakhsh (2015) examining whether job satisfaction was affected by working environment among educational institutes, banking sector and telecommunication industry located in Quetta City, Pakistan. The investigation adopted a quantitative approach, and used probability sampling to attain a group of 210 employees for the survey. The results showed that indeed a positive correlation existed among working environment and job satisfaction. Particularly, working environment had a positive

effect on employees' job satisfaction. Further, unconducive working environment constrained the employee's capabilities to realise full potential, indicating that working environment is noticeably important in entreprises.

Further, Raziq and Maulabakhsh (2015) and Njoroge (2020) alludes that a conducive working environment enables employees to work with ease, relaxed and free environment that does not depict some form of burden or undue pressure which may cause performance of employees to decline. However, Raziq and Maulabakhsh did not interrogate the role of technology and organizational culture as critical aspects of working environment on job satisfaction and by extension employees' service quality, a concern the current study addressed.

Taohid, Sujai and Nugraha (2021) studied whether working environment and work motivation were affected by work disciple of State Civil Apparatus. The study targeted Civil Service employees in Panyileukan District within City of Bandung in Indonesia. In the survey, working environment was shown to have a significant influence on work disciple (at 33%) while work motivation also had a significant effect on work discipline. In light of these findings, Taohid, *et al*. posited that work discipline was significantly impacted by motivation and work environment. In this current study, organizational culture and technology were investigated as components of working environment since the study by Taohid, Sujai and Nugraha (2021) was silent on them in relation to the quality of service delivered by SOEs.

Another study by Langat and Gachunga (2018) on factors influencing electronic commerce adoption by SOEs in Kenya, selected KPLC as the case study. The study utilized descriptive research design, where staff members, in top management and in departments of operations and Information Technology formed the target population. The significance, strength and direction of association between organizational factors, technological variable, environmental variables, individual

characteristics, and E-commerce adoption was tested using Pearson Correlation. The findings indicated that, the SOE's that had invested on E-commerce adoption, had improved its operations and performance compared to the SOE's that had not adopted E-commerce. In concluding, Langat and Gachunga (2018) emphasized the adoption of E-commerce as a key pillar in an SOE's. The current study, investigate whether working environment operationalized as organizational culture and, information and communication technology plays a moderating role on the link between government bureaucracy and services delivered by state corporations in the Kenyan energy sector.

Theoretical Literature Review

Systems Theory

System theory is also referred to as social system theory in social science. The theory was constructed by Ludwig von Bertalanffy in 1940 (Wilkinson & Fay, 2011). From the theory, every component of the system supports the entire system. The theory entails relationships on how an individual piece is connected to the ultimate goal. The individual elements are key in an organization in determining whether the organization succeeds or fails. The system theory views an enterprise as a system that is comprised of other sub-system which interact with one another holistically. The system is viewed in terms of outputs, inputs and outcomes.

To guarantee the success of an enterprise, it is vital to establish the process that show the relationship between the elements and the way the product or the end-user consumers navigate through the system. Based on desired outcomes and purposes, well-designed processes create flexible, efficient and integrated systems. Organizations depend on both the internal and external environment for end-user consumers to purchase their products and services. The system theory approach was an external standard that gave a measure of how effective an organization was, based on long term growth or sustainability (Saylor, 2014).

Service delivery was the overall outcome of the other aspects of leadership hierarchy, Actors' interests, policy compliance and external factors such as political environment. Their effectiveness and successful implementation were manifested in the efficient, prompt response and customer satisfaction in service delivery. The effectiveness was measured based on how well it meets the needs of its consumers. Every element in the organization determined how successful the desired outcome was to be. This implies that difficulty in one of the component generally affect the entire system. All the components must therefore be synchronized towards the main goal of providing better service or achieving the overall goal. Therefore, Service delivery was as successful as the elements of government bureaucracy, as leadership hierarchy, Actors' interest, policy compliance and political environment were. Thus, systems theory allows for the inclusion of more than one factor (leadership hierarchy, Actors' interest, policy compliance and political environment) in the investigation service delivery in the SOEs in the energy sector in Kenya.

METHODOLOGY

The study relied entirely on pragmatism research philosophy because it advocates for mixed-methods research that is deemed prudent for social research (Morgan, 2014). The study utilized both descriptive and explanatory research designs using cross-sectional survey data that allowed for triangulation of data and thus increasing the validity of the findings. This inquiry precisely focused on the two state corporations within the energy sector and the regulator of the corporations. Precisely, on survey was confined to operational personnel, junior level managers and senior level managers working in the head offices of KPLC, REREC and EPRA. Furthermore, suppliers and end-user consumers of KPLC and REREC served at the head offices of KPLC and REREC also constituted part of the population of the study. The study surveyed senior managers who reported to the chief executive officer as they discharged their duties in the various functional

units and were there sufficiently knowledgeable and conversant with relevant practices relating to government bureaucracy, working environment and service delivery in the respective state owned enterprises. An aggregation of subjects comprising the population of this study was 7,558 distributed in the manner depicted in the tabulated data. Generally, the population of the study was distributed into 5138, 2390 and 30 subjects translating to 67.98 percent, 31.62 percent and 0.40 percent for KPLC, REREC and EPRA respectively. In particular, a majority of subjects in the population are associated with KPLC comprising of 20 senior management, 86 junior management, 1711 operation personnel, 76 suppliers and 3245 end-users. The least number of subjects in the population were attributed to EPPRA with 5 senior managers, 9 junior mangers and 16 operational personnel. The rest of subjects in the population were associated with REREC and comprised of 19 senior management, 83 junior management, 378 operation personnel, 48 suppliers and 1862 end-users.

The Ministry of Energy had 6 Semi-Autonomous Agencies, 5 SOEs and an Energy tribunal, from which this study choose KPLC and REREC as the two state owned enterprises are utility institutions offering similar services to end-users and the characteristic profiles of the end-users are similar, in addition to the Energy and Petroleum regulator (EPRA) as an Actor with interest. The sampling frame for this study constituted a list of 7,558 subjects comprising of senior management, junior management, operation personnel of the two state owned enterprises and EPRA, and suppliers and end-users of KPLC and REREC. The sample size of 380 for the survey was determined by using Yamane (1967) formula for computation of sample size.

This survey constituted of primary data that was essentially gathered using a semi-structured questionnaires, a widely applied tool for collecting empirical information required for test hypotheses and drawing conclusions (Kothari, 2014). The questionnaire was structured into two broad sections for general and specific information. The general information section comprised of five questions that sought information relating to characteristics of the respondents involved in this study. The specific information section was intended to elicit information and responses on the observable aspects of the research variables necessary for responding the research objectives of this study. Moreover, the general information section was structured into sub-sections for leadership hierarchy, actors' interest, policy compliance, political environment, working environment, and service delivery. The majority of questions in the questionnaire were closed ended in nature and constructed on a five point Likert rating scales to aid in collection of quantitative data for purposes of facilitating testing of the formulated hypotheses. A smaller proportion of the questionnaire consisted in open ended questions intended to gather qualitative responses that could enrich the data gathered through the closed ended questions.

In this study, four fundamental stages of quantitative data analysis including data preparation, summarization of sample characteristics, diagnostic tests of linear regression, and estimation of population measures were carried out. The collected data was carefully examined for completeness, quality, and consistency. These data were coded and transcribed thus providing for computerised consistency checks and cleaning of data. Descriptive statistics including frequency and percentage distribution, sample mean and sample standard deviation were generated to aid in developing a concise summary of the defining observable features of the surveyed sample. The summary measures of the observed sample were presented in figures and tables. This summary measures were instrumental for carrying out further statistical analysis and testing of the hypothesized relationships between the research variables.

Empirical Model

Moderation Analysis

The moderating role of working environment on the effect of government bureaucracy on delivery of services was carried out as guided by the two steps approach recommended by Baron and Kenny (1986 as also cited by Njoroge, 2020). However, in view of the adopted approach, it was necessary to construct a composite index for leadership hierarchy, actors' interest, policy compliance and political environment using the formula for harmonic mean credited to Gupta (2009) as depicted in equation 1.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \div \sum_{i=1}^{n} (w_i \div x_i) \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots 1$$

Where:

$x_i = i^{th}$ Dimension of government bureaucracy

w_i = Weight associated with i^{th} dimension of government bureurcay

The composite index so generated in equation 1 was crucial for ensuing test of moderation of working environment on the effect of government bureaucracy on service delivery. In line with the adopted approach for moderation analysis, the first step entailed regression of government bureaucracy on service delivery as shown in equation 3.3.

$$Y= \beta_0 + \beta_1 GB + \mathcal{E}\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots 2$$

Where;

Y= Service delivered
β_0 to β_1= Regression coefficients
GB = Government bureaucracy
$\mathcal{E}$ = Error term

The first regression analysis was necessary for making a statistical determination as to whether there is a relation between government bureaucracy and service delivery that can be affected by working environment as a moderator. If the parameter for government bureaucracy turned non-significant at 5 percent level of significance, it would then not be necessary to proceed to the second step of moderation analysis. In the second step, government bureaucracy, working environment and the interaction term (government bureaucracy*working environment) were regressed on service delivery as illustrated in equation 3.

$$Y= \beta_0 + \beta_1 GB + \beta_2 WE + \beta_3 GB*WE + \mathcal{E}\dots\dots\dots\dots 3$$

Where;

Y= Service delivered
β_0 to β_3= Regression coefficients
GB= Government bureaucracy
WE = Working environment
GB*WE = Interaction term
$\mathcal{E}$ = Error term

This step served an important role in making the required statistical decision on moderation analysis. Essentially, if the parameter for working environment (β_2) in equation 3 is significant at 5 percent level of significance then it would follow that working environment is an explanatory variable, however, if the parameters for working environment (β_2) and the interaction term (β_3) are non-significant and significant respectively at 5 percent level of significance, then it would follow that working environment is moderator. The case for no moderation would be indicated if both the parameters for working environment (β_2) and the interaction term (β_3) would turn non-significant at 5 percent level of significance. In the circumstance that there is moderation, the magnitude and direction of moderation of working environment would be explicitly implied by the parameter for the interaction term (β_3).

FINDINGS

Working Environment

In this study, working environment was construed as a moderating variable and operationalized using information and communication technology, and organizational culture. In essence, relevant contextual activities and aspects construed as working environment in the context of state owned enterprises in the energy sector were observed and analyzed to provide insights on the summary measures of the data collected. The results of

analysis of descriptive statistics for working environment are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Working Environment

Information and Communication Technology	n	Min	Max	Mean	Std Dev
Information communication technology facilitates tracking of concerns of actors	305	1.00	5.00	3.29	1.21
Quality of services offered has improved due to information communication technology	305	1.00	5.00	3.54	1.10
Information communication technology has made it easy to serve the interest of the actors	305	1.00	5.00	3.40	1.18
Information communication technology promotes task executions	305	1.00	5.00	3.48	1.06
It's easy to communicate with actors due to information communication technology	305	1.00	5.00	3.46	1.24
Information communication technology matches diverse needs of actors	305	1.00	5.00	3.34	1.03
There is more flexibility in delivery of services due to information communication technology	305	1.00	5.00	3.52	1.21
There is delay in responding to actors complaints due to information communication technology	305	1.00	5.00	2.52	1.09
Aggregate Scores for Information and Communication Technology				**3.32**	**1.14**
Organizational Culture	**n**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**Std Dev**
There is mutual trust amongst actors in the organization	305	1.00	5.00	3.07	1.07
There is coordination of actors effort in the organization	305	1.00	5.00	3.23	1.12
The code of conduct has promoted behavior of actors organization	305	1.00	5.00	3.23	1.05
Dialogue is encouraged amongst actors in the organization	305	1.00	5.00	3.11	1.26
Actors are have a sense of belonging to the organization	305	1.00	5.00	2.97	1.16
There is a friendly atmosphere amongst actors in the organization	305	1.00	5.00	2.99	1.17
Actors take initiatives in the interest of the organization	305	1.00	5.00	2.81	1.16
Actors work together to solve problems in the organization	305	1.00	5.00	2.91	1.25
Sharing of information amongst actors is encouraged organization	305	1.00	5.00	3.24	1.18
There is friendly environment for sharing information organization	305	1.00	5.00	3.02	1.12
Aggregate Scores for Organizational Culture				**3.06**	**1.15**
Aggregate Scores for Working Environment				**3.17**	**1.14**

Source: Survey Data (2021)

The findings in Table 1 shows that the highest sample mean of the data gathered on information and communication technology was 3.54 for the aspect that quality of services offered has improved due to information communication technology with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.10. On the other extreme, the lowest sample mean response of observation made was 2.52 on the aspect that there is delay in responding to actors complaints due to information communication technology with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.09. It is evident that a majority of the sample mean response for aspects construed as information and communication technology tended to a value of 3 on the measurement scale used in this study. This tendency is confirmed by the aggregate mean response and standard deviation of 3.32 and 1.14 respectively associated with information and communication technology. The statistical behavior of the data set gathered confirmed that practices construed as information and communication technology were moderately evident in the surveyed state owned enterprises in the energy sector.

In addition, analysis of the set of aspects espoused for measuring organizational culture revealed that

the largest sample mean response was 3.24 for the aspect on Sharing of information amongst actors is encouraged in the organization. On the converse, the smallest observed mean response was 2.91 for the aspect that actors work together to solve problems in the organization. In general, the summary behavior of the data set gathered on organizational culture approximated to a value of 3.00 on the rating scale used for this empirical inquiry. Corresponding values of sample standard deviation were generally low as they ranged between 1.06 and 1.26 implying that there was low variability of participant responses on the set of aspects measured. The aggregated values of working environment at 3.17 and 1.14 for sample mean and standard deviation respectively

demonstrated that the variability of responses was narrow and as such the sample measures observed could be used in estimation of measures for the population of this study.

Service Delivery

Service delivery was hypothesized as the outcome variable in this study. The indicators that were adopted to measure service delivery included efficiency, effectiveness, turnaround time, and quality of service. The summary measures of central tendency and dispersion for the set of data gathered on service delivery in state owned enterprises in the energy sector are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Service Delivery

Service Delivery	n	Min	Max	Mean	Std Dev
The organization is keen to perform the promised service	305	1.00	5.00	3.32	0.68
There is good accessibility to organizational services	305	1.00	5.00	3.10	0.76
Needs of actors are attended to on a timely basis	305	1.00	5.00	2.95	1.19
There are delays in performance of services in the organization	305	1.00	5.00	2.74	0.95
Actors are satisfied with the levels of accuracy in performance of services in the organization	305	1.00	5.00	2.92	1.21
Actors convenience in performance of service is valued	305	1.00	5.00	3.09	0.75
Service performance meets the expectation of actors	305	1.00	5.00	3.31	0.83
Operating hours of the organization are convenient to actors	305	1.00	5.00	3.42	0.77
Performance of service is characterized by thoroughness	305	1.00	5.00	3.38	0.82
Actors are given individual attention in the organization	305	1.00	5.00	2.92	1.20
Actors are satisfied with the level of service performance	305	1.00	5.00	3.00	0.69
Actors are informed about when the service would be performed	305	1.00	5.00	2.85	1.24
Actors feeling are considered in performance of service	305	1.00	5.00	2.96	1.08
Actors feel safe during performance of service	305	1.00	5.00	3.09	0.72
Organization's documents are free of errors	305	1.00	5.00	2.42	1.21
Aggregate Scores for Service Delivery				**3.03**	**0.94**

Source: Survey Data (2021)

The results displayed in Table 2 revealed that the sample mean response for the observations made that regarding service delivery ranged between 2.42 for the aspect of organization's documents are free of errors and 3.42 for the aspect that operating hours of the organization are convenient to actors. On the former aspect, the corresponding standard deviation is relatively high at 1.21 implying that the responses gathered on this aspect were not close

together on the measurement scale used. The general behavior of the sample mean response of the data set gathered implies that the practices typified by the activities and aspect measured are moderately manifested in the surveyed state owned enterprises in the energy sector.

It is evident that operational hours are convenient to actors, there is thoroughness in service

performance, there is safety during service performance, service performance meet the expectation of actors, and keen interest is manifested in executing the promised services. It was also noted that there are moderate delays in performance of services, and institutional documents are moderately free of errors. The aggregated sample mean response for all aspect of service delivery observed in this study was 3.03 and the corresponding standard deviation was 0.94. These overall behavior of observations gathered implies that the attendant aggregate variability is low and thus the summary measures of the sample are suitable for making generalization to the population of study.

Moderation Analysis

The moderating role of working environment on the effect of government bureaucracy on service delivery was carried out as guided by the two steps approach recommended by Baron and Kenny (1986). However, in view of the adopted approach, a composite index for leadership hierarchy, actors' interest, policy compliance and political environment was constructed using the formula for harmonic mean credited to Gupta (2009). In line with the adopted approach for moderation analysis, the first step entailed regressing government bureaucracy on service delivery. The statistical output for this simple linear regression analysis is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Government Bureaucracy and Service Delivery

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.850[a]	0.723	0.722	0.40198	1.815

Dependent Variable: Service Delivery
Predictors: (constant), Government Bureaucracy
 Source: Survey Data (2021)

In Table 3, the statistics for model summary demonstrates that the correlation coefficient for the estimated model is 0.850 whereas the coefficient of determination (R Square) is 0.723. The implication of the revealed coefficient of determination is that government bureaucracy as

an explanatory variable accounts for 72.3 percent of variation of service delivery in the surveyed state owned enterprises in the energy sector. The unexplained 27.7 percent of variation in service delivery is associated with other research variables that were not investigated in this study.

Table 4: Analysis of Variance

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	127.590	1	127.590	789.613	.000[b]
Residual	48.960	303	0.162		
Total	176.550	304			

Dependent Variable: Service Delivery
Predictors: (constant), Government Bureaucracy
 Source: Survey Data (2021)

The F test for the goodness-of-fit of the estimated model indicated 789.613 as the value for the F statistics at a level of significance (p-value) of 0.000. These results provide a statistical evidence that the estimated model is the most suitable model for

fitting the set of observed data set in this study. Specifically, the estimated model is statistically significant at a level of confidence of 95 percent and 0.05 level of significance.

Table 5: Coefficients of Regression Analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	β	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	0.005	0.110		0.048	0.962
Government Bureaucracy	0.994	0.035	0.850	28.100	.001

Dependent Variable: Service Delivery
Predictors: (constant), Government Bureaucracy

Source: Survey Data (2021)

The regression coefficients tabulated in Table 5 aided in the estimation of respective statistical model as illustrated in equation 4.

Service Delivery = 0.005 + 0.994 Government Bureaucracy…..………………….. 4

The output of coefficients of regression analysis demonstrated that when government bureaucracy is held at a constant level of zero, service delivery would be at 0.005 albeit with a p-value of 0.962 well above the adopted margin of error of 0.05. The implication of these results is that estimated coefficient representing the y-intercept is not significant at 95 percent level of confidence. Further, statistical evidence on the coefficient of explanatory variable indicates that a unit increase in government bureaucracy accounts for an increase of 0.994 in service delivery with a p-value of 0.001. As such, at 95 percent confidence level, government bureaucracy affect service delivery in the surveyed state owned enterprises in the energy sector.

In consideration that government bureaucracy was found to have a significant effect on service delivery, it became necessary to carry out the second step of moderation analysis. In this step, government bureaucracy, working environment and the interaction term (government bureaucracy*working environment) were regressed on service delivery. The results of this linear regression analysis are provided in Table 6.

Table 6: Regression Analysis for the Interaction Term

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.878[a]	.772	.769	.36598	1.728

Dependent Variable: Service Delivery
Predictors: (constant), Government Bureaucracy, Working Environment, Government Bureaucracy*Working Environment

Source: Survey Data (2021)

The tabulated statistical output revealed that the correlation coefficient was 0.878, of an indication of existence of a strong positive linear relationship. The adjusted coefficient of determination was 0.769, which provided the statistical evidence that the estimated model explains 76.9 percent of variation in service delivery in state owned enterprises in the energy sector. The unexplained 23.1 percent of variation in service delivery is associated with other research variables that were not modelled in this relationship.

Table 7: Analysis of Variance

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	136.235	3	45.412	339.049	.001[b]
Residual	40.315	301	.134		
Total	176.550	304			

Dependent Variable: Service Delivery
Predictors: (constant), Government Bureaucracy, Working Environment, Government Bureaucracy*Working Environment

Source: Survey Data (2021)

Further inspection of output of the F-test for the goodness-of-fit of the estimated model revealed 789.613 as the value for F statistics at a level of significance (p-value) of 0.001. It is therefore evident that the estimated model is the most suitable for fitting the set of observed empirical data set. Clearly, the estimated model is statistically significant at a level of confidence and level of significance of 95 percent and 0.05 percent respectively.

Table 8: Coefficients of Regression Analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	β	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.365	.268		1.360	.175
Government Bureaucracy	.449	.112	.384	3.991	.000
Working Environment	.044	.032	.236	1.373	.171
Interaction Term	.269	.103	.285	2.605	.010

Dependent Variable: Service Delivery
Predictors: (constant), Government Bureaucracy, Working Environment, Government Bureaucracy*Working Environment

Source: Survey Data (2021)

The regression coefficients tabulated in Table 8 aided in the estimation of respective statistical model as illustrated in equation 5.

*Service Delivery =0.365+ 0.449 Government Bureaucracy + 0.044 Working Environment +0.269 Government Bureaucracy*Working Environment ….……………………………… 5*

The tabulated output of coefficients of regression analysis demonstrated that when all other factors are held at a constant level of zero, the level of service delivery is 0.365 albeit with a p-value of 0.175 which exceeds 0.05. As such the coefficient for the constant term in equation 4.2 is not significant. Further inspection of these results revealed that the beta coefficients for government bureaucracy, working environment and the interaction term were 0.449, 0.044 and 0.269 respectively.

Apparently, whereas the p-values for government bureaucracy and the interaction term were less than 0.05, the p-value for working environment exceeded 0.05. Accordingly, working environment is a moderator in the modelled relationship. In line with Baron and Kenny (1986), 0.269 as the beta coefficient for the interaction term magnitude and direction of moderation of working environment. Specifically, a unit increase in working environment causes an increase of 0.269 in the slope of government bureaucracy and service delivery. As such, the researcher inferred that working environment moderates the relationship between government bureaucracy and service delivery in

state owned enterprises in the energy sector in Kenya.

The conclusion of this study concerning moderation is consistent with the observation made by Raziq and Maulabakhsh (2015) that a conducive working environment enables employees to work with ease, in a relaxed and free environment that does not exert undue pressure and as such reinforces the outcomes of government bureaucracy. Equally, the findings of this study confirms the empirical observations of Langat and Gachunga (2018) to the effect that working environment is an imperative for delivery of services in state owned enterprises. Similarly, the conclusion of this study validates the proposition made by the systems theory to the effect that all elements of an enterprises are inter-related and inter-dependent, and must therefore be synchronized for efficient and effective functioning of the unified whole (Saylor, 2014) available to actors impact on operational efficiency and has a bearing on delivery of services.

CONCLUSION, CONTRIBUTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The statistical criteria for moderation analysis confirmed that working environment has a statistically significant moderating effect on the direct effect of government bureaucracy on service delivery. The researcher thus concluded that working environment moderates the effect government bureaucracy on service delivery in

In view of the conclusion on the objective of the study, the human resource divisions of state owned enterprises ought to enact policy the buttress mutual trust, team spirit, sharing of information, openness, and sense of belonging. In addition, sufficient resources should be availed for strengthening information and communication infrastructure as one of the critical support system for enhancing the processes of value creation and delivery in state owned enterprises in the energy sector. Information communication technology is key enabler for service delivery in state owned enterprises. This institutional facet plays a key role in effective functioning and integration of efforts in different institutional units. Investments should be made to consistently enhance and upgrade information communication technology in order to promote the working environment in state owned enterprises. Apparently, there is a poor sense of belonging amongst actors in state owned enterprises. This state of affairs has potential to hamper effective delivery of service and as such, senior management should cultivate a warm environment for actors that promote mutual trust, openness and team spirit in state owned enterprises.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, S., & Markandya, A. (2012). Rural electrification programmes in Kenya: Policy conclusions from a valuation study. Energy for Sustainable Development, 16 (1), 103-110.

Agboola, T. O. (2016). Bureaucratic politics and policy development: Issues and challenges. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 10(2), 16-24.

Ajibade, O. & Ibietan, J. (2016), "Public bureaucracy and service delivery in Nigeria: The Neo-Weberian explanation", The Public Administration and Social

Policies Review, Vol. 12 No. 17, pp. 1-18.

Akanga, J. O. (2014). Character development through education in Kenya: A pragmatic perspective (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).

Aliyu, A. O., & Idris, D. M. (2016). Administrative Processes and the Challenges of Service Delivery Incontemporary Nigerian Bureaucracy. Review of Public Administration and Management, 400(3786), 1-9.

Alornyeku, F. K. (2011). The impact of bureaucracy on public service delivery: A study of Kumasi Metropolitan Assembly (Doctoral dissertation).

Alvinius, A. (2012). The Inadequacy of Bureaucratic Organizations. *International Journal of Emergency management.* Retrieved from: https://www. vesmilatavis. net.

Andrews, R., & Van de Walle, S. (2013). New public management and citizens' perceptions of local service efficiency, responsiveness, equity and effectiveness. Public Management Review, 15(5), 762-783.

Ates, A., Garengo, P., Cocca, P., & Bititci, U. (2013). The development of SME managerial practice for effective performance management. *Journal of small business and enterprise development.*

Atieno, Y. A. (2009). Corporate Governance Problems facing Kenyan parastatals: A case study of the sugar industry. *Unpublished thesis, Master of Law and Business.*

Barton, B. & Peat, J. (2014). *Medical Statistics: A Guide to SPSS, Data Analysis and Clinical Appraisal* (2nd ed.) Wiley Blackwell: Sydney, Australia.

Bächtiger, A., Dryzek, J. S., Mansbridge, J., & Warren, M. (2018). Deliberative Democracy. The Oxford handbook of deliberative democracy, 1.

Basheka, B. C. (2012). The paradigms of public administration re-examined: A reflection. *Journal of Public Administration*, 47(1), 25-67.

Baguma, S. (2017). Role of Monitoring and Evaluation and Quality of Service Delivery in Local Governments: A Case of Mpigi District (Doctoral dissertation, Uganda Management Institute).

Baner, D. (2007). ISO 9000: Marketing motivations and benefits. International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management, Vol.14 No.9, pp. , 936–947.

Barongo, M. R. (2018). Factors Affecting Service Delivery in Parastatals: A Case Study of Rural Electrification Authority, Kenya (Doctoral Dissertation, Kabarak University).

Barzelay, M. (2002). Origins of the new public management. New public management: Current trends and future prospects, 15-33.

Bollen, K. A., Biemer, P. P., Karr, A. F., Tueller, S., & Berzofsky, M. E. (2016). Are survey weights needed? A review of diagnostic tests in regression analysis. Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application, 3, 375-392.

Blundo, G., de-Sardan, J. P. O., Arifari, N. B., & Alou, M. T. (2013). Everyday corruption and the state: Citizens and public officials in Africa. Zed Books Ltd.

Bruton, G. D., Peng, M. W., Ahlstrom, D., Stan, C., & Xu, K. (2015). State-owned enterprises around the world as hybrid organizations. Academy of Management perspectives, 29(1), 92-114.

Bunge, M. (2012). Epistemology & Methodology I: Exploring the World (Vol. 5). Springer Science & Business Media.

Cameron, R. (2009). New public management reforms in the South African public service: 1999-2009. *Journal of public administration,* 44(si-1), 910-942.

Chan, F. K., Thong, J. Y., Venkatesh, V., Brown, S. A., Hu, P. J., & Tam, K. Y. (2010). Modeling citizen satisfaction with mandatory adoption of an e-government technology. *Journal of the association for information systems*, 11(10), 519-549.

Chilunjika, A., & Mutizwa, B. (2019). Exploring factors militating against the performance of parastatals in Zimbabwe: the case of the national railways of Zimbabwe from 2008 to 2016. *Journal of Public Administration and Development Alternatives* (JPADA), 4(1-1), 41-60.

Chege, C.J., & Kinoti. F.K. (2019). Risks on the rural electrification project implementation performance in mukurwe-ini sub-county, nyeri county, Kenya

Chouhan, V. S., & Srivastava, S. (2014). Understanding competencies and competency modeling—A literature survey. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(1), 14-22.

Civera, C., De Colle, S., & Casalegno, C. (2019). Stakeholder engagement through empowerment: The case of coffee farmers. *Business Ethics: A European Review,* 28(2), 156-174.

Dahl (1976). Modern political analysis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall.

Dlamini, P.N. (2017). Intra-political infighting versus service delivery: assessing the impact of intrapolitical infighting on service delivery in umsunduzi local municipality.

Donkor, F. & Zhou, D. (2019). Complexity Leadership Theory: A Perspective for State-Owned Enterprises in Ghana. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 7(2), 139-170. DOI:10.17583/ijelm.2019.3647.

Drost, E. A. (2011). Validity and reliability in social science research. Education   Research and perspectives, 38(1), 105-123.

Dunleavy, P., Congleton, R. D., Grofman, B., & Voigt, S. (2019). 'The Bureaucracy' as an Interest Group. The Oxford Handbook of Public Choice. Oxford Handbooks, 1, 567-584.

Dunleavy, P., Gamble, A., Holiday, I., & Peele, G. (Eds.). (1997). Developments in British Politics 5. Macmillan International Higher Education.

Ekundayo, W. J. (2017). Good governance theory and the quest for good governance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 7(5), 154-161.

Fares, R. L., & Webber, M. E. (2017). The impacts of storing solar energy in the home to reduce reliance on the utility. Nature Energy, 2(2), 1-10.

Fedosov.V., & Paientko.T. (2017). Ukrainian Government Bureaucracy: Benefits and Costs for the Society. *Business and Management Studies* Vol. 3, No. 2; June 2017 *ISSN: 2374-5916 E-ISSN: 2374-5924 Published by Redfame Publishing URL: http://bms.redfame.com.*

Ferguson, B. (2019). Competing for influence: The role of the public service in better government in Australia, ISBN 978-1-76046-277-2, ANU Press, Acton, http://dx.doi.org/10.22459/CI.2019.

Ferrell, O. C., & Fraedrich, J. (2016). Business ethics: Ethical decision making & cases. Cengage learning.

Fiaz, M., Su, Q., & Saqib, A. (2017). Leadership styles and employees' motivation: Perspective from an emerging economy. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 51(4), 143-156.

Field, A. P. (2013). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (4th ed.). SAGE publication: London, United Kingdom.

Freeman, J. (2000). The private role in the public governance. NyuL rev., 75, 543.

Gaitho, P. R. (2017). Leadership Qualities and Service Delivery: A Critical Review of Literature. *Saudi Journal of Business and Management Studies*. 2 (6): 643 – 653.

Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: a guide for non-statisticians. *International journal of endocrinology and metabolism*, *10*(2), 486–489. https://doi.org/10.5812/ijem.3505.

Giacobbi, P. R., Poczwardowski, A., & Hager, P. (2005). A pragmatic research philosophy for sport and exercise psychology. The sport psychologist, 19(1), 18-31.

Gliner, J. A., Morgan, G. A., & Leech, N. L. (2011). Research methods in applied settings: An integrated approach to design and analysis. Routledge.

Gogtay, N. J., & Thatte, U. M. (2017). Principles of correlation analysis*. Journal of the Association of Physicians of India,* 65(3), 78-81.

Gumede, N., & Dipholo, K. B. (2014). Governance, restructuring and the new public management reform: South African perspectives. *Journal of educational and social research*, 4(6), 43-43.

Halunga, A. G., Orme, C. D., & Yamagata, T. (2017). A heteroskedasticity robust Breusch–Pagan test for Contemporaneous correlation in dynamic panel data models. Journal of econometrics, 198(2), 209-230.

Henning, B. & Christof. W. (2014). *The SAGE Handbook of Regression Analysis and Causal Inference*. SAGE Publications: London, United Kingdom.

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons?. Public administration, 69(1), 3-19.

Huang, L. J., & Snell, R. S. (2003). Turnaround, corruption and mediocrity: Leadership and governance in three state owned enterprises in Mainland China. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 43(1), 111-124.

Hughes, O. E. (2012). Public management and administration: An introduction. Macmillan International Higher Education

Ireri, E.N (2016). Kenya's Legal and Regulatory Framework on the Appointment of Board of Directors (BOD) for State Owned Enterprises (SOE) and Its Effectiveness. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 6, No. 12; December 2016

Irfan, M.I. (2016), "Survival and dysfunctions of bureaucracy: a critical analysis of public bureaucracy in Sri Lanka", *Advances in Sciences and Humanities*, Vol. 2 No. 4, pp. 31-39, doi: 10.11648/j.ash.20160204.11.

Jensen, D. R. & Ramirez, D. E. (2012). Variance Inflation in Regression. *Advancesnin Decision Sciences*, 1-15.

Johnson, P., & Duberley, J. (2000). Understanding management research: An introduction to epistemology. Sage.

Juma, M. O. (2018). Analysis of pragmatic strategies for improving chemistry performance in secondary schools in Migori County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).

Kiiru, D. M. (2015). Strategic human resource management practices and performance of parastatals in Kenya. (PhD, thesis), Kenyatta university.

Knill, C. and Grohs, S. (2015), "Administrative styles of EU institutions", in Bauer, M.W. and Trondale, J. (Eds), *The Palgrave Handbook on the European Administrative System*, pp. 93-107, Basingstoke; Palgrave Macmillan.

Koech, J.K., (2016). Internal factors influencing service delivery within the Kenya Police Service in Kitui County.

Kolil, S., Ondiek B.A., & Manyasi,J (2019). The effect of leadership on service delivery in county governments in north Rift, Kenya. Vol. 6, Iss. 4, pp 443 - 451 October 15, 2019.

Kornberger, M., Meyer, R. E., Brandtner, C., & Höllerer, M. A. (2017). When Bureaucracy Meets the Crowd: Studying "Open Government" in the Vienna City Administration. Organization Studies, 38(2), 179–200. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840616655496

Kuye, O. L., & Akinwale, O. E. (2020). Conundrum of bureaucratic processes and healthcare service delivery in government hospitals in Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences*.

Langat Leonard, P., & Gachunga, H. (2018). Factors Influencing Adoption of Electronic Commerce by State Owned Enterprises in Kenya: A Case of Kenya Power.

Makowenga, G. O. (2013). Outsourcing and Customer Satisfaction in Kenya Power Nairobi Region (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).

Masiya, T., Davids, D.Y., & Mazenda, Y. (2019). Effective Public Participation in Municipal Service Delivery the Case of Nyanga Township, Cape town.

Matei, A., & Antonie, C. (2014). The new public management within the complexity model. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 109, 1125-1129.

Mariara, J. K., & Kiriti, T. W. (2020). Structural adjustment, poverty and economic growth: *An analysis for Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, AERC).*

Morgan, D. L. (2014). Pragmatism as a paradigm for social research. Qualitative inquiry, 20(8), 1045-1053.

Mitulla, W. V. (2016). Citizen Response Points to Appreciation, Challenges of Kenya's Devolved Governance. Afro barometer Dispatch 105. Retrieved from: www.afrobarometer.org

Mongkol, K. (2011). Implementing New Public Management in a Developing Country: the case of Thailand. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 4(23), 87.

Moteiri, S.O., & Minja, D. (2019) Influence of employee participation on service delivery: a case of Nairobi city water and sewerage Company, Nairobi city county, Kenya, Vol.4, Issue 2 No.2, pp 16 - 30, 2019

Muli, J. V. (2014). Work life initiatives and performance of employees of commercial banks in Kenya. *Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Kenyatta University*.

Mutegi, M. F., & Ombui, K. (2016). An Investigation of the Factors that Cause Poor Performance of State Corporations in Kenya. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(11), 350-359.

Mutua, J., Ngui, D., Osiolo, H., Aligula, E., & Gachanja, J. (2012). Consumers satisfaction in the energy sector in Kenya. Energy policy, 48, 702-710.

Mutuma, N.M. (2018). Influence of shared leadership on service delivery by county government workers in Kenya.

Mwaura, K. (2007). The failure of corporate governance in state owned enterprises and the need for restructured governance in fully and partially privatized enterprises: The case of Kenya. Fordham Int'l LJ, 31, 34.

Ngacho, C., & Odongo, G. (2015). An Assessment of the Quality of Services of Kenya Power (KP) Ltd in Restoring Supply After Unplanned Interruptions Using Statistical Quality Control. *International Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Sciences.* Vol. 3, No. 3, 2015, pp. 194-203. doi: 10.11648/j.ijefm.20150303.16.

Njenga, P. W. (2011). Strategies used by Kenya Power and Lighting Company ltd to reduce non-technical electricity losses (Doctoral dissertation).

Njoroge, J. G (2015). Organizational resources and performance of mobile phone companies in Kenya. (PhD, thesis), Kenyatta university.

Njoroge J. G. (2020) Moderating Role of Environment on Organizational Resources and Performance in Telecommunication Industry in Kenya. The International Journal of Humanities & Social Studies. www.theijhss.com Vol 8 Issue 5 May, 2020

Olsen, J. P. (2006). Maybe it is time to rediscover bureaucracy. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 16(1), 1-24.

Odero, H. (2018). The Influence of Leadership Styles on Service Delivery in Mombasa County.https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/c5d8/e99ffcbdec0516e5606bdbb61dd440da74d2.pdf.

Ohemeng, F. L., Obuobisa Darko, T., & Amoako-Asiedu, E. (2020). Employee engagement and task performance in state-owned enterprises in developing countries: The case study of the power sector in Ghana. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 20(2), e2021.

O'Leary-Kelly, S. W., & Vokurka, R. J. (1998). The empirical assessment of construct validity. *Journal of operations management*, 16(4), 387-405.

Omosa J, J. M. (2014). Failure of good corporate governance in state owned corporations in Kenya: towards a more effective parliamentary monitoring role (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).

Ondenge, N. O. (2018). Operations Modernization Strategies And Service Delivery Among Non-Commercial State Owned Ent Ities In Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).

Onyekwelu, R. U., Okpalibekwe, U. N., & Dike, E. E. (2015). The bureaucracy and the challenges of policy-formulation and implementation: The Nigerian experience. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review* (OMAN Chapter), 4(10), 12.

Orazi, D. C., Turrini, A., & Valotti, G. (2013). Public sector leadership: new perspectives for research and practice. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 79(3), 486-504.

Rahman, M. M., Liberman, L. S., Giedraitis, V. R., & Akhter, T. (2013). The paradigm from traditional public administration to new public management system in Bangladesh: What do reform initiatives stand for. Advances in Economics and Business, 1(3), 297-303.

Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. Procedia Economics and Finance, 23, 717-725.

Ritchie, J., & Ormston, R. (2003). The applications of qualitative methods to social research. Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers, 24, e46.

Riziki, B.M., Asienga, I.C., & Mosoti, Z. (2018). The Factors Affecting Service Delivery in Parastatals. A Case Study of Rural Electrification Authority, Kenya.

Rothstein, B. O., & Teorell, J. A. (2008). What is quality of government? A theory of impartial government institutions. Governance, 21(2), 165-190.

Roper, J., & Schoenberger-Orgad, M. (2011). State-owned enterprises: Issues of accountability and legitimacy. Management Communication Quarterly, 25(4), 693-709.

Safina, D. (2015). Favouritism and nepotism in an organization: Causes and effects. Procedia economics and finance, 23, 630-634.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). Research methods for business students. Pearson education.

Saunders, M. N. K., Lewis, P., Thornhill, A., & Bristow, A. (2015). Understanding research philosophies and approaches: Research methods for business students.

Saylor, R. (2014). State building in boom times: Commodities and coalitions in Latin America and Africa. Oxford University Press.

Scott, V., & Gilson, L. (2017). Exploring how different modes of governance act across health system levels to influence primary healthcare facility managers' use of information in decision-making: experience from Cape Town, South Africa. *Int J Equity Health* 16, 159 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-017-0660-5

Shields, P. M. (1998). Pragmatism as a philosophy of science: A tool for public administration.

Shrestha, N. (2020). Detecting multicollinearity in regression analysis. Am J Appl

Math Stat, 8(2), 39-42.

Simonet, D. (2014). Assessment of new public management in health care: the French case. Health Research Policy and Systems, 12(1), 1-9.

Stoker, G. (2006). Public value management: a new narrative for networked governance?. The American review of public administration, 36(1), 41-57.

Subedi, B. P. (2016). Using Likert type data in social science research: Confusion, issues and challenges. *International journal of contemporary applied sciences*, 3(2), 36-49.

Syapsan, S. (2019). The effect of service quality, innovation towards competitive advantages and sustainable economic growth: Marketing mix strategy as mediating variable. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 26(4), 1336-1356.

Tamene, E. H. (2016). Theorizing conceptual framework. *Asian Journal of Educational Research* Vol, 4(2), 50-56.

Taohid, M. G. R., Sujai, R. A. D. A., & Nugraha, N. M. (2021). Does work discipline affected by the working environment and work motivation?. Economics. Ecology. Socium, 5(1), 13-23.

Taylor, J. K. & Cihon, C. (2004). *Statistical Techniques for Data Analysis* (2nd ed.). Chapman & Hall Publication: London, United Kingdom.

The National Ethics Corruption Survey (2018). EACC Report Reveals 10 Most Corrupt Offices in Kenya. https://www.kenyans.co.ke/news/33600-eacc-report-reveals-10-most-corrupt-offices-kenya

Turkalj, Ž., & Fosić, I. (2009). Organizational communication as an important factor of organizational behaviour. Interdisciplinary Management Research, 5, 33-42.

Ukeje, I. O., Ogbulu, U., Onyema, U. E., Ekwunife, R. A., Obi, V., & Obasi, V. U. (2019). Bureaucratization and service delivery in Nigeria. *Encyclopedia of Public Administration. Global Public Policy, and Governance,* Springer. https://doi. org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3824-1

Usang, O. U. E., & Salim, B. (2016). Political Interference and Local Government Performance in Nigeria: The Moderating Role of Internal Audit Quality. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 10(4).

Wagana, D. M. (2017). Effect of governance decentralization on service delivery in County governments in Kenya, PhD (leadership and governance). Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.

Waikenda,M. (2020). Influence of Stakeholders' Participation on Performance of County Governments in Kenya. *Journal of Research in Management* Vol. 2, No. 4, 2019, pp. 1 – 10 Published by Indonesian Research Society

Warren, M. E. (2017). A problem-based approach to democratic theory. The American Political Science Review, 111(1), 39.

Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and Economic organization fee, New York.

Were, A. (2016). Manufacturing in Kenya: Features, challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Science, Management and Engineering*, 4(6), 15-26.

Weylandt, M., & ANTI, I. (2016). SOE governance in Namibia: Will a hybrid system work. IPPR in partnership with Hanns Seidel Foundation, Briefing paper, 1-19.

Wijetunge, W. A. D. S. (2016). Service quality, competitive advantage and business performance in service providing SMEs in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(7), 720-728.

Wilkinson, A., & Fay, C. (2011). New times for employee voice?. Human Resource Management, 50(1), 65-74.

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis.* [2nd Ed.].

Yap, B. W., & Sim, C. H. (2011). Comparisons of various types of normality tests. Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation, 81(12), 2141-2155.

Yukl, G. (2008). How leaders influence organizational effectiveness. The leadership quarterly, 19(6), 708-722.

Yvonne Feilzer, M. (2010). Doing mixed methods research pragmatically: Implications for the rediscovery of pragmatism as a research paradigm. *Journal of mixed methods research,* 4(1), 6-16.

Zungura, M. (2014). Understanding new public management within the context of Zimbabwe*. International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 6(2), 246-253.