
Research Design and Methodology

This chapter describes the procedures that were used to gather and analyze the data used in the study. It is organized into seven sections. While section one presents the research design elected for the study, section two offers a description of the various study sites. The sample selection procedures, data collection methods, data management and analysis techniques and ethical considerations are presented in sections three through to six, respectively. The final section (seven) focuses on the limitations of the study.

Research Design

A triangulated methodological design blending both quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection and analysis was employed. Specifically, the survey design was employed. This involved the use of questionnaires, interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs). Generally, it is typical to combine different data collection techniques and procedures in the same study in order to generate appropriate and valid information (Mugenda 2013). The mixed method approach not only allows the researcher to be more confident in the results of the study but also provides a clearer understanding of the phenomenon of the study (Jick 1979; Thurmond 2001; Johnson, Onwuegbuzie and Turner 2007). To illustrate, the researcher is able to use qualitative data as the critical counterpoint to quantitative data and by so doing, the quantitative analysis benefits from the perceptions emanating from the personal experiences and the firsthand observations of the qualitative approaches (Jick 1979). More specifically, by combining the quantitative and qualitative approaches, this study sought to not only bring out the major trends (patterns) and practices in student leadership but also elicit specific voices from students and academic managers and policy-makers. Of course, utilizing mixed methods is not without limitations. For instance, it makes replication exceedingly difficult (Jick 1979; Thurmond 2001).

The Sites of the Study

The study was carried out in Kenya. Kenya lies on the eastern side of Africa. The country is bordered by Ethiopia in the north, Sudan in the northwest, Uganda in the west, Tanzania in the south, and Somalia in the northeast. To the east lies the Indian Ocean. The total area of Kenya is about 583,000 square kilometres. The specific sites for the study were two universities namely, Kenyatta University (KU) and the United States International University, Africa (USIU). Whereas the former is a public university, the latter is a private university. The two institutions are located within the city of Nairobi, and have been in existence for a considerable period of time.

Kenyatta University (KU)

Kenyatta University (KU) is a multi-campus public university. Its main campus is located along Thika Road near the Kahawa barracks in Kiambu County, Ruiru Constituency, Kahawa area. The institution's history can be traced as far back as 1965 when the British Government handed over the Templar barracks in Kahawa to the newly formed Government of Kenya. The barracks were converted into Kenyatta College, a constituent college of University of Nairobi in 1970. It was renamed Kenyatta University College (KUC) and specialized in training teachers at the certificate and diploma levels. It was not until 1972 that KUC admitted its first 200 Bachelor of Education students. In 1978 the faculty of education was moved from University of Nairobi to KUC campus a move aimed at consolidating undergraduate and postgraduate programmes in the country. The college was eventually upgraded into a fully-fledged university following an act of Parliament in 1985.

Since its elevation to the status of a fully-fledged university, KU has birthed and nurtured new colleges into fully-fledged universities. Among these are Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT) and Pwani University. The institution remains a leader in university education. Today, the university comprises 12 campuses spread across the country. These include the Main Campus (which was the locus of our study), Ruiru Campus, Parkland Campus, Kitui Campus, Mombasa Campus, City Centre Campus, Nyeri Campus, Nakuru Campus, Kericho Campus, Dadaab Campus, Embu Campus and Arusha Campus. To remain relevant in the changing higher education market, KU has diversified its programmes and currently boasts of the following 17 Schools: School of Humanities and Social Sciences, School of Visual and Performing Arts, School of Education, School of Pure and Applied Sciences, School of Engineering and Technology, School of Architecture and Spatial Planning, School of Environmental Studies, School of Applied Human Sciences, School of Health Sciences, School of Business, School of Economics, School of Agriculture and Enterprise Development, School of Law, School of Hospitality

and Tourism, School of Public Health, Digital School of Virtual and Open Learning and Graduate School.

Kenyatta University is accredited by the Kenya Commission of University Education (CUE), the Inter-University Council for East Africa (IUCEA), the Africa Association of Universities (AAU), the International Association of Universities (IAU) and the Commonwealth Universities. It offers Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral degrees. From a student population of about 15,000 in 2006, the university has experienced tremendous growth in student numbers; the current enrolment stands at approximately 62,000 students, with female students accounting for 45 per cent of the total. Out of the total student population, 87 per cent are pursuing undergraduate courses, while the rest are studying for postgraduate degrees. The institution boasts of a compliment of 960 academic staff, including 27 professors, 60 associate professors, 120 senior lecturers, 455 lecturers and 298 tutorial fellows.

The overall governing body of the University is the University Council. Among others, this is the body charged with the responsibility to administer the property and funds of the university; provide for the welfare of the students; enter into association with other universities, or other institutions of learning, whether within Kenya or elsewhere; and after consultation with the senate, make regulations governing the conduct and discipline of the students of the university. The Council consists of a Chairman, a vice-Chairman and an Honorary Treasurer; all of whom shall be appointed by the Chancellor; who is normally a government-appointed ceremonial head of the university. Other members of the Council include the Vice Chancellor, Deputy Vice Chancellors, Principals of constituent colleges, Permanent Secretary to the Ministry responsible for University Education, Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Finance, up to eight members appointed by the President to represent the Government, four persons appointed by the Senate from among its members, two persons appointed by the Convocation from among its members, two members elected by non-Senate members of the academic staff from among themselves, two members elected by the students' organization, one person elected by the non-academic staff from among themselves and not more than two members co-opted to the Council from time to time.

The internal management of the University includes the Vice Chancellor as the chief executive officer. S/he is deputized by four Deputy Vice Chancellors as follows: Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Deputy Vice Chancellor, Finance and Development; Deputy Vice Chancellor, Administration and Deputy Vice Chancellor, Research and Innovations. Each Deputy Vice Chancellor is assisted by a Registrar. It should be noted that academic matters are normally dealt with by the University Senate. This is a body chaired by the Vice Chancellor and whose membership incorporates Professors, Deans, and Heads of Department.

At Kenyatta University, the Kenyatta University Students Association (KUSA) is the student governing body. KUSA was established in 1970 to represent students' needs and views in the university. However, like other students' organizations, it was banned in the 1990s during the clamour for multiparty democracy in Kenya. The association was reborn in 2004 when the students decided to actively take part in matters affecting them. Since then, the association has been an instrumental part in the governance of the university. The organization is designed to serve the student community in its pursuit of academic excellence, social welfare, peace, competitiveness in the job market, and integrity (Kenyatta University 2014). The aims and objectives of KUSA are to ensure the rights of students in academics, disciplinary actions, administration and health services, catering and accommodation, social welfare services, and security; to deepen the members' sense of duty to our university community, families, and nation; to establish efficient and effective processes and organs for the making and administration of KUSA's policies and; with the approval of the Vice Chancellor, to collaborate with non-political organizations, professional associations, and student groups that share the aims and objectives of KUSA, among many others, (Kenyatta University 2014).

Since KUSA exists to represent all students, any student admitted to Kenyatta University and registered for a course leading to qualification for the award of a diploma or degree of the University becomes an automatic member of KUSA (Kenyatta University 2014). However, a bona fide student is one who has paid university fees and registered on-line during the current semester. Students who have completed a degree programme at Kenyatta University may become affiliate members of KUSA by a written notification to the President of KUSA. KUSA is run by an Executive body and a Congress, made up of elected students through a democratic election that occurs every academic year. The top officials, who normally serve a one-year term, include the President; the Deputy President; the Secretary-General; the Deputy Secretary-General; the Finance Secretary; the Academic Secretary; the Organizing Secretary; the Gender and Social Welfare Secretary; the Special Needs Secretary; the chairpersons of each of the satellite campuses; the Representative for Institution-Based and Open Learning Students and; the Speaker of the Congress as *ex officio* member (Kenyatta University 2014). The governance organs of the association include the Annual General Meeting, also referred to as the AGM; the Special General Meeting, also referred to as the SGM; the Students' Congress, also referred to as the Congress; the Executive Council; and subject to the approval of Congress, any other organ determined by the Executive Council.

The United States International University–Africa (USIU–A)

The United States International University (USIU–A) is a non-profit institution located in the Kasarani area of Nairobi behind Safari Park Hotel, off the Thika Superhighway.

It is the oldest, private secular university in Kenya, having been established in 1969 under the Companies Act, Cap. 486 (now repealed), following an agreement between the trustees of USIU in San Diego, California and the Kenyan Ministry of Education. USIU was part of a multi-campus system of the United States International University based in California. It became regionally accredited in the United States in 1982 as a US entity operating outside of the US. This was the same time it underwent a special review by the Government of Kenya. The university then registered under the Universities Act of 1985 and was inspected by the newly-formed Commission for Higher Education (CHE) in 1987, 1990, 1992, 1992, 1994, 1997, 1998 with a final inspection in 1999 prior to the award of the Charter. The Charter was awarded to USIU on the 10th of December 1999. Officially designated as United States International University–Africa (USIU–Africa), the university is a completely autonomous Kenyan institution governed by the laws of Kenya.

USIU–Africa has undergone considerable changes since receiving its Charter in 1999. Among the most significant developments is the de-linking of USIU in Nairobi from the USIU multi-campus system. USIU–Africa broke away from the USIU San Diego in 2001 to become an independent organization of its own. This was after USIU San Diego merged with California School of Professional Psychology to form Alliant International University. The Commission of Higher Education in Kenya expressed concerns over control of the latter institution. The university hence became independent and sought its accreditation from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) which it received in 2005. The university is now an independent university with accreditation in Kenya and the United States, making it the only dually accredited institution in the East African region. Locally, the institution is accredited by the Commission for University Education (CUE). In addition, the university is accredited in the United States of America (USA) by WASC. This status has had significant implications for governance, academic programming and overall accountability.

Currently, the USIU offers courses under four schools, namely: The School of Humanities and Social sciences, the Chandaria School of Business, the School of Science and Technology, and the School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences (United States International University 2015a). The School of Humanities and Social Sciences houses three undergraduate programmes, BA Criminal Justice, BA International Relations and BA Psychology. In addition, the school offers the following postgraduate programmes: MA Clinical Psychology, MA Counselling Psychology, MA International Relations, Doctorate in Clinical Psychology and Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in International Relations. The Chandaria School of Business is the largest school and offers the following undergraduate programmes: BSc Accounting, BSc Business Administration, BSc Hotel and Restaurant Management, BSc Information Systems and Technology, BSc

International Business Administration and BSc Tourism Management. Graduate programmes offered by the Chandaria School of Business include the Master of Business Administration (MBA), Executive Master of Science in Organizational Development (EMOD), Global Executive Master of Business Administration (GEMBA) and the Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) (United States International University 2015a). The School of Science and Technology, on the other hand, offers BSc. in Applied Computer Technology, BSc. in Information Systems Technology and BA in Journalism at the undergraduate level and two Master's level degrees, that is, MSc. in Information Systems Technology and MA in Communication Studies. Established most recently (Summer 2015), the School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences only offers a single programme, the Bachelor of Pharmacy (United States International University 2015a).

Over the years the USIU has grown to become the largest private institution of higher learning in Kenya, and among the larger of such institutions in the East Africa region. Its current population, as of September 2015, stands at 6,035 students, drawn from 69 countries (United States International University Undated). The international students comprise about 17 per cent of the student body. The current enrolment of 6,035 students represents about 74 per cent growth from the 3,462 students enrolled in the fall of 2006. Of the total students 4,835 (80.1 per cent) are pursuing undergraduate degrees compared to 1,200 (19.9 per cent) who are enrolled in postgraduate courses. In terms of gender composition, 44 per cent of the students are males whereas 56 per cent are females (United States International University, Undated). The university has a compliment of 110 full-time faculty spread across the five schools as follows: School of Humanities and Social Sciences, 48 faculties, Chandaria School of Business (33), School of Science and Technology, 23 and, School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences (6). The university also relies on Adjunct faculty drawn from industry and from public universities.

Based on the revised Charter submitted to the Commission for University Education for approval (the Charter is currently under review to harmonize it with the requirements of the Universities Act No. 42 of 2012), the governance of the USIU-A is vested in the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, the University Council, the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor, the Management Board and the Student Affairs Council (SAC). The Board of Trustees is vested with 'supreme control' over the university. It adopts the institutions annual plan of financial operation and establishes degrees to be awarded. However, the day-to-day responsibility for administration of the university is delegated by the Board of Trustees to the Vice Chancellor and the Management Board. The Board of Trustees is made up of professional individuals and distinguished scholars drawn from several countries. However, as per the University Charter, a third of them must be Kenyans. The Chancellor is the ceremonial head of the university and confers degrees during graduation ceremonies.

Consistent with the Universities Act No. 42 of 2012, the Council is the overall administrative body of the university mandated to manage all its resources. It is charged with the responsibility of policy formulation, creation of faculties and departments, and approval of the appointment of university staff. The Universality Senate, on the other hand, is the overall academic authority of the university and is responsible for academic matters, including control of the instruction, examination, the award of degrees and, the direction of research. It should be noted that the first University Senate for USIU-A is expected to be inaugurated at the beginning of the 2016/ 2017 academic year. The Management Board, chaired by the Vice Chancellor, provides the Vice Chancellor with decision-making support on matters of day-to-day running of the university. It deliberates on issues affecting the university, reviews and/or proposes recommended policies and priorities which contribute to the university's advancement toward accomplishing strategic initiatives. It also functions as a forum for discussion of pertinent issues affecting the day-to-day running of the university on a weekly basis and therefore the management council meets on a weekly basis. As currently constituted, its membership includes all Deputy Vice-Chancellors, the University Legal Officer and Unit Directors.

The Student Affairs Council (SAC) is a learned, secular, internal, non-political and non-sectarian organization for championing academic and social issues affecting students studying at USIU (United States International University 2015b). It is the official body responsible for students' self-governance, representation, and well-being. The SAC leadership consists of an executive committee, student senate and associated committees, clubs and sports. These are elected yearly and include a Chair, a Vice Chair, an Executive Secretary, a Vice Secretary, a Treasurer and representatives from different academic programmes. The officials are expected to work together to represent the issues affecting students in diverse areas such as academics, sports, club activities, health and other matters pertaining to the students' life in the university. Membership of SAC is open to any student attending the University on a full or part-time basis. All students become members upon registration and payment of an activity fee to the University. Based on the SAC Constitution, SAC shall be the only student organization at USIU and shall have offices solely on university premises. In addition, it shall cooperate and collaborate with both the students and the university management in the dissemination of its objectives (United States International University 2015b). The organization is subject to the policies and regulations of the university. As such, any section of SAC may be suspended or dissolved by the Vice Chancellor where there is evidence that there is mismanagement or engagement in activities affecting the reputation of the university or the wellbeing of the students.

The SAC has the following six objectives (United States International University 2015b):

- to support the University in accomplishing its mission of promoting the discovery and application of knowledge, the acquisition of skills and the development of intellect and character in a manner which prepares students to contribute effectively and ethically as citizens of a changing and increasingly technological world.
- to foster a spirit of cooperation, unity and hard work among the students of the university.
- to provide an effective forum for discussion and negotiation with the university management and any other relevant persons on all matters affecting all aspects of the welfare of the students be they social or academic.
- to provide a forum for the promotion of healthy relationships and mutual progress with other student organizations, institutions or person(s) in consultation with the SAC Advisor/ Designee.
- to facilitate intercultural interactions within the University and with the society in a manner that prepares students to effectively function in a multicultural environment.
- to fulfill any other objective in line with University Mission and Vision.

In pursuance of its aims and objectives, SAC endeavours to embrace good governance practices in its day-to-day administrative and other activities, to develop leadership qualities among the students, and to encourage students to participate in local, national and international students' functions, among others (United States International University 2015b).

Sample Size and Sampling Design

The major source of data for this study was 657 students drawn from Kenyatta University (KU) and the United States International University (USIU) as follows: KU, 456 students and USIU, 201 students. These comprised the primary sample for the study. The selection of the students to be interviewed for the study occurred in three stages. Stage one involved the use of purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling method, to select the universities from which respondents would be drawn. As evident from Table 5.1, Kenya has a total of 39 chartered universities out of which 22 are public institutions and 17 are owned privately. Out of this total, two institutions, Kenyatta University and the United States International University, were purposively selected to participate in the study. Whereas KU represented the public sector, the USIU represented the private sector. The two institutions were purposively selected on account of a number of considerations. The first consideration in the selection of the two universities covered by the study was the length of time they have been in existence. A guiding assumption in this regard was that the longer the institution had been in existence the more established it was in many aspects, including governance structures and their attendant governance culture. Kenyatta University, though the third fully-fledged

university to be established in Kenya, after Nairobi and Moi Universities, is the second oldest institution of higher learning in the country. Initially established as a constituent college of the University of Nairobi in 1965, the institution became a fully-fledged university in 1985. Since then, KU has experienced tremendous growth and is today the fastest-growing public university in Kenya. The USIU, on the other hand, is the oldest private and possibly the most established private university in Kenya. As pointed out earlier, the institution was established in 1969 as the first private, secular university to operate in Kenya. Initially it was a satellite African campus of the United States International University of San Diego, California in the United States of America. In 1999, the USIU was awarded a charter by the Kenyan Commission for Higher Education (CHE), granting the University its full accreditation. In 2001, the university broke away from the USIU San Diego to become an independent organization on its own.

Table 4.1: Chartered Public and Private Universities in Kenya by Year of Establishment

Name of Institution		Established
Public Universities		
1	University of Nairobi	1970
2	Moi University	1984
3	Kenyatta University	1985
4	Egerton University	1987
5	Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT)	1994
6	Maseno University	2001
7	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology	2007
8	Dedan Kimathi University of Technology	2012
9	Chuka University	2013
10	Technical University of Nairobi	2013
11	Technical University of Mombasa	2013
12	Kisii University	2013
13	Pwani University	2013
14	Maasai Mara University	2013
15	University of Eldoret	2013
16	Laikipia University	2013
17	Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University	2013
18	Meru University of Science and Technology	2013
19	South Eastern Kenya University	2013
20	Karatina University	2013
21	MultiMedia University of Kenya	2013
22	University of Kabianga	2013

Private Universities		
23	University of Eastern Africa, Baraton	1991
24	Catholic University of Eastern Africa (CUEA)	1992
25	Daystar University	1994
26	Scott Christian University	1997
27	United States International University (USIU)	1999
28	Africa Nazarene University	2002
29	Kenya Methodist University	2006
30	St Paul University	2007
31	Pan Africa Christian University	2008
32	Strathmore University	2008
33	Kabarak University	2008
34	Mount Kenya University	2011
35	African International University	2011
36	Kenya Highlands Evangelical University	2011
37	Great Lakes University of Kisumu	2012
38	KCA University	2013
39	Adventist University of Africa	2013

Source: Commission for University Education 2014

Finally, the limited financial resources available for the study did not allow the study to include a large number of institutions. In addition, to cut costs, it was necessary to minimize travel, accommodation and subsistence expenses to be incurred by the researchers. Second, and closely related to the first factor, was the proximity of the two institutions to the areas of residence of the researchers. All the researchers are residents within Nairobi, the very location of KU and the USIU, thereby minimizing the amount of travelling required to complete the study. As a matter of fact, whereas one of the researchers is an employee of KU, the other two work for the USIU. Third, being employees of the selected institutions, the researchers had the undue advantage of enjoying a good rapport with the two universities.

The second and third stages in the selection of the study's primary sample involved the selection of two schools in each university from which the actual respondents were selected; this was followed by the selection of the specific students who served as primary respondents. To select the schools covered by the study, stratified random sampling was employed. From each university covered by the study, two of its existing schools were selected for inclusion in the study. This culminated in the selection of the Schools of Education and Business in Kenyatta University the Schools of Humanities and Social Sciences and of Science and Technology in USIU. For Kenyatta University, being the larger of the two institutions, the target

sample was 400 respondents, while for the USIU 200 students were targeted for inclusion in the study. These figures were considered large enough to allow for the statistical manipulation of the data gathered and analyzed for the study.

To select the actual respondents, a combination of non-probability and probability sampling methods was used. The researchers relied on information about teaching timetables in the two institutions to select lecture sessions during which the surveys were administered. This involved the application of a combination of availability (or accidental) sampling, a non-probability sampling technique with simple random sampling, probability method. From each course/ lecture session selected, all students willing to complete the surveys were interviewed for the study. The process continued until the minimum targeted number of respondents in each institution was reached. It culminated with the interviewing of 456 and 201 respondents from KU and the USIU, respectively.

To supplement data collected from the primary respondents, interviews were conducted with key informants and focus group discussions (FGDs) were held with selected students. The key informants were selected purposively and included two top management officials (one from each university) and two student leaders (again one per university). Consistent with the selection of the study's primary respondents, students participating in the FGDs were also selected utilizing a combination of availability and random selection methods as follows:

- Lecture sessions were selected on the basis of availability and from each one of them, focus group discussants were selected randomly.
- In all four focus groups, two from each university spread across the two schools participating in the study, were constituted for the study. The two groups from KU comprised of fourteen members (seven per group), while from USIU, one group was made up of seven members and the other one of six members.

Data Collection Techniques

The study employed a combination of self-administered surveys, key informant interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) to collect opinions from students and other stakeholders in the governance process in universities in Kenya. The self-administered surveys constituted the primary source of data for this study. Quantitative data were collected from 657 students spread across two universities. The study utilized a pre-coded questionnaire with the response category 'other [specify]' giving it an open-ended feature. The questionnaires gathered information specific to the study objectives and to the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents. Utilizing a questionnaire has the advantage of being cheaper (Jankowicz 2000) and the ability of 'yielding a large amount of information about a given population ready for codification and analysis' (Strati 2000:147).

To maximize the trustworthiness of the data and enhance credibility, the research instrument was piloted one month prior to the administration of the surveys utilizing a nonrandom sample of twelve individuals drawn from schools in the study sites that were not to be featured in the study but who reflected the major characteristics of those to be studied. The pre-testing was undertaken as a precautionary measure before the main interviews were conducted to enable the investigators to establish whether the items in the instrument possessed the desired qualities to collect the information/data required for the study and to check on the validity and reliability of the instruments. Through pre-testing the researchers assessed the relevance, accuracy, clarity of question items and the ease of respondents' understanding of the question items. Information from the pilot study enabled the researchers to minimize response bias, ensure that the questions covered exhaustively all aspects of the data sought for the study and to estimate the time needed to administer the questionnaire. The major concern expressed by most of the twelve respondents involved the length of the questionnaire; they found it to be too long. The pre-test, therefore, resulted in a trimming of the questionnaire by eliminating some items from it. In addition, the piloting identified some minor weaknesses in the questionnaire, including spellings and the sequencing of items, meaning that they needed to be corrected before the actual data collection commenced.

To supplement data collected from interviews with students, the study gathered qualitative data from key informants and focus group discussants at each site. From each study site, selected members of upper-level management and members of student leadership were targeted as key informants. The gathering of data from them took the forms of semi-structured interviews, utilizing topics selected in advance and tailored to fit the study. This approach allowed for a chain of probes that yielded richer information relevant to the topic being studied. Other advantages of using semi-structured questions include their ability to provide rich data from the respondents while allowing the conversation to explore new issues emerging in the interview and a possibility of investigating the motives and feelings of the respondents (Mäkelä and Maula 2008). This is unlike close-ended questions which require specific answers from the respondents. The specific topics explored during interviews with key informants included the mainstreaming of student participation in governance in institutional policies and practices, support for students' involvement in governance by university organizational structures, the support systems for enhancing student involvement in university governance, the role of self-governance structures in student participation in governance, the level of inclusivity of student involvement in university governance, as well as the impediments to effective students' participation in governance. The FGDs were conducted with students selected from the same schools of the primary respondents, utilizing similar selection methods (see section 3.3). These were guided by an interview schedule developed for that purpose. The schedule emphasized thematic issues comparable to those keyed on by the in-depth interviews with key informants.

Although the actual data collection did not commence until September 2013, fieldwork began in mid-March the same year. During this initial stage of fieldwork the researchers sought research clearance from the Kenya government through the National Council for Science Technology and Innovations (NACOSTI) and acquainted themselves with the two institutions to be studied. The latter took the form of visitations with the top-level officials to explain the study to them and to file formal requests of consent to execute the survey. Once consent was granted, the next stage of the fieldwork involved visits with the selected (sampled) schools in each university to publicize the study and to book appointments to administer the surveys.

Data were collected during the months of June to November 2013. Whereas the process at Kenyatta University lasted from June to August 2013, at the United States International University it spanned the period September to November 2013. In every case, the process opened with one of the researchers or an assistant explaining the purpose of the study to the respondents before the questionnaire was distributed to them. This was done purportedly to further strengthen item accuracy, clarity and ease of respondent completion of the survey. Before enlisting the respondents' co-operation, the researcher or an assistant assured the respondents that their responses would be kept confidential and answered any questions that they might have had. These efforts were supplemented by a letter attached to each questionnaire explaining the purpose of the study, requesting the voluntary co-operation of the respondents and guaranteeing confidentiality of any information given. Interviewees who consented to participate in the study were then issued with a questionnaire and given about 45 minutes to complete it and hand it over to the researcher. As indicated earlier, the surveys were administered during lecture sessions and the cooperation of the specific instructors was essential for the success of the exercise.

Data Management and Analysis

The bulk of the data realized by the study was managed and processed utilizing a computer. The analysis occurred in two stages. The first stage involved the processing of surveys administered to the primary respondents of the study utilizing the SPSS quantitative data analysis software. During this stage, descriptive statistics especially frequency distributions, percentages and, where applicable, means were computed and utilized to display data patterns; that is, to construct a descriptive profile of the study sample and to depict the patterns in the influence of policies and practices targeted by the study. Further statistical treatment of data assumed the form of relational analysis using cross-tabulation. The analysis focused on selected independent variables to assess whether or not they cause variations in perceptions of inclusive governance in higher education institutions. To test for relatedness among variables, the Chi square (χ^2) test was applied. The χ^2 test statistic depicts

association between variables presented in the form of cross-tabulation by examining whether frequencies obtained are different from the frequencies one would attribute to chance variations alone. Where the two frequencies are found to be similar, it is concluded that there is no difference in the two groups under study. On the contrary, where differences are found between the two samples, it shows that, “there is a significant difference in attitudes and/ or perceptions between the two groups under comparison” (Frankel and Wallen 1993: 201).

The second stage in the data management and analysis process involved the transcribing of in-depth interviews and FGDs. These were transcribed and categorized by questions. Patterns from these sources of data constituted a basis for the cross-validation of results (patterns) obtained from the quantitative data. Interpretation was based on themes which emerged from the data and were supported by select quotes.

Ethical Considerations

A major ethical consideration is that the respondents do not come to any harm. The nature of the study did not in any way expose the respondents to any danger. The other consideration is that the respondents’ participation is voluntary. This was ensured by informing the respondents of their right to voluntary participation and withdrawal at the beginning of the interview or at any point of the research. The respondents were also informed about the objectives of the study and what the information was to be used for. Every respondent who consented to be interviewed was guaranteed anonymity. Furthermore, no names were required of those interviewed and the information collected from each respondent was to be utilized only in combination with that collected from others rather than individually. According to the regulations governing research activities in Kenya, permission was also sought from the Kenya government through the National Council for Science Technology and Innovations (NACOSTI).

Limitations of the Study

Three factors in particular are likely to have undermined the quality of this study and hence the value of its core findings. First, the study covers only two institutions; KU (public sector) and the USIU (private sector). Net of the consideration of length of time in existence, a single university from each sector is by no means representative of the likely diverse policies and practices with respect to students’ involvement in university governance in each sector. This has implications on the extent to which the results of this study can be generalized to universities in the public and the private sectors in Kenya. The gravity of the situation is best captured by taking cognizance of the fact that by 2014 Kenya had a total of 22 public and 17 private chartered universities. As pointed out earlier, the decision to key on only two institutions was for the most part dictated by the

financial resources available for the study. Further eroding the generalizability of the study findings is the reliance on the non-probability sampling technique of purposive sampling to select the two institutions keyed on by the study. Reliance on purposive sampling rendered sampled institutions unrepresentative of the 39 chartered universities in the country.

The third factor that may have undermined the quality of this study is the reluctance (disinclination or the lack of eagerness or willingness), especially among top-echelon university managers, to participate in the study as key informants. Such reluctance not only denied the study the opportunity to solicit the ideas of some of major decision-makers in universities but may also have influenced the quality of responses tendered by those who were eventually persuaded to participate as key informants. Nevertheless, the persistent reluctance on the part of top managers in the universities studied must be understood within the context of the sensitivity of the subject of students' involvement in governance. Most universities are still grappling with the question of the extent to which they should democratize the whole process. Some reluctance was also encountered on the part of student leadership. For the most part, the fear among student leaders of victimization by management not only influenced their decision to or not to participate as key informants, but may also have affected the quality of information divulged.

