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Kenya has 42 ethnic groups. The importance of tribal affiliations in the culture has led to reports of ethnic inequality in job distributions, service provision and resource allocation. Higher education institutions (HED) have not been left out in this. This descriptive/exploratory study focused on government/public HEIs with the aim of knowing the perceptions of students regarding the allocation of on-campus housing and how ethnicity influences the process, if any. The sample was made up of 100 students currently enrolled at a public university in Nairobi, Kenya.

The researcher used nonrandom purposeful sampling because there were specific characteristics that the sample was to possess: had to be students at a public university (Kenyatta University in this case) and had to be module-I students. The study utilized a survey containing both closed and open ended questions as the means of data collection. The data were analyzed descriptively and then organized in themes/categories. Findings and the demographic data are presented in graphs and tables. This qualitative inquiry sought to collect and document the views of the students.

Findings from the analyzed data include:

• There is a perception of unequal distribution of campus housing
• Students report a lack of confidence in the system of allocation for campus housing

• Students report a preference that their names are not used in the application for housing because of the fear that knowledge of their ethnic identity may reduce their chances for obtaining housing.
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Part 1

Introduction and Background

Introduction

Kenya is a country of 42 ethnic groups. The major groups consist of the Kikuyu (6.6m), the Luhya (5.3m), the Kalenjin (4.9m), the Luo (4m) and the Akamba (3.8m) (British Broadcasting Corporation, 2010). The country won its independence from the British in 1964. The first president, a Kikuyu named Jomo Kenyatta was succeeded by Daniel Moi, who is a Kalenjin. The current president is Mwai Kibaki, also from the Kikuyu community. The struggle in tribal dominance is reflected in these cyclical changes.

Kenya has seven public universities: Nairobi, Kenyatta, Maseno, Moi Eldoret, Jomo Kenyatta University of science and technology, Egerton and Masinde Muliro Universities. This study focuses one of the public universities because these are government institutions that serve students from all socio-economic, ethnic and religious backgrounds. Students who attain the required university entry points in the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) are eligible to be admitted to the public universities. The students’ regionality or ethnicity is not relevant; all public universities admit students from all over the country. A portion of these students’ study is funded by the government and the Higher Education Loan’s Board (HELB).

Table 1.1 displays the list of Kenya’s seven public universities and the years that they were established. The first to be established was the University of Nairobi in 1970 and the latest was Masinde Muliro University in 2006.
Table 1.1:

*Kenya Public Universities and their Establishment Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Universities</th>
<th>Year Established</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Nairobi</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi University</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Rift Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyatta university</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egerton University</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Rift Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture &amp; Technology</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maseno University</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Nyanza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masinde Muliro University</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Western</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


On the contrary, according to a newspaper article on Kenya’s Standard Digital, Robert Nyasato reports that the current Kenya’s president, Mwai Kibaki, chartered the ‘13th’ public university on February 6th, 2013. These additional 6 universities may be considered as ‘political gifts’ because in some cases, presidents just ‘throw out’ charters to colleges and technical colleges that are constituent of the main public universities. In this same article, for instance, the Foreign Affairs minister, Professor Sam Ongeri thanks the President for ‘giving the Kisii people’ a university. “Ongeri and Obure thanked the president for heading to the request of the Gusii people to give them a university.” ([http://goo.gl/FvK0H](http://goo.gl/FvK0H)).

According to Wikipedia, the ‘other’ Kenyan public universities are actually 15. They are: Dedan Kimathi University of Technology, 2012; Chuka University, 2012; Technical University of Kenya, 2013; Technical University of Mombasa, 2013; Pwani University, 2013; Kisii university, 2013; University of Eldoret, 2013; Maasai Mara University, 2013; Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, 2013; Laikipia University, 2013; South Eastern Kenya University, 2013; Multimedia University

Because the number of students gaining admission into the public universities is on the increase, the scramble for university resources is inevitable. Students’ campus housing is one of the strained resources. This study will explore students’ perceptions about factors influencing the allocation of students’ housing.

**Problem Statement**

Kenya is a developing country. Like other African countries, there is extensive massification in Kenya’s higher education system. The number of students joining university in Kenya is on the increasing. Kinyanjui (2007) foretells that

“The number of students seeking university entry by 2015 will range from 160,000 to 180,000. The number of those who will miss the opportunity to join university in 2015 will be over 100,000, unless additional opportunities for access are created” (p.2).

With the increasing number comes scarcity of resources, prompting stiff competition for the same.

Table 1.2 displays the growth rate of student populations in Kenya’s public universities. Data was collected between 2003 and 2008.
Table 1.2:

Growth in Public University Student Enrolment 2003-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>26,711</td>
<td>33,705</td>
<td>36,339</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyatta</td>
<td>15,775</td>
<td>15,683</td>
<td>18,593</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi</td>
<td>10,447</td>
<td>12,145</td>
<td>14,832</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egerton</td>
<td>9,352</td>
<td>8,498</td>
<td>12,467</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jomo Kenyatta</td>
<td>4,657</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>7,962</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maseno</td>
<td>5,607</td>
<td>4,704</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masinde Muliro</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,549</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,677</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,103</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The data displayed in the table above indicate that between 2003 and 2008, Jomo Kenyatta University had the greatest increase in student enrolment (70.9%), followed by Moi University (42%). The least increased was registered by Maseno University (1.4%). By 05/31/2011, Kenyatta University boasted of a student population of over 32,000 students (Kenyatta University, 2011.)

Sifuna (2010) was concerned that the expansion of the university infrastructure did not keep pace with the increase in student enrollment. This has strained boarding facilities, laboratories, lecture halls and libraries. The consequence of massification has been a rise in the demand for campus housing. Further, Sifuna found that there is congestion in residence halls where rooms designed for two students accommodate as many as six students or more (p. 5). In light of these demands, is there equity? Do all students have equal opportunity in the allocation of campus housing?

**Purpose of the Study**

The University World News (2010) stated that in Kenyan Universities, “most vice-chancellors had been appointed along tribal lines or on the basis of dominant ethnic
affinities in the regions where universities were located, rather than on merit”. Table 1.3 displays the distribution of ethnic groups in Kenya, per province, according to a 1994 report by the Kenya Central Bureau of Statistics.

Table 1.3:

**Distribution of Dominant Ethnic Groups in Kenya by Province**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Total provincial population</th>
<th>Dominant Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>1,324,570</td>
<td>The Kikuyu</td>
<td>428,775</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>3,112,053</td>
<td>The Kikuyu</td>
<td>2,919,730</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>1,829,191</td>
<td>The Mijikenda</td>
<td>994,098</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>3,768,677</td>
<td>The Akamba</td>
<td>2,031,704</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Eastern</td>
<td>371,391</td>
<td>The Ogaden</td>
<td>133,536</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyanza</td>
<td>3,507,162</td>
<td>The Luo</td>
<td>2,030,278</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rift Valley</td>
<td>4,981,613</td>
<td>The Kalenjin</td>
<td>2,309,577</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>2,544,329</td>
<td>The Luhya</td>
<td>2,192,244</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This report indicated that the Kikuyu were the majority in two provinces (Nairobi and Central). Additionally, the Kikuyu in the Central Province had the largest leading number when compared to other leading ethnic groups in other provinces, while the Kikuyu in Nairobi province had the least leading number.

Even though each province has a majority ethnic group, the public universities within each province admit students from all over the country. Furthermore, the universities do not conduct independent admission; selection and admission is done by a body called the Joint Admissions Board (JAB). The purpose of this study is to explore the
possibilities that the allocation of campus housing to students is influenced by the ethnic affiliations of the student and of the people in administrative positions.

**Researcher Bias**

The research was an M.A. student at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, studying Higher Education Administration with concentration in Student Affairs. She is an alumnus of Kenyatta University, the institution from which the sample was drawn. This may have created some bias in the interpretation of data as the researcher had intrinsic knowledge of the system and institution.

Additionally, the researcher and her study assistant both hail from one of the major ethnic groups; they are both Luo. This may have also created some bias in the analysis and interpretation of the data as Kenyatta University, as available literature has shown, is governed by a majority of a different ethnic group.

**Context of the Study**

Historically, universities and colleges concentrated on academic. Factors like housing, transportation and dining were the concern of the students and their families. Residential halls were an Oxbridge innovation (Oxford and Cambridge universities) and that prior to this model, only the student’s “life of the mind” was of interest to faculty and administrators, but, with the invention of the residence halls, higher education embraced the purpose of fostering character, social, emotional, and moral development of a student (Manning & Munoz, 2011, p. 274).

Kenya’s public universities offer on-campus housing to its students, even though they experience the challenge of inadequate bed space. Students must apply for accommodation; some universities have the students do the application online, while
others have them fill in hard copy applications. Audit reports have revealed rampant tribalism within the Kenyan public university administration, from job placements to promotions. This seems to represent ethnic interests (Sifuna, 2010). However, there is hardly any study that has been conducted to examine any effects of this tribalism on the student body. This study was focused on student perception regarding the possibility of ethnic inequality on one university. The following research questions will guide the study:

**Research Questions**

*Central question:* What are the students’ perceptions regarding the influence of ethnic affiliations of both students and administrators in the allocation of campus housing to students at Kenyatta University?

*Sub-questions:*

1. How does Kenyatta University conduct the students’ campus housing allocation?
2. Do students at Kenyatta University perceive that the university administrators’ ethnic affiliations influence the allocation process?
3. Do students at Kenyatta University report that there is unequal allocation of students’ campus housing?

**Limitations of the Study**

i. This study only gathered data from one university.

ii. Sample only consisted of students.

iii. The researcher’s position as an alumnus may have influenced data interpretation and analysis as she already had intimate knowledge of the university system.
iv. The study was done within one year only (snapshot). There were no repetitive studies that could validate the outcome.

v. The investigator did not have control over the selection of subjects. The study relied on a contact/project personnel in Kenya to contact and recruit the subjects. However, the researcher created a protocol for selection of students.

**Definition of Terms**

KCSE – Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education

CHE – Commission of Higher Education

VC – Vice Chancellor

DVC – Deputy Vice Chancellor

JAB – Joint Admissions Board

KU – Kenyatta University

HEI – Higher Education Institutions

Module-I Students – Government sponsored students granted admission by JAB

Module-II Students – Self sponsored students granted admission by the institution

**Significance of the Study**

Universities are mirrors of the society; Young (1981) wrote that the university’s cultural diversity is reflected in the student and staff composition. The tensions and conflicts that divide the national society will likewise reverberate within the university community (p.146). The Kenyan public universities mirror what happens within the Kenyan society. In a society aspiring to be a democracy, an ideal university is one where there is equality in the distribution of resources to students.
The results of this study will enlighten policy makers, students (current and prospective), and other possible stake holders on how university housing is allocated to students, and, further provide them with information they may require in developing a instruments for evaluation of fairness in the allocations. Some of the positive changes expected from this study include:

I. **Policy makers** may use the study findings in making future decisions regarding higher education. For instance, formation of more transparent structures for the allocation of student resources.

II. **Students** will be more vigilant in demanding their rights to equal distribution of university resources.

III. **Future researchers** in this topic. This specific area of university housing in Kenyan universities has not been vastly studied in the past.
Part 2

Review of Literature

Origin of University Housing

Originally, Universities did not always offer housing to students. The first universities to introduce campus housing were Oxford and Cambridge, both in the United Kingdom, through the Oxbridge innovation (Manning & Munoz, 2011, p. 274). At present, campus housing has become a necessity, with many students, especially those in Africa, preferring campus housing to private/off-campus housing because of cost and convenience. Butner and Grospitch (2010) wrote that over time there are benefits to living on campus (p. 3).

Some of these benefits include: (a) positive and indirect effect on the growth and development of students (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005, cited in Butner & Grospitch, 2010); (b) higher levels of involvement/engagement for students who live on-campus (Astin, 1977; Pike, Inkelas, 2008, Schroeder, & Berry, 1997; cited in Butner & Grospitch, 2010) and students who live on campus are more likely to persist and demonstrate high levels of academic and social success (Skahill, 2002, cited in Butner & Grospitch, 2010, p. 3). Additionally, on-campus housing has educational benefits that it offers on students. These roles, according to Riker (1965), are based on the assumptions that: environment influences behavior and that learning is a total process. Satisfactory housing facilities help students nurture satisfactory academic progress.

Even though living on campus may be preferred over living off campus (private housing), some students still may opt to live in their own private residence. This action may be associated with freedom and privacy reasons. But in most developing countries of
Africa, this is often associated with lack of adequate bed spaces in the on-campus housing, necessitating students to find their own housing options.

**Ethnicity and the African University**

African universities were an inheritance from the colonialists. Young (1981) wrote that when African states gained independence, their first agenda was to decolonize the university, because the universities required to be Africanized (p. 147). According to Young, the basic values that form the informal charter of Africa universities (except South Africa) are implicitly anti-ethnic. He goes on to give devastating examples of Lagos, Ibadan and Nairobi Universities, which have had their university lives dominated by ethnicity (p. 148). Even though the universities were introduced by the colonialists, Africans had their own informal education systems (if formality is defined according to colonialists’ point of view).

Kenya, for instance, had its own system of education before the coming of the Europeans (Wosyanju, n.d). There were no classrooms and no special class of people called teachers. All members of the community were involved in the education of the children. Children learned cultural traditions and customs of their ancestors from the community as well as specific skills from their families and other specialized individuals through apprenticeship programs. Localized, relevant indigenous knowledge was, therefore, very important in the organization and transmission of knowledge (p. 2).

Ethnicity within African University is associated also with political power. Coleman (1977), as cited in Young (1981), stated that

"there has been a tendency to establish control over the university through its administration (usually by ethnic appointments congruent with that of the power elite) and the pursuit of variants of an ethnic balance policy aimed at retarding the
further expansion of the predominant ethnic element in the professoriate, while at the same time accelerating the advancement of underrepresented ethnic groups, most particularly that of the power elite."

In the 1960s, when the core support group for the regime was Kikuyu, and the first generation of Kenyan academics (as well as major opposition figures) were recruited heavily among western Kenyans, especially the Luo and the Luhya. This conjuncture appeared to the government to pose the threat of the consolidation of opposition domination of the university framework. The weight of the government was placed on the side of administrative candidates from its regional support group (p. 151).

An important point to be understood is that for ethnicity to exist, the competition had to be between people of the same nationality. Ethnicity heightens the climate of suspicion and distrust of university procedures (p.156). Even though the university is a national institution which recruits its student body from the entire society, ethnicity within the African universities still remain a complex issue. Young (1981) concludes that ethnic conflict within universities has its roots either in the impact of the national political arena upon it, or the competition for scarce resources within it (p.162). Both of these are at play within most African countries because the politics is so tribal and the resources are scarce.

Sawyerr (2004), in a literature review on the challenges facing African universities, agreed with Young that African universities are a post-colonial phenomenon. In his review, he focused on the general issues that universities face unlike Young who focused more on ethnicity. Some of the issues discussed by Sawyerr were: intensification of pressure for new knowledge, resource shortages, and greater accountability for resource use (p.15). When deeply analyzed, Sawyer summarized that increased pressure
for new knowledge leads to an increased university enrollment rate, which leads to a stretch of the available resources (student housing inclusive)

**Ethnicity and inadequate facilities in the Kenyan Public Universities**

This section begin with review of reports of incidences of ethnic inequalities within Kenyan public universities. Opiyo (2012) in the Standard newspaper online version revealed “filthy tribalism” within Kenyan public universities. He noted that the institutions are in total violation of the country’s constitution that demands ethnic and gender balance for all public appointments. An audit revealed that majority of staff either come from the same ethnic group as the Vice-chancellor, the principal, or the locality of the institution.

A similar audit was done in 2010, and was reported in the East African Standard. The then higher education assistant minister, Dr. Kilemi Mwiria, said that tribalism affects the administration of all the public institutions. In a parliamentary discussion, it was revealed that this ethnic imbalance causes tension within the institution, thus causing student unrest which is supported by a 2012 report on the Daily Nation “KU strikes fuelled by tribalism, politics: Report.”

The above audit reports support Young’s contributions about ethnicity. How then might this connect to campus housing? Over the last four decades, the social demands with respect to higher education have clearly intensified (Chacha, 2004, p. 3). The increasing demand has led to the lack of planning. The increase in the number of students demanding access to public universities has led to congestion in the facilities that had initially been designed to accommodate fewer students (p. 9). Gudo, Olel and Oanda (2011) confirmed that the demand for higher education in Kenya has outpaced supply.
This has resulted in the shortage of physical facilities that affects the quality of higher education. The growth in the number of students had not been matched by expansion of physical facilities and academic infrastructure and that some of the existing infrastructure was inadequate, dilapidated and in bad state of despair (p. 206).

The government policy of delinking admission from bed capacity in public universities and technical institutions is spurring rapid growth in property development in Kenya (Mburu, 2011). There is an increase in demand for campus housing, whose capacity is not adequate to accommodate all module-I students. Private investors are therefore putting up private hostels off-campus where students can rent their housing when they fail to get campus housing, or, when they feel like campus housing is not ideal.

In contrast to reports that indicate inadequate quality campus accommodation for students at public universities, a study conducted by Abagi, Nzomo & Otieno (2005) and sponsored by UNESCO stated that Kenyan public universities provide housing to virtually all undergraduate students and, that even though few students may opt to be non-residents, they may resume residence in university hostels if they wish (p.59). If this is the case, then there seems to exist housing that is considered special, making many students apply for it, and those that are considered last resorts. The special ones for Kenyatta University, for instance, may be the single and double rooms. The last resorts would be the congested rooms shared by between 4-8 students. The rooms may also vary in terms of the degree of congestion.

The literature revealed tribalism in the public university mainly in job allocations and promotions and discussed the status of availability of student housing in the public
universities. Housing is inadequate in terms of bed spaces resulting in cases of congestion and competition for better options. However, the literature does not explain how tribalism and the lack of enough bed spaces interact during the allocation process. That gap requires study. This research addressed the gap. Thus this qualitative inquiry explored the possibility of ethnic inequality in the allocation for campus housing to students in Kenyan public universities.
Part 3
Methodology

Research Design

A descriptive exploratory study was selected so that the researcher understand the housing allocation from the participants’ point of view and could explore the problem of ethnicity and its possible influence on students resource allocation needed to be explored. The researcher used closed and open ended survey questions administered to 100 purposefully selected students currently enrolled at a public university in Nairobi, Kenya.

The following research questions guided the study:

*Central question:* What are the students’ perceptions regarding the influence of ethnic affiliations of both students and administrators in the allocation of campus housing to students at Kenyatta University?

*Sub-questions:*

1. How does Kenyatta University conduct the students’ campus housing allocation?
2. Do students at Kenyatta University perceive that the university administrators’ ethnic affiliations influence the allocation process?
3. Do students at Kenyatta University report that there is unequal allocation of students’ campus housing?

Research Site

The recruitment of research subjects took place at the main campus bus stop on Thika Road, the main route between Nairobi City and Thika Town. Students congregate at this bus stop for many reasons. Some use this bus stop as they arrive at the campus to take classes; many residential students depart the campus from this bus stop in order to
shop for food. It is a major hub and is crowded with students at all times of the day. For this reason, it was a suitable place to look for students to fill out the surveys about their housing arrangements.

The following are some pictures that can aid in a better understanding of the research/study site.

![Figure 3.1. Kenyatta University Main Entrance.](image)

This is a picture of Kenyatta University’s main entrance and exit. It is through this gate that students, and other human traffic, enter or exit the institution. Vehicles that come from the left are those coming from Nairobi heading to Thika, and those coming from left are from Thika town and its environs and heading to Nairobi.
Figure 3.2. View of the Public Transport Vehicles outside of KU Entrance.

Figure 3.2 shows the traffic flow. The vehicles with the yellow bands are public transportation. The road gets very busy throughout the week. The bridge that is right ahead on the further right hand side of the picture is a flyover that is used to cross the highway to the other side. Under that bridge, on the left and other right side that the picture does not show, there are bus terminuses where people board public transportation either toward Nairobi or toward Thika town. It is right next to that flyover that the research personnel recruited the study sample and had the respondents fill out the survey. Figure 3.3 below provides a closer view.
Figure 3.3. Closer View of Human Traffic to and from the Bus Terminus.

Figure 3.4. Bus Terminus.
Population/Sample Description

The sample was made up of 100 nonrandom purposefully selected students currently enrolled at Kenyatta University in Nairobi, Kenya. The researcher used nonrandom purposeful sampling because there were specific characteristics that the sample was to possess. These characteristics were:

i. They had to be students at Kenyatta University

ii. Had to be module-I students

The sample was meant to represent at least the 5 major ethnic groups in Kenya. The research personnel recruited study subjects from the main campus bus stop on Thika Road, the main route between Nairobi City and Thika Town. The personnel was able to distinguish students by their dressing, bag types and even books.
Ethical Issues

In this section, the researcher discusses the provision for safety and anonymity of participants and administration confrontation:

Participants’ safety and anonymity – the researcher ensured that no participant identification was required. The study did not require the participant names, signatures or any other identifiable information. The participants were informed within the informed consent forms that they were allowed to withdraw from the study without penalty, were allowed to ask questions and that their participation was voluntary. The informed consent form included a description of the study and the contacts of the investigators.

Study information cards were prepared where if such an incident occurred, the personnel would give an information card to whoever required further information regarding the study. The cards included a brief description of the study and contact information of the investigators. The personnel was trained through a personnel informed consent form that he was required to sign and send to the researcher as a show of understanding and agreement with the study instructions.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was facilitated through the research personnel in Kenya. His responsibility was to print 100 copies of the survey and the participant informed consent forms and distribute a copy of each to each respondent. The process of distribution and collection took a period of one month. Thereafter, the contact sent the hard copy of the questionnaires back to the researcher via post. The research personnel also signed a consent form (Project personnel instructions form) before undertaking this role. He was
trained on the participant consent protocol and how to conduct before issuing any survey questionnaire to any prospective subject.

Instrument

This study used a researcher-created instrument. The researcher sought primary data on the students’ perception concerning allocation of campus housing. Open and closed ended survey questions were used as a means of collecting data. The survey consisted of 29 questions, 14 of which provided space for qualitative responses that expounded on what the respondents report.

Reliability - A pilot survey was conducted with two Kenyan students undertaking their graduate programs at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. These students were both alumni of Kenyatta University. The researcher edited the instrument where necessary, in accordance with the students’ survey responses and general comments.
Part Four

Data Analysis, Presentation and Interpretation of Findings

Data Analysis

The researcher used both quantitative and qualitative research analysis methods to analyze the primary data that were collected. Primary data were handled and reported anonymously. The researcher paraphrased some respondents’ answers. The qualitative data were analyzed through coding and then organized into themes/categories.

The quantitative data included the respondents’ gender, ethnicity, level of study, type of housing option, room preference, and other closed ended questions. This data was analyzed through the use of SPSS; the researcher performed frequency to establish the distribution of responses and cross-tabulation in order to find out how the different variances correlated.

The following tables and charts illustrate the distribution of respondents’ responses in the order in which the closed ended questions were asked in the survey. The questions were:

Gender Distribution

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were more females compared to the males

**Study Levels**

Table 4.2

*Study Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the participants were seniors (n=46); the least number of participants were sophomores (n=5).

**Tribal/Ethnic Groups**

Kenya has 42 ethnic groups. This study focused on the five major ethnic groups: the Luo, the Luhya, the Kalenjin, the Kikuyu, and the Akamba. The remaining ethnic groups included under ‘other’.
Table 4.3

Tribal/Ethnic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhya</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Luo (n=30) were the highly represented in the sample and the Luhya were the least represented (n=8).

Housing Type

Table 4.4

Housing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Housing</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty four participants resided on campus/university housing.
Room Preference

Table 4.5

Room Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes &amp; No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty-nine percent of the participants reported that certain rooms were preferred. These rooms were preferred because of their perceived safety, cleanliness, spaciousness, number of roommates, security (students who reside in single rooms may feel much safer compared to those that have roommates because no one can access the rooms).

Other issues that students may consider when selecting hostels during application are: (i). Safety - those that may be perceived as unsafe are those within regions that border residences of non-students. (ii). Constant availability of water - other hostels don’t have constant water availability, forcing students who reside there to fetch water from tanks and taps in other hostels. They must carry this water in buckets to their hostels/rooms. This process is quite cumbersome in that they have classes to attend, assignments to complete, and private study to conduct. (iii). Privacy - Participant 001 says “..maybe you need privacy so you will opt for a single or a double.”
Equality in Room Allocation

Table 4.6

Equality in Room Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-two percent of the respondents reported an unequal allocation of student housing while twenty-one percent reported an equal student room allocation. The remaining seven percent abstained from responding to this question. Respondent 003 said “…all students have equal access to application forms which form the basis of room allocation”; while 004 who said that the allocation is unequal said “so many students end up not getting a room even if they applied. This is because those allocating them consider relatives or even friends first.”

Ethnic Preference in Room Allocation

Table 4.7

Ethnic Preference in Room Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eighty-six percent of the participants were against the opinion that more chances were given to students from certain ethnic groups.

**Inclusion of Names on Room Allocation Application**

Table 4.8

Inclusion of Names on Room Allocation Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large percentage (76/100) of participants included their names on their housing applications.

**Preference of Personal Information to be Included in the Application**

Table 4.9

Preference of Personal Information to be Included in the Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Registration Numbers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names &amp; Registration Numbers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evident in the previous table, 76 of the 100 participants included their names in their housing application. When asked on what information they would prefer to be included, 66 of the 100 preferred to include only the registration numbers, citing that
doing so could reduce cases of tribalism in the allocation process. For instance, respondent 005 stated, “The use of names may enhance favoritism of a certain ethnic group. Registration numbers will do it fairly.”

**Ethnic Distribution of University Administrators**

Table 4.10

*Ethnic Distribution of University Administrators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty-percent of the participants reported an equal ethnic distribution of university administrators with 44% agreeing and 16% strongly agreeing. Thirty-nine of the participants reported an unequal ethnic distribution of university administrators.
The University Administrators’ Ethnicities Influence on Student Housing Allocations

Table 4.11
The University Administrators’ Ethnicities Influence on Student Housing Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-seven of the respondents do not agree that the ethnicities of the university administrators influence student housing allocations while only 16 respondents reported that the administrators’ ethnicities do influence the allocation process. Seven respondents did not respond to this question.

Students’ Ethnicities’ Influence on Housing Allocations

Table 4.12
Students’ Ethnicities’ Influence on Housing Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In relation to the possibility of administrators’ ethnicities influencing student housing allocations, participants were asked if the students’ ethnicities may influence the same allocations. Eighty-two of the respondents do not agree that the ethnicities of the students influenced student housing allocations. Thirteen respondents reported that the students’ ethnicities do influence the allocation process. Five respondents did not respond to this question.

**Levels of Satisfaction with the Housing Allocation Process**

Table 4.13

*Levels of Satisfaction with the Housing Allocation Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Satisfied</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-one respondents were satisfied with the allocation process. The same number was dissatisfied with the allocation. Only 9 respondents were strongly satisfied. The majority of respondents (47) indicated that they were fairly satisfied with the process.

In comparing variables to determine how respondents from different ethnic groups perceived the allocation process, the researcher utilized cross-tabulation on SPSS and the following were the findings:
Table 4.14

**Respondents’ Ethnicities vs. their Response regarding Equality in Room Allocations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhyas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all the groups, majority reported that there was inequality in room allocation. When asked if there is equal room allocation, 25/30 Luos, 6/8 Luhyas, 9/10 Kalenjins, 15/25 Kikuyus, 6/11 Akambas and 11/16 in the ‘Other’ group all said ‘No.’ Participant 13 writes that the allocation is not equal “coz some students are allocated for a room yet they never applied while others fail to get a room yet they had applied earlier enough.” [sic]
Table 4.15

Respondents’ Ethnicity vs. their Response regarding Ethnic Preference in Room Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Ethnic Preference in Allocation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When participants were asked if there is ethnic preference in room allocation, 25/30 Luos, 6/8 Luhyas, 9/10 Kalenjins, 23/25 Kikuyus, 10/11 Akambas and 13/16 in the ‘Other’ group did not agree.
Table 4.16

Respondents’ Ethnicity vs. their Response regarding their Preference of Personal Information to be included in their Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Personal Information preferred to be Included</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Only Registration Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked what information they prefer to include in their room applications, none of the respondents from all the ethnic groups preferred the inclusion of names. 21/30 Luos, 7/8 Luhyas, 9/10 Kalenjins, 13/25 Kikuyus, 5/11 Akambas and 11/16 in the ‘Other’ group all said that they preferred the use of registration numbers only. One respondent from both the Luo and the ‘Other’ groups did not respond, while the remaining preferred the use of both names and registration numbers.

Majority of the respondents reported a preference in the use of registration numbers only. Participant 43, a Kikuyu, wrote that “only registration numbers should be included to avoid tribalism and favoritism.” Participant 47, a Akamba chose only registration number citing that “with only Reg. No.s, there is no bias whatsoever.” [sic]
The researcher attempted to determine whether the participants’ perceptions were significantly different depending on their tribe. To do this, the researcher used the Pearson’s chi-square to determine the significance in the relationship between participants’ ethnicities and their perception:

i. regarding the personal information they preferred to include in the housing application

ii. on whether there is equal ethnic distribution of university administrators

iii. on whether the ethnicities of university administrators influence students’ housing allocation process

All the chi-square tests indicated that the research participants’ responses and perceptions were not dependent on their ethnicities. None of chi-square tests were significant. However, the researcher had to abandon the chi-square test because a number of cells had insufficient numbers (violated the assumption that the expected values are greater than 5 for each cell). Below is one of the chi-square tests that the researcher did:

**Null hypothesis**: There is NO relationship between student ethnicity and the students’ preference on what information to add on housing application.

**Alternative hypothesis**: There is a relationship between student ethnicity and the students’ preference on what information to add on housing application.
Table 4.17

*Observed and Expected Counts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>PERSONAL INFORMATION TO INCLUDE IN APPLICATION</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Only Registration Numbers</th>
<th>Both Names and Registration Numbers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhya</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18

*Pearson Chi-Square*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>12.484a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.305</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 9 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.

Alpha level = 0.05
The level of significance .254 is more than .05, thus, not statistically significant. Therefore, even though there is NO significant relationship between student ethnicity and the students’ preference on what information to add on housing application, the test failed because there was inadequate numbers. The data did not meet the requirements of chi-square.

Table 4.19

Respondents’ Ethnicity vs. their Perception on whether there is Equal Ethnic Distribution of University Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked whether there is equal ethnic distribution of university administrators, majority in all the ethnic groups said they ‘agreed.’
Table 4.20

Respondents’ Ethnicity vs. their Perception on whether the Ethnicities of University Administrators influence Students’ Housing Allocation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>University Administrators’ Ethnicities influence Student Housing Allocations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked whether the university administrators’ ethnicities influence the students’ housing allocation process, majority of participants in all the groups chose ‘disagree.’ 3 of the Luo participants and three of participants from the ‘Other’ category did not respond. The least participants in all the groups chose ‘strongly agree’.
Table 4.21

Respondents’ Ethnicity vs. their Perception on whether the Students’ Ethnicities influence the Housing Allocation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked whether the students’ ethnicities influence the students’ housing allocation process, majority of participants in all the groups disagreed (n=82) Here too, the least participants agreed (n=13). Five respondents abstained from responding to this question.
Table 4.22

Respondents’ Ethnicity vs. their Level of Satisfaction with the Housing Allocation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Strongly Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Fairly Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked about their level of satisfaction with the housing allocation process, majority of participants in the Luo, Luhya, Kalenjin, Akamba and ‘Other’ groups chose reported that they were fairly satisfied. In the Kikuyu category, an equal number of 8 participants reported that they were either satisfied, fairly satisfied or dissatisfied, while only 1 was strongly satisfied. One Luo participants and one participants from the ‘Other’ category did not respond. The least participants in all the groups strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the allocation process.

**Contradiction**

In determining the response frequencies, the researcher observed that 72/100 participants reported that there was unequal students’ housing allocation, 86/100 reported that there was no ethnic preference in the allocation process, 76/100 included their names in their housing applications and 66/100 prefered that students include only their
registration numbers in the housing applications. This was a disparity because majority used their names in the application process, while majority prefer that only registration numbers are used so that there is no preferences with regards to ethnicities which is made easier with the names.

The high number of participants that reported an unequal student housing allocation attest to the two other findings: preference for the use of only registration numbers (and the reasons given for that) and the fact that majority of the students used their names in their housing application. Thus, there is mistrust in the allocation process if the names are used.

To establish more information regarding the same, the researcher used SPSS to select cases: participants who thought that there was no ethnic preference but preferred to use only their registration numbers in application even though they had included their names in their application.

Table 4.23

Qualitative Contradictions from the Quantitative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Reason for Only Registration Numbers Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>Student leaders have more advantages. They get singles. First years are the most disadvantaged. They also stay in quadruples and common rooms (8 occupants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Luhy</td>
<td>This will help to erase any feelings of unfairness and even favoring a certain ethnic community. Nobody will be able to tell from which community one comes from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>So that the person allocating a room would not be able to identify which kind of student he/she is giving a room e.g. based on ethnic group e.t.c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Reason for Only Registration Numbers Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>To avoid favoritism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>In this case, there would be less discrimination in terms of tribes and students could get the rooms fairly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>Luhya</td>
<td>Only registration numbers so that there can be no preferences in the allocation i.e. the names remain anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>Luhya</td>
<td>Providing only registration numbers will eliminate any instances of biasness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>This is because including names on the application form may bring about favoritism in the future. Some may be forced to favor their relatives or those from their tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>Registration numbers are more convenient because the people allocating will not favor a person or any ethnic group because of the name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>Only registration numbers should be used because if there are chances ethnicity/tribalism will be reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>This reduces ethnic names that root corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>The use of registration numbers only to apply for room would be better because in first year, I witnessed a case where many students from a particular ethnic group missed rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>To prevent biasness when it comes to the process of room allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Registration numbers because it is hard to know their ethnicity and thus avoid discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>The registration numbers will prevent tribalism in room allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>With only registration numbers, there is no bias whatsoever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>This will greatly reduce tribalism if any – only registration numbers – one will not be able to determine from which tribe the student comes from. The students will be treated equally except the special cases for example – the physically challenged students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>To avoid certain situations and favoring among the students because of names and relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Reason for Only Registration Numbers Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>I don’t think writing names is important. Registration numbers is already a way of identification in the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>I think when they give registration numbers only, the person allocating the rooms may not be biased to give friends and ‘if tribal’ his/her tribesmen, thus there will be total equity in the distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>For the purpose of there being fairness in the selection without consideration of ethnic background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>To minimize any form of bias on tribal basis or bias that may arise from anyone having ties with administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>So that no one can discriminate in terms of tribe which may be revealed by some names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>It is not convenient for the students to give out their names when they do have their own registration numbers which provides more details about him/her. This is so because by the look of names, there are likely to be increased cases of biasness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td><strong>To prevent biasness. But I also think it wouldn’t be too effective because those people who got connections with administration are given first priority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>Because that will limit bias on basis of either nepotism or whichever kind of corruptible deals in issuing of rooms to students by virtue of names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>Only registration numbers. This will avoid complaints by the applicants about ethnic groups in Kenya. This will also enhance equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>The use of registration numbers is preferable to prevent any act of favoritism and tribalism in room allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>To avoid instances of tribalism in room allocation should there be any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td>Akamba</td>
<td>It would be fair and clear then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>There might be favoritism as the names usually indicate the ethnic group of a person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>The person allocating will not know names and favor some people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>If in any case there is tribalism, it will be reduced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 continues
087  Luo  This is to ensure that there is no biasness
089  Akamba  To avoid tribalism in allocating accommodation to students
091  Kikuyu  So as not to leave room for bias speculation
092  Other  It is human nature to be biased based on certain names. Just like the end of exam test we write only registration numbers. So there is much to do with certain names
093  Kikuyu  The identity of a student for reasons of favoritism or tribalism will be partly hidden when other factors are not considered. My problem is the interference of KUSA and the staff who make allocations. They should go to hell
095  Kikuyu  To avoid prejudice
100  Other  With use of registration numbers only the bias that arises due to ethnicity

Among these participant responses that registered the explained contradiction, there were 13 Luos, 9 from the ‘Other’ category, 3 Luhyas, 9 Kikuyus, 4 Akambas, and 2 Kalenjins. From their responses above, the researcher established that the contradiction may have arisen from a lack of understanding of the question or because of any other reasons that were not known by the researcher. However, the researcher concluded that even though the quantitative data show that majority of respondents did not agree that there was ethnic inequality in the housing allocation, the qualitative data showed otherwise.

Wordle

Wordle is a program for generating “word clouds” from text that you provide. The clouds give greater prominence to words that appear more frequently in the source text (www.wordle.com).
Figure 4.1: Wordle’s Recurring Words

From the wordle image above, the words that appear to be bigger in size are those that have been mentioned severally/frequently in the selected cases’ responses. The bigger the word, the more used it is. Bias, favoritism, ethnic, and tribalism can be easily spotted. This implies that this same students who say that ethnic preference does not exist in the allocation of housing, are also among the same students that attest to the fact that ethnic preference in allocation indeed exits. Therefore, there is sharp contradiction in their set of data. The researcher may assume in this case that the students don’t want to admit directly that ethnic preference exists, but could admit this indirectly.
Findings for Research Questions

As indicated in the previous chapters, the questions that guided this study were:

**Central question:** What are the students’ perceptions regarding the influence of ethnic affiliations of both students and administrators in the allocation of campus housing to students at Kenyatta University?

**Sub-questions:**

1. How does Kenyatta University conduct the students’ campus housing allocation?
2. Do students at Kenyatta University perceive that the university administrators’ ethnic affiliations influence the allocation process?
3. Do students at Kenyatta University report that there is unequal allocation of students’ campus housing?

**How does Kenyatta University conduct the students’ campus housing allocation?** From the survey responses, the researcher established that campus housing applications are done via an online application form that is filled and submitted. In this form, a student writes his/her name, registration number and specifies the type of room for which he/she is applying for. Even though this is the procedure presented by most of the students, some of the respondents said that they filled out a hard copy application form which they mailed back to Kenyatta University (mostly freshmen), others said that they wrote their names on a list that was at the accommodations office.

Additionally, some of the respondents wrote that there are instances where the house custodians sell rooms to students. This indicates that the application procedure is not clearly followed. The following are some points to note regarding the housing application and allocation process:
i. Unclear procedure – Even though several participants wrote that application for housing is done online and that the allocation is random; others applied through an application form that was attached onto their admission letters; while some also wrote that they applied through leaving their names at the accommodations offices.

“After missing a room in first year, I got one in my second year after applying and reapplying through the accommodations office.” 005

ii. Inconsistency in allocation – Students are not assured of consistently getting allocated rooms. 005 “There are those who get rooms in their first and second years then miss out during final years and the university cannot do anything about it”

iii. Preferences – Students feel that the senior students in terms of study level have higher chances of getting housing than the Junior ones. 012 writes “The higher your level of education, the better the chance you have in getting a room. Meaning that it’s hard for a first year student to get a room than a fourth year”

iv. Transparency and accountability – 028 writes “Am dissatisfied due to lack of transparency and accountability”

v. No explanations given – 064 writes “….others end up missing accommodation without any logical explanation why they did miss…”

Do students at Kenyatta University perceive that the university administrators’ ethnic affiliations influence the allocation process? When asked this, as evidenced in Table 4.20, more students either strongly disagreed or disagreed.
However, it is important to consider some of the reasons why a few respondents perceived that the university administrators’ ethnic affiliations influence the allocation process. From the chi-square test on independence carried out on the Table 4.19 data, the researcher established that the responses that were chosen for this question did not depend on the ethnic affiliations of the respondents in the study and that there was NO relationship between student ethnicity and the students’ perception on whether the ethnicities of university administrators influenced students’ housing allocation process.

Below are what some of the respondents wrote:

- “This is because some of the administrators will be forced or may prefer to allocate better hostels to their relatives or those students whom they know”
  Respondent 019
- “I believe there is a particular ethnic group that the university favors” Respondent 024

**Do students at Kenyatta University report that there is unequal allocation of students’ campus housing?** Even though Table 4.6 shows that more students (72%) reported that there is unequal allocation of campus housing to the students, they do not report that this inequity is solely tribal, but that there exists other forms of inequity. This is because 86% of the participants, as shown on table 4.7 reported that inequality is NOT an ethnic one. The main inequities that the participants reported were favoritism issues.

  i. Study level favoritism/consideration – some of the participants reported that the housing/rooms were allocated according to study level; respondent
012 wrote “the higher your level of education…..the better the chance you have in getting a room. Meaning that it’s hard for a first year student to get a room than a fourth year.”

ii. Relationship favoritism – this implies to people who know each other either because they are related or because they have known each other in the past. A number of the study participants used terms like ‘nepotism, tribalism, unfairness, injustice, discrimination’ among others. Some of the participants’ responses include:

081 “The first allocation is a little bit fair. But when it comes to those who have missed accommodation, one notices that those from a specific tribe get more chances in appeal than others”

088 “In most boys’ hostel, 80% of the students constitute of the Luos and it’s a research that I have carried out. For instance Longonot zone”

088 “…most of the luo and Luhya community got houses”

089 “Administrators allocating houses give students from their ethnic group the first priority”

In relating with the above reasons, the perception is that there is unequal distribution/allocation to the students’ housing.
Part 5

Discussion of Findings, Suggestions for Further Research, and Recommendations and Conclusions

Discussion of Findings

The following are some observations that the researcher made from the study:

**Application process.** There is evident contradiction here. Some respondents say that they applied by filling out an application online; others (especially freshmen) said that filled out a hard copy application form and mailed it back to the university. A number of respondents also said that they applied by filling out their names in a list at the accommodations office. Additionally, all the respondents confirmed that they included their names in their applications.

**Room preferences.** There are several types of housing. There are those that students prefer more than others. Housing is differentiated in terms of room sizes, number of roommates (ranging from single occupant rooms to rooms that are occupied by about 8 students), and geographic location within the university (some locations are closer to the administration block and lecture halls). The better the room, the higher the cost.

**Water availability.** There are some on-campus housing facilities that may not have adequate water supply. When there is no water, students have to fetch water from other hostels by the use of buckets. Because most students often avoid this hard work as the distance may be big, most of them usually apply for accommodation in hostels that are within regions that do not experience water inadequacies.
Inadequate housing. Kenyatta University, like several other universities in Kenya, experiences an upsurge in the number of students being admitted. The number of students keeps increasing but the student resources do not increase. This massification has caused depreciation in the adequacy of student housing. Additionally, because of this, students are opting for private housing that is more expensive in most cases. 005 wrote “There are those who have never been allocated any rooms in campus such that they have opted for private housing.”

034 wrote “The JAB students are so many as compared to the number of rooms…..”

Students’ attitude.

i. Ignorance – Students not showing interest in wanting to know who constitute the administration or how the process of allocation is done, or better still, how ethnicity may influence resource allocation. One participant wrote “University is a place you don’t really get to go to deeper details of ethnic groupings…..you get concern with your life and what befall you.”

077 “I think there is no correlation”…between administrators ethnic group and how it may influence room allocation.

ii. Anger – Students get frustrated by the application and allocation process. Respondent 093 wrote “My problem is the interference of KUSA and the staff who make allocations. They should go to hell.”
Extent of information disclosed during application. Majority of students prefer the use of registration numbers only citing reasons like this will help reduce or event prevent ethnic favoritism in allocation of available space. The use of registration numbers only levels the ground for all the students. However, some students make very valuable points about this still being able to be compromised. Participant 059 wrote “….but I also think it wouldn’t be too effective because those people who got connections with administration are given first priority

Discrimination. Discrimination was often featured in the participants’ responses. Allocation is, in a way, dependent on “who knows who” or “which ethnic group are you from.” The forms of discrimination that the data displayed were:

i. Tribalism. Respondent 024 writes “I believe there is a particular ethnic group that the university favors.”

ii. Nepotism. Respondent 019 writes “This is because some of the administrators will be forced or may prefer to allocate better hostels to their relatives or those students whom they know.”

iii. Study level favoritism. Respondent 002 writes “…first years are the most disadvantaged. They also stay in quards and common rooms (8 occupants).”

Neutral comments. These were those explanations that the participants gave that were neither incriminating nor positive. For instance, a few students indicated that it was not easy to point out that some ethnic groups were favored in allocation more than the rest because the university hostels host students from diverse ethnicities. Participant 006 wrote that “…ethnicity has little or no role to play in hostel allocation.” Participant 009 writes that all ethnic groups are equally distributed in the houses.
Positive comments. These are explanations that applauded the university, the allocation process and the administrators. This shows that even though most students perceive that there is inequality in allocation, a number still have faith in the allocation process. Some of such participants’ responses are as listed below:

i. 022 “Because I think the staff there are qualified and the variation of ethnic groups is clearly outstanding.”

ii. 022 “Kenyatta university is a corruption free zone.”

iii. 047 “…the current system being used is accurate and automatic.”

iv. 058 “I think that so far I have come to meet many people from different ethnic groups which encourages balance among people. This has encouraged socialization and has created strong ethnic ties among the students which brings about unity.”

v. 096 “The application process is very transparent, and all students have an equal opportunity to apply,”

vi. 097 “The admin gives equal chances to every ethnic tribe and is free of any tribalism”

vii. 073 “The allocation was very fair and all the ethnic groups were awarded equally.”

Suggestions for Further Research

Owing to the manner in which the sample of this study was selected and the study conducted, the researcher recommends that a similar study be conducted but with a different method of sampling.
A comparative study between private institutions and public institutions is also recommended in order to see the similarities or disparities in the manner in which resources are allocated to students in both types of institutions.

Lastly, future researchers conducting similar studies need to consider including the institution administrators in order to be able to understand their own points of view to. This may improve clarity as it will compare the students’ perceptions with the administrators’ perceptions.

Recommendations and Conclusion

Students recommendations. When asked about what they thought were the steps the university can take in order to improve the housing application and allocation process, while eliminating tribalism, the students suggestions were as classified below:

i. Independent room allocation body – students think that this will reduce the influence of tribalism on allocation; 002 “.the University should set a body that is mandated to allocate rooms”

ii. Building more hostels – that this will in turn create more space and increase availability. With more spaces available, the need for favoritism may reduce: 022 “Build more hostels….”

iii. Complete housing allocations – students perceive that the rooms that are left vacant, even after opening and students settling in, are the rooms that lead to these ethnic injustices. This is because the vacant rooms are left to the discretion of the custodians/janitors who are in turn tempted to sell them or take bribe in order to allocate them to students: 033 “…ensuring that all rooms are full to capacity.”
iv. Process review – Students suggest that their opinion regarding the allocation process matter. They feel that the process needs review in order to establish what works and what doesn’t work: 003 “The process should be reviewed to include recommendation by students.”

003 “There should be a student representative to oversee housing allocation and ensure its fairness.”

v. Use of registration numbers only - This is to ensure that a student’s ethnicity is not easily revealed through the name.

vi. Priority – majority of students preferred that priority is accorded to first year students, students with disabilities. This is so that the risk of them missing out on the same is eliminated.

010 “…First years should be considered first because they are new and young.”

028 “…..considering students from marginalized communities.”

040: Senior students, students with low social economic statuses “The needy students should also be considered when giving out rooms.”

054”…..strategy of reshuffling room occupants to provide a fair ethnic distribution.”

**Researcher recommendation.**

**Only registration numbers.** This will reduce cases of ethnic preference in allocation. This report has already cited some reasons given by the respondents. In the course of this study, Kenya had an election which was again disputed. A case was filed at the Supreme Court and is currently on going. Political tension is high in this may easily
reflect in the elections between students and between students and administrators. The universities ought to use only the registration numbers in order to reduce suspicions.

**Independent allocation body.** Just as in the case of the registration numbers, hostel custodians or university accommodations administrators need not be placed in charge of room allocations. This is because these people interact with students on a daily basis and may be tempted to favor some students over others. To avoid such misunderstandings, the universities should consider appointing an independent body that is solely in charge of housing allocations. This body will also gain acceptance if it possesses ethnic balance that represents a majority of the different ethnicities.

**Conclusion**

This study lasted a period of one year and the recruitment and data collection lasted for approximately a month. The findings for this study intended to explore other services provided by the Kenyan public institutions, or better still, this particular area of housing allocation can be studied further in order to compare results. The researcher considers the comparison of results as very important because of the conditions under which this study was conducted: the researcher was not directly in charge with recruitment and data collection, and the fact that the researcher’s surname was used as the title of the survey may have influenced the participants’ responses because from the surname, a respondent could easily know from which ethnic group the researcher hailed. The disadvantage of this is that the respondents may tend to hold back certain vital information. It is because of these reasons that the researcher considers this a preliminary study.
The findings of this study are a confirmation of what the researcher was investigating. As stated in the earlier chapters of this report, the purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of students on whether there is ethnic inequality in campus housing allocations. As illustrated in Part Four (presentation of findings), most respondents were for the opinion that there is no ethnic inequality, but as the researcher analyzed their qualitative responses, a great contrast was realized because respondents actually were explaining that ethnic inequality existed.

Public institutions should endeavor to avoid any kind of ethnic inequalities at all costs. Higher education institutions are also public institutions. Kenya, as a country, is polarized by ethnic divisions and strife, something which is easily witnessed in how the central government is run and activities that recur during election periods. This in itself paints a very grim picture of a country that considers itself a 'democracy.' Higher education institutions and other public institutions should strive to ensure that students are treated equally without any trace of favoritism. This is because these institutions serve as the mirror of the society.

If resources are distributed equally among the student population, then, these students will, in their course of learning, gain the understanding that each and every person is equal. However, if these student groups continue witnessing ethnic sidelining and unequal distribution of public university resources, they will tend to adopt the same kind of behavior when they hit the job market. Their mistrust of the system will also grow. This is surely not the best route for government institutions to take.
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Appendix I

Participant Informed Consent Form
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Title:
Equity in the allocation for campus housing to students in Kenyan public universities

Purpose:
This research project will explore the perceptions that undergraduate students hold regarding the allocation of campus housing at a Kenyan University. The intent is to describe the procedure for student room allocation. Knowledge of the present allocation procedures will aid in improving the allocation process. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate. You are invited to participate in this study because you are a Module I, Kenyan public university student.

Procedures:
A survey will be given to you only after you read and understand this form. You will be asked to respond to the various research questions regarding your perception of the student room allocation process. Your response to the survey will signify your acceptance to participate. Researchers will interpret and analyze your responses.

Participation time:
After reading, understanding and accepting to participate in this study, responding to the survey questions will take not more than one hour.

Benefits:
There is no direct research benefit to you as a research participant.

Risks and/or Discomforts:
There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this study.

Confidentiality:

141 Teachers College Hall / P.O. Box 880360 / Lincoln, NE 68588-0360 / (402) 472-3726 / FAX (402) 472-4300
You will not be required to write your names, or to sign on the survey sheet. No identifying information will be obtained during this study. Upon your acceptance of this agreement, you will receive a unique designation identifying any data associated with you. Data will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the investigator's office and will only be seen by the investigator during the study and for one year after the study is complete, after which the questionnaires will be destroyed. The information obtained in this study may be published in scientific journals or presented at scientific meetings but will be presented as aggregated data.

**Opportunity to Ask Questions:**

You are permitted to ask any question concerning this study and have questions answered before agreeing to participate in or during the study. You may contact the investigator at the phone numbers below. Please contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (+1) (402) 472-6965 to voice concerns about the research or if you have any questions about your rights as a research participant.

**Freedom to withdraw:**

Participation in this study is voluntary. You can decline to participate or withdraw at any time without receiving a penalty.

**Consent, Right to Receive a Copy:**

You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Your receipt and response to the survey questions will certify that you have decided to participate having read and understood the information presented. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

**Name and Phone number of investigator(s)**

Diana Carole Awoor, Principal Investigator
Cell: (+1) (302) 607-8369

Miles Bryant, Ed.D., Secondary Investigator
Office: (+1) (402) 472-0960
Appendix II

Project Personnel instruction Form
PROJECT PERSONNEL INSTRUCTION FORM

As a Research Assistant, you need to understand the following:

1. The subjects' rights have to be respected
2. The filled surveys have to be kept in a locked file cabinet

For your information:

a. Regarding the subjects
   i. They will not include any identifying information on the survey
   ii. They have no direct benefits
   iii. They will receive the survey only after reading and understanding the Informed Consent form
   iv. They have freedom to withdraw from participation in this study

b. Regarding the Informed Consent and Surveys
   i. You will receive the 2 documents via email; an Informed Consent form and a survey.
   ii. Print both documents. Issue a subject, a copy of the Informed consent. Each participant should read and understand the information within the consent form before deciding to participate or not. Filling out the survey will be an indicator of acceptance by a participant.
   iii. Each subject should fill in the survey independently, without discussion with anybody and without coercion
   iv. If you have more than one subjects filling the survey, have them sit further from each other to eliminate any kind of influence
v. Store all documents in a safe locked cabinet

vi. When all the subjects have filled the surveys, mail back the surveys to the address below:

Diana Carole Awuor
4119 Holdrege St, Apt #6
Lincoln, NE 68503-1441
USA

Consent:
You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study by helping in recruitment and data collection. Your signing of this Project Personnel Instructions form will certify that you will adhere. You will be given a copy of this instructions form to keep.

Signature of Research Assistant:

__________________________________________  ______________________________
Signature of Research Assistant                  Date

Name and Phone number of investigator(s)

Diana Carole Awuor, Principal Investigator        Cell: (+1) (302) 607-8369
Miles Bryant, Ed.D., Secondary Investigator      Office: (+1) (402) 472-0960
Appendix III

Awuor Survey
### AWUOR SURVEY ON EQUITY IN STUDENT HOUSING ALLOCATION

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. As described in the Informed Consent Form, our interest is on what you report about how your current institution allocated housing to you. The questions below concern your experience in the application and seeking of housing, and, your perception of whether the process is just or not.

1. **Gender**
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

2. **Area of study**
   - [ ] First Year (Freshman)
   - [ ] Second Year (Sophomore)
   - [ ] Third Year (Junior)
   - [ ] Fourth Year (Senior)

3. **Your ethnic group**
   - [ ] The Luo
   - [ ] The Luhya
   - [ ] The Kalenjin
   - [ ] The Kikuyu
   - [ ] The Akamba
   - Other (please specify): [ ]

4. **Where do you reside?**
   - [ ] Campus Housing
   - [ ] Private Housing
AWUOR SURVEY ON EQUITY IN STUDENT HOUSING ALLOCATION

5. If your answer in (4) above is 'campus housing,' would you please explain how you got your room?

6. If your answer in (4) above is 'private housing,' would you explain why you opted for that option?

7. If your answer in (4) above was 'campus housing,' would you please clarify whether the room you have now is what you applied for.

☐ Yes
☐ No
AWUOR SURVEY ON EQUITY IN STUDENT HOUSING ALLOCATION

8. If your room is not what you had applied for, would you explain what happened?
   
9. Do you think that certain rooms are preferred more than others?
   E.g.
   i) Depending on sizes
   ii) Depending on number of occupants
   iii) Depending on gender (do different genders have different preferences?)
   
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Yes & No
AWUOR SURVEY ON EQUITY IN STUDENT HOUSING ALLOCATION

10. Please explain your answer in (9) above

11. Do you think that all students get equal chances in the allocation of campus housing?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Yes & No

12. If your answer in (11) above is YES, would you explain why you think so?
13. If you answered NO in (11) above, why do you think so?

14. If your answer is YES & NO in (11) above, why do you think so?

15. More chances were given to students from a certain ethnic group

- Yes
- No
16. If you selected YES in (15) above, which ethnic group(s) do you think were given more chances?

- [ ] The Luo
- [ ] The Luhya
- [ ] The Kalenjin
- [ ] The Kikuyu
- [ ] The Akaniba

Other (please specify):

17. What are your reasons for (16) above?


18. I included my name in my housing application

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

19. Your opinion on what personal information students should give when applying for housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only registration numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both names and registration numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AWUOR SURVEY ON EQUITY IN STUDENT HOUSING ALLOCATION

20. Please explain your answer in (19) above

21. University Administration distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is an equal representation of ethnic groups within the University Administration</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Please explain your choice in (21) above
### AWUOR SURVEY ON EQUITY IN STUDENT HOUSING ALLOCATION

#### 23. University Administrator's ethnic groups versus housing allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ethnic group of the University Administrators influence the housing allocation process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 24. Please explain your answer in (23) above


#### 25. Student's ethnic group versus housing allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ethnic group of a student influences neither chances in the housing allocation process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Please explain your answer in (25) above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Level of satisfaction with the housing allocation process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Please explain your answer in (27) above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. What changes in the housing allocation process of your institution, if any, would you recommend?
Appendix IV

IRB Application Form
1. General Project Information

1. Project Title:
Exploring the Possibility of Ethnic Inequality in the Allocation for Campus Housing for Students in Kenyan Public Universities

2. Principal Investigator and 3. Secondary Investigator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator:</th>
<th>Diana Awuor</th>
<th>Secondary Investigator:</th>
<th>Miles Bryant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dianacarole34@yahoo.com">dianacarole34@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbryant1@unl.edu">mbryant1@unl.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>Department of Educational Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Type of Project: Research

5. Does the research involve an outside institution/agency other than UNL?
No

6. Where will participation take place (e.g., UNL, at home, in a community building, schools, hospitals, clinics, prisons, unions, etc)? Please specify and give location if not already listed above.
In the University community of Kenya University in Nairobi

7. Briefly describe the facilities available for the research (e.g., there will be a quiet room in the school to conduct interviews, a secure lab space is available, etc).
The research will consist of the research assistant meeting with subjects in public places to gain their consent and to have them complete the survey. The Signed copies of the informed consent will be obtained.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Present / Proposed Funding Source:</td>
<td>There is no funding source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Study Start Date</td>
<td>04/15/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Study End Date</td>
<td>05/19/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is this a multi-institutional study?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Project Information Continued

1. Does the research involve prisoners?
   No

2. Will the research only be conducted in schools or educational settings?
   No

3. Does the research involve only the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior?
   No

4. Does the research involve only the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens?
   No

5. Does the research involve only studying, evaluating or examining public benefit or service programs?
   No

6. Does the research involve only a taste and food quality evaluation or food consumer acceptance study?
   No
3. Description of Participants:

1. In the table below, please the estimated number of participants per category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Unspecified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please indicate which special groups will be utilized/recruited for your study. Check all that apply:

- [ ] Adults, Non Students
- [ ] Children (under age 19)
- [ ] Institutionalized Persons
- [ ] Pregnant Women/Fetuses/Neonates
- [ ] Persons with Limited Civil Freedom
- [ ] Persons with HIV/AIDS
- [ ] Persons with Psychological Impairment
- [ ] Adults w/ Legal Representatives
- [ ] Employees
- [ ] UNL Students
- [ ] Decisionally Impaired
- [ ] Students
- [ ] Persons with Neurological Impairment
- [ ] Language Impaired
- [ ] Prisoners
- [ ] Persons with Mental Retardation
- [ ] Handicapped
- [ ] Other

3. Will participants of both sexes/genders be recruited?  
   Yes

4. Will participation be limited to certain racial or ethic groups?  
   No

5. Describe the participant population to be included in this research and how they are selected, including any special characteristics targeted for inclusion:
   A convenience sample will be selected with the following parameters:
   i. Proportional representation of different ethnic groups (The Kikuyu, the Luo, the Kalenjin, the Akamba, the Luhya and other minority Kenyan ethnic groups)
   ii. Proportional representation of both the male and female genders
6. Describe your access to the population that will allow recruitment of the necessary number of participants.
I have a research assistant in Nairobi, Kenya who will be recruiting students according to the criteria for selection.

7. The research plan should have adequate provisions to protect the privacy interests of participants.
Explain provisions to protect privacy interests of participants. This refers to how investigators will access private information from or about participants during and after their involvement in the research (e.g., time, place, etc of research procedures).
   i. The names of participants will not be identified
   ii. The data provided will be aggregated
   iii. After the analysis, the surveys will be destroyed
The information will be kept in a secure area (locked locker)
The research assistant will have to sign an agreement to respect the participant privacy and also to keep the consent forms and surveys in a safely locked cabinet.
Each participant will be assigned a unique designation identifying any data associated with him/her

8. Describe your process to ensure that all persons assisting with the research are adequately informed about the protocol and their research-related duties and functions.
An informed consent form, with details about the study and rights of subjects will be given to all subjects who will sign as a way of acceptance. A survey will be given to a subject only after they sign the informed consent form.

9. If not already described above, will any groups or categories of participants be excluded from this research?
Yes

9.a. If yes, please specify and provide the rationale for excluding these participants:
Module 11 students (self sponsored students) - The study focuses on only Module I (government sponsored students) because they are the students offered on-campus housing and the main campuses.
Self sponsored students are those who did not qualify for initial admission by (JAB-Joint Admissions Board) but are accepted if they can pay and if there is room.

10. Will some or all subjects likely be vulnerable to coercion or undue influence?
No
4. Unique Research Methodology or Data Sources

1. Will your project involve audio taping?
   No

2. Is this project web-based research?
   No

3. Is this study utilizing Protected Health Information (PHI; e.g., information obtained from a hospital, clinic, or treatment facility)?
   No

4. Does this project involve genetic data, sampling, or analysis?
   No

5. Does this project ask questions about illegal drug use or criminal activity that places the participant at risk for legal action?
   No

6. Does this project involve photography?
   No

7. Does this project involve videotaping?
   No

8. Does this project involve archival or secondary data analysis?
   No

9. Does this project involve biological samples?
   No

10. Does this project ask participants to perform physical tasks?
    No
5. Purpose, Methods, & Procedures

Describe the research purpose of the project

1. What is the significance/purpose of the study? (Please provide a brief 1-2 paragraph explanation in lay terms, to include a brief literature justification.)

The purpose of this study is to explore the possibilities that the allocation of campus housing to students is influenced by the ethnic affiliations of the student and of the people in administrative positions.

A report by Opiyo (2012), on the Standard newspaper online version, revealed tribalism within Kenyan public universities. Opiyo noted that the institutions are in total violation of the country’s Constitution that demands ethnic and gender balance for all public appointments. An audit revealed that majority of staff either come from the same ethnic group as the Vice-chancellor, the principal, or the locality of the institution.


Description of the Methods and Procedures

2. Describe the data collection procedures and what participants will have to do.

Data collection will be facilitated through a contact in Kenya. His responsibility is to print 100 copies and distribute a copy to each participant/respondent. The process of distribution and collection will be given a period of 1 month. Thereafter, the contact will send the hard copy filled questionnaires back to the researcher via post. The contact will also have to sign a consent form (research assistant consent form) before undertaking this role.

Participants will be given the survey only after reading and understanding the consent form

3. How long will these procedures take the participants to complete? Please describe the duration of the session, the number of sessions, over what period of time, etc.

The procedure with a single participant will last a period of 2 hours. The research assistant will schedule a time and place to meet with a participant, he will give the participant a copy of the informed consent form, after reading and understanding, the participant will decide whether or not to respond to the survey, acceptance will be signified by the filling of the survey.

The participant will then complete the survey at the same sitting and hand it over to the research assistant. There will be no discussion at the time that the participant responds to the survey.

4. Will there be any follow-up or will reminders be sent?

No
5. Differentiate any procedure being done solely for research purposes from procedures being done anyway.

Not any

6. Describe the time you have available to conduct and complete the research (e.g., the time from initiation of the research to completion of data analysis).

12 months, from initiation of the research to completion of the data analysis (April-February 2012)
6. Description of Recruiting Procedures

1. How will the names and contact information for participants be obtained?

The research assistant will obtain the names and contact information during the time that he will be recruiting participants. He will then prepare a list of the names and contacts and send them to the researcher.

2. How will participants be approached about participating in the study?

The research assistant is a module-I student at the Kenyan public university whose students will be participants in the study. He will be knowing some of the students.

The research assistant will select the first few through personal identification. He will ask them if they are interested in taking part in a research study. Then, with the help of this number that he will personally identify, he will identify more study subjects. This will be sort of a snowball technique. This method will be useful especially in identifying the students who reside off-campus.

Description of Benefits and Risks

3. Explain the benefits to participants or to others.

There is no direct benefit to research participants.

4. Explain the risks to participants. What will be done to minimize the risks? If there are no known risks, this should be stated.

There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this study.

5. Describe the availability of medical or psychological resources that participants might require as a consequence of the research.

The study will not require any medical or psychological resources for the participants as a consequence of the research.

6. Will compensation (including money, gift certificates, extra credit, etc.) be provided to participants?

No
7. Informed Consent Process

1. How will informed consent/assent be obtained?

The informed consent form will be emailed to the research assistant who will then print out 100 copies. He will then conduct the consent interview, give each participant the consent form to read and ask questions. The participant's response to the survey after reading the consent form will be an indication of acceptance. The participant will fill/respond to the survey within the same sitting and then give the filled survey back to the research assistant.

Once all the participants fill out their surveys, the research assistant will post the hard copies to the researcher.

2. Who will conduct the consent interview?

The research assistant will conduct the consent interview after receiving all required directions and signing his own consent form (research assistant consent form - attached)

3. Who will provide consent or permission?

The prospective participants.

4. What is the waiting period, if any, between informing the prospective participant and obtaining consent?

All within the two hours, which includes responding to the survey, if, the prospective participants accepts to participate.

5. What steps will be taken to minimize the possibility of coercion or undue influence?

Informing the research assistant about his responsibilities and the rights of the participant (no coercion and undue influence included). The prospective participants will also be informed about their rights.

6. What is the spoken language used by those obtaining consent?

English

7. What is the language understood by the prospective participant or the legally authorized representative?

English

8. Will any subjects be decisionally impaired so that they may not have the capacity to give consent?

No
9. In certain cases for children over the age of 14, such as UNL students who are 17 or 18, waivers of informed consent can be granted. Would you like to request a waiver of consent?

No
8. Confidentiality & Data

Description of How Confidentiality will be Maintained

1. The research plan should make adequate provisions to maintain the confidentiality of the data. How will confidentiality of records be maintained?

1. The participants will not be required to write their names on the survey sheet
2. Any information obtained during this study that could identify the participants will be strictly confidential
3. Upon participant’s acceptance to participate in the study, he/she will receive a unique designation identifying any data associated with him/her
4. The researcher will interpret and analyze the responses, after which the questionnaires will be destroyed (after 1 year)
5. The data will be stored in a locked cabinet in the investigator’s office and will only be seen by the investigator during the study and for one year after the study is complete. 6. The information obtained in this study may be published in scientific journals or presented at scientific meetings but these data will be presented as aggregated data.

2. Will individuals be identified during data collection or in the results?

No

3. How long will records be kept?

The records will be kept for one year after the study is complete

4. Where will records be stored?

In a safely locked cabinet in the researcher’s office

5. Who has access to the records/data?

During the study, the research assistant will have access to the records but after the data collection is complete and he sends the survey forms to the researcher. Only the researcher will have access to the records/data after receipt from the assistant

6. How will data be reported?

In a thesis

Monitoring of data to ensure safety

7. Does this research involve more than minimal risk to participants?

No
9. Attachments and Comments

Copies of questionnaires, survey, or testing instruments:

1. Awuor Survey - attached

Uploaded Attachments:

- PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM.doc
- RESEARCH ASSISTANT CONSENT FORM.doc
- AWUOR SURVEY.pdf

General Comments:

Reviewer: Diana Awuor
Date: 04/02/2012 09:12 pm
Comment: N/A