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ABSTRACT
The study assessed the systemic barriers to ISO compliance at the Moi University, situated in the North Rift region of Kenya. It was guided by Scientific Management Theory as well as Contingency Theory. The study was both qualitative and quantitative in nature. Data were collected using semi-structured questionnaires supplemented by interview schedule guides. The target population for the study comprised 1,343 officers drawn from the various systems of the University. Stratified random and purposive sampling techniques were employed in selecting respondents. The sample size came to 404 officers who constituted 30% of the target population. It included top management, Directors, Deans, Heads of Department, lecturers and administrative staff. Cumulative frequencies, percentages means and standard deviation were computed to help derive meaning from quantitative data. Qualitative data from interview schedule guide were transcribed, thematically classified and arranged before being reported in narrations and quotations. The findings were then presented in form of tables, charts, graphs and narratives. From the findings of the research, it emerged that, despite the various departments, schools and campuses of the Moi University addressing the existing barriers to compliance with ISO, the extent of their effort was insufficient. As such, the low compliance with the standards have compromised the quality of services on the institution. It was recommended that there should be continuous training for all staff members, including support staff, on the importance of quality services and how to achieve them particularly on ISO awareness and implementation. The study contributes to the body of knowledge in the area of quality management systems.
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INTRODUCTION
Standardization refers to deliberate efforts to specify weights, measures, terminology, classifications, characteristics, ingredients, processes, or desired behaviour for repeated use in a given market or community (Reed, 2012). In many ways standards make life simpler, safer and more predictable for producers and consumers. According to their proponents, standards reduce confusion and fraud, enhance efficiency, facilitate the flow of goods and services and promote industrial development (Tavernor, 2007; Murphy & Yates, as cited in Reed, 2012).

Reed (2012) further explains that standardization is also an arena for inter-firm competition in which individual companies seek to promote their proprietary technologies. More importantly, it can serve to extend and consolidate the authority of a centre over a periphery. It has long been
used by elites to reinforce their dominant positions. Standardization has been a tool of imperial expansion since the earliest times, from Roman foot to the Code Napoleon, from British gallons to MacDonald’s hamburgers. Powerful economic interests based in the advanced industrialized economies use international standardization to consolidate and enhance their global advantage, and to regulate the terms on which developing countries and their firms are inserted into the global economy (Reed, 2012).

Standards, in short, are instruments of regulation (Brunsson & Jacobsson, 2012). What makes this form of regulation fascinating is that it is largely invisible. Standards, like all infrastructures, form a pervasive, invisible substrate upon which events and interactions occur, becoming visible mainly when they fail or are extended to new domains where other standards and forms of knowledge prevail. They are distributed unevenly, are relative to particular communities of practice (one person’s trade facilitator is another’s barrier) and complexity nested in, and integrated with, one another (Reed, 2012). Even at their most technical, they embody particular ethics and values and they shape how people think and act (Star & Lampland, 2009). The fact that they are boring, taken for granted and “usually considered a “MEGO” (“my eyes glaze over”) subject” in corporate boardrooms (Sheldon, 1997) makes them all the more significant as a mode of regulation.

Notwithstanding standards’ invisibility, grand claims have been made on their behalf for centuries: that they are essential to the realization of human liberty and equality, they ‘assist in promoting the peace, and enlarging the commerce of the world’, and the voluntary consensus process employed by ISO and similar organizations can help solve humanity’s most pressing problems, from industrial relations to global governance (Tavernor, 2007).

ISO, for its part, claims that international standards ‘make an enormous and positive contribution to most aspects of our lives’, making production safer, cleaner and more efficient, facilitating global trade, providing a technical base for health, safety and environmental legislation, protecting consumers, transferring technology and good practices to developing countries and helping them compete and grow (ISO, 2004a). More recently, it has claimed that standards are critical to achieving global sustainable development (ISO, 2004b).

Implications of ISO 9001 Standards
Many scholars have analysed the benefits of the ISO 9001 standard in several performance dimensions (operational benefits, customer results, et cetera). The three benefits most frequently analysed by researchers are improved efficiency, improved customer satisfaction and improvements in relations with employees. These are followed by profitability and improved systematization.

Conversely, the three benefits least studied are an improvement in competitive position, improved relations with suppliers and improved relations with authorities and other stakeholders. In order to analyse these benefits arising from the ISO 9001 standard, some authors examine its effects through a list of benefits, whereas others base themselves on, or even propose a classification of such benefits. Such is the case of Lee (1998) who classifies benefits into benefits gained with respect to internal operations (better team spirit, less staff conflict, reduced wastage, increased efficiency, shorter lead time), benefits gained with respect to customer relations (improved sales through new customers, longer contracts with existing customers, less control from existing customers, fewer complaints from existing customers), and benefits gained with
respect to subcontractor relations (subcontractors to become certified, better relations with subcontractors, more stringent control over subcontractors).

Nield and Kozak (2014) show that the benefits of the standard may be the following: operational benefits (improved operating systems, enhanced operating practices), marketing benefits (improved customer satisfaction, gained competitive edge, nation-wide recognition), and human resources benefits (gained more committed work force, reduction in staff turnover). Casadesús and Giménez (2011) indicate that these benefits are people results (work satisfaction, suggestions system, health/safety, turnover, absenteeism), operation results (errors and defects; order processing; reliability; costs; on-time-delivery; cost savings; lead time; stock rotation), customer results (customer satisfaction; complaints; repeat purchases) and financial results (market share; sales; return on sales; return on assets).

Casadesús, Jiménez and Heras (2001) classify the benefits as internal benefits and external benefits. Internal benefits are the following: work satisfaction, safety at work, suggestions system, absence from work, salaries of workers, safety and reliability, on-time delivery, order processing, number of errors, stock rotation, quality costs, cost savings. As external benefits they find the following: customer satisfaction, number of complaints, number of repeat purchases, market share, sales per employee, return on assets, return on sales. Casadesús and Karapetrovic (2015) have found that these benefits may be related to financial results (increased sales, returns on investment, market share, and sales per employee), operational results (reduced logistic costs, improved supplier relationship, increased inventory turnover, fewer non-conformities, compliance with delivery dates, and shorter lead time) and customer-related results (loyalty purchases, customer satisfaction, and fewer complaints).

Similarly, other scholars use two general groups of benefits related to operational performance and financial performance (Naveh & Marcus, 2005; Briscoe, Fawcett & Todd, 2005). For example, for operational performance, Naveh and Marcus (2014) show defect rate, cost of quality, productivity, on-time delivery and customer satisfaction. On the other hand, Briscoe et al. (2005) list the defect rate as a percentage of production, cost of quality, productivity, and on-time delivery. For financial performance both studies show market share, sales, and export growth. Based on this review, in general terms, the ISO 9001 standard creates benefits related to customer satisfaction (for instance, fewer complaints and improved customer satisfaction), improvement in staff management issues (for instance, more training for employees) and improved efficiency, documentation and clear knowledge of tasks by employees (Chow-Chua, Goh & Wan, 2003; Magd, 2008). These results indicate that most firms experience improvement in these issues, due to the fact that the ISO 9001 standard allows them to reduce mistakes and rework, save on costs and improve the management of the firm.

Many firms also attain these benefits because ISO 9001 allows for an improvement of the documentation and work procedures, and a greater clarity of work. Other benefits obtained by many firms are an improved image and an improved service or product quality, because the fact that they possess a certificate enhances their image in the eyes of their customers. In turn, the greater control exercised upon their internal processes allows them to improve the quality of the product or service. Similarly, several studies provide evidence of certified firms outperforming non-certified firms (Heras, Dick & Casadesús, 2002; Corbett, Montes-Sancho & Kirscck, 2005; Sharma, 2005). This improvement is attributed largely to improvement in internal business processes. In this context, other studies also show that ISO 9001 certification is not associated
with significant financial performance in the longer term, or that there is no significant difference
between the impacts of quality management on financial performance for firms with and without
ISO 9001 certification (Häversjö, 2000; Singels, Ruël & van de Water, 2001; Tsekouras, Dimara
& Skuras, 2002).

These ideas indicate that, although there are firms that do succeed in improving their financial
results (for instance, their market share and their sales, because the quality certificate opens the
door to certain customers), there are many others that do not manage to attain any improvement.
Therefore, as the studies show, there is not such an unquestionable relationship between the
standard and the financial results. Consequently, the impact of ISO 9001 on firm performance
was more mixed compared with the impact of QM on firm performance which was much more
unanimous (Martínez-Costa Martínez-Lorente & Choi, 2012). Therefore, the clearest benefits are
those influencing the internal performance or operational results, customer results and people
results, while the effects on financial results are inconclusive.

ISO Certification in Higher Education
Superb and superior service quality of a university is a means to attract students and scholars
globally, build good image and reputation, attract funding and contribute to global innovation
and customer satisfaction (Fen & Lian, 2011; Ree, 2009), customer loyalty (Kotler Human and
Societal Development). Barnett (1992) defines quality in higher education as an activity that
demands the establishment of an institutional culture, not so much as a matter of total quality
management but rather one of total quality care, in which each professional is seized of his or her
responsibilities and takes care over all his or her own professional efforts.

According to Green and Harvey (2013), quality may be defined as exceeding standards (going
beyond requirements and specifications), getting things right first time, fitness for purpose (based
on customer satisfaction and is therefore subjective), value for money and as a transforming
change. Watty (as cited in Viktorias, 2014) analyses Green and Harvey’s definition and
concludes that transformation is the most important dimension of quality because it is a
qualitative change and education is about doing something to the student as opposed to doing
something for him.

There is growing recognition particularly in Africa of the role of higher education institutions in
steering economic growth. Consequently, Africa has witnessed a mushrooming of these
institutions but at the same time there is a widespread perception that educational quality is being
compromised in the effort to expand enrolment in recent years. In addition, a new range of
competencies, such as adaptability, team work, communication skills, and the motivation for
continual learning, have become critical. In fact, studies reveal that graduates need a unique
portfolio of skills when they initially enter the job market and these skills are different from
those that they need to retain the jobs (Mwiti, 2009). Thus tertiary institutions are challenged to
adjust their program structures, curricula, teaching and learning methods to adapt to these new
demands. In recognition of this challenge, greater attention is being focused on quality assurance
as a critical factor to ensuring educational relevance. Strong quality assurance systems are then
seen as critical in addressing today’s challenges (World Bank, 2012).

ISO and Systemic View of Organizations
The acronym ISO denotes International Organization for Standardization. ISO requires the
implementation of Quality Management System (QMS) which provides a benchmark for
organizational performance, quality assurance and product quality. A major component of ISO 9001:2008 is documentation of business activities and transactions. This implies the provision of evidence to support not only the transaction of business but also to demonstrate conformity to specified QMS documentation requirements.

The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) has classified eight principles which guarantee successful implementation of any quality management system. One of the principles is systems approach to management, i.e. identifying, understanding and managing interrelated processes as a system contributes to the organization’s effectiveness and efficiency in achieving its objectives. This principle recognizes that the behaviour of any part of a system has some effect on the behaviour of the system as a whole (Hoyle, 2013).

Systemic view of organizations is fundamental in implementation of ISO standards. Deming (as cited in Ravichandran & Rai, 2011) built a case for treating the organization as a total system and attributed the variations in observed quality performance to the capability of the organizational system. They argued that factors unique to individual workers or specific technology account for a minimal proportion of the variation in quality performance and that most performance variations are due to system factors. They added that managerial attention should be focused on designing a total system capable of achieving the desired level of quality performance.

Such a system is much broader than work processes; it includes management processes and structural arrangements created to steer the organization toward its quality goals. The purpose of this study is to identify systemic barriers that may hinder the intended effectiveness and efficiency in organizations hence filling this gap in literature. Research indicates the distinction between companies that apply the typical management approach versus those that apply systems approach in ISO implementation. Companies that use the typical approach many a times take a very superficial approach to implementing ISO standards. They write procedures and work instructions that are designed from a compliance perspective to satisfy the auditors and add little value to the business. Their procedures exactly follow what is in the ISO standard and actually mimic what the standard says, word for word in some cases. They hang the ISO banner on the side of the building to proclaim themselves as an ISO certified company.

Conversely, more sophisticated companies take the time to interpret the principles and logic behind the requirements in the ISO standard and to more fully understand how it applies to their business. They start with a business model that is based around a systems approach for making their business operate effectively. They do not mimic what is in the ISO standard; they simply use it as a checklist of best practices to validate the way they are managing the business. Any ISO requirements are fully integrated into their normal business management system with any other standards and management tools that may be relevant.

**Barriers to ISO Compliance**

Standardizing routines and processes may not always have a positive effect (Brunsson & Jacobsson, 2012). Like rules and regulations, standards and standardization are not always welcome; they can be seen as unnecessary and harmful intrusion into a world of free, distinct individuals and organizations that are wise enough to decide for themselves (Brunsson & Jacobsson, 2012). Flexibility in processes may be needed in some cases when customers or clients ask for tailor-made services and/or products.
Adopting a QMS implies the introduction of new organizational reforms, such as change of the organizational structure which includes a new organizational design, new business culture, new processes and procedures, and new management perspectives (Maguad, 2011). These elements are significant parts of the implementation of a quality management system, and since it requires change there may be employee and manager resistance, issues of adaptation, new roles and tasks and much more that will affect the introduction (Maguad, 2011). Adopting a management system often results in recurrent problems such as poor system quality, long development time, user and employee dissatisfaction and high costs (Ravichandran & Rai, 2011). Other factors that are likely to act against change are group norms, fear, uncertainty, ingrained behaviour and member complacency (Carlsson & Carlsson, 2014).

Carlsson and Carlsson (2014) examined 114 Swedish organizations which had been ISO certified and found the process too costly and time consuming. Cachadinha (2009) also examined implementation process of Portuguese construction companies and found that the barriers to implementing ISO 9001 in the companies were: (1) the systemization and structuring of the processes and procedures, (2) strict document control procedures caused organizational resistance, (3) defining and maintaining procedures of ISO 9001, (4) achieving client satisfaction, (5) the interaction between the quality and production department, (6) costs and allocation of human resources. Other barriers presented by Beckford (2010) included: (1) the systems and procedures inhibiting the pursuit of quality, (2) the organizational culture preventing quality and the change, (3) the design of the organization inhibiting the strive for quality, (4) the managerial and employee recognition of the importance of quality and attitudes towards it, and (5) costs of quality resulting from not maintaining a certain quality level. What most of the researchers on quality systems have in common is that the most critical factor for achieving quality is the full commitment from management and without it the program is likely to fail (Maguad, 2011).

ISO 9000 is a set of universally accepted standards that prescribe good quality practices in organizations the world over. The standards have become widely accepted by companies aiming to achieve cost effective and quality assurance methods (Nurre, 2000). Registration or certification demonstrates to customers that the certified organization has achieved a basic level of quality assurance (Wahid & Corner, 2011). The standards are also aimed at quality consistency (Singel, 2010). Certification that an organization’s quality system meets the requirements of ISO standards is established by an independent body selected by the organization (Simmons & White, 1999). In Kenya, this is done by the Kenya Bureau of Standards (KEBS).

Previous studies indicate that there are a number of barriers in various organizational systems that interfere with implementation of ISO standards which must be acknowledged and addressed in order to achieve quality standards. Biondi (2013) argue that the adoption of the standards is a complicated procedure where difficulties can appear in the different stages, acting as barriers for its implementation. Zutshi and Sohal (2004) explain that companies broadly experience two different barriers in implementation of ISO standards. These are industrial barriers such as technical information, capital costs, configuration of existing operations, competitive pressures and industry regulations; as well as organizational barriers such as employee attitudes, poor communication, past practice and inadequate top management leadership and support.
Hillary (2009) categorized the barriers into external and internal barriers. Internal barriers include lack of resources, negative attitudes and company culture, inadequate understanding and perception and implementation problems. External barriers include certification difficulties such as difficulty in obtaining certification, associated costs, amount of documentation required and bureaucracy. Sunderland (1996) notes that for small and medium-sized enterprises, the costs and other barriers associated with maintenance of ISO certification can become prohibitive. Juran (1989) observes that companies which are at the beginning stages of their quality efforts would find that ISO standards provide them with basic quality systems. However, for companies with good quality systems the standards often just add costs, delays and burdensome documentation, rather than providing any competitive advantage. This may act as a barrier to its adoption.

Systemic Barriers

Stupak and Leitner (2011) explain that the responsibility for quality within an organization is not related to one individual or division, but belongs to everyone. In a larger context, it emphasizes the interdependence of the parts of an organization. Failure to recognize and fully understand interrelatedness results in many of the problems an organization encounters (Stupak & Leitner, 2011). They add that adoption of total quality means that organizations must develop an understanding of cross-functional relationships while breaking down barriers and boundaries that previously had a detrimental impact on the organization’s ability to achieve quality results. Effectiveness is diminished when concentration is focused on improvement of only a few dimensions of a system. The systems approach encourages management to develop joint problem solving techniques that enable the organization to function in an integrated manner that produces better results (Stupak & Leitner, 2011).

An organization’s performance is centred within its systems, not its people. Therefore, leaders and managers must work with employees to identify systemic barriers that prevent work from being done correctly the first time. In adopting a systems approach, organizations must view themselves holistically. There must be an understanding of the interrelatedness of the parts and how this contributes to the overall functioning and productivity of the organization (Stupak & Leitner, 2011). Deming (2010) and Ishikawa (2012) argue that 60% to 90% or more of the causes of performance problems are systemic problems. It is necessary to improve all subsystems at the same time, while reaching for the highest results of the work, because weak achievements in one management area negatively affect the overall functioning of the organization.

A system is a collection of parts (or subsystems) integrated to accomplish an overall goal. Systems have inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes, with ongoing feedback among these various parts. If one part of the system is removed, the nature of the system is changed. Every organization in the world is a system and Moi University is no exception. An organization of even modest size is composed of many units or departments, such as personnel and payroll, customer service, or billing and shipping and each of these units is a system. A system is a whole made up of parts. Each part can affect the way other parts work and the way all parts work together to determine how well the system works. If one part of the system changes or malfunctions, the overall system is likely to be influenced through the network of relationships between parts and fails to meet its objectives.

Institutional/systems forces existing at the organizational level become extremely resistant to change (Oliver & Qu, 1999). Such forces include political pressures (questioning of the legitimacy of the old practice by a growing number of organizational members, performance
crisis, decreased dependence on institutional constituents), functional pressures (technical re-evaluation of the usefulness of the practice, loss of rewards for the practice, conflict between performance criteria and the practice, dissonant information from the environment), and social pressures (loss of cultural consensus, changes in industry/regulatory environment that discourage the use of the practice, geographical dispersion in the institutional environment).

Statement of the Problem
The Moi University falls under the education sector of the service industry in Kenya. The service industry was chosen for the study because of its significant contribution to Kenya’s economy. The industry provides crucial inputs for the rest of the economy, thus having a significant effect on the overall investment climate, which is an essential determinant of growth and development. It also contributes directly to achieving social development objectives.

The speed at which the University has expanded coupled with the double intake of students has overstretched its resources in terms of human capital, finance and infrastructure. Centralized systems such as Examinations, Estates and Finance have to provide services that accommodate the new demands. This situation often causes delays in service delivery. Cases of misplaced documents such as letters, memos, imprests and medical claims are quite common. Lecturers have to traverse the country to offer teaching services in satellite campuses in addition to offering part time teaching often resulting in delayed or missing marks. Overcrowded classrooms are fertile grounds for examination cheating.

These challenges combined with poor sanitation, lighting, repairs and grounds become barriers to quality service delivery. There is need therefore to assess how this rapid expansion has affected the quality of services offered by the various University systems to their customers. One of the fourteen principals for quality management, according to Deming (2010), is to break down barriers between departments. However, he failed to substantiate how this can be achieved. Consequently, there is need to establish the best methods of breaking down barriers between the various systems of the University. Deming (2010) proposed that employees in all organizational functions must work together as a team to foresee and solve problems of production. Therefore, it would be necessary to break down any barrier between all systems in the University in order to achieve University quality objectives for continued ISO certification and to remain as the University of choice in the region.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
The study adopted a mixed method and applied a descriptive survey research designs. In the study, the population consisted of academic, administrative, and clerical officers of Moi University, Main Campus. These categories were chosen because they actively participate in service delivery and ISO audits hence determining the status of ISO certification in the Institution. To determine inter-campus barriers to ISO compliance, top officials of the town campuses formed part of the population for this study. The target population for this study was 1,343 senior employees of Moi University in Academic and Administrative sections. Those from the Academic Division comprised 16 Deans, 8 Directors, 43 Heads of Departments, 549 Academic Staff, 94 Administrative Staff, 75 Secretarial Staff and 44 Clerical Staff. Those from the Central Administration composed of 93 from the Vice Chancellor’s office, 163 from the office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor for Administration, Planning and Development, 79 from the office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor for Finance, 50 from the office of the Deputy Vice
Chancellor for Students’ Affairs, and 129 from the office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academics, Research and Extension.

Stratified random sampling technique was used to identify subgroups in the population and proportions selected from each sub-group to form a sample. Simple random sampling was then used to select the respondents. Purposive sampling was used to select categories of staff to study lived experiences of a specific population. Top management staffs at the Main Campus as well as those in town campuses were selected purposively. Thus from the target population, a sample of 30% (403) was computed and from each sub-group, proportionate samples drawn. This comprised of 185 staff members from the Academic division and 218 from the Central Administration section.

Questionnaire and interview schedule guide were the tools used to collect data for this study. The questionnaire tool was administered to the middle and junior staff members while interviews were conducted with the senior staff members or their representatives. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used in data analysis. Cumulative frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviation were computed to help derive meaning from quantitative data. Qualitative data from interview schedule guide were transcribed, thematically classified and arranged before being reported in narrations and quotations. Further, the themes emerging from secondary data were identified to augment primary data. The researcher used data condensation mode of analysis to extract, abridge or abstract the most important themes from data collected from the interviews. Themes were identified and organized into coherent categories that summarized and brought meaning to the data. The researcher interrogated the themes in light of the objectives of the study and upheld to the definition of the natural meaning units as stated in the reviewed literature.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Impact of Systemic Barriers to ISO Compliance on Service Delivery

The study sought to establish the impact of systemic barriers to ISO compliance on the delivery of quality service at the University. Responses from academic and administrative staff were analysed basing on a 5-point Likert scale as illustrated in Table 1 below. The five-point scale was as follows: Strongly Agree-5; Agree-4; Undecided-3; Disagree-2; Strongly Disagree-1.

Table 1: Effect of Systemic Barriers to ISO 9001:2008 on Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of barriers to service delivery</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grounding of activities due to lack of funds</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting and confusing roles</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays caused by lengthy bureaucracies</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time wastage on constant follow-up of official requests</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transparency and accountability</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in commencement of teaching</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion and burn out of staff due to back to back semesters in a bid to cope with rapid</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increased cases of examination cheating | 145 | 156 | 0 | 29 | 19 | 4.09  
Increased cases of missing marks | 132 | 141 | 0 | 40 | 36 | 3.84  
Failure of students to graduate on time | 130 | 151 | 0 | 39 | 29 | 3.89  
Frustrations, high stress levels and suicidal threats by students for failure to graduate owing to missing marks | 134 | 153 | 2 | 35 | 25 | 3.96  
Unhealthy competition between schools | 121 | 148 | 0 | 57 | 13 | 3.79  
Discrimination between schools with more students and those with less due to higher income generated by the former | 115 | 134 | 12 | 51 | 37 | 3.68  
Discrimination between schools offering professional programs and those offering non-professional programs | 115 | 134 | 10 | 49 | 37 | 3.65  
Students and lecturers fighting over teaching venues | 109 | 142 | 2 | 53 | 43 | 3.63  

**Aggregate mean** 3.89

Based on the findings in Table 1 above, it is apparent that the quality of service delivery is grossly compromised in the event that there are impediments to the implementation of ISO 9001:2008 standards. An aggregate mean of 3.89 is indicative of the fact that majority of the respondents agreed that the quality of service delivery at the University had been compromised due to barriers that stood on the way of implementation of the quality management system. Notable from the findings is the fact that the barriers to the implementation of the quality management system had led to delays in the University’s commencement dates of teaching (mean, 4.35), increased examination malpractices in the form of increased cases of cheating (mean, 4.09) and lack of transparency and accountability (mean, 4.08).

Respondents drawn from the secretarial and clerical sections were also required to indicate effect of systemic barriers to QMS implementation on service delivery at the University. Majority of these respondents (86.1%; 31) indicated that the main impact of barriers to implementation of ISO 9001 is delays in provision of required materials (stationery) which then creates conflict between employees and the management for not being able to complete tasks within the required schedule.

Besides, the delays in provision of materials tend to orchestrate employees overstay at work in a bid to beat deadlines subsequently leading to burnout. Those who mentioned lack of transparency and accountability accounted for 66.7%; 24). Figure 1 below summarizes the responses of this category of participants.
While agreeing with the findings of this study, Nield and Kozak (2014) list the benefits of ISO standard as: operational benefits (improved operating systems, enhanced operating practices), marketing benefits (improved customer satisfaction, gained competitive edge, nation-wide recognition), and human resources benefits (gained more committed work force, reduction in staff turnover). Further, Casadesús and Giménez (2011) show that these benefits are people results (work satisfaction, suggestions system, health/safety, turnover, absenteeism), operation results (errors and defects; order processing; reliability; costs; on-time-delivery; cost savings; lead time; stock rotation), customer results (customer satisfaction; complaints; repeat purchases) and financial results (market share; sales; return on sales; return on assets).

Casadesús, Jiménez and Heras (2001) further classify benefits as internal benefits and external benefits. Internal benefits are the following: work satisfaction, safety at work, suggestions system, absence from work, salaries of workers, safety and reliability, on-time delivery, order processing, number of errors, stock rotation, quality costs, cost savings. As external benefits they find the following: customer satisfaction, number of complaints, number of repeat purchases, market share, sales per employee, return on assets, return on sales. Obviously, in the event that there are impediments to the implementation of this standard, then an organization misses out on this crucial benefits resulting to an impact on the quality of services provided by an organization.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Based on the research findings, it is clear that various departments, schools and campuses of Moi University are doing their best to address the systemic barriers to ISO compliance. However, a lot still needs to be done since non-compliance is affecting a number of services in the institution. This impact of evidenced by the delays in the provision of required materials, lack of transparency and accountability, unhealthy competition between various faculties and sections and inter-faculty discrimination. Therefore, it is recommended that there should be continuous training for all staff members, including support staff, on the importance of quality services and how to achieve them particularly on ISO awareness and implementation.
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