Perception of Corporate Governance Practices at the University Of Nairobi

Rachel Muga Monyoncho[1]

This study aimed at determining how corporate governance practices of public universities, impact on decision making and leadership processes. Public universities are complex institutions and the expectations of their stakeholders are continuously changing and increasing. This is especially in terms of quality of service and academic performance. It is also known that management reforms and leadership capability are continuously become critical in institutional capacity building. This is a case study of University of Nairobi carried in 2004. A sample size of 200 respondents was selected The study showed that poor governance structure resulted in bad leadership and bureaucratic decision making. This in turn negatively impacted on the quality of services in the university. The paper recommends a review of governance structure, with a view of improving the management processes and decision making at the university. It further recommends improvement of communication and capacity building of University Administrators on leadership and management skills. The results of this study had a heavy implication on the overall management and governance of public institutions, especially the introduction of competitive selection and appointment of Vice-chancellors and senior university staff. This has since greatly enhanced the performance of public universities in Kenya and contributed to their competitive positioning in the region and the continent

Key Words: *Perception, Corporate governance, Practices, university of Nairobi*

---

[1] University Of Nairobi School Of Business *rmonyoncho@gmail.com*

Introduction

Corporate governance is a topic that has attracted a lot of attention both locally and internationally. The concept Corporate Governance is not a new one, it is as old as management itself. Corporate governance refers to the ethical framework within which management decisions are taken (kuiiter, 1996). It is a way of ensuring that shareholders and other stake holder value is enhanced. It refers to the manner in which power is shared and exercised in the process of managing organizational resources. Organizational structure plays a very important role in organizational effectiveness (Osborne, 1997). This is because it determines how work is divided and coordinated in addition to reinforcing accountability. An organization structure also determines the effectiveness and efficiency of and organization. Institutions of higher learning are a very important component of a countries human development strategy. Education is a basic human right and therefore a basic need (Ankumah,1996).

Perkings, (1978) suggests that autonomy or self governance is the key ingredient in the ideology of institutions of higher learning. Corporate governance envisages the freedom to make decisions on broad and complex issues without reference to external non-university entities (Sawyesrr, 1999). Regardless of the nature and type of organization, structure is central to achieving organizational objectives (Jeuch and Glueck, 1998). With the growing number of public universities in the country, the size, scope, importance and cost of higher education has brought increased pressures for accountability from funding organizations. The issue therefore is to balance between autonomy, too much of which may compromise the universities' responsiveness to the society and its stakeholders and accountability, too much of which may destroy the academic ethos. There is however a difference between academic freedom and university autonomy. According to Berdahl (1991): "Academic freedom is that freedom of the individual scholar in his or her teaching and research to pursue truth wherever it seems to lead without fear of punishment or termination of employment."

Sifuna (1998), academic freedom is therefore more directed at the individual, whereas campus autonomy operates at the institutional level. It is important to note that the ideology of autonomy and academic freedom has been very contentious issue in Kenyan universities (Onyango, 2003). The prevailing political system and the nature of national governance greatly impacts on governance at the universities. This is because democracy by its very nature guarantees autonomy while authoritarian form of government stifles the concepts of autonomy and academic freedom (Magrath 1996).

Government is involved in public universities in the area of management. It has been appointing key university administrators and members of

95|

university council. It also directs the number of students to be admitted and determines the terms and conditions of staff. For the purposes of this paper, we will focus our study on the University of Nairobi, which is the first and the oldest in the country. University of Nairobi can be assumed to be representative of other public universities.

Public Universities have experienced a series of student and recently staff unrests. Examples of these have been experienced at the University of Nairobi's various campuses including Kikuyu campus, Upper Kabete campus and Kenyantta National Hospital campus. In all the cases, the students and in some cases, staff demanded the removal of the principles of these colleges. The scenario has been repeated in other public universities in the country as well.

An article, on a similar strike at Maseno University, that appeared in The Daily Nation of 6th July 2003 observes: "The closure of Maseno University last week following student unrest illustrates the fact that institutions of higher learning remain steeped in mismanagement and lack of academic freedom". Several studies have been done both locally and internationally in the area of corporate governance in public universities. Some of these studies include: Sifuna, (1998), Swayerr (1999) and Knott and Pyane (2001).

The study seeks to achieve the following major objective:

To determine how the corporate governance practices of public universities, as perceived by the key stakeholders, impact on the decision making and leadership process.

This paper was significance in various respects. By examining the structure, decision making and leadership process, we will attempt to identify existing gaps that need to be addressed be order to improve the corporate governance at the university. The key findings will be of use to public universities in other parts of the world, other public institutions of learning, the Government of Kenya through the ministry of education, donor community and Commission of Higher Education (CHE). Other National and International Agencies will also find this study useful in making informed decisions that affect the institutions of higher learning not only in Kenya but also in other parts of Africa. The paper will be useful in providing important information that would form the basis for change in public institutions of higher learning.

Literature Review

Governance is concerned with the processes, systems, practices and procedures (formal and informal) that govern institutions. It is the manner in which these rules and regulations are applied and the subsequent relationships that these rules create. In an institutional framework it addresses the leadership role. Corporate governance refers to the manner in which power is exercised in the management of economic and social resources. It is a vital ingredient in the maintenance of a

dynamic balance between the need for order and equality in the society, the efficient production and delivery of goods and services, accountability in the use of power, protection of human rights and freedom and the maintenance of an organized corporate framework within which individuals can contribute fully towards finding innovative solutions to common problems.

Corporate governance is therefore the manner in which power is exercised in the stewardship of the corporation's total portfolio of assets and resources with the objective of achieving stakeholder satisfaction in the context of its corporate mission. It is concerned with creating a balance between economic and social goals between individual and communal goals, while encouraging efficient use of resources, accountability in the use of power and stewardship and to align the interests of individuals, corporations and society.

Corporate governance creates a process of value-creating and value adding. In so doing, it ensures firstly, that, the board has set strategic objectives and implemented proper management structures to achieve these goals. Secondly that the structures work to maintain corporate integrity, reputation and responsibility towards all stakeholders. Simply put, corporate governance refers to the establishment of an appropriate legal, economic and institutional environment and allows corporations to thrive to enhance stakeholder value, human development, while remaining

conscious of their primary responsibilities to the environment and society.

Institutions have a vital role to play in promoting economic development and social progress. They are responsible for providing employment, goods, services and infrastructure. The efficiency and accountability of institutions has become a matter of both public and private interest. The Commonwealth Association for Corporate governance states "The globalization of the market place has ushered an era where traditional dimensions of corporate governance defined within the local laws, regulations and national priorities are becoming increasingly challenged by global circumstances and events.

Corporate governance is therefore important to create competitive and efficient organizations, enhance accountability and performance of those entrusted with managing these organizations and promote efficient and effective use of organizational resources. Without efficient organizations, the country can not create wealth, without which economies will stagnate and collapse. There is need for well governed enterprises and institutions that remain viable, sustainable and competitive in the global market place.

State owned corporations refer to corporations in which the government is a main shareholder. The main features of such corporations are complexities arising ownership, political and structural issues. Such complexities include among other

things: elaborate set of relationships ranging from the CEO, to the board, parliament and government ministries; the need to satisfy a complex and conflicting range of political, economic and social objectives; diverse nature of stakeholders; absence of annual general meetings; and enabling legislation.

The national capacity to compete in the global market depends on the competitiveness of individual corporations and their ability to produce goods and services that meet international standards. This in turn depends on the board's ability to apply focused intelligence and knowledge to push and integrate their corporation into the competitive global market. Efficient Corporation can only be established and developed by responsible, creative and innovative boards.

A report of a seminar on implications for public sector reforms was held in 1997 at the European Center for Development Policy Management, observed that the political and administrative changes taking place in Africa have profound implications for African institutions and policies. It further noted that, the civil systems have to respond to these changes, especially in terms of the roles expected from politicians, governments and civil society.

According to Kent, (1998), four main issues arise as public universities strive to carry out their missions: Push for participatory governance, Mandate for efficient management, The urgency to adopt to a changing environment and

Salience of effective leadership. Like any other organization, public universities are complex, messy and strewn with ambiguities. Skeptism about the ability of public institutions to change is not uncommon. The society continues to demand better quality and ample coverage. In a study of three Mexican public universities, Kent emphasizes that the basic fundamental purpose of modernization of public universities is recovering the basic function required of a university. In Mexico, reform came as a result of conflict resulting from institutional collapse, resulting from collapse of internal control systems and the crumble of their external legitimacy relationships. He concludes that management reform and renewal of leadership are crucial preconditions for rebuilding institutional capacity. These are periods when structures lose footing and cultures evolve, old leaders and values are questioned and new ones revealed.

It takes successful leaders to push the process in new a direction and grasp the opportunity to institutionalize new values. The leaders will have to , avoid the temptation to subordinate the need for experimentation to the pressures for increased political control. They will also need to distribute emergent capacity for innovation more uniformly throughout the organization. Capitalize the experiences of academics who have participated in recent reforms for promotion into leadership positions and recruit new talent to begin supplanting members of the old guard. Other related research work has been done locally and in other parts of

Africa on Corporate Governance in Public universities. Such work include among others:

Sifuna, (1998) investigated issues in public university governance and its impact on the quality of education and the effect of government involvement in the management of universities. He found that, quality of higher education can be maintained through credible systems based on improved management and planning. In another study, Inter-university Council of East Africa, (2002/3), found that African Universities and their Leadership need to be re-engineered to make them more focused, efficient and effective. That there is an urgent need and demand for Leadership and Management training for Leaders and Senior Administrators of various universities in the region. Sawyerr, (1999), studied the various challenges facing African Universities. He established that challenges facing the universities are complex and are not separate from the complexity of the environment within which higher education is undertaken.

This include low participation rates, inequitable access, reduced resources, limited capacity of the state to make its own policies as a result of pressure from powerful transnational commercial interests. He established that there are no easy choices and cautions governments and donor community against insisting upon one-sided, simplistic, usually economic prescriptions for dealing with complex problems facing African Universities. He calls for humility on the part of experts and openness to all ideas by

policy makers, institutional and political leaders to mobilize and act decisively once social consensus has been established.

He concludes that autocratic decrees by governments, self-serving technical and policy advice by experts and agencies cannot be part of a long-term solution to the problems of higher education in Africa. Knott and Payne, (2001), explored whether the state governance structure affects the resources allocated and activities undertaken by the universities. The key finding of this study was that productivity and resources were higher at universities with a statewide board that is decentralized and with members are not primarily appointed by the state governor.

Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework that informed the study is Institutional theory (Scott, 2004). Institutional theory focuses on the deeper and more resilient aspects of social structure. It considers the processes by which structures, including systems, procedures, rules, norms, and routines, become established as authoritative guidelines for social behavior (Scott, 2004). Institutional theorists assert that the institutional environment can strongly influence the development of formal structures in an organization. Innovative structures that improve technical efficiency in organizations are legitimized in the environment.

Meyer and Rowan (1977), argue that Organizations adopt the vocabularies of structure prevalent in their

environment such as specific job titles, procedures, and organizational roles. These formal structures of legitimacy can, however, reduce efficiency and hinder the organization's competitive position in their environment. The other theory that informs this paper is the Stakeholder Theory. Freeman (1994), defines stakeholders as: any group or individual who can affect, or is affected by, the achievement of a corporations purpose. The focus of the stakeholder theory is articulated in two core questions formulated in the theory are: what is the purpose of the firm and what responsibility does management have to stakeholders?

Methodology

The research design is a case study based on the University of Nairobi (Winegardener, 1998). A case study was considered appropriate in this study because The University of Nairobi is the first public university to be established in the country. Compared to the other public universities it is the largest and data collected here would be assumed to be representative of other public universities. It can therefore be assumed to be representative of public universities in Kenya.

Primary qualitative data was collected about the University of Nairobi through structured interviews using interview guide, which was mainly based on the perception of individuals interviewed. Data was collected by the researcher with the help of one research assistant and using an interview guide attached in appendix 1. The interview guide consisted of seven sections as follows:

Section A- personal information
Section B-General issues
Section C- Organization structure
Section D- Leadership process
Section E-Decision making
Section F-Role of government

A sample size of total 200 was selected and was equally distributed between the various Campuses targeting equal number of respondents of the key stakeholders as follows: fifty academic members of staff, thirty non-academic members of staff and one hundred and twenty students. Respondents were selected using convenience sampling method, and will be from among people who have interacted with the university for not less than two years.

DATA ANALYSIS AND Results

Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean scores, which were used to analyze data involving rating scales. A rating scale of 1 to 4 was used, where 1 represented the lowest rating and 4 the highest rating. Content analysis and percentages have been used to analyze open ended questions where the respondents were free to express there opinion. The data was organized in five main sections, Key problems affecting the university, Governance structure, leadership process, decision making and role of government.

Key Problems Facing The University

Table 1: Key Problems Facing The University

PROBLEM	% of Reponses
Resource allocation	39.2
Policy issues	21.6
Leadership	13.9
Politics	7.9
Corruption	7.3
Others	10.1
TOTAL	**100**

Table 1 shows that resource allocation emerged as the major problem with a percentage score of 39.2% followed by policy issues at 21.6%. Only 7.3% of the respondents saw corruption as a problem. Although leadership also came quite frequently, resource allocation and policies are a reflection of the nature of leadership.

Table 2: Reasons For The Problems

REASON	% Response
Poor administration	41.2
Resource allocation	11.1
Politics	10.8
Policy issues	10.5
Poor leadership	7.6
Bureaucracy	4.5
Corruption	3.0
Others	10.7
TOTAL	**100**

In table 2 , 41.1% of the respondents perceive poor administration as the reason why the above mentioned problem is a problem. Resource allocation with a score of 11.2 , bad -- policies and politics scoring 10.5% and 10.8%. Only 3% of the respondents thought corruption was responsible for the problems.

Governance Structure of The University

TABLE 3: Is the current governance structure responsible for problems at the university?

RESPONSE	%RESPONSE
YES	91.49
NO	8.51
TOTAL	100

An overwhelming 91.49% of the respondents agreed that the governance structure is to blame for the problems at the university. This is because the respondents do not seem to have a lot of confidence in the appointment and selection of members of the main governance body which is the council. The members of the council are also perceived to be politically correct individuals who tend to represent the interest of the government.

Extent to Which The Current Governance Structure Is Appropriate To The Achievement Of The Objectives Of The University

This question had a mean score of 1.89 and standard deviation of 1.5311. This indicates shows that the current governance structure is not appropriate for the university to achieve its objectives. Some of the reasons for this could be the composition of the university council, the main decision making body of the university is largely seen to be political appointees to fulfill the desires of those they represent. There was a general consensus by the respondents that governance structure is responsible for the problems of the university. There were a few people who thought otherwise. Of those who thought otherwise gave the following reasons as the cause:

Tribalism, political interference in leadership selection and appointments, outdated rules and regulations, mismanagement, bad student attitude and lack of commitment

Table 4: Recommendations To Solve The Above Problems

Recommendation	% response
Improve communication	19.6
Make university autonomous	6.2
Review polices on academic programs	7.7
Appoint leadership on merit	5.7
Automate university processes	4.6
Enhance accountability	6.8
Others	49.6
TOTAL	**100**

In table 4 19.1% of the respondents felt that improving communication would greatly resolve the problems at the university. Only 6.8% suggested enhancement of accountability as a solution.

Leadership Process

Table 5: Criteria For Selection Of Leaders

REASON	% Response
Political considerations	28.1
Academic qualification	22.8
Tribalism	14.0
Favoritism	14.0
Nepotism	10.5
Corruption and inefficiency	10.5
TOTAL	100

28.1% of respondents feel that political considerations form the main criteria for selection of leaders as shown in table 5, 22.8% perceive academic qualification to form the criteria. Only 10.5% perceive Nepotism , corruption and inefficiency as a criteria for selection.

On how much weight is given to merit when selecting leaders, the respondents felt that very little weight is given to merit. A means score of 1.61 and standard deviation of 1.57 indicates that not much weight is given to merit in selection and appointment of leaders. They feel that political correctness gets top consideration followed by academic qualification. Nepotism and Tribalism was also mentioned severally.

Table 6: Effectiveness Of The Process Of Selecting Leaders

Response	Not effective	Somewhat effective	Effective	Very effective	Mean score	Standard deviation
How effective is the process of appointing leaders	47	39	6	1	1.58	1.448
Extent to which the process is in line with the university of Nairobi act	34	38	7	5	1.8	1.319

In table 6 , 47 respondents felt that the process is ineffective, 39 felt it was somewhat effective. This tells us that there is some discomfort with the current process. A mean score of 1.58 and 1.8 and standard deviation of 1.448 and 1.319 respectively indicate that the current process is not effective and that is not in line with laid down procedures and the university of Nairobi Act. Senior administrators are normally appointed by the university council, which largely perceived to be under a lot influence of the government.

Table 7: Recommendations For Change In The Practice Of Appointing Leaders

Recommendation	% Response
Order of merit through independent bodies	47.4
Advertise posts	14.9
Transparency	17.5
Involve stake holders	9.1
Root out Nepotism	3.9
Others	7.2
Total	100

As shown in table 7, 47.4% respondents recommended that appointment on merit by an independent recruitment bodies should be introduced. 14.9% suggest that positions should be advertised 17.5% would like to see more transparency in the process. 3.9% however felt that nepotism should be eliminated from the process.

DECISION MAKING

TABLE 8: DECISION MAKING

Response	Very small	Significant	Great	Very great	Mean score	Standard deviation
Extent to which decisions are made according to procedure	33	39	14	2	1.83	1.303
Extent to which the University of Nairobi act effective for decision making	36	44	7		1.67	0.763

A mean score of 1.83 and 1.67 and standard deviation of 1.303 and 0.763 in table 8 show that the respondents perceive decisions not being made according to the rules and regulations. Only 2% however perceive the decisions to be according to the procedures. Despite the high level of dissatisfaction, there is still a small remnant of people who feel otherwise.

TABLE 9: IMPACT OF CURRENT DECISION MAKING PROCESS ON LEVEL OF ACCOUNTABILIY

IMPACT	%RESPONSE
No accountability	51.4
Haphazard decision making	20.3
Lack of good communication	14.2
Bureaucracy	12.2
Non performance	1.4
Total	100

51.4% of the respondents felt the current decision making process has resulted to no accountability, while 20.3% feel it has resulted to haphazard decision making. 1.4% perceive it to contribute to poor performance.

Table 10: Recommended Changes on Decision Making Process

RECOMMENDATION	%RESPONSE
Involve key stake holders	27.6
Decentralize minor decisions	18.3
Review current procedures	11.9
Follow laid down procedures	6.6
Introduce controls	5.3
Quicken implementation process	3.9
Use recruitment advisory services	3.9
Others	22.5

Table 10 shows 27.6% f the respondents feel that key stakeholders should be involved. while 18.3% feel that minor decisions should be decentralized. 11.9% number feel that the current procedures should be reviewed. For recruitment decisions 3.9% number feel that independent recruitment services should be used.

Role of Government

Table 11: Impact Of The Of Government On The Effectiveness Of The University

IMPACT	% RESPONSES
Resulted to poor state of the university	46.1
Resulted low morale of lecturers and students	18.6
Lack of accountability	16.2
Resulted to tribalism	5.8
Corruption	1.2
Improved financial management	1.2
Others	10.5
Total	100

Table 11 shows that 46.1% of the respondents perceive the government to have contributed to the current poor state of the university. !8.6% see it to be have resulted to low morale of lecturers and students. 1.2% however feel that the government has contributed to improved financial management.

Table 12: Reason For Above Responses

REASON	%RESPONSE
Interference	46.1
Assist with loans	21.1
Unrest	17.1
Corruption	6.6
Slow down of policy implementation	2.6
Tribalism	2.6
Change of syllabus	1.3
Freedom of expression	1.3
Effectiveness of management	1.3
Total	**100**

As indicated on table 12, 46.1% of respondents see the government as interfering on the affairs of the university. 1.3% feel it has contributed to effective management of university

Extent To Which The Current Role Of Government Is In Line With The University Of Nairobi Act

The mean score here is 1.82 and a standard deviation of 1.367, which shows that the current role of government is not in line with the university of Nairobi act. Most respondents blamed the government's for the poor state of the university. A good number felt the government has contributed to lack of accountability and low morale. A few, however, thought that the government has contributed to improved financial status. The government is seen to interfere with the affairs of the university.

Table 16: How The Government Should Be Involved With The University

HOW	% RESPONSES
Provision of funds	55.4
Supervise performance of university	7.6
Provide policy guidelines	5.9
Intervene in times of problems	3.4
Supervise the appropriation of funds	3.3
Others	24.4
Total	100

55.4% of the respondents feel the government should concentrate in the provision of funds and 7.6% feel it should oversee the performance of the university. Only 3.3% feel that the government should oversee the appropriation of funds.

TABLE 17: RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

RECOMMENDATION	%RESPONSES
Make university autonomous	32.2
Provide funding	28.3
President should not appoint Chancellor and VCs	5.1
Be more transparent	5.0
Involve students	1.0
Others	7.1
Total	100

32.2% of the respondents felt that the government should be made autonomous as indicated on table 17. Another key element coming out here is that Chancellors and Vice Chancellors should not be presidential appointees. 1% of respondents feel that the government should involve students in key decisions.

SUMMARY DISCUSSIONS OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

From the findings it is evident that corporate governance practices are characterized by the following main features: Inappropriate policies and procedures, poor resource planning and allocation, poor management practices, poor communication and corrupt practices. Poor governance practices have resulted to various problems at the university, which include poor administration, inappropriate governance structure and politics.

Decision making has been affected such that decisions take too long to be made and even when they are made, implementation is normally delayed, resulting to general inefficiency. Some of the decisions involved decisions on courses offered and student intake among others. Module II program has been singled out as one of those decisions which has not been given adequate thought. This has resulted to straining the already over stretched resources.

It also emerged that policies and procedures are not always followed especially in selecting and appointment of leaders. This process is largely seen to be based on political considerations other than merit. This has resulted to bad leadership practices and subsequently low morale of staff and students. The government is seen more as playing an interfering rather than facilitating. The leadership process as represented by the process of appointment selection of leaders has also been singled as not being very transparent.

These findings agree very closely with Sifuna D. (1998).He observes that not all

academicians who are outstanding scholars can make effective administrators. Selection by voting was feared to create an electioneering situation that could seriously harm the academic and research mission of the university. The role of the views of the government seemed to dominate in council deliberations and hence easily steer the universities affairs in government's favor. The system of university council governance has seriously undermined universities autonomy and academic freedom.

The method of appointing leaders also frustrates the process of decision making. As sifuna(1998) denotes, soon after appointment most administrators quickly surround themselves with intellectual supporters "who help them to identify their enemies, real or imagined". Lack of appropriate administrative culture in public universities has led to concentration of real decisions in the office of the vice chancellors to the extent that in their absence the vice-chancellors cannot take decisions. The vice chancellors have therefore been relegated to a subordinate or sycophantic advisors to the chancellors and vice-chancelors.

In Sifuna's study, he found that senates did not function as stipulated I the university acts. The erosion of their powers has largely to do with the composition of these senates. The university of Nairobi act provides for autonomy. To some extent, the university has enjoyed some degree of autonomy in student admission and staff recruitment.

This lack of autonomy has resulted to the apparent deterioration of the quality of education and the overall function of the university. A few respondents however felt

that since the government involvement with the university is justified since they provide funding for university programs. Knott and Payne (2001), found that the strengths and weaknesses of different higher education governance structures are mediated by historical and geographical cultures and economic conditions. These features play a very important role in the university performance. As a result public universities face stiff competition from well developed systems of private institutions. In the west however public universities dominate the higher education landscape. They also found out that universities with decentralized systems seem to have more resources and are better managed than those with centralized systems. This seems to reflect the feeling of most respondents that minor decisions should be decentralized to quicken decision making.

Limitations of the Study

The study faced several limitations, the major one being the timing. Data was collected at a time when both lecturers and students were busy with exams. As a result, any of them were reluctant to participate as it may not have been a priority, hence the response rate was only 50%. The nature of the study was also seen to be very sensitive, in some instances the sources of the research was suspect to most respondents. In some instances some respondents sought to conceal their identity by not giving the correct occupation, for example, some lecturers indicated they were students. The study was based on individual perception at a time when unrests at the university was heightened. This could give room for individual biases and some level of subjectivity.

Recommendations for Further Studies

For future study, I would recommend the study of trends in other public universities. The study could even be extended to private universities and a comparative study done to determine if differences exist in governance practices in public and private university. The study of corporate governance practices in other institutions of learning both private and public is also another interesting area of study. There were aspects that were not under investigation but consistently came up in the study. These included the issue of HIV/AIDS and other malpractices by students like prostitution and crime. These could also form interesting study areas where one would attempt to determine the existence, courses and extent of these social issues in our institutions of higher learning.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

From the results of the study, there is need to review the current governance structure with a view of improving operations and decision making and hence efficiencies at the university. The possibility of making public universities autonomous and independent of government interference and especially in appointment and selection of leaders. Building leadership and management capability is going to be critical going forward. The need to develop and leadership curriculum for the training and development those already in leadership and those aspiring to leadership positions at the universities cannot be over emphasized. When appointing and selecting of leaders, more focus should be given to leadership, managerial capability and past experience instead of academic qualification alone.

The university administration may consider reviewing the current policies, processes and procedures to ensure they are current and in line with the needs of the university. Decision making especially involving minor decisions need to be decentralized in order to improve the process and efficiency. The area of communication needs to be addressed. There is need to enhance communication at all levels to reduce the level of uncertainty at the campus. In so doing key stake holders in the various processes need to be consulted and involved when making decisions that impact on them. Developing and implementing a communication strategy would greatly enhance communication at all levels. This includes communication on the mission, vision, strategy and corporate objectives.

Conclusion

Since the study was done in 2004, it is worthy to note that lot of recommendations in this study have since been implemented. This includes competitive appointment of Vice Chancellors and other administrative and academic staff. The study was an eye opener to the governance problems in our public universities. The University has since reviewed the governance structure and attained some level of autonomy from the government.

References

Ankumah E.A. (1996). Good governance and African charter on Human and people's rights, African legal Aid, African Commison of Human Rights. London.

Aosa E. (1998). The Leadership challenge facing Africa". The Journal of certified public accountants of Kenya. January-March pp. 24-26.

Aosa E. (1992). Management in Africa: Contextual factors and their influence, Journal of African Financial and Economic Development press.

Bartol K.M. and Matin D.C. (1991). Management. McGraw-Hill Inc.

Bate T. and Zethmi C.P. (1993). Management functional strategy. 2nd Edition. Richard D. Irwin Inc, U.S.A.

Belaso J.A, Hampton D.R. and Price K.F. (1995): Management Today, New York: John Miley and Sons, Inc.

Berdahl R. (1991), "Autonomy and accountability in US higher education", In Neave, G. and van Vught, F.A.(eds.), Prometheus Bound. The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe, Pergamon Press plc

Boven T.V. (1995) Human rights and emerging concept of good governance, University of Limberg press.

Chanon D. (1999), Encyclopedic Dictionary of Strategic management, Blackwell London.

Corkery J and Osborne D, (1997), Governance and policy formulation: implications for public service reform.

Heinman T. Scott, W.G. and Connor P.E. (1992): Managing the Modern Organization. Hoghton Miffin company.

Jauch L. and Glueck W. (1998), Business Policy and Strategic Management (5th Edition). MacGraw-Hill Inc.

Kanter R.M. (1997), On the frontiers of Management, Havard Business school press, Boston.

Kent R. (1998). Institutional reform in Mexican Higher Education, Washington D.C.

Knott J. and Payne A. (2001). The impact of State Governance Structures on Higher Education Resources and Research activity.

Koontz H. and O'Donnel C. (1996): Principles of management, New York, McGraw-Hill Inc.

Kuiiter A, (1996) Good governance for Africa, Maashrich.

Kwasi P.(2002) Persistent Corporate Governance deficit in the Ghanaian Public Sector:

agenda for reform. Ghana center of for Democratic Development.

Magrath P. (1996). The Future of Public Universities.

Massie J.L. (1996): Essentials of Management. Prentice hall. Inc. Englewood Cliffs, U.S.A.

Meyer, J.W &Rowan B. (1977). Institutional Organizationa: formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Scociology, issue 83, pp340-363.

Mills L. Governance, CVultural Change and Environment. Journal of Modern African Studies, Vol. 30.

Moore F.C. (1992). The Management of Organizations. New York, John Mitley and Sons Inc.

Onyango D. (2003)Divide and Rule in Academia, Daily Nation, 21st August, 2003

Osborne D. (1997). Action for better governance: the role of donors, IDS bulletin, vol. 24, p 67-73.

Perkins J. A. 1978. Autonomy. The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education, Vol. 2A, pp. 578-83. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Private Sector Corporate Governance Trust, (1999), Principles for Corporate Governance in Kenya.

Private Sector for Corporate Governance Trust, (2002), "Guidance for Members", Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.

Private sector corporate governance Trust, (2002)"Guidelines for Good corporate

Governance in State owned corporations, Oakland Media Services.

Richards M.D. and Nedler W.A. (1992). Readings in Management, Cincinnati, Ohio, South Western Publication Co.

Rue L.W. and Byars L.L. (1992). Management Skills and Applications. 6th edition. Richard Irwin Inc. U.S.A.

Sawyerr, A. (1999), "Challenges facing African Universities".

Scott, W. Richard 2004. "Institutional theory" P408-14 in Encyclopedia of Social Theory, George Ritzer, ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sifuna D. (1998), "The Governance of Kenyan Public Universities."

Thomson J.L (1990). Strategic management Awareness and Change. Chapman and Hall, London.

University of Nairobi website www://uonbi.ac.ke

Winegardener, K. E, (1998). The case study Method of Scholarly Research. The Graduate School of America, Minneapolis, MN.