



Student Leaders Involvement in Decision Making Processes on Management of Student Affairs in Selected Public Universities in Kenya

Lucy Muthoni Murage

*PhD Graduate Student, School of Education and Social Sciences
Karatina University*

Johannes Njoka & Micheal Gachahi

*School of Education and Social Sciences
Karatina University*

ABSTRACT

Management of student affairs continues to be a major challenge to student affairs' professionals, university management, ministry, government and all stakeholders of university education in Kenya. Students' protests over the provision of student services have caused incalculable destruction both financial and social to the public and university. The study established that effectiveness in management of student affairs could be increased to a high level with increase in level of student leaders' involvement in university decision making process. The result indicated that change in involvement in decision making by one unit can affect effectiveness in student affairs management by 0.275.

Key Words: *Decision Making Processes, Involvement, Public Universities, Student affairs, Student Leaders*

BACKGROUND

Public universities in Kenya are undergoing social, economic and political transformation due to global and national development initiatives of democratizing institutions of higher learning (Republic of Kenya, 2010). Student leadership has become important due to the growing students' demand for involvement in decision-making on matters affecting their welfare and effective participation in the governance of universities. The Universities Act (2012) provides the functions of student leadership in public universities (Republic of Kenya, 2012). The rights, wishes and beliefs of students have to be represented in institutions' governing organs and therefore it is no longer the dispensation of the institutional administration alone to transmit its suggestions and impose on students.

The Constitution of Kenya (2010), Chapter Four on the Bill of Rights Part 1, articulates the rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals by expressing the purpose of recognizing and protecting the same. Part 3, clause 55, states that, "The State shall take measures, including affirmative action programmes, to ensure that the youth have opportunities to associate, be represented and participate in political, social, economic spheres of life" (Republic of Kenya, 2010). Therefore, students' involvement in decision making through the student leaders is an avenue that help increase the legitimacy of the democratic processes.

Public universities are highly structured and have relatively clear lines of authority, stated objectives and momentum to carry them forward. However, addressing the basic personal needs of students and providing a comprehensive set of out of classroom student services and programmes (Eshiwani, 2009) need more support and involvement of student leaders. This calls for the harnessing of student leaders in university management system. There is also need for incremental influence beyond the routine directives and formal position requirements of student leaders (Surua, 2009). Students' leadership is necessary because of the incomplete universities social structures of students to help; structure the tasks, decide who should do what and delegate work assignments. Student leadership is also necessary to solve internal conflicts and settle differences of opinion amongst students (Obiero, 2012). Student leaders have a delicate role to play especially when viewed against the problems facing universities in Kenya today.

Education reforms in higher education such as expansion, lowering of minimum mean grade to B-(Minus) in 2014, introduction of Privately Self-Sponsored Programme (PSSP) and opening up of a university in every county has caused a phenomenon growth of students population (MOEST, 2014). The introduction of free primary education in 2003 and subsequent subsidized secondary education in 2008 in Kenya; increased secondary schools enrolment from 879,956 in 2003 to 1,382,211 (57.1% increase) in 2008 (Orodho, 2014). The high number of students who qualified to join universities in Kenya necessitated the government to upgrade the existing middle level colleges into universities (MOE, 2012). A move that has been applauded for it has created opportunities for many Kenyans to further their studies.

Public universities enrolment increased from 81,491 in 2004/2005 to 97,107 (19.1% increase) in 2007/2008 (CHE, 2009; Republic of Kenya, 2010)

and 212,664, an increase of 219% in three years from 2009 to 2012 (Waweru, 2013). The number of public universities also increased from seven in 2008 to 31 in 2013 and 35 in 2017 (CUE, 2014; CUE, 2017). The government funding towards education is still very low (Aina, 2007). The noticeable shortage of funds available to institutions of higher learning has been responsible for high tuitions, declining library, social and laboratory facilities which cumulate into students unrests in most tertiary institutions in the country.

University managers are still faced with challenges of non-adherence to the set discipline standards of their educational institutions. A series of student protests led to destruction of properties and closure of a number of public universities in Kenya over management of student affairs (Report to Parliament by the Minister for Education, 2015). Some universities experienced student protests twice within the same year. Among others students protested over: interference with student elections, increased fees, poor conditions of residential facilities, limited representation in university governing bodies such as the council and senate and poor communication channels with university authorities (MOEST, 2014). Management of student environment within the university dictates how often this phenomenon recurs. Obondo (2000) posit that student leaders represent an important untapped resource in university effort to confront the emerging disarrays, since staffs have limited contact and access to students' activities away from lecture room. Surua (2009), point that involvement of student leaders in decision making processes over the management of student affairs within higher education will enable them to respond to these challenges.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

As argued, regardless of student capacity to influence the university decisions, the student participation in university governance is necessary and important for effective university governance. Despite this clear necessity and importance, the body of empirical evidence on student participation and how that is enacted is still not extensive even in the western literature (Klemenčič, 2014). However, there is a great need of documentation, studies and analysis of student participation in university governance. Mass education movements in the last three decades have posed several challenges for making education more relevant, equitable and efficient to the Kenyan context. Mutual efforts of all key stakeholders including students of the universities are essential to deal with these challenges. Students' role is important to supply relevant information on the expertise and to legitimize the university decisions and their outcome in university governance.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted the descriptive survey research design. Stratified random sampling was used to select student leaders and four public universities while purposive sampling was used to select universities' administrators in the academic division. The sample size comprised of 142 student leaders, four student counsellors, four deans of students and four registrars ARSA making a total of 154 respondents. A questionnaire was used to collect data. The questionnaire comprised closed ended questions. The questionnaire was pretested before da-

ta collection for validation and reliability. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The analyzed data was presented using tables. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used. To determine the significance of each variable that affected competitiveness t-test was used. Multiple linear regression model was used to show whether the stated independent variables significantly influenced competitiveness. The study established a positive linear correlation between all the independent and the dependent variable

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study was guided by participatory leadership theory advocated by Bass and Bass (2008). The theory provides awareness to how student leaders can be encouraged to participate in decision making without destroying the overall purpose and undertakings of the organization. Leadership is the manner and approach of providing direction, implementing plans and motivating people. The leader involves the people in the decision-making, although the process for the final decision may vary from the leader having the final say in facilitating consensus in the group. Participatory leadership also referred to as democratic leadership, reflects democratic principles and processes that including inclusiveness, self-determination and equal participation.

Democratic leaders often lack formal position and power. Democratic leaders are characterized by collective decision-making, comradeship, active member or follower involvement, fair praise and restrained criticism. They facilitate collective decision-making. They offer their followers choices and support. Students will more readily accept policies and decisions that are reached by general consensus. This cuts down on the resistance that new university policies will experience and speeds up the process of implementing new ideas. Student leaders are given a personal stake in the success of new policies by being involved in the process of creating and approving these policies and this helps the university to adjust rapidly to policy changes. Student leaders that are given a voice in the operation of the institution feel personally liable for the success of the institution. Their morale remains at a high level because there is an appreciation for the chance to be part of the institution decision-making process. Student leaders will also take a more active role in improving the existing conditions when they know that they can directly affect the policies that govern their institution. When you encourage students through their leaders to give their opinions on issues affecting their welfare and how to solve them, they will give a variety of solutions to choose from. Participative leadership empowers student leaders to use their creativity to develop more productive co-curricular activities that make them develop a positive attitude towards the staff and university management, hence creating calm environment. Participation will increase university effectiveness as leadership is potentially available to any legitimate stakeholder. This will succeed in 'bonding' students together and in easing the pressures on university management. The burdens of leadership will be less if leadership functions and roles are shared and if the concept of leadership concentration were to emerge as a viable replacement for autocratic leadership.

The theory demonstrates how participation encompasses empowering students to take responsibility in their undertakings. Student leaders are

expected to be responsible and consequently, be vigorous in student affairs administrative procedure. In the perspective of student leaders' involvement in participative governance, the university authority should deliberately create a room for student leaders to be involved in decision making processes. A strong point of this theory is that it highlights the importance of this stems from the fact that if finite, the empowerment of some must involve the dilution of the power of others.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework comprised of independent variable which was the involvement of student leaders in universities' decision making processes. Independent variables interacted with dependent variables represented by effective student affairs services, whose indicators were positive attitude towards university education, adherence to rules and regulations, campus harmony, stability, quality grades and graduation on time (See Figure 1).

Independent Variables
Dependent Variables

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Growth of High Education and Impact on Students

Massification of high education is the global exponential growth of enrolment in tertiary education. It is the expansion of provision and uptake of higher education. The term massification in the context of higher education systems was used to describe the rapid increase in student enrolment in the latter part of the twentieth century (Scott, 1995). Trow (2000) presented a definition of the term massification by coining the terms elite, mass and universal higher education, with elite representing a national enrolment ratio of up to 15%, mass representing a ratio of up to 50%, and universal a ratio in excess of 50%. Although the use of national enrolment ratios or participation rates may be appropriate to define massification of higher education in industrialised countries, this may not necessarily be the case for developing countries. As a result,

most African countries have a very low higher education enrolment ratio but they have experienced a very rapid increase in actual numbers of students enrolled in higher education; that, too, should be considered as massification. Massification of higher education resulted in the evaluation of social/cultural, economic, political, and technological outcomes and advances and trends in the 21st century. Development and evolution of these higher education systems presented challenges and opportunities in management of universities.

UNESCO (1999) affirms that significant increases in enrolment are a positive sign of democratization of access. Admission is not only open to those with the classic definition of student i.e. a person of 18-24 years who has entered higher education directly from secondary school or soon thereafter, but is also available to older students who wish to further their education in this era of “lifelong learning”. Students of all ages, social class and calibre can access education. Massification is therefore seen in a positive light because it is a proof of the democratization of access and is no longer elitist. Massification has also lead to greater human capital formation, providing countries with expert human resources needed for development. On a global level, it seems to be important in this knowledge economy where the two classical pillars of a successful university have been changed to four and are no longer limited to quality teaching and research, but also the ability to innovate and to share knowledge.

On the other hand, massification has brought challenges on: institutional management and governance, funding, quality, relevance, infrastructure, teaching, learning, research, and quality of student life. University students are perhaps the main victims of massification. Students have to contend with overcrowded classrooms, unavailability or insufficiency of academic facilities including accommodation, reading materials, research equipment, computers etc. Academic life becomes very stressful since students have to cope with a myriad of challenges (The Economist, 2005; Chevaillier, 2000). These frustrations usually lead to students becoming more ungovernable and usually taking to the streets in demonstrations against either the management of the university or the government in order to improve their lot. Those who cannot adjust, usually complete higher education without having gained the necessary skills to make them employable. Most of students spend their time just trying to survive and pass their exams and therefore do not have much time for self-development.

Student Leaders and Involvement in Decision Making Processes

Involvement in decision making refers to the process of including and considering the student leaders' opinions in the course of making major decisions and policy formulation on student- related matters. Such involvement allows for leadership training. Some authors and researchers have opined that higher education has been recognized as key to delivering the knowledge requirements for political development. Research has also affirmed that the university system is a community and the students are the main-stakeholder in education. The researcher has become concerned and need to know whether students hold significant member seats on few university committees despite their numeric strength in Kenyan universities. This is in regard to the level of

students' participation in university governance.

Decision Making and Students' Governance

Jeruto and Kiprof (2011) describe students' involvement in decision-making as all aspects of university life where students make contributions informally through individual negotiation as well as formally through purposely created structures and mechanisms. Universities across Africa, in the face of democracy, have embraced the idea of student involvement in the affairs of educational institutions. Given that direct participation by large numbers of students in the running of the organizations is, in practice, impossible, it can only be replaced by some form of representative system whereby elected members represent the electorate and carry out the members' will (Bukaliya & Rupande, 2012). Luescher (2005) describes students' governance as the participation of students as active agents in the governance of higher education. Akomolafe and Ibijola (2011) assert that students should be well represented on all university statutory committees including senate and council committees to enhance levels of organizational effectiveness in the system. In their study they found a significant relationship between students' participation in university governance and organizational effectiveness. Akomolafe and Ibijola, (2012) asserts that students' participation in university governance allows for development of leadership. According to Lambert (2012) the campus is now the most veritable training ground for future politician and leaders. Involvement of students in university decision-making, according to Luescher-Mamashela (2013), is one of the main ways in which universities engage with students, listen to them and help them to acquire leadership skills.

There are many reasons that have been advanced for student involvement in decision making processes in educational institutions. The proponents of these rationales have given five schools of thought as to why students' participation in the decision making processes has been given the green light in most institutions of learning particularly those of higher education. The rationales have been advanced as the moral reason, the morale reason, decisional reason, educational reason and credibility reason. The driving force for student involvement in the affairs of the university rests in the generally accepted political proposition that in a free society all affected by a policy have the right to be involved in the formulation of such a policy even at its inception (ROK, 2010). Otherwise the policy stands to be resisted. Johnson (1991) proposed the morale argument in favour of student participation in university decision processes whose reason for the involvement lies on the premise that student input creates a sense of ownership and engagement between students and the institution. The decisional paradigm for student representation and involvement support that, students have special information and expertise not available to faculty and administrators and which would not be represented if students were not included in the deliberations. Students provide information, knowledge, perceptions and opinions that can only be held by someone who is the recipient, customer and has purpose the educational process.

The educational motive for student involvement posits that one of the main goals of educational institution is to educate the students for citizenship and democratic living. To instill the philosophy of democracy and citizen-

ship in them, they must be afforded the opportunity to participate in civil and democratic dispensations in which they are directly involved in making decision which affect them most (Northington, 1972). Starkweather (1975) argues that it seems reasonable that students would be better able to move from the role of students to the role of a citizen if they experienced optimum decision making while at university. The credibility reason paradigm postulates that student involvement in university governance allows for policy decisions to be viewed as more legitimate by the student body resulting in the institution avoiding looking paternalistic (Ryan, 1976). It eventually leads to improved quality of educational decisions and policies, diminished student dissent and unrest, giving legitimacy to university and creation of patriotic and better citizens.

Akomolafe and Ibijola (2012), argue that the rationale for students' participation in university governance among others includes; higher degree of level of commitment on the part of the students, easy attainment of set goals or objectives, efficient policy formulation and implementation, uninterrupted flow of academic programmes, leadership training and development, stable economic gain and reduction in crime or anti-social behaviour on the part of the students. Students have so much regards for their leaders even more than for the university authorities probably because they believe in the course of their leaders. For that reason, the student leaders make the process of democratic representative and participation in the faculty and the university decision making bodies easier. This could imply that, formal student representation in university governance have been serving as a training ground for leadership in civil society, as the skills and competencies acquired in the university context could immediately be transferred to organized civil society.

Lizzio and Wilson (2009) state that in the merits of involving students in the running of the affairs of institutions are generally described from one of the three perspectives namely: functional, developmental and social. No matter what activities the students are involved in should be beneficial to the university, to the student and also to the society. Sabin and Daniels, 2001 in Lizzio and Wilson (2009) affirm that the advantages of sharing governance from the functional perspective brings about enhanced accountability in terms of transparency of policy and decisions, evident deliberation in relation to consideration of the stakeholder views and learning from experience.

Involving students in quality control mean obtaining direct feedback from the customers and consumers of the education (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Students are more concerned about what they will get in return in an environment of competitive market. Universities are more market oriented and the students have the right to question how the money they pay is used within the university. Universities for that reason get direct feedback from the consumers of the products. Owing to the competitive market the students have the freedom to choose the best provider. A university is therefore forced to come up with new innovations in the kind of programs they have to offer. Students have an opportunity to choose from a variety of programmes and courses in various faculties.

Ede (2000) described universities as international community's engaged in the daily business of search for knowledge and truth. Students as

members of the academic community, share a responsibility of their education and for the institution which provides the framework for this education (Bergan, 2005). Therefore the idea of taking students as clients, receivers or buyers of a final product in the university system contradict the idea of seeing students as members of the academic community. Nearly all the universities are managed by committee system, which plays a very important role in the decision making process, as it allows for democratization of the decision making process.

Akomolafe (2002) in his study asserts that a democratic leader should believes in consultation and joint decision-making as it is one of the principles of decision making process. He affirm that despite the numeric strength of the students, they still hold minority member seats on very few university committees, thereby making their contributions at such committee meetings very insignificant in decision making, and this seems to be a major factor of the instability in the university system.

Student leaders gain a lot of knowledge about structure and politics of a large non-profit organization such as a university. By their participation in the committees, they learn how to express and defend well-founded opinions in meetings. When given opportunity students who are in leadership positions experience a certain level of control over their own decisions. Involvement empowers them and they can confidently be actively involved in discovering other areas of improvement (Visser et al, 1998). Participation also improves the relationship between the student leaders and the administrators. The merits of involving student leaders in committees are numerous as student participation can have an influence on the quality of educational end product of the university. Through their participation in committees the student leaders can facilitate the evaluation of the curricula and the teaching practices through the identification of the shortfalls in the university's programmes and instruction (Lee, 1987 cited in Menon, 2005). In addition it is also argued that by closely involving student leaders in quality control means obtaining direct feedback from the consumers of education. Students in leadership position have a comprehensive overview of the complete curriculum (Visser et al, 1998; Echina, 1980, Huppatz, 1996). The student leaders are best placed to give important feed back in several aspects of the curriculum.

Student leaders have many ideas and suggestions and the university has a duty to find out or listen to their experience. Students in leadership position gain by participating in student governance in that they have improved self- discipline, increased development of multicultural view, a better acceptance of diversity and divergent thinking, a better understanding of complex organizations and democratic ideals, and a good avenue for the students to realize a democratic process (May, 2009, Pascarelli & Terenzini, 2005, Logue. et al, 2005, Boland, 2005). Saha (2000) supports that participation and leadership in formal settings such as student government on campus and voluntary associations on or off campus are among the typical indicators of active citizenship. According to Kanperin (2004) as he emphasised on the importance of student's participation in university governance, viewed students' participation in the university governance as when students feel responsible for their learning.

Student Leaders and University democratization

Student politics in Africa in the twenty-first century can be understood in terms of at least broad structuring factors namely: the impact of the political liberalization and the re-institution of multi-party politics of the 1990s on student politics in Africa can be seen most strikingly in these regards. Democratization of national politics has deeply eroded the legitimacy of student leaders to act as ‘extra-parliamentary opposition’ and the activist ‘spokespersons of the masses’. This role has now come to be claimed by opposition parties. Again, there has also been an increasing institutionalization of student representation – however partial and co-opted – in both national and institutional higher education decision-making structures, on the back of less authoritarian and more liberal and pluralist national political cultures overall and a modernization in the governance and management of universities.

In particular at institutional level, governance reforms providing for an inclusion of student leaders in university decision-making have often followed politically-realist recognition that an inclusion of students in formal decision-making and responsiveness to student demands prevents an escalation of conflicts as well as leading to greater leadership effectiveness (Luescher-Mamashela 2013; cf. Macharia 2015; Oni & Adetoro 2015; Oanda 2016). Drawn in both developments is the rise of multiparty politics in Africa, and the role that political parties have come to play in student politics. Mugume (2015) as he supports Luescher-Mamashela and Mugume (2014) argues that multiparty politics has so far had an ambiguous impact on student interest representation.

Luescher-Mamashela (2010), argue that student leaders are seen as junior members of the academic community and power rests with the senior academics and the students have very minimal formal participation in decision making. However informal consultation is very common between the students and scholars but in most case formal participation of the student leaders is quiet limited. Student leaders ought to participate in the university boards and committees to assist in achieving the university goals. Luescher-Mamashela (2010) assert that university democratization is the reconstitution of internal decision-making in universities with reference to democratic principles, among others, by making decision-making processes in university more representatives of internal constituencies such as students. Student leaders as stakeholders have right to participate in the governing of the university in a representative democracy. Unilateral ‘monolithic mode of governance where a single group of intellectuals dominates decision making has been criticized by the stake holders, giving rise to the democratic credentials of governing. Student leaders as a result fight for their space in the running of the university and create awareness of the desires of the larger student body. Democratization in university is viewed to involve a transformation of internal governance arrangements in keeping with a vision of university as a “representative democracy” (Olsen, 2007, de Boer & Stensaker, 2007). According to Olsens (2005), democracy is viewed as an end in itself, so it is important that student leaadere are given a say in decisions affecting them. Involvement in decision-making is organized around election, bargaining, voting and coalition building among the organized group with the aim of accommodating their interests

(Olsens, 2005). When student leaders are involved in governance, they act like bridge between the administration and the student body. By means of the better use of communication modes available within the university, decision-making is enhanced.

Student leaders in most cases fight to have equal representation both in legal and budgetary powers (de Boer & Stensaker, 2007). Nevertheless this is not the case in most universities world over and Kenya included. Student leaders participate in decision-making but in matters privy to the university they are just informed of the decision made. Decision-making powers should not be concentrated but fused or separated among the several; ideally, in a system of horizontal checks and balances that the representative council has the upper hand. Student leaders are supposed to represent the student body in the university governing organ and ensure that voice of the students is heard. Luescher-Mamashela, (2012) state that students have rights to representation in decision making as a means of safeguarding their interests.

In Kenya, students' involvement in decision making is significantly different between private and public universities. It has been interpreted that students' involvement in decision making was better in private universities compared to public universities. This largely explains why there have been more student riots in public universities as compared to private universities (K'Okul, 2010). Despite the fact that universities in developing countries are much smaller in size and simpler in structure, complexities in power and authority are similar to and reminiscent of many liberal universities. They all consist of several communities and associated subcultures which any administration has to reckon with.

However, student leaders' participation in decision-making in universities is often viewed as problematic owing to the fact that students may be viewed as minors, immature and lacking in the expertise and technical knowledge that is needed in making decisions regarding the universities (Oke, Okunola, Oni & Adetoro, 2010). In most cases the senate or council meetings are convened when the students are in the class and so have to either miss the lectures or the meetings. Student involvement and formal representation in university governance have not eliminated student activism in the institutions (Luescher-Mamashela, 2015). This may be due to the complications arising from huge student enrolments, the expansion of universities and a lack of corresponding levels and numbers of representation.

FINDINGS

Involvement in Decision Making

The study third objective was to assess how student leaders were involved in decision making processes in selected public universities in Kenya. The survey results were analyzed and presented under this section of the study as shown in table 1.

Table 1: Leaders Involvement in Decision Making Processes

Senate and council attendance

	Freq &%	Very small extent	Small extent	Not sure	High extent	Very high extent	NR	Mean	Stdv
Student leaders often attend senate and council meetings that discuss students' welfare	Freq	20	40	36	20	22		2.884	1.285
	%	14.5	29	26.1	14.5	15.9			
There are regular consultation between student leaders and university management on matters concerning students' welfare	Freq	24	41	18	37	15	3	2.837	1.311
	%	17.4	29.7	13	26.8	10.9	2.2		
Student leaders attend committees or boards where students' discipline matters are discussed	Freq	35	23	7	30	40	3	2.622	1.233
	%	25.4	16.7	5.1	21.7	29	2.2		
Student leaders are involved in planning of co-curricular activities	Freq	16	36	9	53	21	3	3.200	1.315
	%	11.6	26.1	6.5	38.4	15.2	2.2		
Student leaders are involved in formulation of university student rules and regulations	Freq	28	30	12	34	31	3	2.793	1.276
	%	20.3	21.7	8.7	24.6	22.5	2.2		
Student leaders are involved in dialogue about issues of social justice, inclusion, power, privilege, and oppression in one's practice.	Freq	42	21	14	26	35		2.837	1.328
	%	30.4	15.2	10.2	18.8	25.4			
Policies are effected after identifying and then effectively consulting with key stakeholders and those with diverse perspectives to make informed decisions	Freq	37	43	3	38	17		2.822	1.424
	%	26.8	31.1	2.2	27.5	12.3			
Changes are made after facilitating consensus processes where wide support is needed	Freq	36	25	30	30	14	3	2.711	1.349
	%	26.1	18.1	21.7	21.7	10.2	2.2		
Management intentionally including diverse perspectives of student leaders to inform decision making and reconcile diverse viewpoints	Freq	30	33	40	26	6	3	2.593	1.161
	%	21.7	23.9	29	18.8	4.3	2.2		
Student leaders are equal partners with university administrators in decision	Freq	51	29	11	28	16	3	2.474	1.465

In regard to this statement 60(43.5%) indicated that student leaders often attend senate and council meetings that discuss students' welfare to small extent, while 42(30.4%) to a high extent. 36(26.1) were not sure and three 3(2.2%) had no response. This implies that most of important decisions are made by the senior management as on 60(43.5%) attend senate. The university authorities feel that involving student leaders in discussing policies related to welfare may be ineffective because they are not professional and authorities in such areas. Student leaders may be inefficient but through voicing of their demands, the university authorities can be in a position to see the loop holes in the administration. Luescher-Mamashela (2013), point that the extent of student representation in university committees dealing with teaching, learning and research may be understood with regard to the setting and level of governance (course, programme/department/school, faculty, university-wide academic policy), the nature of issues under consideration (e.g. student assessment, timetable setting, academic staffing, teacher awards, quality assurance) and most importantly, the perceived expertise and seniority of the students affected by a decision (undergraduate, postgraduate). Provisions for student representation may involve consumerist commitments to giving students a formal mechanism to voice their preferences thus providing input and feedback into the academic process. Academic staff's commitment to democratic and participatory pedagogies, involving notions of membership/partnership (and co-production) in a learning community, may also influence the extent to which students are involved in co-determining aspects of teaching and learning.

Regular consultation with management

On regular consultation 65(47.1%) of the respondents indicated that to a small extent agreed there are regular consultation between student leaders and university management on matters concerning students' welfare, 52(37.7%) agreed to a high extent, 18(13%) were not sure and three 3(2.2%) had no response. The minimal consultation implies less information concerning the challenges in provision of student services. Maina (2012) concurs that universities that keep students informed of the challenges that they face in providing services, candidly explaining any setbacks and how these are handled, give students an opportunity to experience management in action. Providing opportunities for student leaders to manage their own affairs within the constraints of available resources offers useful experiences for personal development and self discovery.

Attend disciplinary committees or boards

In regards to attendance of disciplinary committees 70(50.7%) of the student leaders support that the student leaders attend committees or boards where students' discipline matters are discussed to a high extent, while 58(42.1%) to a small extent. Seven (5.1%) had no response and three 3(2.2%) had no response. A significance number 58(42.1%) of respondents did not attend disciplinary committee and therefore cannot advise their constituents' accordingly. The active involvement of student leaders in disciplinary process is viewed as central to having long-lasting results. According to Kiprop (2007) co-creating discipline solutions contribute to ownership for the students and a catalyst for long

-term responsible behaviour.

Involvement in planning of co-curricular activities

In regard to planning co-curricular activities, 74(53.6%) of respondents to high extent supported that student leaders were involved in planning of co-curricular activities while 52(37.7%) to a small extent. Nine (6.5%) were not sure and three 3(2.2%) had no response. Student leaders should be involved in all areas of campus life. The range of activities that make up the work of a campus can be categorized in a number of different ways to give student leaders an opportunities for involvement in each major area related to student affairs. Student affairs professionals should improve the management of students' welfare to play a fundamental role in promoting student participation in co-curricular activities. Fox, Barr-Anderson, Neumark-Sztainer and Wall (2010) concurs that there were positive associations between involvement in physical activities and academic achievement among students. Therefore, students' leadership is required to facilitate participation and enhance involvement in co-curricular activities.

Formulation of rules and regulations

In regard to formulation of rules 65(47.1%) of the respondents to a high extent support that student leaders were involved in formulation of university rules and regulations and 58(42%) support to a small extent, 12(8.7%) were not sure and three 3(2.2%) had no response. A significance number 58(42%) of respondents were involved to a small extent. Students should be encouraged to come up with rules and regulations that could be incorporated in the already established laws. This would give them a feeling of ownership since they will view them as their own creation and thus strive to obey them. Students are far more likely to internalise and respect rules and regulations that they helped create than rules that are handed to them. During the formulation of rules and regulations, involvement must be extensive and should include all student leaders and not limited to just a few students in student government. Such students may be least likely to challenge the rules in the first place. Studies conducted by Obondo (2000), concurs that involving students in university governance is very important. If governance is shared, then students feel more positive towards university goals and objectives. A clear evidence of this is found in the work of the University of Cantabria Student Council (Urraca, 2005), which consistently implemented measures on different fronts with the aim of achieving real and effective student participation in reviewing regulations, reviewing electoral calendars and processes, recognising dedication to these representative and participative bodies, and providing specific training in this respect.

Involvement on dialogue on social justice

To a small extent, 63(45.6%) of respondents indicated that student leaders are involved in dialogue about issues of; social justice, inclusion, power, privilege, and oppression in ones practice while 61(44.2%) agreed to a high extent and 14 (10.2%) were not sure. The rationale for students' involvement in dialogue is desirable and most of the problems leading to students' unrest could be re-

solved if students are allowed their rightful place in university governance. On this principle, committee system of management that allow dialogue, play a very important roles in the decision making process in the management of universities. According to Ibijola (2010) providing committee systems as a way of involving students in management is importance for coordination in any organization, especially in the university system. It is in this light that the students' representatives should be seen as leaders in their own capacity, knowing fully that they represent the significant percentage of the university community. Agili & Okibo, (2015) support student leaders should recommend to students what change initiatives to embrace or reject, informing the management of students' views on the changes proposed, consulting and dialoguing with students to reach a compromise on the changes proposed by management.

Policies are effected after consultation

According to 80(57.9%) of respondents, to a small extent they support the statement that policies are effected after identifying and then effectively consulting with key stakeholders and those with diverse perspectives to make informed decisions while 59(42.7%) to high extent and three 3(2.2%) had no response. Policies are made by committees where student leaders are not involved. The responsibility of student leaders is to influence student to adhere to the policies. Luescher-Mamashela (2015) support that failure to involve student leaders in decision making, increase students' activism in university, where students feel underrepresented, misrepresented or not represented at all in the formal decision making processes of university governance. Kaba (2000) suggests that while participation fosters a sense of equality and ownership among student members, they are not given a corresponding opportunity to substantively affect policy and other changes. The students therefore are not in possession of the same level of power like other power bases that are a source of legitimate authority to effect policy changes in the institution.

Changes are made after consensus

On changes 61(44.2%) indicated that to small extent changes are made after facilitating consensus processes where wide support is needed while 44(31.9%) to high extent. 30(21.7%) were not sure and three 3(2.2%) had no response. This implies that most of are made without student leaders consent. Backman *et. Al.* (6440), points that the students are given very few opportunities to influence curriculum content, learning methods or changes. A number said that trying to do so was often a bad experience and that no one listens to what they said and that the reaction of the management is negative. Therefore, they choose to be passive and do not think that they could influence anything at all. Studies done by Sifuna (2012) also support that management of public universities did not effectively involve students in decision making as were the private universities. Inadequate involvement of staff and students in decision making has impacted negatively on the quality of teaching and learning in public universities. To support above Obiero (2012) did a study and assessed the influence of university administration on the involvement of student leaders in the governance of university. He based his case study on Kenyatta University, Kenya. He conducted his study after the University had restored some

calm after a period of successive unrests. He attributed the calmness experienced to adequate consultation between the student leaders and the university administration. But even though the students indicated that they were involved in the decision making process, there were times they felt they were being ignored on sensitive issues where decisions were made without consulting them.

Management

On management 66(45.6%) of respondent indicated that to a small extent, the management intentionally includes diverse perspectives of student leaders to inform decision making and reconcile diverse viewpoints and 32(23.1%) to a high extent. 40(29%) were not sure and three 3(2.2%) had no response. This means that the absence of students' participation in university governance may hamper decision making process by other stakeholders therefore making it ineffective. In the institutional autonomy student leaders represent the views of other students but they are conceived as minors or junior members. This concurs with the findings of Menon, (2005) who state that student leaders felt that in some decisions they were just like rubber stamps to indicate they were part of the decision making process. Mwangi (2013) established that students were not fully involved in university governance and that students were excluded from key decision making areas.

Equality

Concerning equality 80(58%) of the student leaders to a small extent are equal partners with university administrators in decision making about students wellbeing while 44(31.9%) to a high extent, 11(8.0%) were not sure and three (2.2%) had no response. Student leaders are members of the university community and so they have a right to equal representation in matters affecting the students directly. They play a role of mediating between the student body and the administrators for the information to move from top to bottom and vice versa. Communication need to reach the intended destination appropriately and there should be in between connection, which in this study is displayed by the role the student leaders' play. Management should consider giving more of a voice and vote to certain governing organs, particularly those closest to the student welfare, whereas also making the functioning and decision-making of these bodies more transparent. Management should establish bodies where representation is equal between students and other members of the university, or give students more time on governing bodies to present their needs and proposals. Bukaliya and Rupande (2012) assert that students are members of the university community and so they have a right to equal representation in matters affecting them directly. Student leaders have a duty to engage the university administration.

RESULTS FOR THE TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

The study sought to test the third hypothesis: H_0 , There is no significant relationship between involvement in university decision making processes and effectiveness of performance in management of student affairs. The overall model for the construct student involvement findings shows the coefficient of

determination R Square= 0.075 and R=.274 at 0.05 at significance level. The coefficient of determination indicates that 7.5% of the variation on effectiveness in managing student affairs is explained by student leader’s involvement in decision making processes. This shows that there exist a positive correlation coefficient between effectiveness in managing student’s affairs and student leader’s involvement. This relationship is positive and statistically significant at 0.05 levels of significant with a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.274 as shown in Table 2. Therefore, the involvement in decision making processes and effectiveness of performance are highly related. The null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between involvement in decision making process and effectiveness of performance in management of student affairs is rejected and the alternative accepted.

Table 2: Model Summary of Involvement and Effectiveness in Management of Student Affairs

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.274 ^a	.075	.068	.171658	.075	11.042	1	13	.001
a. Predictors: (Constant), Involvement in decision making									

The results of Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for regression coefficients are as shown in Table 3 below. The analysis results indicate that the significance of F statistics is 11.042 which is less than 4. This implies that there is a significant relationship between involvement in decision making processes and effectiveness in management of student affairs.

Table 3: ANOVA for Involvement and Effectiveness in Management of Student Affairs

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.325	1	.325	11.042	.001 ^b
	Residual	4.007	136	.029		
	Total	4.333	137			
a. Dependent Variable: Performance in managing student affairs						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Involvement in decision making						

The tests of Beta coefficient show that there is significant relationship between effectiveness in managing student affairs and student leader’s involvement which is positive but small percentage. The Beta coefficient, β shows that change in involvement in decision making by one unit can affect effectiveness in student affairs management by 0.275. The value of t shows the significance or insignificance of independent variable upon dependent variable. If the value is $t > 2$, then it means results are significant. The significance coefficient of 0.00 is significantly greater than zero since the t -statistics 9.383 is greater than 2 as shown in table 4. This demonstrates that involvement in decision making has positive effect on effectiveness in management of student affairs.

Table 4: Coefficients of Model Summary Involvement and Effectiveness in Management of Student Affairs

Coefficients ^a								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error				Beta	Tolerance
1	(Constant)	.442	.047		9.383	.000		
	Involvement in decision making	.275	.083	.274	3.323	.001	1.000	1.000
a. Dependent Variable: Performance in managing student affairs								

CONCLUSION

Student leaders as the major stakeholders in public universities are not satisfactorily involved in decision making processes as most of them do not; often attend senate and council meetings that discuss students’ welfare, hold regular

consultation with university management on matters concerning students' welfare, involved in committees that discuss student welfare and participate in policy making processes. This means that they have limited avenues to voice students' grievances and these amounts to weak representation. As such, there seems to be a gap between the students and university administration because their representatives are less effective than expected and in some cases, almost dysfunctional.

The effectiveness of student leaders is beneficial more than ever before in today's challenging university environment. As such, university system cannot afford to ignore the role student leaders' involvement in decision making could play in the effectiveness of management of student affairs. Consequently, involvement of student leaders in university decision making processes is perceived as worthwhile to enhance effective student affairs services. The moderate level of student leaders' involvement in decision making processes as revealed by this study is an indication that students do not take part in all university committees. The study reveals that there is a positive correlation between student leaders' involvement in decision making and effectiveness of performance in management of student affairs.

RECOMMENDATION

Student leaders need to be fully involved in the management of the university to strengthen their involvement in decision making. There should be forums to provide specific training to student leaders on participation in decision making processes. Measures should be put in place to enhance student leaders' involvement in the different decision making committees of the university to promoting more decisive than consultory participation from students.

REFERENCES

- Adesanoye, A. P. (2000). *A study of Students participation in School Management*. A case study of some Secondary Schools in Ikale Local Government Area of Ondo State; An unpublished M.Ed Thesis. O.A.U. Ile- Ife.
- Agili J, & Okibo W., (2015). Factors Influencing Implementation of Change in Selected Public Universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Mngement: United Kingdom*. Vol. III, Issue 8, May 6459. ISSN 2348 0386 <http://jecm.co.uk/>
- Akomolafe C. O., (2002). *Principals' behaviour and staff development in Ekiti State Secondary Schools*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis.
- Akomolafe, C.O. & Ibijola, E.Y. (2011). Students' Participation in University Governance and Organizational Effectiveness in Ekiti and Ondo States, Nigeria. *American Journal of Social and Management Sciences*. Vol.2 (2):231-236.
- Akomolafe, C.O., & Ibijola, E.Y (2011). Students' participation in university governance and organizational effectiveness in Ekiti and Ondo states, Nigeria. *American Journal of Social and Management Sciences*, 2(2): 231-236.
- Aluko, M., Odugbesan, O., Gbadamosi, L. (1997): *Business Policy and Strategy*. Remof Themes Limited (Educational Publishers), Lagos. Nigeria.
- Aina, O. I. (2007). *Alternative Modes of Financing Higher Education and implications for University Governance*. In J. B. Babalola and B. O. Emunemu (eds) *Issues on Higher Education: Research Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa*. Lagos Bolabay Publications.
- Backman, E. & Trafford, B., (2006) *Democratic Governance of Schools*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Ballantyne, J. and Spade, J. (2004) *Schools and Society: A Sociological Approach to Education*, New York: Wadsworth State University.
- Bass B.M & Bass R. (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership Theory, Research and Managerial Applications*. (4th Ed.). Free Press: New York.
- Bosire, J., Chemnjor, C., & Ngware, M. (2008). Students' Leadership in Selected Public Universities in Kenya: Disfranchised Pressure Groups or an Integral Component in University Management? *African Research Review*, 2 (3), pp. 195-221.
- Bukaliya, R. & Rupande, G. (2012). Assessing the Effectiveness of Student Representative Councils in Open and Distance Learning: A Case for the Zimbabwean Open University. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and their Implications*. Vol.7, Issue5 Article 2:03-82.
- Chevallier, T. (2000). *The Changing Conditions of Higher Education Teaching Personnel*, Sectoral Activities Programme, Working Paper (IREDU -CNRS)/ Université de Bourgogne, ILO Geneva, July.
- Ede, S.A. (2000). *Educational administration and Management*, Jos, Nigeria:

Ichedum Publication Nigeria, Ibadan, Nigeria Spectrum Books Ltd.

Kaba, M. (2000). "They Listen To Me ... But They Don't Act On It": Contradictory Consciousness and Student Participation in Decision-Making." *High School Journal*, December 5 6444.

Kamugisha, S. (2013). *The Effects of Change Management in an Organization: A case study of National University of Rwanda*. A published PhD thesis.

Kiganda, C (2009). *East African Universities Vice Chancellors Urged to shift Students Roles to Centre and make the Partners and Responsible Stakeholders*. Inter-University Council for East Africa (IUCEA). Newsletter Vol. 39 pp 8-16.

Kiprop, C. J. (2007). *Disciplinary Strategies that Public School in Kenya can adopt to curb Indiscipline in Post Caning Era*. Nelson Mandela University SA: Unpublished Thesis.

K'Okul, F (2010). Perception of Students on the Status of Guidance and Counseling in Selected Universities in Kenya for Minimizing Student Riots. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Kenyatta University.

K'Okul, F., (2010). 'Perception of Students on the Status of Guidance and Counselling in Selected Universities in Kenya for Minimizing Student Riots', Unpublished PhD thesis, Kenyatta University.

Klemenčič M. 2014). Student power in a global perspective and contemporary trends in student organizing. *Studies in Higher Education*, #5 (3), 396-411, doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.896177

Lizzio, A. & Wilson, K. (2009). Student Participation in University Governance: The Role *Studies in Higher Education*. Vol. 34. p. 69-84. Retrieved on 13 October 2011.

Luescher, T.M. (2009). Student Governance in Transition: University Democratization and Managerialism. *A Governance Approach to the Study of Student Politics and the case of the University of Cape Town*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Cape Town. From <http://www.theiryluescher.bolgsport.no/p/Publications.html>.

Luescher-Mamashela, T. M. (2010). From University Democratization to Managerialism: *The Changing Legitimation of University Governance and the Place of Students, Tertiary Education and Management*. Vol. 50. p. 259-283. Retrieved on 13th October 2011 from <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rtem20>

Luescher-Mamashela, T.M. (2013). Student Representation in University Decision Making: Good Reasons, a New Lens? *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(10), pp. 1442-1456. DOI:10.1080/03075079.2011.625496

Luescher-Mamashela, Thierry M. & Mugume, Taabo (2014). Student representation and multiparty politics in African higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 73:7, 944-515, DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2014.896183

Luescher-Mamashela, T.M. (2015). The Rising Student Activism in and Beyond the 20th Century: The contribution of Philip G. Altbach. In M. Klemenčič, S. Bergan, & R. Primožič (Eds.), *Student Engagement in Europe: Society, Higher Education and Student Governance*. Council of Europe Higher

Macharia, Mwangi J. (2015). Comrades' power: Student representation and activism in universities in Kenya. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, 3:1, 19-34. DOI: 10.14426/jsaa.v3i1.90

Menon. M. E. (2005). Students View Regarding their participation in University Governance: Implication for Distributed Leadership in Higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*. Vol. 11. p. 167-182.

MOEST. (2014). *Report to Parliament by the Minister for Education; On Unrest in Education Institutions*. Nairobi.

MOEST. (2015). *Cabinet Secretary Meeting with Vice Chancellors over Students'*. Nairobi

Oanda, Ibrahim O. (2016). The evolving nature of student participation in university governance in Africa: an overview of policies, trends and emerging issues. In: Luescher, T., Klemenčič, M., Jowi, J.O. (Eds.) *Student Politics in Africa: Representation and Activism*. Cape Town and Maputo: African Minds.

Oni, Adesoji A. and Adetoro, Jeremiah A. (2015). The effectiveness of student involvement in decisionmaking and university leadership: A comparative analysis of 12 universities in South-west Nigeria. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, 7:5 09-81. DOI: 10.14426/jsaa.v3i1.93

Obiero, N.A. (2012). The involvement of Student Leaders in the Governance of University. *An Implication of Shared Leadership*. Unpublished M.ED Thesis, University of Oslo.

Republic of Kenya (2012a). *Kenya Vision 2030: A Globally Competitive and Prosperous Kenya*.

Republic of Kenya (2014). *Report of the Vice Chancellors' Committee on Causes of Disturbances/Riots in Public Universities*. Nairobi: Government Printer

Republic of Kenya. (2012). *Universities Act No. 42* In Kenya Gazette Supplement No. 192 (Act No.42). Nairobi: Kenya Government Printers.

Sarua. (2009). Leadership Challenges for Higher Education in Southern Africa: *Southern Africa Regional Universities Association Leadership Dialogue Series*, Vol. 5 No. 5 6443.

Sifuna, D. N. (2012). Leadership in Kenyan Public Universities and the Challenges of Autonomy and Academic Freedom: *An Overview of Trends since Independence*. JHEA/RESA Vol. 54, No.5

Sifuna, D.N. (2010). Some Reflections on the Expansion and Quality of Higher Education in Public Universities in Kenya, *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, Vol. 59, No. 4.

Wang, J. & Salo, T. (2009). *Council of Graduate Students (COGS) Representatives Guide*. <http://www.cogs.umn.edu/pdfs/ProgramRepGuide.pdf>. Retrieved 15/5/2016.