



# **TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND PERFORMANCE OF MANDERA COUNTY GOVERNMENT IN KENYA: THE MODERATING ROLE OF GOVERNMENT POLICIES**

**Yussuf Mohamed Daud** 

PhD Candidate, School of Leadership, Business and Technology,

Pan Africa Christian University, Nairobi, Kenya

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6949-223X, [daud.mohamed@students.pacuniversity.ac.ke](mailto:daud.mohamed@students.pacuniversity.ac.ke)

**Caren A. Ouma**

PhD, Lecturer, Chandaria School of Business, United States International University Africa,

P. O. Box 14634 - 00800, Nairobi, Kenya

[ouma\\_caren@yahoo.com](mailto:ouma_caren@yahoo.com)

**Afred Ong'era**

PhD, Lecturer, School of Business, Strathmore University,

P.O. Box 59857, 00200, City Square, Nairobi, Kenya

[aongera@strathmore.edu](mailto:aongera@strathmore.edu)

## **Abstract**

*The study of leadership in various settings has demonstrated the significance of the full range, right mix leadership of transformational leadership approach over other leadership styles in determining employee, organizational performance, and other positive outcomes. Mandera County has faced a plethora of challenges including its inability to marshal, develop, direct and control the human and financial resources leading to maladministration and poor service delivery, among others. Transformational leadership is the panacea for solving contemporary management and leadership challenges in sub-national levels. This study investigated the moderating role of government policies on the relationship between transformational leadership and performance of Mandera County government in Kenya. A descriptive correlational research*

*design was applied in this study, targeting a population of 696 respondents drawn from the personnel elected and appointed and/or in the office of the Governor, Members of County Assembly and public service board employees of the county government who are concerned with the day – to – day running of the affairs of the County. Stratified random sampling technique was applied to select the sample size from the total population (n=247). The study used structured questionnaires as the primary tool for data collection. SPSS version 24 was applied to compute descriptive and inferential statistics. The study found government policies have a statistically significant moderating effect on the relationship between transformational leadership and performance of Mandera County Government ( $p < .05$ ). In addition, Government Policies have a statistically significant moderating role on the relationship between the individual four dimensions (4Is) of TL and the performance of the County Government of Mandera ( $P < .05$ ). The success or failure of leadership selected depends on the compliance to the rule of law. For instance, adherence to legal, fiscal, and policy framework will greatly enhance the success rates. Furthermore, leaders should inform their followers by conducting trainings, capacity building or civic education to enlighten the citizenry on important issues.*

*Keywords: Mandera County Government; Moderating role; Organizational Performance; policies; Transformational Leadership*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Transformational leadership (TL) brings fundamental changes in the political, economic, or social institutions or community. TL requires that those in charge of their organizations ought to lead from the front (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). One of the ways of offering leadership is through bringing a transformative agenda in addition to ensuring that whatever the organization aspires to do is sustainable. Burns (1978) further stated that effective leadership is exhibited through the satisfaction of human beings in addition to the accomplishment of intended goals. In agreeing with this, Perera et al. (2018) demonstrates that transformational leadership can lead to improved efficiencies in organizations and the delivery of desired outcomes for the benefit of the organization. Northouse (2018) states that achievement of organizational common goals by a group of individuals characterizes appropriate leadership. Over the last three decades, TL has snowballed into one of the central theories of organizational behaviour. It is a leadership practice that translates values into actions, visions into realities and creates a climate of remarkable successes (Wright & Pandey, 2012; Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

This study underscores that leadership can be enhanced through transformative leadership attributes and ethics since moral values define the extent to which societies are able to prosper. Guided by ethical approach in organizational leadership, several scholars have suggested the need for leaders in Africa to gravitate towards transformational approach compared to transactional leadership (Banks *et al.*, 2016; Hoch *et al.*, 2018). Agreeing with the existing body of literature, Antonakis and Day (2017) underscore the need for those in charge of public institutions to entrench a culture that supports transparency and accountability through institutionalizing accepted moral standards. There is resounding scholarly evidence that supports the need for ethical leadership as a basis of transforming the socio - economic and political fortunes for organizations. Ciulla *et al.* (2012) suggested that by civilizing the citizenry, leaders can tackle the ethical challenges they face.

Scholars have delved into leadership and how political and socio - economic development has stagnated owing to poor leadership. Majority of the studies have shown how ineffective leadership has contributed to underdevelopment in the global South (Alexander & Kaboyakgosi, 2012; Mayanja, 2013). The concept of transformational leadership continues to be an argumentative subject among researchers. Yet, there is consensus among scholars that transformative leaders inspire their subordinates, signifying that they prioritize organizational goals over and above individual goals (Antonakis & Day, 2017). Despite the relevance of transformational leadership in the modern institutional management, limited research has been conducted in the Mandera County on the various leadership styles and their effect on performance. This research gap informed the basis of the study.

Most of the organizations in Kenya and indeed in Mandera County continue to face sharp criticism due to inadequate leadership capacities. Majority, if not all counties in Kenya have been facing many challenges, such as conflict, poverty, underdevelopment, corruption, and insecurity owing to a wave of poor leadership that has precipitated underwhelming performance of governance systems (Oyugi, 2015). The predicament of Kenya and by extension Mandera County in terms of underdevelopment, poverty, insecurity, clan conflict and corruption can be adduced to the problem of leadership. Since Kenya's independence in 1963, democracy and leadership in political and governance arena has seen mixed results with developmental failures largely due to colonial legacies, poor leadership, corruption, and institutional failures (Hope, 2014). To ameliorate democratic and leadership challenges, Kenya took a great leap in promulgating a new constitution in August 2010, making a critical departure in the nation's political and constitutional dispensation with the adoption of a devolved system of government. This led to the creation of two tiers National and the 47 county governments.

Devolution has become a global governance model, gaining prominence and momentum since the 1990s. The global trend towards devolution is driven by pressure for more local democratic control, the need to address disparities, ensure greater efficiency in public service delivery and accountability, advances in information, communication and technology, globalization of economies and population growth, citizen push for more inclusive and equitable democracy (Giddens, 2018). Rodriguez-Pose and Gill (2013) suggests that the global arena has successfully experimented devolution, where federalism has been most successful in United States of America, India, and a few African countries. This demonstrates a shift from a world mostly dominated by strong national governments, to strong regional state governments. Administrative and fiscal decentralization in the People's Republic of China was adopted while adhering to a policy of political centralisation. Decentralization provided considerable power to regional and local governments and encouraged socio-economic development. Moreover, through this form of decentralisation, China has witnessed rapid economic growth and its transformation from an insular economy to an open one with the local governments playing an instrumental role in this journey (Wong, 2010).

In Africa, there is unprecedented interest in decentralised systems of governance with several countries entrenching systems of local government in their constitution (WB, 2011). Few countries have stood out in Africa such as Comoros, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Nigeria, and South Africa. The push factor and the growing interest in decentralisation is the urgency to reduce poverty and bring about development (Boone, 2012; Makara, 2018). For instance, evidence contained in Dijk *et al.* (2011) and Agegnehu and Dibu (2017) indicates that transfer of power to quasi autonomous units in Ethiopia took place in 1991, while Ethiopia promulgated a new constitution in 1995. Decentralization led to formation of a central government with 9 regional governments at the periphery. The reasons for transfer of part of the political power and resources were to enhance delivery of services to the citizenry, integration of minor ethnic communities to the development agenda, democratization and increase public administration.

Devolved power and TL play a central role on socio-economic and political transformation. Although the relationship between devolution and leadership has attracted research attention, several scholars have reported mixed results. Focusing on the effects of TL on governance in Kajiado County Government, Samson and Ombui (2016) conclude that TL had a significant negative relationship on governance in Kajiado. Most studies carried out on devolution focused mainly on the impact of devolution on development, the effects of conflict on development and devolution as a means of promoting public participation and inclusion in political dispensation. Studies also considered effect of devolution on financial management, on service delivery and management of land.

During the last fifty-seven years, Kenya has witnessed a significant change in its political and democratic system, from a highly centralized autocracy to a decentralized democracy. Before the historic referendum of August 2010, Kenya's political landscape was marked by a single party system, a strong presidency and centralized power in Nairobi, with the executive branch and national assembly having autonomy over all resources in the country, post elections violence and ethnic tensions during every election. The imperial and authoritarian presidency had contributed largely to Kenya's political and development problems. Ostensibly, the national government under a patrimonial state did not consider the needs of minorities and marginalized groups because in most cases, they lacked active representation and did not bring the voting basket to the table. This had left certain regions marginalized and smaller ethnic groups left out from the leadership, political and development discourse (Hope, 2014).

Kenya first adopted devolved governance in the *Majimbo* Constitution after independence in 1963. According to Maxon (2016), the *Majimbo* Constitution adopted by Kenya provided a framework that created regional assemblies and a bicameral legislature which consisted of the House of Representatives and the Senate, where the Senate was the Upper House while the former was the Lower House. KADU negotiated for the constitutional provisions to secure the rights and aspirations of the minority groups since KANU was perceived as a conglomeration of the major tribes in Kenya. However, a year later (1964), KADU was merged with KANU to reflect the position of unitary government that was proposed in the Lancaster House constitutional talks in London. Cannon and Ali (2018) states that during the 1960s and 1970s, the Kenyan government argued that it had the capacity to offer superior services, which led to various constitutional changes that created imperial presidency.

In the 1980s, delivery of government policies had deteriorated to the extent that this raised questions on the effectiveness of a government structure where functions were centralized. This led to various decentralization measures, such as the creation and implementation of DFRD that acted as budgeting and planning framework. In 1991, Kenya marked the return of multiparty democracy where the multiparty political system was introduced owing to pressure from the civil society and politicians allied to the opposition who mounted pressure on the government to introduce political pluralism. The 2007-2008 post-election violence necessitated a new conversation which opened a window for a new constitution.

In 2010, Kenya created a new constitution that ushered in a devolution system that created 47 devolved units. The 2010 Constitution of Kenya was officially enacted into law on 27th August 2010 marking a defining moment in the country's history as it altered the balance of power by introducing two tiers: the National government and 47 elected county governments (Hope, 2014). The constitution significantly reformed the nation by "steering in a set of reforms

across the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the state, and forming and establishing counties as the most significant and powerful level of devolved government in the country” (UNDP, 2015, p.8).

According to Ongwae (2016), devolution came into effect in March 2013 where powers of self-governance and economic resources were devolved to forty-seven counties. There are various systems of decentralization, which include delegation, de-concentration, and devolution. Williamson and Mulaki (2015) state that decentralization in Kenya is interpreted as sharing of fiscal, administrative, and political duties between the county governments and the national government. Several scholars have provided their perspectives about devolution, where there seem to be consensus that devolution encompass “the full transfer of responsibility, decision-making, resources, revenue generation and political powers to the lower-level authority: thereby, bringing services and development closer to its citizens” (Rodriguez & Gill, 2013). To provide a more nuanced definition of devolution, Khaunya and Wawire (2015) define devolution as a “political arrangement where political, administrative and fiscal power is distributed to semi-autonomous territorial and sub-national units”. Burbidge (2017) contends that the devolution dream was to address Kenya’s long-standing challenges regarding development, equitable access to resources, inequalities within and between ethnic groups, the question of exclusion and inclusion, and delivery of basic services to the people through creation of a more responsive, accountable, and efficient governance model.

### **Statement of the Problem**

In the 2017/2018 audit report, Mandera County financial management was queried. The county was allocated a total of Ksh.6.4 billion in audited financial year but managed to spend Ksh. 5.3 billion leading to under expenditure of Ksh. 1.1 billion. Further, the county did not achieve its revenue collection targets in the 2017/18 financial year where the county had planned to collect Ksh.141 million from own sources of revenue. However, the county reported a collection of Ksh.61 million demonstrating a huge under performance (Audit Report, 2017/2018). Public functions are provided to populations that are more informed and demanding more accountability. This demonstrates the lack of capacity and skills to implement plans and delivery of services and ineffective leadership to utilize available resources and ensure accountability (Ngigi & Busolo, 2019). This negatively impacts on the overall performance of the county.

Various irregularities were reported with County Public Service Board in the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission report 2014/2015. Some of these irregularities include irregular appointments, unfair recruitment practices, corruption and other forms of nepotism and favouritisms. Since the promulgation of 2010 Constitution, the public sector has faced

challenges which have derailed the county's push towards attaining effectiveness and quality service delivery (Nyamunga, 2016). The county's success depends on effective employees and leadership. The workforce in the county came from other sectors of the economy owing to perceived attractive compensation and better terms of engagement (Chebet, 2015). There was expectation that the quality of services and performance of the county would improve. However, this was not the case as lack of a well-planned and executed human capital management and lack of qualified personnel, as most qualified personnel opted to work in other parts of the country where there are conducive working conditions and security. This had led to ineffective operation and dismal performance by various county governments in Kenya.

These challenges affected critical services offered to the population thereby causing much suffering and derailed county's overall performance, and failure to put in some interventions may impact the achievement of the devolution dreams (Yussuf, 2016). To improve institutional performance, transformational leadership practices and approaches have become more important. There have been efforts by county governments in Kenya to increase efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery through service charters and adhering to rules and procedures that govern the management of devolution systems (Kuria & Nzuve, 2015). Moreover, this study underlines that Mandera County continues to design and implement citizen-centred policies aimed at upscaling service delivery effectiveness. This study further asserts that a number of public-sector institutions in Mandera County have formulated solution-focused, people-centred, service-oriented, and purpose-driven strategies in service delivery. However, the county and these organizations still face a plethora of snags in an endeavor to embed an organizational change culture that focuses on not just processes, but also results. Unfortunately, even after the government policies through fiscal, legal, and statutory frameworks have documented how county governments should operate for posterity, the same is still lost (Njambi, 2014). This appears to suggest that government policies, play a significant role in improving the performance of counties. This study delves into the moderating role of government policies on the relationship between transformational leadership and performance of the county government of Mandera.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Karungani and Ochiri (2017) carried out a study on the degree to which performance of Nairobi City County is affected by regulatory and policy framework. The study revealed that the regulatory and policy frameworks within the procurement department of the county were instrumental in augmenting organizational performance. Through creation of a level engagement ground, the study revealed that government policies, particularly procurement

guidelines were important in streamlining the reputation of the county government of Nairobi. In addition, it was noted that the policy framework is critical in enhancing transparency and accountability of public officers. This finding is relatable to the situation in Mandera County where several procurement laws have been flawed and tenders awarded to non-qualifying companies or individuals leading to loss of funds. Thus, the current study investigated the extent to which the legal, regulatory and policy framework have been entrenched in the county of Mandera.

Makena *et al.* (2018) sought to establish the influencing factors of devolved government and how they affect Makueni county government's health sector. Quantitative data solicited from health workers and analysed using statistical techniques indicated that performance of the county was affected by organizational policy and among other factors, such as human resource management, leadership and bad financial resources management. Furthermore, the study noted that organizational policy had a moderately strong positive association with performance. Thus, the current study sought to establish the place of government policies on the governance and performance of the county government of Mandera.

Cheboror *et al.* (2017) inquired into how the devolution framework on selection practices influences the performance of employees in Nakuru County Government. Deducing from the data collected from employees at Nakuru County headquarters, the study established that employee awareness on HR strategies, turnover and attrition, county policy and human capital needs of the county significantly affected the performance of employees. This finding can be compared with Mandera County where the devolution framework moderates the performance of the county government. It appears that despite the centrality of leadership attributes of the leaders in the county, HR policies play a substantial role in predicting the performance of employee of Mandera County government. Towards this end, this study was designed to determine the moderating role of government policies on the relationship between TL and the performance of Mandera County Government.

Tsofa *et al.* (2017) examine the interplay between devolution and health workforce performance in Kilifi County, where the authors argued that transfer of political power and resources through devolution enhances technical efficiency, accountability, equity, and community participation, particularly in the health systems. Using a case study of HRH and EMMS management health systems, decision space framework developed by Bossert and Mitchell (2011) was applied to appraise the earlier implementation of the health systems. The research findings illustrated that health systems in the counties were hurriedly implemented, and this affected HR functions and permitted political interference. Owing to poor HR services and infiltration from the political class, most of the workforce in the county resigned; however,



upon implementation of the laid down county procedures, the challenges witnessed were circumvented. This finding from Kilifi County is relatable to the human resource situation in Mandera County where some employees have quit, suggesting that devolution policies on human resources seem to be in dire need of reforms. Thus, the current study determined the extent to which policies in the county government of Mandera has augmented performance.

Mwikali and Wafula (2015) studied the effects of devolved governance on organizational performance of Mombasa County government, where the background information of the study underlined the centrality of democracy in the provision of services to the citizenry. The study noted the essentials of devolution in addressing the recurring challenges of underdevelopment in Kenya. The study noted that devolution powers had made it possible for the county of Mombasa to receive finances that have been instrumental in enhancing greater performance. The study noted that provision of quality services to the counties can be augmented through availability of funds and employee training and motivation. These results are applicable to the situation in Mandera County where it has been suggested that the county suffers from low funding (even though it receives one of the highest funding from the exchequer) to the extent that this has affected provision of services to the citizens, which is a key indicator of performance. To this end, the current study sought to offer a nuanced approach in determining the place of devolution policies in the performance of the county government of Mandera.

Government policies as a moderating variable is yet to be explored since most of the studies, such as Mencl *et al.* (2016) have largely used the attributes of the leaders as a predictor variable. In the absence of this kind of information, much of the evidence in empirical literature is unreliable. Therefore, this study takes a holistic approach in determining the effect of the 4Is of TL on performance, while cognizant of the moderating role of government policies on devolution systems. This study is guided by lack of empirical evidence on the application of TL since most studies on leadership took place in varying contexts and hence the gap here is that this field is evolving and much of the research seems to focus on individual-level outcomes, implying that there has been limited scholarship to test the relationships on large aggregates, such as performance of the government agencies compared to just measuring the performance of the employees. This appears to suggest that the existing evidence assumes that countries and sectors have homogenous cultures, signifying that, results from one sector/industry can be replicated on another, which is empirically unsound. To this end, this study sought to fill the knowledge lacuna in literature by empirically examining the moderating role of government policies on the relationship between transformational leadership and performance of the county government of Mandera.

## METHODOLOGY

The study employed a descriptive correlational research design to establish the interplay between TL and the performance of the County Government of Mandera. The study targeted directors, executive committee members, chief officers, elected and nominated Members of the County Assembly (MCAs), members of the County Assembly Board, and members and employees of County Public Service Board. The total population for the study were 696 respondents.

The sample size was calculated using Fischer's et al (2019) formula at 95% confidence interval shown below:

$$n = p \times q \left[ \frac{z}{e} \right]^2$$

Where:

n = required minimum sample size

p = the proportion belonging to the specified category

q = the proportion not belonging to the specified category

z = the value corresponding to the level of confidence required (90% certain=1.65, 95% certain=1.96 and 99% certain=2.57)

e% = the margin of error required

Calculation of the Sample Size

P = 50%, q = 50%, z = 1.96 (95% certain) e = 5% (i.e. within plus or minus 5% of the true percentage, the margin of error that can be tolerated).

$$\begin{aligned} n &= 50 \times 50 \times \left[ \frac{1.96}{5} \right]^2 \\ &= 2500 \times 0.153664 \\ &= 384 \end{aligned}$$

The researcher further applied finite correction formulae (nf) and Yamane formulae (1967) in successive steps as indicated below. This is because the population was less than 10,000.

$$\begin{aligned} n' &= \frac{384}{1 + \left( \frac{384}{10000} \right)} \\ &= \frac{384}{1.0384} = 247.4667 \\ \text{Approx.} &= 247 \end{aligned}$$

The sample size was distributed among the the categories of the population to ensure equal chance of representation by each category in the study.

The study adopted stratified simple random sampling technique, where the population were clustered into departments of employees in the county according to the office of the Governor, County ministries, Public Service Board, and County Assembly. After clustering the population into homogenous groups, random samples were proportionately drawn according to

the size of the groups. close-ended questionnaires were used to solicit for numeric data to aid in hypothesis testing. The questionnaires were administered to the respondents using a drop and pick method. To check for reliability and validity of the questionnaire, a pilot experiment was conducted by administering questionnaires to 26 heads of departments of Mandera County Government. The pilot study was done through random sampling. data were entered into SPSS version 24 that was used to analyze quantitative data. The quantitative data yielded inferential statistics that aided in hypothesis testing using hierarchical regression analysis.

To ensure that the research instruments provided consistency in terms of yielding similar results irrespective of the number of time data was collected, the Cronbach's alpha (1951) was conducted. To measure the internal consistency of the instruments, the coefficients from the Cronbach's alpha was 0.700, which signifies that the reliability of the data collection instrument applied in this study was sufficiently reliable since it supported internal consistency of the results. Coefficient less than 0.7 were not acceptable, suggesting that the higher the coefficients of the Cronbach's alpha, the greater the internal consistency of the research instruments. The credibility of the research instruments was established using content and construct validity. To ensure that the instruments achieved content validity, the items of the tools were constructed in a manner that represents the phenomenon under study. Adequate items were included in the questionnaire to ensure that the phenomenon under study was sufficiently captured to upscale validity. Furthermore, the questionnaire items were constructed in a way that was easier to understand by the respondents. To ensure construct validity, the questionnaire items were operationalized in light of the existing literature and theoretical framework.

## FINDINGS

The study tested the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) which stated as follows:

*H<sub>05</sub>: National government policies have no significant moderating effect on the relationship between transformational leadership and performance of Mandera county government in Kenya.*

The objective of the study was to assess the moderating effect of Government Policies (GP) on the relationship between TL and performance of Mandera county government in Kenya. To determine the moderating effect of GP, hypothesis five ( $H_{05}$ ) was tested. Hierarchical regression was applied to test the existence of the relationship or the lack thereof. The equation of GP on county performance stated:  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X + \beta_2Z + \beta_3X * Z + \varepsilon$ ,

Where,  $\alpha$  =constant (intercept),

X= is the composite index of government policies,

$\varepsilon$  = Error term.

The probability value corresponding to  $\beta_1 - \beta_3$  was calculated and hypothesis determined through  $P\text{-value} \leq \alpha$ , reject  $H_0$ .

### Government Policies and Performance

Before testing for the moderation effect of the GP, the study sought to establish whether GP had a statistically significant effect on the performance of the Mandera County Government. This was done using simple linear regression analysis. The equation of GP on county performance stated:  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X + \varepsilon$ , where  $\alpha$  =constant (intercept),  $X$ = is the composite index of IM,  $\varepsilon$  = Error term. The p-value corresponding to  $\beta_1$  was computed and hypothesis determined through  $P\text{-value} \leq \alpha$ , reject  $H_0$ . Table 1 details the results.

Table 1: Regression Results on the Effect of Government Policies on Performance

<b>Model Summary</b>						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.592 <sup>a</sup>	.351	.348	.73063		
a. Predictors: (Constant), Government Policies						
<b>ANOVA<sup>a</sup></b>						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	57.429	1	57.429	107.580	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	106.231	199	.534		
	Total	163.660	200			
a. Dependent Variable: Performance    b. Predictors: (Constant), GP						
<b>Coefficients<sup>a</sup></b>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.100	.242		4.543	.000
	Government Policies	.643	.062	.592	10.372	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Performance						

Table 1 illustrates the effect of GP on the performance of the Mandera County Government. The results show that there is a significant association between government policies and the performance of the Mandera County Government ( $P > .05$ ). Correlation coefficient (R) is 0.592 for performance. The correlation between GP and the performance of The County Government of Mandera is moderately high. The results further indicate that there are different variations in county government performance and government policies. The  $R^2$  of 0.351 explains that 35.1% of the variations of county performance is a result of GP. This signifies that performance variance of 64.9% is explained by variables not contained in this study.

The Analysis of Variance in Table 1 shows a probability value of 0.00, which is less than the predetermined level of significance (0.05). This indicates that the model has a

goodness of fit, denoting that the model can predict the association between the variables. The simple linear regression results indicate that holding GP constant, the performance of the County Government of Mandera will be 1.100. Furthermore, a unit change in GP will lead to .643 units increase in the performance of the county government.

The model,  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X + \varepsilon$ ,

Where:

Y= Performance of the County Government of Mandera and X= government policies becomes:

$$\text{Performance} = 1.100 + .643 \text{ government policies} + 0$$

### Transformational Leadership, Government Policies and Performance

The study sought to determine the moderating effect of GP on the association between TL and the performance of Mandera County Government in Kenya. To determine the moderating effect of GP, hypothesis five ( $H_{05}$ ) was tested. Hierarchical regression was applied to test the existence of the relationship or the lack thereof. The equation of GP on county performance stated:  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X + \beta_2Z + \beta_3X * Z + \varepsilon$ , where  $\alpha$  =constant (intercept), X= is the composite index of TL (4Is),  $\varepsilon$  = Error term. The probability value corresponding to  $\beta_1$ -  $\beta_3$  was calculated and hypothesis determined through P-value  $\leq \alpha$ , reject  $H_0$ . Table 2 present the result.

Table 2: Regression Results on the Moderating Effect of Government Policies on the Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Performance

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.117 <sup>a</sup>	.014	.009	.90066	.014	2.753	1	199	.099
2	.596 <sup>b</sup>	.356	.349	.72984	.342	105.055	1	198	.000
3	.611 <sup>c</sup>	.373	.363	.72174	.017	5.469	1	197	.020

a. Predictors: (Constant), TL

b. Predictors: (Constant), TL, GP

c. Predictors: (Constant), TL, GP, TL\*GP

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.234	1	2.234	2.753	.099 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	161.426	199	.811		
	Total	163.660	200			

2	Regression	58.193	2	29.096	54.624	.000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	105.467	198	.533		
	Total	163.660	200			
3	Regression	61.041	3	20.347	39.061	.000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	102.618	197	.521		
	Total	163.660	200			

Table 2...

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), TL

c. Predictors: (Constant), TL, GP

d. Predictors: (Constant), TL, GP, TL\*GP

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	2.866	.419		6.840	.000
	Transformational Leadership	.183	.110	.117	1.659	.099
2	(Constant)	1.431	.367		3.896	.000
	Transformational Leadership	-.113	.094	-.072	-1.197	.233
	Government Policies	.667	.065	.614	10.250	.000
3	(Constant)	4.354	1.301		3.345	.001
	Transformational Leadership	-.928	.361	-.591	-2.572	.011
	Government Policies	-.132	.348	-.122	-.380	.704
	Transformational Leadership*Government Policies	.220	.094	1.032	2.339	.020

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Table 2 illustrates the summary of the moderating effect of GP on the relationship between TL and performance of Mandera County Government. The results show that the correlation coefficient (R) of TL is 0.117, when the parameter of GP is added it increases to 0.596, with addition of the parameter of the interaction of TL and GP (X\*Z) it increases to 0.611. The correlation between TL and GP on performance of Mandera County Government is moderately high. The results further indicate that there are different variations in performance of the county government by TL and GP. The R<sup>2</sup> of 0.373 explains that 37.3% of the variations of performance of Mandera County Government are a result of TL, GP, and the interaction of TL and GP. This suggests that 62.7% of the performance variance is a result of variables not contained in the study.

The Analysis of Variance in Table 2 under model 3 shows a probability value of 0.00, which is less than the set level of significance (0.05). Thus, the model has a goodness of fit to predict the association. The study's null hypothesis stated that national GP have a significant moderating effect on the association between TL and performance of Mandera County Government in Kenya was rejected at 95% confidence level. This elucidates that GP have a statistically significant moderating effect on the relationship between TL and performance of Mandera County Government in Kenya.

The hierarchical regression model  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X + \beta_2Z + \beta_3X * Z$

Where:

Y= Performance of the County Government of Mandera; X= TL, Z= GP, and X\*Z= interaction between TL and GP.

becomes:

$$Performance = 4.354 - .928TL - .132GP + .220TL * GP$$

### Individualized Consideration, Government Policies and Performance

The study sought to determine the moderating effect of GP on the relationship between IC and the performance of Mandera County Government in Kenya. Hierarchical regression was applied to test the existence of the relationship or lack of it. The equation of government policies on county performance stated:  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X + \beta_2Z + \beta_3X * Z + \varepsilon$ , where  $\alpha$  =constant (intercept), X= is the composite index of IC, Z= is the composite index of GP;  $\varepsilon$  = Error term; XZ=interaction terms of IC and government policies;  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$  = coefficient estimate of the effect of X, Z and X\*Z on Y respectively. The p-value corresponding to  $\beta_1- \beta_3$  was calculated and effect determined through  $P\text{-value} \leq \alpha$ , reject  $H_0$ . Table 3 details the results.

Table 3: Regression Results on the Moderating Effect of Government Policies on the Relationship between Individualized Consideration and Performance

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.129 <sup>a</sup>	.017	.012	.89925	.017	3.386	1	199	.067
2	.596 <sup>b</sup>	.355	.349	.73008	.338	103.908	1	198	.000
3	.610 <sup>c</sup>	.372	.363	.72220	.017	5.346	1	197	.022

a. Predictors: (Constant), IC  
b. Predictors: (Constant), IC, GP  
c. Predictors: (Constant), IC, GP, IC\*GP

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.738	1	2.738	3.386	.067 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	160.921	199	.809		
	Total	163.660	200			
2	Regression	58.123	2	29.061	54.523	.000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	105.537	198	.533		
	Total	163.660	200			
3	Regression	60.911	3	20.304	38.928	.000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	102.749	197	.522		
	Total	163.660	200			

Table 3...

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), IC

c. Predictors: (Constant), IC, GP

d. Predictors: (Constant), IC, GP, IC\*GP

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	2.953	.333		8.872	.000
	IC	.157	.086	.129	1.840	.067
2	(Constant)	.825	.341		2.416	.017
	IC	.080	.070	.066	1.141	.255
	GP	.636	.062	.585	10.194	.000
3	(Constant)	3.320	1.131		2.936	.004
	IC	-.610	.306	-.501	-1.992	.048
	GP	-.024	.292	-.022	-.082	.935
	IC*GP	.181	.078	.884	2.312	.022

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Table 3 illustrates the summary of the moderating effect of GP on the relationship between IC and performance of Mandera County Government. The results show that the R of IC is 0.129, when the parameter of GP is added it increases to 0.596, with addition of the parameter of the interaction of IC and GP (X\*Z) it increases to 0.611. The correlation between IC and GP on performance of Mandera County Government is moderately high. The results further indicate that there are different variations in performance of Mandera County Government by IC and government policies. The R<sup>2</sup> of 0.372 explains that 37.2% of the variations of performance of Mandera County Government are a result of IC, GP, and the interaction of IC and GP. This suggests that 62.8% of the performance variations are a result of variables not contained in the analysis.



The Analysis of Variance findings in Table 3 under model 3 shows a probability value of 0.00, which is less than the set level of significance (0.05). This indicates that the model has a goodness of fit in predicting the relationship under study. Thus, the study concludes that GP have a statistically significant moderating effect on the relationship between IC and performance of the county government.

The hierarchical regression model  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X + \beta_2Z + \beta_3X * Z$

Where:

Y= Performance of the County Government of Mandera; X= IC, Z= GP, and X\*Z= interaction between IC and GP.

becomes:

$$Performance = 3.320 - .610 IC - .024GP + .181 IC * GP$$

### Inspirational Motivation, Government Policies and Performance

The study sought to determine the moderating effect of GP on the relationship between IM and the performance of Mandera County Government in Kenya. Hierarchical regression was applied to test the existence of the relationship or lack of it. The equation of GP on county performance stated:  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X + \beta_2Z + \beta_3X * Z + \varepsilon$ , where  $\alpha$  =constant (intercept), X= is the composite index of IM, Z= is the composite index of GP;  $\varepsilon$  = Error term; XZ=interaction terms of IM and GP;  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$  = coefficient estimate of the effect of X, Z and X\*Z on Y respectively. The p-value corresponding to  $\beta_1- \beta_3$  was calculated and effect determined through  $P\text{-value} \leq \alpha$ , reject  $H_0$ . Table 4 details the findings.

Table 4: Regression results on the moderating effect of government policies on the relationship between inspirational motivation and performance

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.051 <sup>a</sup>	.003	-.002	.90567	.003	.526	1	199	.469
2	.619 <sup>b</sup>	.383	.376	.71437	.380	121.849	1	198	.000
3	.634 <sup>c</sup>	.402	.393	.70465	.020	6.504	1	197	.012

a. Predictors: (Constant), Inspirational Motivation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Inspirational Motivation, Government Policies

c. Predictors: (Constant), Inspirational Motivation, Government Policies, Inspirational Motivation\*Government Policies

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.431	1	.431	.526	.469 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	163.229	199	.820		
	Total	163.660	200			
2	Regression	62.614	2	31.307	61.347	.000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	101.045	198	.510		
	Total	163.660	200			
3	Regression	65.844	3	21.948	44.203	.000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	97.816	197	.497		
	Total	163.660	200			

Table 4...

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Inspirational Motivation

c. Predictors: (Constant), Inspirational Motivation, Government Policies

d. Predictors: (Constant), Inspirational Motivation, Government Policies, Inspirational Motivation\*Government Policies

#### Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
				Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.801	.347		10.950	.000
	Inspirational Motivation	-.066	.091	-.051	-.725	.469
2	(Constant)	1.821	.327		5.562	.000
	Inspirational Motivation	-.234	.073	-.182	-3.188	.002
	Government Policies	.684	.062	.630	11.039	.000
3	(Constant)	4.290	1.021		4.203	.000
	Inspirational Motivation	-.926	.281	-.721	-3.297	.001
	Government Policies	.010	.272	.009	.036	.972
	Inspirational Motivation*Government Policies	.187	.073	.914	2.550	.012

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Table 4 illustrates the summary of the moderating effect of GP on the relationship between IM and performance of Mandera County Government. The results show that the R of IM is 0.051, when the parameter of GP is added it increases to 0.619, with addition of the parameter of the interaction of IM and GP (X\*Z) it increases to 0.634. The correlation between IM and GP on performance of Mandera County Government is moderately high. The results further indicate that there are different variations in performance of Mandera County Government by IM and GP. The R<sup>2</sup> of 0.393 explains that 39.3% of the variations of performance of Mandera County Government are a result of IM, GP, and the interaction of IM

and GP. This suggests that 60.1% of the variations in performance are a result of variables not part of the study.

The Analysis of Variance findings in Table 4 under model 3 show a probability value of 0.00, which is less than the predetermined level of significance (0.05). This illustrates that the model has a goodness of fit to predict the association. Thus, the study elucidates that GP has a statistically significant moderating effect on the relationship between IM and performance of Mandera county government in Kenya.

The hierarchical regression model  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X + \beta_2Z + \beta_3X * Z$

Where:

Y= Performance of the County Government of Mandera; X= IM, Z= GP, and X\*Z= interaction between IM and GP.

becomes:

$$Performance = 4.290 - .926 IM - .010GP + .187 IM * GP$$

### Idealized Influence, Government Policies and Performance

The study sought to determine the moderating effect of GP on the relationship between II and the performance of Mandera County Government in Kenya. Hierarchical regression was applied to test the existence of the relationship or lack of it. The equation of GP on county performance stated:  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X + \beta_2Z + \beta_3X * Z + \varepsilon$ , where  $\alpha$  =constant (intercept), X= is the composite index of II, Z= is the composite index of GP;  $\varepsilon$  = Error term; XZ=interaction terms of II and GP;  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$  = coefficient estimate of the effect of X, Z and X\*Z on Y respectively. The p-value corresponding to  $\beta_1- \beta_3$  was calculated and effect determined through  $P\text{-value} \leq \alpha$ , reject  $H_0$ . Table 5 indicates the results.

Table 5: Regression Results on the Moderating Effect of Government Policies on the Relationship between Idealized Influence and Performance

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.046 <sup>a</sup>	.002	-.003	.90590	.002	.424	1	199	.516
2	.609 <sup>b</sup>	.371	.365	.72111	.369	116.059	1	198	.000
3	.612 <sup>c</sup>	.375	.365	.72075	.004	1.198	1	197	.275

a. Predictors: (Constant), Idealized Influence

b. Predictors: (Constant), Idealized Influence, Government Policies

c. Predictors: (Constant), Idealized Influence, Government Policies, Idealized Influence\*Government Policies

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.348	1	.348	.424	.516 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	163.312	199	.821		
	Total	163.660	200			
2	Regression	60.699	2	30.350	58.364	.000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	102.961	198	.520		
	Total	163.660	200			
3	Regression	61.321	3	20.440	39.347	.000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	102.339	197	.519		
	Total	163.660	200			

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Idealized Influence

c. Predictors: (Constant), Idealized Influence, Government Policies

d. Predictors: (Constant), Idealized Influence, Government Policies, Idealized Influence\*Government Policies

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.389	.261		12.978	.000
	Idealized Influence	.045	.069	.046	.651	.516
2	(Constant)	1.443	.275		5.240	.000
	Idealized Influence	-.145	.058	-.148	-2.508	.013
	Government Policies	.693	.064	.638	10.773	.000
3	(Constant)	2.397	.914		2.623	.009
	Idealized Influence	-.414	.252	-.423	-1.640	.103
	Government Policies	.431	.247	.397	1.745	.083
	Idealized Influence*Government Policies	.072	.066	.422	1.094	.275

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Table 5 illustrates the summary of the moderating effect of GP on the relationship between II and performance of Mandera County Government. The results show that the R of II is 0.046, when the parameter of GP is added it increases to 0.609, with addition of the parameter of the interaction of II and GP (X\*Z) it increases to 0.612. The correlation between II and GP on performance of Mandera County Government is moderately high. The results further indicate that there are different variations in performance of Mandera County Government by II and GP. The R<sup>2</sup> of 0.375 explains that 37.5% of the variations of performance of Mandera

County Government are a result of II, GP, and the interaction II and GP. This suggests that 62.5% of the performance variations are a result of variables not contained in the analysis.

The Analysis of Variance findings in Table 5 under model 3 show a probability value of 0.00, which is less than the set level of significance (0.05). This illustrates that model is significant in predicting the association. Thus, the study elucidates that GP have a statistically significant moderating effect on the relationship between II and performance of the county government.

The hierarchical regression model  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 Z + \beta_3 X * Z$

Where:

Y= Performance of the County Government of Mandera; X= II, Z= GP, and X\*Z= interaction between II and GP.

becomes:

$$Performance = 2.397 - 0.414 II + 0.431 GP + 0.072 II * GP$$

### Intellectual Stimulation, Government Policies and Performance

The study sought to determine the moderating effect of GP on the relationship between IS and the performance of Mandera County Government in Kenya. Hierarchical regression was applied to test the existence of the relationship or lack of it. The equation of GP on county performance stated:  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 Z + \beta_3 X * Z + \varepsilon$ , where  $\alpha$  = constant (intercept), X= is the composite index of IS, Z= is the composite index of GP;  $\varepsilon$  = Error term; XZ=interaction terms of IS and GP;  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$  = coefficient estimate of the effect of X, Z and X\*Z on Y respectively. The p-value corresponding to  $\beta_1 - \beta_3$  was calculated and effect determined through P-value  $\leq \alpha$ , reject  $H_0$ . Table 6 presents the results.

Table 6: Regression Results on the moderating Effect of Government Policies on the Relationship between Intellectual Stimulation and Performance

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.264 <sup>a</sup>	.070	.065	.87462	.070	14.944	1	199	.000
2	.598 <sup>b</sup>	.358	.351	.72868	.288	88.699	1	198	.000
3	.605 <sup>c</sup>	.366	.357	.72555	.009	2.710	1	197	.101

a. Predictors: (Constant), Intellectual Stimulation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Intellectual Stimulation, Government Policies

c. Predictors: (Constant), Intellectual Stimulation, Government Policies, Intellectual Stimulation\*Government Policies

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.432	1	11.432	14.944	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	152.228	199	.765		
	Total	163.660	200			
2	Regression	58.528	2	29.264	55.115	.000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	105.132	198	.531		
	Total	163.660	200			
3	Regression	59.955	3	19.985	37.964	.000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	103.705	197	.526		
	Total	163.660	200			

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Intellectual Stimulation

c. Predictors: (Constant), Intellectual Stimulation, Government Policies

d. Predictors: (Constant), Intellectual Stimulation, Government Policies, Intellectual Stimulation\*Government Policies

Table 6 illustrates the summary of the moderating effect of GP on the relationship between IS and performance of Mandera County Government. The results show that the correlation coefficient (R) of IS is when the parameter of government policies is added it increases to 0.598, with addition of the parameter of the interaction of IS and GP (X\*Z) it increases to 0.605. The correlation between IS and GP on performance of Mandera County Government is moderately high.

The results further indicate that there are different variations in performance of Mandera County Government by IS and GP. The R<sup>2</sup> of 0.357 explains that 35.7% of the variations of performance of Mandera County Government are a result of IS, GP, and the interaction of IS and GP. This suggests that 64.3% of the variations are a result of variables not contained in the analysis.

The Analysis of Variance in Table 6 shows a probability value of 0.00, which is less than the predetermined level of significance (0.05). This illustrates that the regression model has a goodness of fit to predict the association. Thus, the study concludes that GP have a statistically significant moderating effect on the relationship between IS and performance of Mandera county government in Kenya.

Table 7: Regression Coefficients on the Moderating Effect of Government Policies on the Relationship between Intellectual Stimulation and Performance

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	2.124	.375		5.662	.000
	Intellectual Stimulation	.379	.098	.264	3.866	.000
2	(Constant)	.745	.345		2.160	.032
	Intellectual Stimulation	.124	.086	.086	1.439	.152
	Government Policies	.614	.065	.565	9.418	.000
3	(Constant)	2.799	1.294		2.163	.032
	Intellectual Stimulation	-.449	.358	-.313	-1.253	.212
	Government Policies	.061	.342	.056	.179	.858
	Intellectual Stimulation*Government Policies	.152	.092	.745	1.646	.101

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

The hierarchical regression model  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X + \beta_2Z + \beta_3X * Z$

Where:

Y= Performance of the County Government of Mandera; X= IS, Z= GP, and X\*Z= interaction between IS and GP.

becomes:

$$Performance = 2.799 - .449 IS + .061GP + .152 IS * GP$$

### Combined Effect of the 4Is and Government Policies on Performance

The study applied multiple linear regression analysis to establish the relative influence of each of the predictor and moderating variables (GP, IC, II, IS, IM) in relation to performance of the County Government of Mandera. Table 8 presents the analysis of data.

Table 8: Regression results on the Combined Effect of the 4Is and Government Policies on Performance

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.682 <sup>a</sup>	.465	.451	.67023

a. Predictors: (Constant), Government Policies, Individualized Consideration, Idealized Influence, Intellectual Stimulation, Inspirational Motivation

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	.796	.365		2.180 .030
	Individualized Consideration	.185	.072	.152	2.563 .011
1	Inspirational Motivation	-.383	.093	-.298	-4.142 .000
	Idealized Influence	-.198	.073	-.202	-2.716 .007
	Intellectual Stimulation	.459	.103	.320	4.452 .000
	Government Policies	.650	.061	.599	10.732 .000

Table 8...

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

As indicated in the model summary, coefficient of determination demonstrates the degree to which the outcome variable can be explained by the changes in the predictor variables. The five variables that were studied, explain 46.5% of variance in performance of Mandera County Government represented by the  $R^2$ . This therefore means that other factors not studied in this research contribute 53.5% of variance in the outcome variable. The Analysis of Variance in table 8, the overall model was significant in predicting the relationship between the 4Is of TL, GP and the performance of the County Government of Mandera. The Probability value was 0.000, which was less than the ser level of significance (0.05. This indicates that the model has a goodness of fit to predict the association.

## SUMMMARY

The study assessed the moderating role of GP on the relationship between TL and the performance of Mandera County Government. Findings indicated that the county's coordination with the national government was effective. Furthermore, the study revealed that policies made at the county level reflected the aspirations of the great people of the county of Mandera. Analysis of the data further revealed that public participation in the Mandera County was carried out on regular basis. Furthermore, it was established that the public participates actively in the Mandera County Government current projects.

The study revealed that the Mandera County Government had clearly defined service charter, which means that service delivery was effective. Furthermore, the study findings revealed that the Mandera County Government responded to the requests of the service seekers in a convenient way, thus reducing bureaucratic cumbersomeness in the county. It was revealed that interdepartmental coordination in the Mandera County Government was effective



in addition to the existence of an open-door policy on access to information. Moreover, the study findings showed that the Mandera County Government conducted civic education to enlighten the citizenry on important issues further to the existence of strong monitoring and evaluation systems to enhance performance. Notably, the Mandera County Government regularly sought opinions on what the public thinks about the county government, whereas it was established that implementation of national government policies had enhanced service delivery.

Judging from a coefficient of 0.643 and a probability value of 0.000 for univariate linear regression, it is clear that the latter is less than the set level of significance. This indicates that GP significantly influence performance ( $P < .05$ ). The study elucidates that GP have a statistically significant influence on the performance of the County Government of Mandera. Furthermore, the results from hierarchical regression GP have a statistically moderating effect on the relationship between TL and performance of the County Government of Mandera ( $P < .05$ ). In addition, government policies have a statistically significant moderating role on the relationship between the individual four dimensions (4Is) of TL and the performance of the County Government of Mandera ( $P < .05$ ).

## DISCUSSIONS

The study established that GP have a statistically significant moderating effect on the relationship between the four dimensions of TL and performance of the County Government of Mandera. Notably, the study found that all the 4Is of TL are significantly associated with performance when the variable of GP is introduced. This seems to suggest that policies, such as devolution framework ensures that leadership is effective since those in positions of authority are bound by a code of conduct that regulates behavior. The findings of the current study are comparable to studies done on the place of government policies in the leadership realm. For instance, Karungani and Ochiri (2017) found that regulatory and policy frameworks significantly influence procurement performance for public entities.

Furthermore, Makena *et al.* (2018) found that organizational policies in counties are moderately associated with performance. This finding is relatable to Mandera county since the county has reported several bottlenecks that dissipate effective delivery of services. Similarly, Cheboror *et al.* (2017)'s work revealed that devolution framework on employee awareness on HR strategies, turnover and attrition, county policy and human capital needs of the county significantly affected the performance of employees. Equally, Tsofa *et al.* (2017) established that devolution policies are significantly related with technical efficiency, accountability, equity, and community participation. Mwikali and Wafula (2015)'s work equally agrees with the current study by stating that devolution has addressed the recurring challenges of underdevelopment.

Thus, devolution powers have made it possible for the counties to receive finances that have been instrumental in enhancing greater performance.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the study indicated that Government Policies have a statistically significant outcome on the performance of the County Government of Mandera ( $P < .05$ ). Thus, the study illuminates that Government Policies are significantly influence the performance of the County Government of Mandera. Furthermore, the results from hierarchical regression, Government Policies have a statistically moderating effect on the interaction between TL and performance of the County Government of Mandera ( $P < .05$ ). In addition, Government Policies have a statistically significant moderating role on the relationship between the individual four dimensions (4Is) of TL and the performance of the County Government of Mandera ( $P < .05$ ).

The study recommends that Leaders should adhere to the devolution policies since they provide the code of conduct on what can be done and what cannot be done. Furthermore, the study recommends that the success or failure of leadership selected depends on the compliance to the rule of law. For instance, adherence to legal, fiscal, and policy framework will greatly enhance the success rates. Furthermore, leaders should inform their followers by conducting trainings, capacity building or civic education to enlighten the citizenry on important issues.

The study was limited to the County Government of Mandera in Kenya denoting the need to conduct a study across all the various county governments in Kenya to unravel the moderating effect of government policies on the relationship between transformational leadership and performance of devolved units in Kenya. Furthermore, the study relied on primary cross-sectional data, using quantitative method signifying the need to apply other forms of data and research designs, such as longitudinal or panel data and mixed methods to establish the moderating effect of government policies on the relationship between transformational leadership and performance of Mandera County government in Kenya from a wholistic perspective.

## REFERENCES

- Agegnehu, A., & Dibu, W. (2017). Does decentralization have a role in poverty reduction? The Ethiopian experience. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 9(1), 1-6.
- Alexander, K., & Kaboyakgosi, G. (Eds.). (2012). *A fine balance: Assessing the quality of governance in Botswana*. African Books Collective.
- Antonakis, J., & Day, D. V. (2017). Leadership: Past, present, and future.
- Banks, G. C., Rogelberg, S. G., Woznyj, H. M., Landis, R. S., & Rupp, D. E. (2016). Evidence on questionable research practices: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 31(3), 323-338.

- Burbidge, D. (2017). Security and devolution in Kenya: Struggles in applying constitutional provisions to local politics. *Strathmore LJ*, 3, 131.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row
- Cannon, B. J., & Ali, J. H. (2018). Devolution in Kenya Four Years On: A Review of Implementation and Effects in Mandera County. *African Conflict and Peacebuilding Review*, 8(1), 1-28.
- Chebet, J. (2015). *Determinants of Employees' Performance in the County Governments of Kenya*. Nairobi: UON.
- Cheboror, A. K., Waiganjo, M., & Ragama, P. (2017). Effect of Devolved Recruitment and Selection Practices on Employee Performance at Nakuru County Government Headquarters. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 9(25), 35-42.
- Ciulla, J. B. (2012). Worthy work and Bowie's Kantian theory of meaningful work. In *Kantian business ethics*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Giddens, J. (2018). Transformational leadership: What every nursing dean should know. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 34(2), 117-121.
- Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 501-529.
- Hope, K. R. (2014). Devolved government and local governance in Kenya: Implementing decentralization underpinned by the 2010 constitution. *African and Asian studies*, 13(3), 338-358.
- Karungani, W. P., & Ochiri, G. (2017). Effect of policy and regulatory framework on organizational performance: A case of Nairobi County, Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 5(6), 565-573.
- Khaunya, M. F., & Wawire, B. P. (2015). Devolved governance in Kenya; is it a false start in democratic decentralization for development?
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2012). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen*. Atlanta, GA: Better World Books.
- Kuria, R. N., & Nzuve, P. S. (2015). Factors Perceived To Influence Employees' Performance; A Case Of The Kenyan State Law Office. *Journal of Business & Economic Policy*, 2(3), 214.
- Makena, J. M., Mugambi, H., Ombui, K., & Shisia, A. (2018). Influence of Devolved Governance on Performance of Health Sector in Makueni County Government, Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 6(7).
- Maxon, R. M. (2016). The demise and rise of majimbo in independent Kenya. In *Kenya After 50* (pp. 19-48). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Mayanja, E. (2013). Strengthening ethical political leadership for sustainable peace and social justice in Africa: Uganda as a case study. *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 13(2), 113-146.
- Mencil, J., Wefald, A. J., & van Ittersum, K. W. (2016). Transformational leader attributes: interpersonal skills, engagement, and well-being. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.
- Mwikali, P., & Wafula, M. (2015). Effects of devolved governance on organizational performance: A case of Mombasa County Government. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 5(6), 1-10.
- Ngigi, S., & Busolo, D. N. (2019). Devolution in Kenya: the good, the bad and the ugly. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 9(6), 9-21.
- Njambi, C. (2014). *Factors influencing employee motivation and its impact on Employee Performance: a case of AMREF health Africa in Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa).
- Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Sage publications.
- Nyamunga, R. O. (2016). *Factors affecting the performance of employees of county governments: A case study of Kisumu County* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa).
- Ongwae, E. M. (2016). *The effect of corporate social responsibility (csr) on profitability of commercial banks in Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Oyugi, B. (2015). Potential Impact of devolution on motivation and job satisfaction of healthcare workers in Kenya: Lessons from early implementation in Kenya and experiences of other Sub-Saharan African Countries. *The journal of global health care systems*, 5(1).

- Perera, K. B. P., Kularatne, M. G., & Wehigaldeniya, W. G. D. S. (2018). The Most Influential Factors on Youth Female Unemployment Incidences in a Sri Lanka. 4th International Conference on Social Sciences 2018, Research Centre for Social Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka.
- Rodríguez-Pose. A & Gill, N (2013). The Global Trend towards Devolution and its Implications. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, Volume: 21 issue: 3, page(s): 333-351.
- Samson, M. and Ombui, K. (2016). The effects of Transformational Leadership on Governance in Kajiado County Government. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*. Volume 6, Issue 10,
- Tsofa, B., Goodman, C., Gilson, L., & Molyneux, S. (2017). Devolution and its effects on health workforce and commodities management—early implementation experiences in Kilifi County, Kenya. *International journal for equity in health*, 16(1), 169.
- Van Dijk, W. W., van Koningsbruggen, G. M., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Wesseling, Y. M. (2011). Self-esteem, self-affirmation, and schadenfreude. *Emotion*, 11(6), 1445.
- Williamson, T., & Mulaki, A. (2015). Devolution of Kenya's Health System: The Role of HPP. Washington, DC, Health Policy Project.
- Wong, C. A., (2010). Authentic leadership and nurses' voice behaviour and perceptions of care quality. *Journal of nursing management*, 18(8), 889-900.
- Wright, B. & Pandey, S. K. (2012). Pulling the levers: Transformational leadership, public service motivation, and mission valence. *Public administration review*, 72(2), 206-215.
- Yussuf, A. A. (2016). *Challenges in the Strategy Implementation of Mandera County Government* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).