

Moderating Effect of Participatory Management on the Relationship between Union Management Relations and Collective Bargaining Process in Public Universities in Kenya

Kuto Y. Luka, J. K. Kwonyike & L. S. Mulongo
School of Business and Economics, Moi University

Corresponding Author's Email Address: lukakuto@yahoo.com

Abstract

The objective of this study was to determine the influence of Union Management Relations (UMR) on collective bargaining process (CBP) and the moderating effect of participatory management (PM) on the relationship between UMR and CBP in public universities in Kenya. The study was anchored on Dunlop's Systems theory of industrial relations and adopted pragmatic research paradigm, mixed methods approach and sequential explanatory research design. The target population of the study was 1462 members and officials of KUSU comprising 1087 from Moi University and 375 from Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology and eight key informants, four from each university. A sample of 314 respondents was obtained using Yamane formula. Quantitative data was collected through structured questionnaires from a sample of 314 respondents selected randomly from each stratum while qualitative data was collected using interview schedule from 8 key informants four from each university. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Inferential statistics were analyzed using correlation and hierarchical regression. The correlation results indicated that UMR positively and significantly correlates with CBP ($r=0.690$, $p=0.000$). The regression results indicated that Union management relations ($\beta=0.204$, $p<0.05$) has a positive and significant influence on collective bargaining process. Participatory management negatively and in significantly moderated the relationship between UMR and collective bargaining process ($\beta= -0.996$, $p>0.05$). The study concludes that UMR influences collective bargaining process. The study recommends that for public universities to have effective collective bargaining process, they should utilize UMR by encouraging cooperation between unions and management. In this study, UMR and participatory management accounted for 58.5% of the variation in collective bargaining process. The study has therefore; extended literature by indicating that participatory management does not moderate the relationship between UMR and CBP. This means that other factors not in this study such as the effect of technology, economics and market context on CBP should be considered in future studies for more insight and knowledge in Kenya and beyond.

Keywords: Union Management Relations, participatory management, Collective Bargaining Process and public universities

INTRODUCTION

In this 21st century democratic processes and institutions have come to be widely accepted not only in the government of countries but also wherever collective decision making is involved. Both intra-group and inter-group relations in most of the industrialized countries like the United Kingdom, United States of America, Canada, Germany, Japan, and Sweden are determined through democratic processes (Katz & Kochan, 2004). Unlike in the political sphere, ability to bargain

is limited to some extent by federal and state laws in force in every country (ILO, 2010).

In Africa, most heads of state have maintained tight control over their public universities (Oso, 2002). African presidents have traditionally been chancellors and appointing officers of the university chief officers. Government representatives have dominated the university councils and heavily dictated the budget. These arrangements have infringed not only on the academic freedom but also the state of industrial relations in the universities by contravening the freedom for workers and the university management to negotiate the terms and conditions of work through collective bargaining process.

Industrial relations in Kenya enjoy legal and constitutional backing. There is an elaborate set of laws that regulate affairs in the labour sector for harmonious industrial relations through institutions like the Industrial Court, National Labour Board, and Wage Councils leading to faster economic growth.

In 1981 the Kenya government banned unions in public universities arguing that university staff did not need a union to articulate their terms and conditions of service. This scenario was reversed in 2004 when the government registered UNTESU (Now KUSU). Since then, the terms and conditions of university staff have been determined through CBP (Waswa *et al.*, 2008), a move that has restored participative approach to labour disputes resolution through CBP.

However, in recent times CBP in public universities has faced a myriad of challenges which have generated a lot of debate in both print and broadcast media a situation that is indicative of the existence of union management disharmony. This study therefore will be paramount in understanding which UMR are good for effective collective bargaining process. Hence, the objective of the study was to determine the moderating effect of participatory management on the relationship between UMR and CBP in public universities in Kenya.

Statement of the problem

When the relationship between the trade union and the management of an organization is cordial and trusting there will be harmony and peace leading to an enabling industrial relations environment for effective collective bargaining process in that organization. The industrial relations environment in public universities in Kenya has been hostile, conflict ridden and poisonous as evidenced by recurring strikes and standoffs over salaries, wages, allowances and other terms and conditions of service as well as failed implementation of CBAs. In 2012 there was a nationwide strike in public universities involving teaching staff represented by UASU and non-teaching staff represented by KUSU. This was followed by similar strikes in 2014 and 2017. The most recent one ended in December 2017 after both parties agreed to conclude negotiations by 28th February, 2018. This adversarial atmosphere has created a state of conflict and rivalry that can hardly facilitate effective CBP. The objective of this study was to determine the influence of UMR on CBP and the moderating effect of PM on the relationship between UMR and CBP using KUSU members in Moi University and Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology.

Objective of the Study

1. To determine the effect of union management relations on collective bargaining process in public universities in Kenya.

2. To analyze the effect of participatory management on the relationship between union management relations and collective bargaining process in public universities in Kenya.

Research Hypotheses

H0₁: UMR has no significant relationship with collective bargaining process in public universities in Kenya.

H0₂: Participatory management has no moderating effect on the relationship between union management relations and collective bargaining process in public universities in Kenya.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Union Management Relations and Collective Bargaining Process

The parties to the process of collective bargaining include employer or employers' associations and employees' representative or a trade union and government (Dunlop, 1958). Studies of industrial relations systems have shown that these three actors are generally viewed as exclusive to the industrial relations and workers' rights arena (Egelszanden *et al.*, 2009). Fashoni (2004) found that willingness to consult or negotiate, generally to engage in social dialogue is fundamental to effective participation. The study further reported that as a process of interest mediation in distributive conflicts, then the consultative mechanism can only derive its legitimacy, hence its relevance, from the extent to which it represents key stakeholders in the industry.

Pyman *et al.* (2010) found that co-operative relationships require active engagement and maintenance of the relationship from both parties, but this entails significant time and resource demands. It also requires a concerted effort from all the three parties-workers, unionists and employers. The study suggested that employers should regard their employees and union representatives as useful partners and should have a better feel on how organizational members perceive the company's policies and practices. Similarly, workers and unionists have to understand that their well-being is linked to that of their companies (Wan *et al.*, 1997). The establishment of trust between the parties and the existence of mutual recognition are also prerequisites of co-operative relationships (Peetz and Fronst, 2007).

Rehman (2003) asserts that negotiation of a balanced settlement between workers and employers is of vital importance for the management as well as the trade union, because on one hand it helps in creating good and congenial working environment thus resulting in improved productivity, while on the other hand, it enables the organization to achieve viability and productivity.

Jain *et al.* (2004) observes that the negotiating team should consist of representative of both workers and employees with adequate qualities, job knowledge and skill for negotiation. They should not only truly represent the two parties but also have full authority to speak for them and make decisions. Both parties should be equally keen to reach a win-win agreement and if this can be achieved, the future relationships between parties are more likely to be harmonious (Armstrong, 2006). According to Dubin (1957) the determination of wages, hours, and working conditions is a central function in the whole employment relationship between employer and employees. If this function is not fulfilled there will be no employer-

employee relationship. Therefore, no single group has as much power regarding wages, hours, and working conditions as would be true in a bilateral or unilateral determination of them.

Evidence from the extant literature reviewed shows that the parties to the collective bargaining must regard each other as useful partners and be willing to negotiate for negotiations to succeed. They should also have legitimacy of representation and acceptable by both parties. Besides, they must show commitment and bargain in good faith. This will ensure that there is co-operative relationship between the parties to collective bargaining. However, one conspicuous lacuna in this body of literature is that not enough attention has been accorded to the issues relating to the effect of union management relations on collective bargaining process. This study therefore, was intended to fill this gap. The purpose of this study therefore, was to establish the influence of union management relations on collective bargaining process in public universities in Kenya.

Participatory Management

Participatory management is about involving employees in the decision-making initiatives where the employees feel that they have the opportunity to discuss problems and can influence organizational decisions. The overall impact of participation is increased employee job performance and low turn-over. In addition, organizations can act to increase or decrease the levels of these moderating variables within their personnel and potentially strengthen the positive effects of employee participation.

Mutai, Cheruiyot and Kirui (2015) on employees' participation mechanisms found that employees' active participation leads to commitment and job satisfaction. However, the study did not clearly show how participatory management will affect employees' performance through collective bargaining. In a related study, Oloo and Orwar (2016) indicated that participatory decision making amongst the junior staff of the retail markets affects enhanced performance. Muindi (2011) in his study found a significant relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction among academic staff in the school of business, university of Nairobi. However, the findings from the study did not include all participatory management aspects as moderator.

From the above studies, there has been a little attention given to exploring the relationship between UMR and collective bargaining process with moderating effect of participatory management hence the need to fill this knowledge gap.

This raises questions on how participatory management moderates the relationship between union management relations and collective bargaining process. Thus, the study hypothesized that:

H0₂: *Participatory management has no moderating effect on the relationship between UMR and collective bargaining process in public universities in Kenya*

Theoretical Perspectives

This study is supported by Dunlop's Systems Model of industrial relations (1958 & 1993) which integrates the whole industrial relations system. Dunlop is credited with the application of the systems approach to Industrial Relations (IR). He visualized IR to be a systematic construct namely, a sub-system of society. An organization is considered an open system, existing in a context called

environment. The organization influences its environment as well as gets influenced by the environment (Singh, 2011). The industrial relations in its operations is regarded as comprising certain actors and a body of rules created to govern the actors at the work place. The actors are employers, employees and the state. The creation of rules according to Dunlop is the output that an IR system seeks to create. Rules govern all forms of compensation, duties and performance expected. They also define rights and duties of employers and employees and govern the procedures for establishing and application of rules (Sivarethinamohan, 2010).

The three 'actors' interact in the input transformation and feedback process. The 'actors' include managers and their organizations, workers and their organizations, the state and its agencies concerned with workplace issues. The actors do not function in isolation but in an environmental context which influences them as they influence it. There is the technical context of workplace which relates to how work is organized and the state of technology whether it is labour or capital intensive (Singh, 2011). Furthermore, there is the transformation which in an industrial relations context relates to the activities of bargaining, conciliation, arbitration, legislation and judgment, which comprise the industrial relations system in Kenya.

Besides, there is the market context or the revenue which comprises product demand, market growth, number of competitors and profit margin. These influence the interaction of the 'actors'. The power context is how power is distributed among the 'actors'. In addition, discussion and bargaining must be the preferred way to solve disputes. In their interaction the state has a clear role as an arbiter in certain matters (Sivarethinamohan, 2010).

This study therefore sought to contribute to theory by highlighting the influence of union management relations on CBP and the moderating effect of participatory management on the relationship between UMR and CBP in public universities in Kenya.

METHODOLOGY

The study utilized pragmatic research paradigm, mixed methods approach and sequential explanatory research design. Pragmatic paradigm examines issues raised in the study by using a method which appears best suited to the research problem without getting caught up in the philosophical debates. Mixed methods design involves sequential data collection, analysis and integration of quantitative and qualitative data to best understand the research problem (Morgan, 2007). The study was conducted at Moi University and Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology.

The target population was 1462 which comprised of the 1087 members of (KUSU) from Moi University and 375 from Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology. These were non-teaching from grades 5 to 15 on permanent terms of employment, who are members of Kenya universities staff union (KUSU). They included Registrars in charge of administration and top officials of KUSU from the two universities. A sample size of 314 was obtained using Yamane formula (1973).

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where N = population size

n = Sample size

e = Margin error of the study set at $\pm 5\%$

Applying this formula the sample size is calculated as follows:

$$n = \frac{1462}{1 + 1462(0.05)^2} = \frac{1462}{1 + 1462 \times 0.0025} = \frac{1462}{4.655} = 314 \text{ or } 21.5\% \text{ of the target population}$$

This is in line with Kothari (2008) who argues that a study sample of between 10% and 30% of the target population is adequate for a study.

Stratified simple random sampling was used to select the respondents. This study employed both probabilistic and non-probabilistic sampling techniques. Probabilistic sampling utilized stratified and simple random sampling techniques while non-probabilistic technique employed purposive sampling. Stratified sampling was used to obtain the grades of the non-teaching staff of the two universities who are members of Kenya Universities Staff Union (KUSU). This constitutes registrars, administrators, technicians etc. Stratified sampling was used since every unit in a stratum/Grade has equal chance of being selected and adequate representation of each group can be ensured by varying proportionate sampling among the strata as required. Staff identification numbers were utilized to select the respondents. This was achieved using proportionate sampling of the non-teaching staff of both universities in each stratum (table 1).

Simple random sampling was used in selecting the required respondents from each stratum. This provided an opportunity where all subsets of the sample frame are given an equal probability and each element of the frame had an equal probability of selection. Purposive sampling was utilized to identify the two universities, Moi University and Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology and to identify the eight key informants, four from each university who were not captured using simple random sampling.

Table 1: Sample Size Distribution by Grades and University

Grade	Moi University		Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology		Total Sample
	Target Population	Sample	Target Population	Sample	
15	4	1	2	1	2
14	23	5	3	1	6
13	48	10	11	2	12
12	113	24	18	4	28
11	4	1	14	3	4
10	69	15	43	9	24
9	137	29	58	13	42
8	94	20	75	16	36
7	239	51	53	11	62
6	105	23	67	14	37
5	250	54	31	7	61
Total	1087	233	375	81	314

Source: KUSU membership records, 2016

Face and content validity of the research instruments were established by presenting the instruments to the supervisors in the school of business and economics, Moi University for verification and judgement. The instrument was modified based on their opinions and suggestions; criterion validity was ascertained using KMO, factor analysis (CFA) and Principal Component Analysis (PCA) while

construct validity was confirmed by deriving dimensions of IR and CBP from existing literature. Factor analysis was also used to verify the suitability of the variables for inferential analysis (Hair et al, 2010).

Reliability test of the instrument was based on Cronbach's Alpha and an overall reliability of 95.2% was obtained and accepted as it was greater than the laid down threshold of 70%.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data for the study was collected using closed ended questionnaire and interview schedules constructed by the researcher based on the objectives of the study. The researcher administered the questionnaires personally to the respondents and thereafter, the filled questionnaires were collected immediately for data analysis. Qualitative data was collected using interview schedules from 8 key informants.

Descriptive analysis was used to describe the demographic profile of the target respondents and inferential statistics was used to analyze, interpret and draw conclusions on the hypotheses of the study. Pearson's product moment of correlation was used to test the strength and direction of the relationship between the variables. Multiple Regressions was used to test the direct effects of union management relations on collective bargaining process while hierarchical regression was used to test the moderating effect of the moderator, participatory management on the relationship between union management relations and collective bargaining process. Qualitative data from interview schedules was analyzed using content analysis.

RESULTS

Union Management Relations

The objective of this study was to determine the effect of union management relations on CBP in public universities. The results are shown in table 2. The results in table 2 showed an overall mean of 3.72. Therefore, majority of the respondents agreed that union management relations are key to the success of collective bargaining process in public universities in Kenya. Additionally, the highest mean score of 4.05 was from the statement "*The university management and the union are always willing to confer with each other*". This suggested that public universities emphasized good working relationship between the university management and the union through free communication. The lower mean score of 3.28 was in relation to the statement that "*There is joint participation in decision making between the union and university management*". This suggests that more efforts need to be focused on improving the level of cooperation between the university management and the union. Conceivably, more efforts should also be dedicated to regular meetings between the two parties in order to enhance collective bargaining process.

Similarly, the results depicted that standard deviation ranges from 0.98 to 1.28 with an overall SD of 0.78. This explained the dispersion in the distribution of data. Hence, the statement in this variable indicated an approximation of a normal distribution. Furthermore, the values for both skewness and kurtosis for union management relations were generated and presented in table 2. Evidently, the results indicated that the values of skewness are within the conventional value of <3 whereas the values for kurtosis are less than the recommended value of <10 (Kline, 2011). Consequently, it suggests that the responses with respect to the union

management relations as an explanatory variable in the study followed a normal distribution, thus, these results connote that there is non-violation of normality assumption (Groeneveld & Meeden, 1984).

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics for Union Management Relations

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
There is good cooperation between the union and university management	3.90	1.10	-1.18	0.85
The university management and the union have mutual regard for each other	3.99	1.16	-1.18	0.62
The university management and the union are always willing to confer with each other	4.05	0.98	-1.19	1.50
The university management is always willing to facilitate union operations	3.46	1.20	-0.68	-0.44
There is joint participation in decision making between union and the university management	3.28	1.28	-0.39	-0.85
The university management and the union resolve conflict and disputes	3.58	1.19	-0.76	-0.30
The university management attitude is favourable to the union	3.93	1.06	-0.91	0.22
The university management and the union share information freely	3.57	1.20	-0.67	-0.33
The union has respect for university management as cooperative	3.63	1.16	-0.62	-0.44
The union has respect for university management	3.78	1.14	-1.05	0.45
Mean	3.72	0.78	-0.65	0.13

Source: Survey data, 2016

Participatory Management

The results (table 3) indicated that the overall mean for all the statements in respect to participatory management was 3.90. This suggests that the respondents mostly agreed that participatory management is a vital part of successful collective bargaining. Process in public universities. It makes employees feel involved in the management of the institution and hence decision making in matters that affect industrial relations environment like collective bargaining process. The higher mean score of 4.07 indicated that participatory management was important in public universities. However, the lower mean of 3.56 denoted that the respondents moderately perceived participatory management as vital to collective bargaining process.

Equally, the standard deviations for all the statements on participatory management ranged between 1.162 and 0.85 with an overall standard deviation value of 0.57 as shown in table 3, hence, showed greater dispersion of the responses around the mean. The values for skewness and kurtosis for all the statements with regard to participatory management were within the acceptable value of <3 for skewness and value of <10 for kurtosis (Kline, 2010) and (Groeneveld & Meeden, 1984) respectively with overall skewness value of -0.62 and kurtosis of 1.34. Therefore, the results indicate that there is a normal distribution of the responses in respect to participatory management in public universities in Kenya.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics for Participatory Management

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
University makes decision that are based on every member idea	4.05	0.85	-1.37	2.76
Union suggest ways the university in improving member job performance	3.80	0.89	-0.92	1.26
University allows members to participate in solving university problems	3.86	1.00	-0.83	0.30
University allows members to participate in university budget making	3.98	0.90	-1.30	2.39
Active participation of the union members in University major decision making	3.92	1.00	-1.31	1.69
Free flow of communication, sharing information and networking	4.05	0.86	-1.16	1.96
All employees are involved in collective bargaining	3.85	1.02	-1.30	1.63
There is a trade union representative in the organization	4.04	0.88	-1.33	2.48
Frequently discuss matters of work welfare with the trade union	4.07	0.86	-1.23	2.38
Visit trade union offices frequently for updates	3.56	1.16	-0.54	-0.49
Trade union representatives call us frequently in open discussion	3.66	0.96	-0.68	0.11
Mean	3.90	0.57	-0.62	0.96

Source: Survey data, 2016

Collective Bargaining Process

According to the results (table 4) collective bargaining process had an aggregate mean of 3.54 indicating that the respondents agreed on most of the items on collective bargaining process while the standard deviation was within the range of 1.30 and 0.95. This revealed a wide spread of the responses around the mean. The highest mean score of 3.84 indicated that the universities emphasized the importance of collective bargaining process as a way of ensuring healthy industrial relations in public universities in terms of encouraging the degree of members' participation. On the other hand, the lower mean score of 3.20 suggested that the universities should focus on improving collective bargaining process especially with regard to the time taken to reach an agreement and implementation of the same.

Furthermore, the value of skewness and kurtosis for all the statements with regard to collective bargaining process in public universities indicated that skewness and kurtosis were within the acceptable values of <3 for skewness and <10 for kurtosis ((Kline, 2010) and (Groeneveld & Meeden, 1984) respectively. This shows that the responses with respect to collective bargaining process in the study followed a normal distribution.

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics for Collective Bargaining Process

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
The fairness of the process	3.76	1.05	-0.80	0.28
The willing of the management to negotiate	3.67	1.30	-0.68	-0.59
The time taken to reach an agreement	3.52	1.13	-0.56	-0.42
The level of concern for other party point of view	3.84	0.95	-0.87	0.86
The willingness for both parties to give and take	3.60	1.23	-0.68	-0.47
The degree of feedback given to members	3.31	1.19	-0.34	-0.76
The degree of members participation	3.20	1.21	-0.25	-0.80
Implementation of agreed terms	3.39	1.10	-0.46	-0.47
Mean	3.54	0.77	-0.42	-0.20

Source: Survey data, 2016

Correlation Analysis

The correlation results revealed that UMR has a positive and significant relationship with collective bargaining process ($r=.690$ $p<0.00$). The findings revealed that there is a linear relationship between collective bargaining process and UMR ($F= 48.428$, $p\text{-value} = 0.000$). The moderating variable participatory management showed a positive and significant correlation ($r=.424$, $p<0.00$) and CBP. From the foregoing, there is a linear relationship between UMR, participatory management and collective bargaining process. This means that the independent variable can be used to predict the behaviour of the dependent variable, collective bargaining process

Regression Analysis

Hypothesis H_{01} stated that *UMR has no significant influence on collective bargaining process in public universities in Kenya*. The findings showed that UMR had a positive and significant effect on CBP ($\beta = 0.204$, $P<0.05$). The null hypothesis was thus rejected and the alternative accepted and it was therefore concluded that UMR have a positive and significant effect on collective bargaining process. This suggested that there was up to 0.204-unit increase in collective bargaining process for each unit increase in UMR. The effect of UMR was more than 2 times the effect attributed to the error; this was indicated by the t-test value of 2.736.

Hypothesis H_{02} stated that participatory management does not significantly moderate the relationship between UMR and collective bargaining process.

In line with the recommendations of Aiken West (1992) Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to test the moderating effect of participatory management on the relationship between UMR and collective bargaining process. The results of the moderated regression indicated a negative and insignificant moderating effect of participatory management on the relationship between UMR and collective bargaining process ($\beta=-0.996$; $p>0.05$). These results led to hypothesis H_{02} being accepted. Therefore, the effect of UMR on collective bargaining process is negatively and insignificantly moderated by participatory management. Collective bargaining process is negatively affected by -0.996 units with every unit increase of participatory management. This implies that whenever there is participatory management for instance when each member's idea is considered of value in decision making, collective bargaining process is negatively affected as employees' views are put into consideration since they are diverse and sometimes conflictual hence encouraging negativity in the Collective bargaining process. Consequently, with participatory management, UMR negatively affect collective bargaining process. This implies that UMR policies are set and do not adequately play a key role in the collective bargaining process which is dynamic and situation based. In this study, UMR and participatory management explained 58.5% of the variation in collective bargaining process. This means there are other factors contributing to the variation in collective bargaining process.

DISCUSSION

Relationship between union management relations and Collective Bargaining Process

The results reported a positive and significant correlation between union management relations and collective bargaining process ($r=0.690$, $p<0.01$). This result is confirmed by the regression results which showed that union management

relations had a positive and significant effect on collective bargaining process ($\beta=0.204$, $p<0.05$). The findings support the hypothesis that a union management relation has a positive and significant relationship with collective bargaining process in public universities in Kenya.

Key informants in the interviews reported that union leaders have their own lines of communication while management also have their own. But when it comes to decision making, management normally prevails over unions. Furthermore, union leaders in reality do not have autonomy of their own as they are normally influenced by university management. On many occasions cases of breakdown in communication have been reported in which case the union leaders resort to use of threats such as threat of strike.

Consistently, Pyman *et al.* (2010) found that co-operative relationships require active engagement and maintenance of the relationship from both parties. Besides, the author confirmed that efforts are also required from parties-workers, unionists and employers. To further corroborate the results, Peetz and Fronst, (2007) elucidated that the establishment of trust between the parties and the existence of mutual recognition are fundamentals of co-operative relationships. The results of the study also concur with that of Rehman (2003) which indicated that negotiation of a balanced settlement between workers and employers is important for both the management and the union. Commensurate with the results, Armstrong, (2011) established that the future relationships between parties are more likely to be harmonious if the parties in question are equally keen to reach a win-win agreement. Notably, the relationship between the union and management is essential in the collective bargaining process. It is clear that the results of the study tally with that of the extant literature despite there being scant information on the link between union management relations and collective bargaining process. The study has therefore added important insights regarding the important role of amicable relations between management and union in collective bargaining process.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that UMR is a critical factor in CBP since it positively and significantly influenced CBP in public universities in Kenya. This therefore means that union and management in public universities should operate under conditions of mutual trust, joint participation and free exchange of information in an effort to achieve win-win solutions to industrial disputes for mutual gains during CBP and evolve an enabling industrial relations environment.

Practical Implications

Union Management Relations is an area that has remained controversial in Industrial Relations studies. This study provides insight into the effects of union management relations on collective bargaining process by establishing that union management relations do positively and significantly affect collective bargaining process.

Besides, since union management relations positively influences collective bargaining process in public universities in Kenya. It is important that both union and management develop a positive regard for each other and maintain cooperative relationship. Precisely, it is instrumental that both parties have mutual trust for each other, joint participation and have favourable attitude towards each other by

negotiating as equal partners during CBP. The study also established that participatory management plays a significant role in the CBP hence it should be considered by encouraging mutual understanding between unions and management for effective negotiations.

The findings presented in the study are based on the influence of union management relations on collective bargaining process and the moderating effect of participatory management on the relationship between UMR and CBP which accounts for 58.5% in the dependent variable in the two public universities in Kenya. Future research should be done on the factors not included in the study such as economic, technology and market context in order to extend the span of knowledge and theory to the entire education sector and other sectors in Kenya and beyond.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L.S. & West, S.G. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Armstrong, M. & Taylor, S. (2014). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. (13th Edition). London, Kogan Page Publishers.
- Armstrong, Michael (2014). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. 10th Ed. London: Kogan Page limited.
- Dubin, R. (1957). "Power and Union-management relations: administrative science." *Quarterly*, 2. 1, 60-81.
- Dunlop, John Thomas (1958). *Industrial Relations Systems*. New York: Holt.
- Egels-Zandén, N. & Hyllman, P. (2009). *Translating competing models of industrial relations local bargaining versus global rules in the Swedish clean clothes campaign*. Available: http://www.helsinki.fi/project/eva/ncr/egels-zanden_hyllman.pdf (September 15, 2010)
- Fashoyin, Tayo. (2004). "Tripartite Cooperation, Social Dialogue and National Development." *International Labour Review* 143. 4.
- ILO (1996). *Complaint against the government of Kenya Presented by Education International (EI)*. Paper No. 302 Case No.1809 <http://www.ilo.org/iiolex/cgi> 7¹ September 2010.
- Jain, N.C and Saakshi Jain (2004). *Personnel Management & Human Resources*. New-Delhi, India: All India Travelers Bookseller.
- Katz, Harry C., and Thomas A. Kochan. (2004). *An Introduction to Collective Bargaining and Industrial Relations*. 3rd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin
- Kothari, C.R. (2011). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. 2nd Ed. New Delhi: Wiley & Sons.
- Kline, R.B. (2010). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. The Guildford Press, New York.
- Morgan, D.L (1998). *Practical Strategies for Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: Applications to Health Research*. *Qualitative Health Research*, 8(3), 362-37.
- Muindi, F.K. (2011). *The relationship between Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in the School of Business, University of Nairobi*.
- Mutai, E.K., Cheruiyot, T.K., & Kirui, J.K. (2015). *Impact of Participatory Management on Employee Performance: A Case of Moi University*. *Global Journal of Commerce & Management Perspective*, 4(2), 54-59.
- Oloo, P.A., & Orwar, B.H. (2016). *Influence of Participatory Decision Making of Junior Staff at the Retail Markets in Kenya*. An Empirical Study of Uchumi Supermarket in Nairobi. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 4(2), 1-18.
- Oso, W.Y. (2002). *State control and the management of public universities in Uganda: The case of Makerere University*. Unpublished master's thesis, Makerere University, Kampala.
- Peetz, David and Frost Ann. (2007). "What Workers Say: Employee Voice in the Anglo-American Workplace." *Employee Voice in the Anglo-American World: What Does it mean for Unions?* Eds. R. B. Freeman, P. Boxall and P. Haynes Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press: 166-80.
- Pyman, A., Holland, P., Teicher, J., & Cooper, B. K. (2010). "Industrial relations climate, employee voice and managerial attitudes to unions: An Australian Study." *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48.2, 460-480
- Rehman, Shafiq (2003). "Collective Bargaining and Wage Determination in Pakistan." PhD Dissertation University of Karachi.
- Singh, Gangarm and Dannin Ellen (2002). "Law and Collective Bargaining Power: Results of a Stimulated Study, Social Science Research.

- Sivananthiran, Alagandram (2010). *Promoting Decent Work in Export Promotion Zones*.
- Wan, D., Haut, O. C, & Yuee, L. H. (1997). *Industrial Relations climate in the manufacturing sector in Singapore*. Journal of Management, 14, 123-141.
- Waswa, Fuchaka and Katana Gabriel (2008). "Academic Staff Perspectives on Operating Beyond Industrial Actions For Sustainable Quality Assurance In Public
- Yamane, Taro. (1973). *Statistics, An Introductory Analysis, 2nd Ed.*, New York: Harper and Row