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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine the role of communication in crisis management in institutions of higher learning in Kenya, focusing on Daystar University Students’ crisis (unrest) of 2017 and 2018. The study objectives were to determine the causes of the crisis, examine how communication was used to manage the crisis, and establish the effectiveness of communication during a crisis. The study used descriptive research design and targeted the deans of the various Daystar University schools, the head of the university’s Corporate Affairs department, the heads of Strategic & Organizational Communication and Language & Performing Arts departments, Daystar University Students Associations (DUSA) members, Senior Staff Association of Daystar University (SSADU) members, and third- and fourth-year Masters of Communication students. The study used a census approach to select a sample size of 95 target population. A questionnaire was used to collect data, and the data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 21. The study found that the students’ crisis was caused by different factors, including random fee hikes, lack of value for money, lack of transparency, poor facilities at the university, and autocratic management. The findings pointed to the role of communication in crisis management in helping to reduce and contain harm, provide specific information to stakeholders, manage image and perception, initiate and enhance recovery, and explain and justify actions. The channels used to mitigate this crisis include face-to-face, social media, mainstream media, written communication, and phone calls. The most effective channel was face-to-face and social media. However, most of the respondents believed that effective communication during the crisis was hindered by misinformation, communication breakdown, and delayed feedback. The study recommends the need for university managements to embrace more open communication/dialogue/forums when making decisions involving students’ welfare.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Introduction

Crisis communication refers to efforts made to reduce and contain harm, disseminate relevant information, manage image and perceptions, introduce and facilitate recovery and eventually learn from the crisis (Seeger, Sellnow, & Ulmer, 2008). The author further emphasized that crisis communication aims to provide up-to-date information to the affected stakeholders regarding strategies the organization is taking to reduce and contain harm. Hence, for crisis managers communication is veritable tool for effective crisis management.

According to Fern-Banks (2012), efficiency of crisis management requires that in all the three stages (before, during, and after), crisis communication not only eliminates the crisis but enhances and maintains a positive repute. Fearn-Banks further posited that mitigation strategies employed in a crisis are meant to minimize injury to the company’s repute. Thus, even though crises can occasion damaging outcome to institution’s publics, it can as well be solved amicably. Hence, the communication that follows a crisis plays a key role in this success (Seeger, Sellnow, & Ulmer, 2007).

The deployment of a successful crisis communication strategy at the beginning of a crisis is integral in accepting responsibility and relaying information urgently, consistently and truthfully to the public. Putting in place an effective crisis communication strategy is important. With the internet and many other communication outlets reaching the masses quickly, it is paramount to consistently communicate about the crisis (Argenti, 2012).
Values such as openness, honesty and sincerity are key in an effective crisis management strategy.

Organizations that have a crisis communication plan (CCP) are therefore better placed to appropriately respond within a limited time (Fern-Banks, 2012). Tact and effective communication are of essence in crisis management. In the absence of these, the safety and protection of an organization’s stakeholders and its reputation are at risk. This implies that disseminating information in an organization impacts public perception both in crisis response, coordination and mitigation, (Stephenson & Malone, 2009).

Anthonissen (2008) indicated that the approach adopted in handling a crisis should be tactful in being both effective and timely through communication. This will assuredly protect an organization’s image. The public look at an organization by the approach it adopts in handling a crisis hence, effectiveness and efficiency is crucial. The main objective of crisis communication strategy is limit harm and protects stakeholder’s relationship with the organization. Hence, effective crisis management in all the three stages is dependent on communication for its success, (Coombs & Holladay, 2010)

A report by Plan International (2008) on a study of more than 1200 schools in the United States (US), and a study by Davies (2010) on school councils in the United Kingdom (UK) showed that universities where administrators communicated effectively by allowing student consultation in decision making were better placed to successfully stem out student unrest. When students feel involved by the university’s administration it erases any hostility and antagonistic behaviours because they feel supported by management.
In Kenya, a national baseline survey on student participation in school governance was conducted by United Nation Children’s Fund (UNICEF, 2009a) in response to the spontaneous and widespread unrest in Kenyan learning institutions. The findings revealed that there is need to involve the students in matters of school governance, through effective communication and consultation. The survey proposed that administrators in learning institutions should enhance effective communication to students through representation in key decision-making panels.

Studies conducted by Government of Kenya (GOK 2008), Kindiki (2009), Mule (2011), Smith (2010) found that most students interviewed after incidences of unrest in schools attributed their actions to the administration’s high handedness and absence of consultation between students and the school administration when decisions that concern students were made. As a result, there has been an increased emphasis for good governance in schools by adopting a structure that allows students to participate in decision making and governance.

Bakhda (2011) in his study on the importance of communication in learning institutions found that successful crisis management is dependent on open communication or dialogue especially in relaxing tensions between students and management. The study concluded that lack of communication or ineffective communication may result in chaos, misunderstanding, lack of confidence in the management team and unrest among the students and staff. Craig (2011) concurred with Bakhda’s findings when he asserted that through consultation with stakeholders there is increased trust that is founded on the basis that the institution is working to safeguard, example student’s welfare. This common ground is where the mutual respect and trust essential in maintaining relationships’ in
schools are nurtured. Bakhda’s study recommended that communication should be as clear as possible, promptly given without delay to avoid being misunderstood. Such communication should be networked between the school administration, teachers, workers, students and parents (Bakhda, 2011).

Ham (2016) argued that the occurrence of students’ protest indicates a breakdown in university procedures for consultation. Protest is a way of influencing when all other avenues have been shut down and often if it is not sorted out properly it lends to students’ unrest. It should be acknowledged as legal and call for university management to come to a mutual agreement. The role of the administrator can only be realized by an established comprehensive system of communication. Communication is essentially a bridge of understanding between people in any institution (Mbti, 2010).

Decisions made through consultation distribute power making it a participative and consultative leadership (Okumbe, 2008). Such kind of leadership discourages impartiality and upholds steadfastness, honesty, mutual respect and confidence on stakeholders towards the organization. Moreover, through a corporative effort, democratic leader facilitates a binding energy among their stakeholders (Armstrong, 2010). In institutions of higher learning, student’s harmony can be achieved through prior consultation before decisions are made concerning their wellbeing. Participative or consultative leadership fosters a favorable environment for more learning and more knowledge-based-sharing (Armstrong, 2010).

Background to the Study

Argenti (2012) noted that there is no organization that can be immune to a crisis and that crises can occur with little or no warning at all. Reynolds (2006) noted that once
this happens, people’s welfare may be threatened and the standing of an organization or institution be exposed. Therefore, all stakeholders should be prepared for crisis. Argenti continued to state that a crisis can originate from within an organization or from outside. Once this occurs, lives may be endangered and an organization’s standing may be exposed.

Coombs (2010) described a crisis as the outlook of an occurrence that endangers organization’s performance and stakeholder’s relationship. Therefore, a crisis is that which occurs when an organization’s reputation is threatened. A reputation is stakeholders’ assessment of how best an organization is fulfilling their objectives based on previous experiences. Stakeholders are the affected populace or those that can have an impact the organization in this case, Daystar University managements, its students and staff (Mitchell, Castillo, & González 2007). Reputation is consequently a valuable asset that is worth protecting. A damaged reputation may lead to the disappearance of valued customers and this can directly affect an organization’s existence (Coombs, 2007).

On his part, Fern-Bank (2007) described a crisis as an unpredictable event with the ability of producing unfavorable results impacting institution’s stakeholders, commodities, practice and repute. Furthermore, a crisis interferes with the normal working of an institution and it may be for an indefinite length of time. The potential negative outcomes may include financial loss, boycotts of the company’s products or services, structural and property damage, tarnishing of institutions image and repute.

Sheaffer and Mano-Negrin (2003) observed that any negative occurrence injures the relationship of institution’s stakeholders and describes stakeholders as individual groups that have an impact or gets impacted by an organization’s activities. Hence, a good pre-crisis reputation shelters an organization against the reputational capital loss during a
crisis. According to Mosha (2008), crises pitting students against management of learning institutions get a lot of notice because they are often associated with protest that result to property loss, students abstaining from classes and the subsequent closure of the institution. In such a case different parties with a stake tend to observe keenly how the crisis is handled. A similar scenario was observed at Daystar University.

In the recent past, Daystar University has experienced incidences of students’ unrest leading to learning paralysis as students protested against what could be described as an unfair administration. According to a report in The Citizen Digital of November 16, 2017, the protest in both Daystar campuses grew amid claims that the university’s management had declined to address student’s grievances as well as calling for the vice chancellor to resign (Reporter, 2017). Citizen Digital further reported that the Nairobi Campus student leader stated that “We are demonstrating here (Nairobi) and in Athi River because a few people must go. A lot of money is being embezzled and there is a problem that needs to be addressed. School fees hiked with no justifiable reasons and the Vice Chancellor had refused to dialogue with students for many months. A leaflet handed out to students listed grievances that included misuse of funds, culture of fear and complaints that went unaddressed” (Reporter, 2017)

Similarly, The Daily Nation of April 11, 2018 reported that The Daystar University Senate had closed its Nairobi and Athi River campuses amid student unrest that had rocked the institution for months. The Daily further reported that a forensic report found that there was failure to address students’ grievances, random fee hikes and tribalism within department to mention but a few. Moreover, the report revealed obscure underlying issues
highlighted by both students and staff that entangled the elite communication-famed university into crisis (Reporter, 2018)

The success of organization is dependent on how effectively they communicate to their stakeholders. Hence, decisions made are derived from productive feedback as a result of effective two-way communication. The former affirms that communication is an important tool for effective and better achievement of corporate goals (Armstrong, 2010). Armstrong further observed that the mantra of communication is to relay messages that can be apprehended and received by others. This reaffirms the stand of communication as a veritable tool of managing and organization (Nwankwo, 2014). It is from this context that the researcher set out to examine how communication was used to manage the highlighted crises and establish the communication gaps before and during the crises.

Daystar University

Daystar University is a Christian based higher learning institution, with two campuses, namely Athi River Campus, situated on the on the edge of Athi River plains approximately 38 kilometers from the city of Nairobi, and Nairobi campus, located off Valley Road, about two kilometers from Nairobi City (Daystar University, 1997). According to the Daystar university registrar in 2018 the institution had a student population of 4852. It hosts diploma, postgraduate, day and evening pre-university and undergraduate programmes.

For a long time since its inception, the university never experienced cases of student unrest to warrant media attention or its indefinite closure. The university was famed with the production of exceptional communication professionals. However, the year 2017 and 2018 saw students go on rampage demonstrating against what they termed as an
unjust administration, which they claimed declined to address students’ grievances. This led to unwarranted media attention and indefinite closure.

The corporate affairs department at Daystar University relates with all stakeholders with the view of creating a two-way communication between the publics and the institution. The department is headed by a corporate affairs manager and has a public relations section. The corporate communication department seeks to maintain the reputation of the university and has since been the custodian of Daystar University’s image. The department is not only meant to enhance mutual understanding, persuade and inform both internal and external publics, but also to implement appropriate ways of communicating before, during and after a crisis (Daystar University, 1997).

Statement of the Problem

Daystar University has experienced a number of crises, some of which led to indefinite closure of the institution. For instance, in 2017, Daystar University students from both the Athi River and Valley Road campuses held demonstrations over fees hike and dilapidated facilities among other issues. The students reported that the administration had been evasive since 2011. The institution was closed toward the end of the semester, after the involvement of post graduate students in the strike.

Most recently, in April 2018, students from both campuses boycotted classes to demand the resignation of the Vice-Chancellor. The students alleged that there was massive corruption and lack of transparency at the institution (Nyamai 2018). According to The Daily Nation of April 12, 2018, other grievances include limitations on transfer credit, lack of value for money, and substandard facilities.
Officials of Daystar University Students Associations (DUSA), Senior Staff Association of Daystar University (SSADU) and Daystar University General Staff Association (DUGSA) were suspended after questioning management’s integrity, leadership system and demanding the release of a report from the Forensic Audit that had been carried out (Kwamboka, 2018). In both instances, there is no record or media report indicating that the university management tried to handle the crises through communication to address the raised grievances. Instead, the University Council suspended the student leaders and staff unions leaders over demands to have the forensic report availed to all stakeholders for scrutiny. Later, the University’s Council closed both campuses amid student unrest (Asamba, 2018). The handling of these crises is indicative of the ineffectiveness that exists in the institution’s crisis communication plan.

Griffin (2012) identified poor communication as a major source of student turbulence in universities and colleges. The author further observed that most studies done have blamed students” unrest in the universities on poor communication. The Ministry of Education profoundly emphasizes on the use of effective strategies to deal with causes of students’ unrest. Such strategies include open communication democratic management of learning institutions and participatory decision-making which may act as checks to unwarranted students’ unrest. It is from this context that the researcher set out to examine how crisis communication was used to manage the highlighted Daystar University crises and establish the communication gaps before and during the crises.

Purpose of the Study

The study's purpose was to examine the role of communication in crisis management, focusing on Daystar University students’ crisis (unrest) of 2017 and 2018.
Objectives of the Study

1. To determine the causes of Daystar University crises of 2017 and 2018.
2. To examine how communication was used to manage Daystar University crises.
3. To establish the effectiveness of communication during the crises.

Research Questions

1. What were the causes of Daystar University crises of 2017 and 2018?
2. How was communication used to manage crises at Daystar University?
3. How effective was the communication during Daystar University crises?

Justification for the Study

Mukii (2016) posited that it is high time we ask pertinent questions as to how practical issues of crisis resolution within institutions of higher learning are handled and the role communication plays in the processes. Daystar University is known for producing exceptional communication human resources across Kenya and Africa at large; but the inconsistencies in communication challenges the very existence of the organization. Daystar University has had three strikes in a span of two years.

The grievances that were captured in 2017 included misuse of funds, complacency of senior management, a culture of fear and silence around the Vice Chancellor, broken hostels and facilities and the administration having refused to meet the students (Ngina, 2017). In all the three strikes, the students claimed that Daystar University management was evasive and failed to address the grievances they raised, a situation that evidences a weakness in the university’s crisis communication framework.

This may ruin the university’s reputation of producing exceptional communication professionals and ultimately weaken the institutions’ competitive advantage. Therefore,
this study will be useful in providing frameworks of appropriate communication responses to be used by the institution in crisis management and therefore serve to strengthen and sustain its competitive advantage.

Significance of the Study

The information provided would be of relevance to the Ministry of Education policy makers by offering frameworks of appropriate communication responses during crisis. Additionally, the contributions of this study are not expected to be exclusive to the context of learning institutions and should be of value to other organizations responding to crises.

The expanse of this study would be of interest to scholars in crisis communication as well as practicing corporate communication managers particularly those in learning institutions as reference when on how mitigate student unrest.

The study’s findings would also benefit universities’ stakeholders in understanding the role that effective communication plays in a crisis, how and when to mitigate a crisis. By informing its publics, they will be sensitized on the need to understand what would be expected of each one of them during a crisis. Other institutions can also benefit from this study by ensuring that they too have a policy or put in place a policy which they can use to counter a crisis episode if and when it occurs and the best practices to employ in the circumstance.

Assumptions of the Study

1. The success of Daystar University was dependent on effective crisis management and therefore and any crisis in the institutions adversely impact realization of their strategic objectives.
2. That the management and students at Daystar University would be truthful in responding to the research questions.

3. That management and students at Daystar University provided relevant information to the researcher.

Scope of the Study

The study was conducted at Daystar University’s Nairobi and Athi River campuses in January 2019 to August 2019. The University was selected because of the student unrest experienced in the recent past and therefore information regarding the crisis can be provided by the study participants who included both students and management staff at the university.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The respondents not giving honest feedback due to fear of victimization. To delimit this, prior arrangement was made to meet with the respondents to assure them that their identity would be kept confidential and the study was solely for academic use.

The other limitation was bias since the researcher is a Daystar University student. To mitigate this limitation, the researcher made use of research assistants in data collection and remained objective in reporting of the findings.

Definition of Terms

Effective Communication: has been defined as the accomplishment of the desired purpose of communication (Keyton, 2010). In this study, effective communication was described as the sharing of information designed to mitigate a crisis involving students’ grievances against management of the university.
Crisis management: involves identifying and analyzing issues and crises in a bid to develop suitable communication response to minimize harm on organization repute and stakeholder’s relationship (Cornelissen, 2008). In this study, crisis management referred to how the student’s unrest at Daystar University has been handled through communication in the past to mitigate crisis.

Internal communication: Described as sharing of information and ideas in an organization (Thill, 2010). In this study, it referred to the exchange of messages between the management and student and staff.

Student: This is a person studying at the university or any higher place of education (Kalla, 2015). In this study, students included undergraduates and post graduate learners at Daystar University.

Crisis: is described as an outlook of occurrence that endangers organization’s performance and stakeholder’s relationships (Coombs, 2010). In this study, crisis referred to the student unrest experienced by Daystar University.

Reputation: A cumulative analysis that stakeholders have in regard to how effectively an institution fulfills stakeholder’s expectation on the basis of previous conduct (Coombs, 2007). This study, described reputation as the way Daystar University outsiders view the university in terms of its ability to effectively manage its crises and produce exceptional graduates.

Leadership style: Defined as certain characters exuded by a leader to encourage subordinates accomplish an institution’s objectives (Cheloti et al, 2014.) In this study, leadership style referred to the management’s directives given to staff and students on what should be done and how to accomplish the tasks to mitigate the crisis.
Summary

This chapter has covered the introduction, background and purpose of the study, statement of the problem, objectives and research questions. It has also focused on the justification of the study, explaining the terms used and also covered limitations and delimitations of the study. The next chapter covers the literature review.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter focuses on an evaluation of pertinent literature on the issues relating to the role of communication in crisis management. It examines academic works by various scholars and researchers in the area of crisis communication. The key areas covered include the theoretical framework, general and empirical literature review and the conceptual framework.

Theoretical Framework

Theoretical framework is a collection of interrelated ideas about the nature of phenomena, whose effort is to demystify events based on certain principles (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). A theory refers to a body of knowledge organized into a system of interrelated constructs of elements that constitute a certain phenomenon (Mugenda & Mugenda 2008). The study used the attribution theory and situation crisis communication theory.

Attribution Theory

The theory focuses on the causes of events and outcomes including achievement-related success and failures (Weiner, 2010). It is concerned with how individuals interpret events and how this relates to their thinking and behavior. This study drew from Fritz Heider, the founder of the attribution theory, who posited that generally people tend to infer causes in terms of how they perceive a situation and how the factors related to the event faced will have an impact on individual being (Mukii, 2016; Littlejohn & Foss, 2011).
The theory provides a useful guide for interpreting crisis management and serves as the basis for explaining the relationships between crisis response strategies and crisis situations (Coombs, 2007). The theory echoes that any result of an event whether positive or negative; stakeholders will look for the cause of that outcome. Hence, decisions are made based upon dimensions of locus, stability, and controllability (Weiner, 2010). Dimension of locus assesses whether the cause for an event is in the actor (internal) or in the situation (external).

The dimension of stability examines whether the cause of the occurrence have always been present (stable) or vary from time of time and situation (unstable). Controllability dimension evaluates whether the actor can influence the causes that determine the outcome of an event (controllable) or it is beyond their control (uncontrollable). Coombs (2007) translated the principles of attribution theory into language appropriate for crises and organizations. He also posited that stakeholders make attributions about the cause of a crisis and they assess crisis responsibility.

Attributions of internal locus, controllability, and stability create the perception that an organization is responsible for the crisis. Different crisis situations facilitate certain attributions of organizational responsibility for a crisis. The stronger the attributions of organizational responsibility, the more likely it is that the negative aspects of the crisis will damage the organization. The stakeholders will perceive an organization’s image more negatively and will be less likely to interact with the organization (Coombs, 2010).

Weiner (2010) explained that causal attributions and their underlying properties of locus, stability, and controllability in turn generate differentiated affective reactions. The attributions that stakeholders make about a crisis generate emotions about the organization
and these emotions will affect their future interactions with the organization. Sympathy and anger are identified as the most important emotions from attribution theory for application to post-crisis communication (Coombs & Holladay, 2012).

Crisis responsibility is related to the effect created by a crisis. Stronger perceptions of crisis responsibility strengthen the negative effect (anger and schadenfreude) while lower perceptions of crisis responsibility are related to positive effect (sympathy). The emotions may require certain crisis response strategy in order for the response to be effective and protect the organizational reputation (Coombs & Holladay, 2012). One way that crisis-response strategies attempt to repair the damage from a crisis is by altering how publics perceive the attribution dimensions or the subsequent feelings attached to those attributions (Coombs, 1995).

Hence, the theory is crucial for this study as the causes students attribute to events, in this case the strikes, influences their character and reasoning in response to later events. For example, what was the communication (verbal or nonverbal communication) that led to Daystar University’s crisis? What response led to the closure? What exactly did the students want to communicate? Was the message really delivered? What then was the problem? Did the university understand student’s communication or messages? All these questions and more are meant to identify the causes that lead to the crisis at Daystar University. This denotes that any conduct or event can be deemed to apply the cause and effect principle, and the cause we associate impacts the meaning of our communicative acts.

The students attributed the current crisis under study to external or situational causes. This is because among other issues the students raised central was massive
corruption and lack of transparency at the institution. With all these grievances, the University Management had never tried to handle the issues through communication on how it had handled or intended to address the raised grievances. This situation caused the crisis of the current study.

Attribution is inclusive of what we communicate and conflict about (Manusove, 2008). Hence, the main features of theory are central to this study as they assist the researcher in working out the causes of Daystar University crisis and identify communication gaps during crisis management. The theory will also highlight the plan of action and steps to be implemented during crises resolution. In the case of the crisis being studied, the students attribute the crisis to Daystar University Management, who by failing to address the students’ grievances through effective communication, left the students with no choice but to strike.

Situation Crisis Communication Theory (SCCT)

Situational crisis communication theory was put forth in 2007 by Timothy Coombs. The theory establishes how major aspects of crisis impacts stakeholder’s attribution as a result understanding they respond to the crisis informs the crisis communication (Coombs, 2007). SCCT expands upon attribution theory stand to project the reputational threat presented by a crisis and to prescribe crisis response strategies designed to protect reputational assets. Indeed, one among many reasons on emphasis of effective communication in crisis management is the aspect of reputation. Coombs provides crisis managers with framework of evaluating and offer a guide for crisis response strategies.

Coombs (2007) described a reputation is a cumulative analysis that stakeholders have in regard to how effectively institutions is fulfilling stakeholder expectations based on
its past behaviors. Reputations are largely acknowledged as an asset: A good repute attracts clients, produce, investors, financial institution, employee’s satisfaction, creates customer loyalty, and enhances a corporate competitive advantage leading higher profitability (Carmeli, 2005). Organizations with successful repute have a range of skills that their opponents recognize as unique. Attaining uniqueness entails regular actions that demonstrate credibility and earn the trust of key constituents (Anthonissen, 2008).

The SCCT proposes that crisis managers should first determine the reputation threat before choosing a crisis response strategy. Reputational threat here means the amount of harm caused by a crisis to an institution if no action is taken to respond to it. Reputational threat is influenced by three elements: The initial crisis responsibility, the crisis history and the prior relational reputation (Benoit, 2010).

Initial crisis responsibility refers to how much the organization’s publics attribute the crisis to the organization how responsible the key publics hold the organization itself for the crisis (Lee, 2014). In assessing the level of reputational threat facing an organization, crisis managers must first determine the type of crisis facing the organization. Another element that threatens an organization’s reputation is its history of crisis; whether it has faced similar crises in the past. Within this context, Coombs evaluates how well an organization has treated its publics in the past. The organization’s prior relational reputation also plays a part in assessing reputational threat (Allen, 2011). If an organization has history of facing crises or a poor history of dealing with its publics, attributions of crisis responsibility and the level of reputational threat are greater.

Agenti (2012) posited that due to crisis responsibility and reputational threat, crisis can influence changes in a person’s emotions and consequently behaviors. If an individual
person perceives high level of crisis responsibility towards an organization then there are possibilities of arousing livid emotions and hostility while the vise-versa invokes feelings of sympathy. Such emotions influence people’s behaviors towards an organization and their response thereafter. After determining the levels of crisis responsibility and reputational threat, SCCT provides a framework for strategic crisis response. Coombs (2007) found that the primary responses to crises in SCCT form three groups: deny, diminish and rebuild.

Each of these strategies helps the organization get its side of the story into the media. After all, how the crisis is framed in the media will determine how the organization’s publics view the situation (Sturges, 2013). The media’s frames become the public’s frames. The denial strategy distances the connection of the organization with the institution. Hence, rumors are dispelled and there is acceptance from both the public’s and mainstream media that there is no crisis and no damage on organization’s repute.

Diminish crisis responses attempt to reduce the connection between the organization and the crisis and help the organization’s publics see the crisis as less severe. However, these strategies must be reinforced with credible evidence because the organization’s publics will adopt whichever frame that comes from the most credible source. Rebuild strategies help change perceptions of an organization during a crisis by offering real or symbolic forms of aid to victims and asking their forgiveness. These strategies attempt to take the focus off the crisis by embracing positive action (Nyabisi, 2012). A secondary type of responses attempts to use former repute with the aim of changing stakeholders’ negative perceptions, bolstering (Coombs & Holladay, 2001). The strategy is mostly used to stimulate feeling of sympathy towards the organizations.
The SCCT alludes that stakeholder’s perception is influenced by how an organization relates with their publics. Consequently, the perceptions mold organization’s stakeholders conduct or how respond or relate with the organization. Therefore, Daystar University’s crisis communication decisions made as a crisis response to the students could have great consequences, either positively by averting regular student unrest or negatively by fueling regular student unrest which soil the university’s reputation. It is imperative that crisis managers, in this case at Daystar University act strategically to save the university from repeated student unrest by effectively stating how it intends to address the issues they raise. This will assist the institution realize their goals of crisis communication which include preventing undesirable outcomes (Benoit, 2010).

From the SCCT theory review, it is clear that crisis management and reputation are intricately interlinked. Crandall (2010) stated that communication provides the entrance into a university and progression through it gives rise to a whole host of pressure and stresses both internal and external, which may lead to maladjustment. Sichei (2005) maintained interpretation of information environment communally. It sets the stage for how organization stakeholders are likely to make sense of the crisis episode. Effective communication strategies are required to elaborate crisis plans before during and after to all stakeholders. Consequently, effective management of the two variables, that is communication and crisis management will automatically lead to a better reputation. Thus, SCCT is relevant in this study in examining how communication was or was not used at Daystar University in managing student arrest.
General Literature Review

Causes of Crises in Universities

According to Wangai report (2001), the cause of crises due to students’ unrests was absence of consultation between students and administrators, poor administration and poor parenting. When parents give a lot of money, students become rude to teachers. Indiscipline is misbehavior against the established rules and regulations (Ngwakabuenui, 2015). Indiscipline is also caused by the influence of media that propagates information on students’ unrests and the same trends of unrests become a “copycat” even in learning institutions which have never had issues to cause such unrests (GOK, 2010). The same is emulated from the society which addresses matters affecting them through demonstrations, fighting and abuse. This has spilled over to learning institutions which in turn lead to violence and unrest in attempting to air their grievances and seeking for solutions first like it is done by the society.

Entrance into a university and progression through it gives rise to a whole host of pressure and stresses both internal and external, which may lead to maladjustment. Sichei (2005) maintained that fear of failure in examinations is a constant and ever-present force. Indiscipline is misbehavior against the established rules and regulations (Ngwakabuenui, 2015). Indiscipline is also caused by the influence of media that propagates information on students’ unrests and the same trends of unrests become a “copycat” even in learning institutions which have never had issues to cause such unrests (GOK, 2010). The same is emulated from the society which addresses matters affecting them through demonstrations, fighting and abuse. This has spilled over to learning institutions which in turn lead to violence and unrest in attempting to air their grievances and seeking for solutions first like it is done by the society.

Entrance into a university and progression through it gives rise to a whole host of pressure and stresses both internal and external, which may lead to maladjustment. Sichei (2005) maintained that fear of failure in examinations is a constant and ever-present force. On curriculum implementation, poor teaching mechanism that is as a result poor preparation (planning prior to teaching) against what the profession demands. This leads to poor syllabus coverage. Towards the end of the course they create a lot of pressure in the hope of preparing students for examination, a situation that causes stress to students and hence bursting into students’ unrest. Such are the poor curriculum implementation emanating from unprofessional pedagogical skills practiced by teachers (Wangai report, 2001). The report further noted that students who were not included in the making of
school rules or in decision-making were bound to break them and misbehave. In this manner, students respect what they were involved in making as part of the strategic planners of their own institution.

Williams and Chavkin (2009) echoed that frequent communication promotes mutual trust with all stakeholders and provides conducive environment for students” academic learning, social and emotional development. Through such communication, rumours, suspicions and bad plans will be done away regarding school administration. Instead, open communication is embraced by students who would rather communicate complaints directly or indirectly instead of highly planned students’ unrest as a last resort. Nasibi (2008) attributed the cause of strikes/unrests to poor administration hence disciplinary problems are not dealt with appropriately.

Omari and Mihyo (2006) analyzed academic issues as one of the causes of unrest by university students. The academic issues may include protest against hard exams, unskilled staff, insufficient of resource (books), and favouritism in teaching and examinations (Omari & Mihyo, 2006). Leadership style is another factor that causes student crisis in learning institutions. Leadership style describes certain characters exuded by a leader to encourage juniors to accomplish the institution’s objectives, (Okumbe, 2008). The author further cited that poor leadership as a cause of crisis in learning institutions. He stated that autocratic leadership style limits stakeholder’s ability to participate in decision making which has a profound administration, student leadership, students and staff relation (D’souza, 2008).
Communication as a Process

Miller (2005) observed that one of the points of convergence that many authors agree on when defining communication is that Communication is a process. The other two include communication is transactional and communication is symbolic. The process aspect suggests that communication is continuous and no communication event or behavior can be arbitrary isolated. Hence, this implies that any engagement is influenced by the past and will also have important implications on future interactions.

Crises do not happen in isolation: There may be a vacuum, lack of control or even inconsistencies in the information given. Lack of information management leads to failure to control the crisis; when the flow of information by an organization is inconsistent conflict ultimately arises. Communication is key in our daily relations and creating understanding is the essence of sending a message. Ndege (2017) noted that before any communication take place the communicator needs to understand and factor in essential elements of effective communication.

The process exerts emphasis on the second aspect of convergence and that is, communication being transactional. A model that best describes this premise is the transactional model of interpersonal communication. This model terms both the sender and receiver as communicators in the communication process: And that there is no one sender or receiver but all are communicators seeks to be understood. Whereas an example of communication being symbolic is evident when the sender decides on which signals should be used for the receiver’s smooth interpretation. Thus, effective communication that creates understanding is quite involving and even more in crisis episodes.
Internal Communication

Central to the study is the role communication in crisis management precisely between the administration and Students of Daystar University. Thus, due to the nature of relationship, the researcher noted the urgency to address major aspect of internal communication. Traditionally it was easy to distinguish between Internal from external forms of communication. However, advert new technologies (E-mails, blogs, internet Whatsapp) has meant that messages to the internal stakeholders do not remain inside, (Cornelissen, 2008).

Simkondo (2016) observed that with the arrival of new technology new communication tools such as emails, internet, videos online and newsletters border between internal and external communication. Internal communication in an organization is central in that it affects the bottom line of the organization. Effective internal communication motivates, builds trust, improves engagement and creates an environment where members are free to share ideas. It also facilitates a long-term relationship hence encouraging the organization to achieve it financial goals.

Typical communication flow in an organization are downwards, upwards and lateral or horizontal (Fisher, 2007;Simkondo, 2016). Downwards communication entails flow information from management to the subordinates. Upwards communication involves information from employees, staff and students (In our case) to management in an institution (Conelissen, 2008). Lateral communication on the other hand, is information amongst students or employees (Simkondo, 2016). Hence, for communication managers to meet organization’s goals there should be a balance amongst all flows of communication in an organization.
Whereas downwards communication transmits decision, rules and orders, lateral communication on the other hand allows for sharing information and coordination of task upwards, stimulates concerns and encourages feedback on practices procedures and new organizational changes. It is crucial to understand that feedback is an important component in communication and the way it is handled by the management will determine how organizations considers its internal stakeholders (Simkondo, 2016). Communication is only considered to be effective when the dialogue resulted in an adoption and implementation (Kalla, 2015).

Apart from feedback, communication barriers should also be removed for seamless interaction. Communication barriers are always considered to be the major problems in organizations relationships. Simkondo (2016) described barriers to communication as those that “distort or block the form of much needed information (Fisher, 2007). Barriers to effective communication include: Frame of reference, filtering (sender manipulates the message to suit the receiver), information overload (where a person involved in the communication process is frequently over burdened with information than they can effectively handle), Semantic (misunderstanding of the words, because meaning in the mind of the people that receive the message) and lastly, status difference (the higher the status in organization, the less likely the person will have effective communication with personnel a few levels removed) (Simkondo 2016). Thus, if today’s function of internal communication includes transmitting goals, activity, new development, achievement and personal contribution (Kalla, 2015), then barriers should be removed to enhance effective communication for organizational success.
Organizational Crisis Communication

Crisis management is designed to ease the destruction a crisis can exert on an institution and its publics during a crisis episode (Mukii, 2016). In managing a crisis, before, during, after there is need to pay keen attention in all the phases. Pearson and Mitroff (2008) provided a five-stage approach of understanding crisis stages which include: Signal detection, which is any form of warning which a crisis brings. Every organization should become adept to signal detection mindset. The second stage approach is preparation or prevention, which involves formation of a crisis management that provides a systematic plan of handling the crisis. The third is the containment/damage limitation stage which involves containing the crisis to the greatest extent possible. It is a stage where actual crisis management takes place. The fourth stage, where the organization makes effort to resume to normalcy is called the recovery stage. The fifth one is the learning stage where managers learn from the crisis.

Every decision made in every stage determines how soon the crisis will be neutralized and the organization moves to normalcy (Mukii, 2016). Of essence to the study is the containment and damage limitation stage, where actual crisis management takes place. Reilly (1993) stated that in managing a crisis, there is need for managers to consistently communicate starting from your decision making, resource mobilization and implementation such that communication is in betwixt all aspect of crisis management.
During a crisis, uncertainty takes center stage where there are questions of cause, blame, responses, public perception, solution, and implication arise (Lerbinger, 2007). Therefore, the essence of information sharing is to lessen stakeholder uncertainty about the crisis. The denial that the crisis did not occur may results to a huge image problem of an organization (Coombs, 1999). A good prior (pre-crisis) repute acts as a shield against the reputational capital loss during a crisis. Further, the institution that has invested heavily on corporate image can lessen the negative outcomes as they tend to communicate effectively (Coombs, 2007).

*Figure 2.1: Process of Crisis Management*
Source: Reilly (1993)
Crisis Communication Strategies

Coombs (2007) posited that during a crisis, the essence of communication is to shield, maintain and even enhance a positive image by shaping public’s perception about the crisis. Sturges (2013) concurs with Coombs that aside from informing the public’s protecting the organization’s image and influence stakeholder’s perception, another key aspect in crisis management would be damage control hence, the need for a crisis communication strategy to guide the crisis managers effectively.

When choosing crisis communication strategy crisis managers should consider, the target audience, the type of crisis, available evidence and severity of damage, the organization’s performance history, and legal issues (Coombs, 2010). Another element is credibility, this is meant to imply that stakeholders are inclined to believe an organization that is highly reliable or with a favorable repute. Culture is also another element which impacts how an organization relates with the different stakeholder groups by influencing what are considered appropriate responses. Consequently, having a strong impact on whether an organization takes responsibility, offers an excuse, or places blame somewhere else (Coombs, 2010).

Non-existence strategies seek to nullify the existence of a crisis, clarifying as to why the crisis does not exist, attaching and intimidating of others who are less powerful. Denial implies an organization declares that crisis did not happen; clarification is where an organization explains why there is no crisis while attack means confronting those who erroneously publish a nonexistence crisis. Intimidation involves using institution’s power such as litigation to counter-attack (Coombs & Holladay, 2012).
Distance strategies, describes efforts made to infirm the link between the crisis and the organization. Here, the organization acknowledges existence of a crisis however, provide excuses or justify the crisis. Excuses are attempts to lessen organizational responsibility toward the crisis. Justifications are efforts to belittle the damage so that the public’s can view it in a less negative light. The results indicated that of the six strategy categories, top on the list was mortification (Coombs & Holladay, 2012).

The ingratiation strategy thrives on gaining public acceptance such as bolstering, where an organization cushions or fortify itself using its positive repute: Another attempt would be transcending the crisis to a more favorable state, and commending others in an attempt to gain their approval. Mortification strategies are those who attempt to win forgiveness and create acceptance. These include remediation, to offer compensation to the victims, repentance, to ask for forgiveness, and rectification to clearly show that mechanisms are in place to prevent a similar crisis from occurring again (Sturges, 2013)

And lastly the suffering strategy attempts to win public sympathy. An organization can achieve this by portraying itself as a victim, hence instead of anger they draw public sympathy.

Channels of Communication

Communication channels are the means or medium by which a message is conveyed (Hargie & Tourish, 2010). Organizations needs depict the use of either internal or external communication thus an appropriate channel is chosen based on this demand. Various communication channels can be used to reach the targeted receivers and the goals of the communication. Therefore, the channel used should consider with the audience, objectives, and message content. According to Munter (2009), communication channels
could be divided into written and oral channels. Examples of written channels are hard copies, public internet, websites, blogs, wikis, and emails. Oral channels on the other hand include among others telephones, voice mails, podcasts, and conference calls. The purpose of communication channels as seen by Jones (2008) is to reach as many of the target recipients as possible, as reliably and swiftly as possible.

Canary (2011) characterized communication as vertical, horizontal, or diagonal. Diagonal communication is termed as information sharing between managers and the subordinate. Vertical communication is where communication occurs among peers. Diagonal communication aspect was meant to delimit challenges brought about by the older forms (Hargie & Tourish, 2010). Communication channels have in recent years been reshaped by technological innovations and the internet. With technology dissemination of information is fast and has not geographical limitation. Thus, communication channel options are more varied than ever before (Munter, 2009).

To many organization technologies like emails and web-based environment have become more popular in the running of business. Technology has the capacity overpower geographical limitations of time and place, to search for related materials, to examine multiple contents, and to support many communication channels. The mediated nature of communication allows greater control and more cautiousness of personal information. The delayed nature gives participants time to check, revise, or cancel their communications before the information is sent. (Miles, Kwan, & Hatem, 2011). However, Mehra (2012) upheld the preposition that media technologies lack visual output and the “inhumaness” of technologies. Hence, regardless of its pervasiveness in organizations it is inevitable to completely nullify face to face communication.
Effectiveness of Channels of Communication

Central to any communication is the assumption of call and response using certain communication channels. Reinsch & Lewis (2010) defined a channel as a medium that allows transfer of information from sender to receiver and vice versa. The author further posited that in any communication event, organizations decide on the channel that meets their objective. This implies that there are certain situations that a channel or channels would be used and other times completely ignored. Today, while sharing information, many organizations employ more than one channels. Studies by Boczkowsky & Orlikowski, 2011; Dennis, Fuller, & Valacich, (2008) revealed that the old and the new channels can be used simultaneously to reinforce messages like telephone, text messages, emails and face to face (Monge & Kalman, 2012).

Ruppel and Burke (2011) indicated that in order to achieve company’s objectives, many organizations are obliged to use of different channels simultaneously. For crisis managers to get favourable results, it is crucial to grasp the specific characteristics of communication channels. The principal characteristics for understanding various communications channels are as follows: reliability, speed and effectiveness (Lapidoth & Narayan, 2010). Reliability is the degree of certainty that the channel will function, meaning the possibility that the channel will deliver the communication content and allow feedback. Reliability depends on many factors, such as the nature of channel disturbances, the information available to the sender, the presence of any feedback from the receiver or the communication skills and motivation to use this or that channel. Cultural and organizational differences can also affect reliability and build communication barriers (Shrivastava, 2012).
Speed refers to how fast it is possible to obtain a feedback from the communication, meaning either that information is delivered or a response is received (Ballard, 2013). Bellard continued to state that communication speed is finite in terms of time and space and that it is also associated with organizational practices and values, as well as with some individual characteristics. International studies show that contemporary business communication channels like e-mail and social networks significantly accelerate the creation and broadcasting of messages as they significantly change business communicative space (Castells, 2011). One way to overcome the obstacles that arise from the increasing speed of communications is the use of not one, but several communication channels (Stephens, Cho, & Ballard, 2012). As in the case of reliability, the use of different communication channels leads to receiving a higher amount of responses.

Effectiveness refers to selection of the right channel, or multiple of channels to resolve some organizational issues and enhance its growth (Leonard et al., 2011). Effectiveness means that goals set for the communication interaction are fulfilled (Westmyer et al., 2012). Thus, the channel is perceived to be effective when it allows the organization to either send information or to receive responses from the recipient of that information. At the same time, the effectiveness of the channel depends on high efficiency, reliability and speed of communication. According to Devito (2013), messages sent and received in communication may take any form. This could be through written, oral, non-verbal or electronic forms:

Written communication: Internal communication systems in organizations can be enhanced by various forms of written communication. These forms are always slow due to information delays in the channels (Stephens et al., 2012). The authors similarly posited
that written channels are characterized by red tape or is too procedural and sometimes there’s no feedback. They range from memos, letters, notices, advertisements, newsletters, reports, bulletins, magazines and posters.

Oral communication: This is the most commonly used means of communication and contains clarity (Bauman, 2012). This is appropriate for use in internal communication in organizations, especially when it comes to employee relations. It enhances reception of messages by non-verbal cues. There’s an opportunity for face to face interaction, which creates chances for an effective internal communication system (Westmyer et al., 2012). There’s a high level of feedback thus suitable in addressing employees’ grievances. Bauman (2012) stated that to understand and use oral communication in a modern organization, one must map formal and informal channels and make careful decisions about using either or both for a given communication purpose.

Non-verbal communication: Non-verbal indicators within an organization may include the way we act, walk, eat, location of offices, number of secretaries, eye contact and posture. These paint a positive image of the organization and communicate a lot about the organization to the insider even though they mean little to the outsider (Devito, 2013). Non-verbal communication too elucidates feedback. Though actions or body language back up verbal communication, it is not the case in the modern world where our words or actions are ever having conflicting intentions (Kreitner, 2011). Listeners or the audience too require a lot of skill to match the uttered words and the body language least one escapes his/her attention and the message is missed out or distorted.
Payne (2011) indicated that non-verbal communication reinforces verbal behaviour positively or negatively up to ten percent of our engagements. However, some non-verbal cues are not planned and come naturally without being aware of their existence.

Audio-visual media: With the current trends of technology revolution, there are many changes taking place in organizations. These recent developments have fostered a faster transmission of messages to their destinations with electronic communications such as E-mail (Edmunds & Morris, 2009). E-mail sends messages faster and the faster the information moves through the channel the closer the sender and receiver are brought. Acknowledging the importance of technology in the modern enterprises, Andrews and Herschel (2016) posited that technology has changed the way employers interact with their employees.

A decade ago, group meetings were held in traditional conference rooms, where employees shared information and ideas, argued, and sometimes confronted each other face to face across a conference table. Now, in many organizations, electronic meeting allows employees to share data and ideas, solve problems and make decisions without necessarily using their voices. This indicates that now, more than ever, there more knowledge-based sharing between different structures of an organization. An organization has the liberty to choose the channel that best suites the target audience (Edmunds & Morris, 2009). Whether using one or more medium message should reinforce the other to avoid conflicting messages (Bakhda, 2011).

Empirical Literature Review

Mukii (2016) conducted a study on the role of communication in higher learning institution during crisis management found out that 96% of the respondents agreed that a
communication policy is an important document as it provides guidelines to the stakeholders on what the institutions expectations are about communication issues. One of the respondents reiterated that communication is the glue that binds people together and there is no way an institution can manage or solve a crisis without communication. Further, 99% of those interviewed appreciated the relevance of communication in crisis management. These findings underline the importance of communicating in a timely, precise and consistent manner. Failure to do this, others including the media may give information that can lead to framing on how the crisis will be deemed by stakeholders.

Kiboiy (2013) study on dynamics of student unrest also interrogated aspect of communication and efficiency by analyzing how grievances were handled during unrest. His conclusion was that in the absence of effective communication, issues and problems affecting student which would otherwise be understood by the student create some intolerance and results to great consequences. This means that the management of learning institutions need to facilitate the free flow of information, both vertically and horizontally within their institutions. By so doing, issues that may emerge within the student body can reach the decision-making bodies for appropriate action to preempt conflicts that end up being crises.

A study conducted by Bakhda (2011) on the importance of communication in learning institutions found that open sharing of information is key in helping managers relax any tensions between students and management. The study concluded that lack of consultation leads to confusion and loss of credibility with management’s team which results to unrest among the students and staff. Craig (2011) concurred with Bakhda’s findings when he asserted that through consultation with stakeholders across the board, the
organization builds mutual trust with the principle aim of safeguarding their stakeholder’s welfare. This common ground is where the mutual respect and trust essential to warm and sincere relationship in a school are nurtured. Bakhda’s study recommended that communication should be as clear as possible, promptly given without delay to avoid being misunderstood. It is the researcher’s view that such communication should be networked between the university administration, lecturers, general workers, students and parents.

Similarly, Kamanyi (2012) conducted a study on students’ rights awareness among the teaching staff and students in public universities. The study established that students’ rights continued to be abused in secondary schools by both management and teachers hence a rise in cases of students’ unrest. Lack of avenues for dialogue in most secondary schools was found to be another factor that leads to students' unrest. This means that with effective communication geared to addressing students’ grievances and respect of their rights, unrest in learning institutions can be managed.

In another study by Nyabisi (2012), it was found that that one of the major reasons for conflict and indiscipline in schools is misunderstanding, due to zero consultation between the schools’ administration and the students. The lack of freedom of expression may build up pressure and create situations where students may have no way of expressing their frustrations, hence, leading to disruptive behaviors’ in schools.

In studies conducted by GOK (2008), Kindiki (2009), Mule (2011), and Smith (2010), most students interviewed after incidences of unrest in schools attributed their actions to the administration’s high handedness and refusal to consult with students when decisions that concern students were made. As a result, there has been an increased
emphasis for good governance in schools by adopting a structure that allows students to participate in decision making and governance.

Moos (2008) recommended that there is need for school administrations to move away from the hierarchical and authoritarian forms of school governance to a system that emphasizes collaboration, communication, dialogue and participation for democracy. In support of this argument, Eacott (2011) emphasized that management of learning institutions should have a recognized system that permits all students and staff participate in decision making. A report by United Nation Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2010) also found out that students want to be involved in making decisions about their schools, since being free to express opinions and contribute to decisions and policy making. Larfela’s (2010) study revealed that students’ unrest can be stemmed through effective communication as organizations enhance teamwork and mutual trust among their publics.

Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework is a brief explanation of the phenomena being studied followed by diagram depicting major variables of the study ((Mugenda & Mugenda, 2008). Figure 2.2 illustrates the conceptual framework of the study.
Independent variables

- Communication
  - Timely Content/Messages
  - Appropriate Channels
  - Feedback
  - Appropriate Leadership style.

Intervening variable

- Previous Experience
- Attitude
- Perception
- Negative external influence

Dependent variables

- Dependent Variables: Effective Crisis Management.
  - Appropriate Response in:
    - Problem sensing and diagnosis.
    - Reduced Student strikes
    - Information flow.

Figure 2.2: Conceptual Framework
Source: Author (2020)

Discussion

The independent variable in this study is communication which is timely and done through appropriate channels and feedback. Crisis Management is the dependent variable involving early identification of the problem and diagnosis, decision making, resource mobilization and information flow. The previous experience, attitude and perception towards a crisis are the intervening variables. This leads to effective communication, effective crisis management and reduced instances of student unrest. The study assumed that administrations of academic institution are the crisis manager and students receive the actions geared to manage the crisis. Independent variables were the various procedures employed by institutions of higher learning to mitigate crises. Dependent variable was the crucial role that communication plays in crisis management plans and how through effective communication, administrations can to neutralize crisis. The intervening variables
explained the causal link of independent and dependent variables. It should be noted that intervening variables are hypothetical but may impact the outcome.

Summary

This chapter has presented an evaluation of the related literature on the role communication plays in crisis management. It has examined the literature by various scholars and researchers in the relevant areas. The major areas covered include theoretical framework, general and empirical literature review, and the conceptual framework. The next chapter presents the research methodology.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2008), research methodology as a blueprint adhered to when conducting research. This chapter therefore focuses on the research design, population of the study, sample size and sampling technique used. It also presents the target population, data collection instruments, data collection procedures, pretesting, data analysis and the ethical considerations observed.

Research Design

A research design refers to a plan for executing the investigative activities in a study with the intention of minimizing bias, distortion, and ensuring attainment of accuracy (Hapner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2007). According to Kothari (2008), a research design facilitates effective execution of research operations to generate data with efficiency of time, effort and money. Different research designs exist that can be applied however, in this study, descriptive research design was employed. Descriptive research design was used to ascertain and define the variables in a situation as they exist (Chandran, 2004). Descriptive studies are about fact findings and results in formulating key principles of knowledge and answers to fundamental problems. The design was most suitable for this study since it helped in explaining the context of the situation by providing a clear picture regarding the role of communication in crisis management at Daystar University. This design used quantitative approach to collect data from the respondents which will answer questions regarding the existing condition of individuals under study.
Population

This describes the total number of subjects from which the data is sought (Kothari, 2008). The study’s population consisted of all the Daystar University employees and students, who were 280 and 4852 respectively. The figures were obtained from the registry department of Daystar University in 2019.

Target Population

According to Toor (2009), target population is a group of people who are the focus of the study. It is the total of all items that are consistent with some determined specifications (Churchill, 2005). The author further noted that the specifications identify the elements that constitute the target group and those that do not. The target population for this study included the deans of schools, the heads of corporate affairs department, the heads of Strategic and organizational communication and Language and performing arts departments, Daystar University Students Association (DUSA) members, Daystar University Senior Staff Association and third- and fourth-year Master of arts communication students.

Daystar Crisis Management task force members were targeted because they were identified and mandated to manage the crisis. The head of corporate affairs department was also targeted because the department facilitates information sharing between stakeholder and the institution. Further, the head of communication department was targeted because the department consists of communication professionals with the understanding of what appropriate communication is during a crisis. Similarly, the third and fourth year master of Art Communication students were targeted because besides being communication professionals in the making, they had been in the university long enough and therefore...
understood how crisis communication had been done all through. The DUSA members were targeted because they were the link between students and the University management in terms of presenting their grievances. The SSADU and DUGSA members were equally targeted because they were suspended after they questioned the University management’s integrity, leadership system and demanding the release of a report from the Forensic Audit that had been carried out. Table 3.1 illustrates the Target population.

Table 3.1: Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Management Task Force Members</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoD Strategic and organizational communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoD language and performing arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Corporate Affairs Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUSA Members</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSADU Members</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUGSA Members</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third and Fourth semester MA Communication</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Daystar University (2018)

Sample Size

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2008), a sample is an element chosen to represent the study’s population. Since a census of the entire target population was conducted, the sample size for this study was 95 respondents.

Sampling Techniques

Mugenda and Mugenda (2008) described sampling as a process of identifying the number of individuals to constitute the greater population. There are two categories of sampling which are probability and non-probability sampling. This study used purposive sampling technique, which is a non-probability sampling technique. This technique
involves choosing definite cases aimed for specific purpose rather than randomly to form a sample size (Kothari, 2008). This helped the researcher target purposefully only respondents that had the required information or were qualified to provide reliable information during data collection.

Key informant technique was also used in selection of undergraduate students. Marshall (1996) posited that key informants are expert sources that have rich and detailed information about an incident. Moreover, the informants occupy positions of responsibility and influence. In this study, instead of randomly selecting from undergraduate students’ the researcher obtained data from DUSA members representing the undergraduate population, hence the study’s key informants. Based on the above explanation, the groups mentioned in Table 3.1 were chosen to achieve the purpose of the study. Further, Kothari (2008) noted that at times, the target population may not be sufficiently large, a fact that warrants the researcher to consider the entire target population in the study which is a census, since data is collected from all subjects under study. Hence, in this study, a census of the target population consisting of 95 respondents was adopted.

Data Collection Instruments

Krishnaswamy, Sivakumar, and Mathirajan (2009) provided three main data collection techniques, namely observation, interview and questionnaires. This study employed questionnaires in the collection of data. Krishnaswamy et al (2009) stated that questionnaires provide a pool of fixed questions for the respondents to answer and results to data on facts, attitudes, motivation and knowledge. Axinn and Pearce (2006) recommended questionnaires because among other reasons, it allows data standardization and adoption of generalized information amongst any population. Similarly, Cannoway
and Powell (2010) argued that questionnaires tend to encourage accurate answers from respondents and thereby eliminating bias. It is for these reasons that the study used questionnaires in data collection. The questions were classified into two. The first part gathered data on respondents' characteristics, while the second section gathered data on the role of communication in crisis management at Daystar University.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection began by seeking approval from Daystar University’s ethical review board and an introduction letter from Daystar University’s Communication department which was used in seeking a research permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). Questionnaires were then administered by the researcher and a trained research assistant. The research assistant was trained before data collection started. Questionnaires were dropped and picked at a later date to allow time for the respondents to fill. Before collecting questionnaires, they were checked for completeness.

Pretesting

Chandran (2004) described pretesting as a methodology of understanding the extent to which a questionnaire communicates. The questionnaire was pretested before being distributed to the respondents. Pretesting helped the researcher review the question and clarify them to the respondents. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2008), 10% of the sample size is an adequate sample for a pretest in ensuring validity of the data collection tools. Since the sample size for this study is 95, the researcher carried out a pre-test on 9 respondents, which is 10% of 95. The respondents were randomly picked from Technical University of Kenya (TUK) because the University had experienced student unrest in the
past. The pretested results were examined to determine whether the questionnaire was well formulated. The pretest results revealed two deficiencies in the questionnaire including ambiguous or unclear questions and insufficient space to write the responses. The researcher therefore made adjustments in the questionnaire to clarify the questions and allow enough space for the responses to make the questionnaire reliable for data collection.

Reliability Analysis

Reliability analysis is the degree to which research method produces stable and consistent results. The study used Cronbach’s Alpha measures on every objective which formed a scale and the results from the reliability test are shown in Table 3.2.

| Causes of University crises | .817 | Reliable |
| Communication use in Crises management | .831 | Reliable |
| Effectiveness of communication during crises | .746 | Reliable |

It was found that the Alpha Co-efficient for the three objectives was 0.817, 0.831 and 0.746. This implies that the instrument used was reliable because the figures are beyond the specified limit of 0.7 (Kothari, 2008). Hence, there was no adjustments required on the research instrument.

Data Analysis Plan

LeCompte and Schenshul (2013) posited that data analysis occurs at the completion of data collection. The author continued to state that data analysis starts with data cleaning, where data is checked for consistency after which the data is coded and entered into SPSS. When data has been entered, the next step is data processing which involves carrying out different statistical tests in the pursuit of answers to the research questions.
In this study, quantitative data from closed-ended questions was first coded whereby all responses were given numeric codes for ease of data capturing. This was followed by data entry into SPSS and then analysis followed. Qualitative data from open-ended questions in the questionnaire were analyzed using thematic analysis approach whereby data obtained in each open-ended question was categorized into themes and each theme assigned a subtitle. The subtitles were coded, entered into SPSS and statistically analyzed like quantitative data. The findings of both quantitative and qualitative data were presented using descriptive statistics in form of frequencies tables, charts and figures.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were observed through obtaining clearance from the Daystar University Ethical Review Board and a Research Permit from NACOSTI. The nature of the study was explained to the participants and a consent form issued for signing as an indication of willingness to participate in the survey. The questionnaires were coded to protect the respondents’ identity, hence, maintaining their anonymity and confidentiality in responses. The researcher will avail copies of the findings to the Daystar University Library, Daystar University School of Communication and the Ministry of Education through NACOSTI for accessibility and for the betterment of stakeholder relationships, especially in institutions of higher learning.
Summary

The chapter has focused on the study’s methodology which includes research design, target population, sample size and sample techniques. Moreover, the researcher has presented instruments of data collection, data collection procedures, pretesting of the research instruments, data analysis, and ethical considerations.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Introduction

This chapter has covered the data presentation, analysis and interpretation of the research findings. The study aimed to examine the role of communication in crisis management in institutions of higher, with a specific focus on Daystar University students’ unrest. The data from the completed questionnaires was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 and interpretations made. The key findings were subsequently presented.

Analysis and Interpretation

Response Rate

In this study, 66 questionnaires were administered to the students. However, out of the 66 questionnaires, 57 were duly filled and returned resulting in a response rate of 86%. On the other hand, the researcher administered 29 questionnaires to management respondents, where 20 questionnaires were filled and returned, resulting in a response rate of 69%. Mugenda (2003) noted that a response rate of 50% in a descriptive research is adequate for analysis and reporting, 60% is good, and 70% or more is excellent. Therefore, this study’s response rate of 86% and 69% respectfully were excellent and good and they are illustrated in tables 4.1 and 4.2.
Table 4.1: Response Rate for Student Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administered questionnaires</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned questionnaires</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Response Rate for Management Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administered questionnaires</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned questionnaires</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following presentation are for two categories of respondents namely, management and students.

Management Responses

Gender of Responses

The study sought to know the gender of management respondents and the findings are illustrated in Figure 4.1.

![Figure 4.1: Gender of Respondents](image-url)
The findings on the respondents’ gender shown in Figure 4.1 show that 11(53%) were male, while 9(47%) were female. This implies that both genders were represented in the study although male were slightly more than female.

Age of Respondents

The researcher sought to know the age of respondents and findings are presented in Figure 4.2.

![Pie chart showing age distribution]

*Figure 4.2: Age of Respondents*

Findings shown in Figure 4.2 reveal that 8(41%) of the respondents were 51 years and above, 6(29%) were aged between 41-50 years, 4(18%) between 21-30 years, while 1(12%) were between 31-40 years. The findings indicate that the respondents were mature (70% above 41 years) and probably had the experience at Daystar University and hence could provide the relevant information for the research.
Highest Level of Education

The respondents were asked to state their level of education and the findings are presented in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate that 7(35%) of the management respondents were degree holders, 8(40%) were master’s degree holders and 5(25%) were PhD holders. The findings suggest that all the respondents were able to read and understand the questions on the questionnaires. It might also be said that they have some level of understanding and appreciation of research.

Causes of Daystar University Student Unrest

The researcher also inquired into the causes of Daystar student unrest of 2017 and 2018 and results are illustrated in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of Strike</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration’s lack of consultation with students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for the Vice Chancellor to resign</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor student-management communication</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of value for money</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Transparency</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictions on the transfer of credits by students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results indicate that the student strike was caused by different factors whereby the need for the resignation of the Vice chancellor and lack of value for money was found to be leading both at 12(60%), followed by poor student-management communication at 10(50%). Other causes included lack of transparency at 8(40%), lack of consultation by the administration with students at 7(35%), autocratic management at 8(40%) and restriction on the transfer of credits by students 2(10%).

Formal Channels of Communication Used

This section sought to know the formal channels of communication through which important information was received from Daystar University, findings of which are presented in Figure 4.3.

![Figure 4.3: Channels of Communication Daystar University Uses](image)
Findings indicate that email was the most used channel of communication at 12(59%), followed by chapels forums at 6(29%) and phone calls at 2(12%). The findings imply that the university administration preferred to relay most information through the email.

Further the respondents were asked what they would like to see done to improve communication at Daystar University. Figure 4.4 illustrates the findings.

![Figure 4.4: Improving Communication at Daystar University](image)

Findings revealed that in order to improve communication at Daystar University, 76% of the respondents stated that proper communication has to be adopted, while 24% stated that the university administration should be prompt in providing feedback to student's grievances. Bakhda’s study recommended that proper communication should be as clear and timely to avoid being misunderstood and enhance seamless interactions. Such communication should be networked between the school administration, teachers, workers, students and parents (Bakhda, 2011). Hence, Daystar University communication should always be timely and consistently clear.
Daystar University Management’s Crisis Response

This section asked respondents to evaluate how the university managed the crisis during the strike, findings of which are presented in Table 4.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate that most respondents at 14(70%) rated Daystar University’s crisis response as bad during the 2017 and 2018 strike. The percentage is arrived by adding categories bad and very bad. Further, 6(30%) of the respondents evaluated it as good and very good. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that overall, the management of the crisis at Daystar University was not effective in the view of its stakeholders.

Further, the respondents were asked to explain why they evaluated the crisis response as they did and Table 4.6. illustrates the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dictatorial response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay in response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership was scared of students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strike was solved amicably</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management listened to students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings show that 10(50%) of the respondents thought that the crisis response was bad because of the dictatorial manner in which it was done, 5(25%) indicated it was because the crisis response was delayed leading to a crisis, 2(10%) stated that leadership was scared of students. On the other hand, 4(20%) of the respondents indicated that the crisis response was good since it was amicably resolved, 2(10%) stated that management listened to the students’ grievances, while 4(20%) stated that a crisis management task force was created. This implies that the respondents differed on their views in the manner in which the crisis was handled, with most of the respondents are of the opinion that although there was a response towards managing the crisis, the response was dictatorial and delayed.

Channels Employed in Crisis Resolution

The research also inquired of the channels that were used in solving the student strike crisis and Table 4.7 illustrates the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting between students and management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Consultations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings show that 8(40%) of the respondents stated that meetings between management and students were held to resolve the crisis, 6(30%) stated that emails were used, 5(25%) indicated that crisis resolution involved stakeholder consultations, while 1(5%) stated that memos were used. The data shows that different forms of communication were employed in the effort to resolve and involve many stakeholders in the process.
Factors that Hindered Communication at Daystar University

The study also sought to identify that factors that acted as barriers to effective communication during the students strike (crisis) at Daystar University, Table 4.8. illustrates the findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mis-information</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication breakdown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed feedback</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of repercussions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that mis-information hindered effective communication at 4(20%), communication breakdown at 7(35%), delayed feedback at 7(35%) and fear of repercussions at 2(10%). This implies that management tried to address the crisis however, these barriers hindered the effective communication at the time of crisis.

Student Responses Age of Respondents

The researcher sought to know the age of respondents and findings are presented are presented in Table 4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 years and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that 4(7%) of the respondents were below 20 years, 30(53%) were between 21-30 years, 15(26%) were between 31-40 years, 5(8.8%) were between 41-
50 years, while 3(5.2%) were 51 years and above. This data represents a cross section of undergraduate and postgraduate students.

Educational Levels

Respondents were required to indicate their education level and their responses were as presented in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10: Respondents’ Highest Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to the level of education, the researcher found out that 52(91%) of the respondents had degrees, 5(9%) had master’s degrees. The largest number of degree holders is because the research targeted master’s students who should at least hold a first degree. While undergraduates have secondary certificates (KCSE) and are yet to graduate however, were present during the time of crisis. Example, DUSA members were a link between management and students.

Respondents’ Occupation

The study also sought to know whether of the respondents were employed, Table 4.11. illustrates the findings.

Table 4.11: Respondents’ Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings in Table 4.11 show that 18(31.6%) of the respondents were employed, 25(44%) were unemployed, while 14(24.6%) were self-employed. More than half of the respondents may be taking themselves through school whether directly or indirectly at 56.2%. The percentage is arrived by adding self-employed and employed categories. Hence, timely solutions should be arrived when issues are raised before they escalate into a crisis, leading to the closure of the institution.

Whether the 2017 and 2018 Could Been Averted

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether they thought the Daystar University students’ strike of 2017 and 2018 could been averted hence Figure 4.5.

From the findings, 34(59%) of the respondents indicated that the strike could have been averted, 11(19%) indicated no, while 13(22%) stated that they did not know. The data indicates that majority of the respondents were of the opinion the strike was avoidable.

The respondents were further asked to explain why they thought the 2017 and 2018 strike could have been averted. Table 4.12 shows the findings.
### Table 4.12: How the 2017 and 2018 Strike Could Have Been Averted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective use of communication channels</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings with students</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing broken hostels and facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring accountability in the use of funds</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing students’ grievances</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings, the respondents thought the strike could have been averted if the university administration had effectively used communication channels at 7(20.5%), if regular meetings with students were held at 12(35.3%), if the broken hostels and facilities were repaired at 8(23.5%), while 5(14.7%) of the respondents indicated the strike could have been averted by ensuring accountability in the use of university funds and 10(29.4%) by addressing students’ grievances. These results reveal open and regular meeting with the management on student’s welfare would be one way of addressing student’s grievance as we as enhance accountability on both parties.

On why the students thought the strike could not be averted, Table 13 depicts the findings.

### Table 4.13: How the 2017 and 2018 Strike Could Have Been Averted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dictatorial administration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money had already been misappropriated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vice chancellor was not approachable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 2011, students’ issues were not addressed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students did not see value for their money</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the findings, the respondents thought the strike could not have been averted since the university administration was dictatorial at 2(18.1%), money had already been misappropriated at 4(36.4%), the vice chancellor was not approachable at 3(27.3%) since 2011, students’ issues remained unaddressed at 5(45.5%), while 3(27.3%) of the respondents thought the strike would not be averted because students did not see value for their money. A greater number of the respondents suggested that the strike could not have been avoided due to prolonged issues that went unresolved. That is, since 2011 student grievances have not been addressed scoring the highest at 45.5%.

Causes of 2017 and 2018 Daystar University Student Strike

This section sought to examine the causes of the 2017 to 2018 Daystar University students’ strike, findings of which are depicted in Table 4.14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>F/%</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consultation from Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor leadership style</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transparency</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor facilities</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random fee hikes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to whether the 2017 and 2018 students strike were caused by lack of consultation from Administration, 36(63%) of the respondents were in agreement, while 8(14%) were neutral and 13(22.9%) respondents disagreed. The agree category is arrived at by adding the strongly agree and agree categories. A similar working is done for the
disagree category. Further, 36(63%) of the respondents stated that the strike was caused by poor leadership at the university, while 5(8.8%) were neutral and 16(28%) of the respondents disagreed that poor leadership was responsible for the strike.

On whether lack of transparency led to the students strike, 37(64.9%) of the respondents were in agreement, 6(10.5%) were neutral and 7(12.3%) disagreed. Similarly, 38(66.6%) of the respondents agreed that the strike was caused by poor facilities at the university, 7(12.3%) were neutral and 12(21.1%) disagreed with the statement. Regarding whether random fee hikes were responsible for the strikes, a large majority of respondents at 47(82.5%) were in agreement, 2(3.5%) remained neutral and 8(14.1%) disagreed. This implies that random fee hikes, poor quality facilities, lack transparency and consultative leadership were the major causes of the students strike each scoring 82%, 66%, 64% and 63% respectively.

Post graduate students and Closure of the University

On whether the involvement of post graduate students in the strike influenced the closure of the institution, Figure 4.6 illustrates the findings.

![Figure 4.6: Post graduate students and Closure of the University](image-url)
Findings revealed that at 30(52%) indicated that the involvement of postgraduate students influenced closure of the university, 23(41%) disagreed and 4(7%) indicated they did not know. The respondents are of the opinion that post graduate students have a profound impact on the running of Daystar University management.

Why the Council Suspended the Daystar University Staff

This section required respondents to indicate why the university Council suspended Daystar University staff, findings of which are depicted in Table 4.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>F/%</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They questioned management’s integrity and demanded release of forensic report</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They supported the student strike</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the respondents at 50(87.7%) stated that the university staff were suspended because they questioned management’s integrity and demanded release of forensic report, while 7(12.3%) disagreed with this statement. Further, 48(82.2%) of the respondents indicated that the staff members were suspended because they supported the students in the strike. The data reveals that the council’s suspension could have been avoided if the council had not demanded for the release of the forensic report. May be this was alluded because at the time of suspension the students were demanding for the release of the forensic report to all by management.

Effectiveness of the 2017/2018 Students’ Strike

The students were asked to indicate whether the students' strike of 2017-2018 was effective or not and the results, Figure 4.7. illustrates the findings.
Table 4.16: Effectiveness of the 2017/2018 Students’ Strike

The findings revealed that the strike was effective at 46(81%), while 11(19%) indicated it was not effective. The data indicated that more than half suggested that the strike was effective, may be because the former vice chancellor resigned and the forensic audit report was released though not to everybody.

Communication Channels Used to Manage the Crisis (students strike)

The researcher sought to know the communication channels used by Daystar University administration in managing the 2017-2018 student's crisis. Table 4.17 illustrates the findings.

Table 4.17: Communication Channels Used in Crisis Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very frequent</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to face communication</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written message (SMS)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main stream media</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings revealed that in managing the 2017/2018 students’ strike, 41(71.9%) of the respondents stated that face to face communication was always used. The always category is arrived at by adding the sometimes, very frequently used and always categories. Similar working is done on the other categories to arrive at the percentages. 10(17.5%) indicated the channel was rarely used and 6(10.5%) stated this channel was never used. In regard to use of phones, 37(66.7%) respondents indicated they were used, 8(15.8%) stated they were never used and 12(21%) of the respondents indicated phone were rarely used. On the use of written communication channels, 32(56.2%) respondents stated they were used, 14(24.6%) indicated they were rarely used and 10(17.5%) stated they were never used. Regarding social media usage, 33(57.9%) indicated it was used, 14(24.6%) stated it was rarely used and 10(17.5%) indicated it was never used. Similarly, 28(49%) of the respondents stated that main stream media was used, 20(35.1%) stated it was rarely used, while 9(15.8%) indicated it was never used.

These findings demonstrate that in managing the crisis, different channels of communication were deployed, though to various extents. Majority of the respondents vouched for face to face and social media which scored the highest at 71.9% and 57.9% respectively. Social media may have been considered due to the internet and many other communication outlets reaching the masses quicker than the main stream media. Moreover, the age bracket of the recipient in Table 4.9 is evidence that majority of the students fall at ages 21-30 which may have prompted management to use the channel to speedily reach the student population.
Effectiveness of the Communication Channels Used in Crisis Management

This section examined the usefulness of the communication channels used in solving the crisis and Table 4.18 depicts the findings.

Table 4.18: Effectiveness of the Communication Channels Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>F/%</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very frequent</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to face communication</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written message (SMS)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main stream media</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings, the respondents stated that face to face communication channels was effective at 36(63.1%). The percentage is arrived at by adding sometimes, very frequently and always categories. Similar working is done on the other categories to arrive at the percentages. Rarely effective at 11(19.3%) and was never effective at 10(17.4%). In regard to effectiveness of written messages, 28(49.1%) respondents stated it was effective, 13(22.8%) stated it was rarely effective and 16(28.1%) indicated it was never effective. Further, 29(50.8%) respondents indicated that phone calls were effective, 16(28.1%) said it was rarely effective and 12(21%) said it was never effective. Regarding social media, 38(66.6%) respondents stated that it was effective, 14(24.6%) said it was rarely effective and 5(8.8%) said it was never effective.

Further, 24(42%) respondents said that the mainstream media was effective,13(22.1%) stated it rarely effective and 20(35.1%) indicated it was never effective.
effective. These findings demonstrate that Social media seems to be the most effective channel scoring the highest at 66% during the time of crisis.

Role Played by Communication in Crisis Management

The researcher sought to understand the respondents’ level of agreement regarding the role played by communication in crisis management and the findings are illustrated in Table 4.19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce and contain harm</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide specific information to stakeholders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage image and perception</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate and enhance recovery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain and justify actions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologize and promote healing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn and change</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings revealed that 36(63.2%) of the respondents were in agreement that communication helped to reduce and contain harm. The percentage is arrived at by adding agree and strongly agree categories. Similar working is done on the other categories to arrive at the percentages. 11(19.3%) disagreed, the disagree percentage was arrived at by adding disagree and strongly disagree categories. Similar working was done on the other categories to arrive at the percentages. While 8(14%) remained neutral. Also, 43(75.4%) of the respondents were in agreement that communication helped in providing specific
information to stakeholders, 7(12.3%) disagreed with this statement, while 7(12.3%) remained neutral. 39(68.4%) of the respondents agreed that communication was helpful in managing image and perception, 11(12.3%) disagreed and 7(12.3%) were neutral. Also, 31(54.4%) of the respondents agreed that communication was used to initiate and enhance recovery, 14(24.5%) disagreed, while 12(21%) were neutral. Similarly, 33(57.9%) of the respondents indicated that communication was used to explain and justify actions, 10(17.5%) disagreed, while 4(7%) were neutral.

Regarding whether communication was used to apologize and promote healing, 14(24.5%) were in agreement, 33(57.9%) disagreed, while 10(17.4%) remained neutral. Further, 15(26.2%) of the respondents stated that communication was used to learn and change, 26(45.6%) disagreed and 16(28.1%) remained neutral. More than half of the respondents appreciated that the main role of communication in crisis management is to provide specific information to stakeholders, manage image and perception and reduce and contain harm, each scoring 75.4%, 68.4%, 63.2% respectively.

Perceptions of how the Crisis was Managed

Table 4.20 illustrates the findings of respondent’s perceptions held concerning crisis management during the 2017/2018 crisis.
Table 4.20: Perceptions of Crisis Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>F/</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The information received was adequate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents were consulted to give advice</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication procedures were easy to follow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration responded to student complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on issues was usually delayed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings show that 10(17.5%) of the respondents stated that the information received from the university was adequate. The percentage is arrived at by adding agree and strongly agree categories same to strongly agree and disagree. Similar working is done on the other categories to arrive at the percentages. 39(68.3%) disagreed, the disagree percentage was arrived at by adding disagree and strongly disagree categories. Similar working was done on the other categories to arrive at the percentages. At 7(12.3%), the respondents remained neutral. Also, 21(36.8%) of the respondents said that they were usually consulted to give advice on matters that affected them, 30(52.5%) disagreed and 6(10.5%) were neutral.

Further, 36(63.1%) respondents disagreed that the communication procedures at Daystar University were easy to follow, 11(19.3%) indicated the procedures were easy to follow, while 10(17.4%) were neutral. Regarding whether the university administration responded to student complaints, 2(3.5%) of the respondents said they did, 43(75.5%) said
they did not, while 12(21%) were neutral on the statement. Finally, 31(54.4%) of the respondents indicated that feedback on issues was usually delayed, 12(21.1%) disagreed and 14(24.6%) remained neutral. The data demonstrate that respondents hold unfavorable perceptions concerning crisis management during the 2017/2018 crisis. This is on the basis that the disagree category scored the highest percentage in every variable, each at 50% and above.

Factors Hindering Effective Communication at Daystar University

This section examined the factors that hindered effective communication at Daystar University and Table 4.21 presents the findings.

Table 4.21: Factors Hindering Effective Communication at Daystar University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>F/%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mis-information</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication breakdown</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed feedback</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of administration</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of repercussions</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.20 show that at 48(84.3%), respondents were in agreement that effective communication was hindered by mis-information. The percentage is arrived at by adding agree and strongly agree categories. Similar working is done on the other categories to arrive at the percentages. Whereas 50(84.7%) respondents agreed that effective communication was hindered by communication breakdown, none disagreed and 7(12.3%) remained neutral. The findings also show that 51(89.4%) respondents agreed that delayed
feedback hindered effective communication, while 6(10.5%) remained neutral. Respondents further indicated that fear of administration was a hindrance to effective communication at 49(85.9%), while 8(14%) were neutral. Lastly, 52(91.2%) of the respondents were in agreement that the fear of repercussions hindered effective communication and 5(8.8%) remained neutral. The data shows that Daystar University has serious communication problems with all the variables in the table above scoring over 80%.

Communication Strategies to Address Students’ Strike

Respondents were asked to suggest the communication strategies that can be used to address students’ strikes, findings of which are illustrated below.

![Figure 4.7: Communication Strategies that Can Used to Address Students’ Strike](image)

Findings show that 30(52%) of the respondents require that there be regular communication between university management and students, 23(41%) suggested that frequent forums be held where university management and student body consult on issues
affecting students and 4(7%) respondents suggested that barazas be used to address student strikes. The respondents were of the opinion that open and consultative strategies should be embraced by management to avert any student strike in future.

Extent of Understanding of Students' Communication by the Administration

This part inquired from the respondents of the extent to which Daystar University administration understood students' communication and Table 4.22 presents the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very great extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small extent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted in Table 4.22 indicate that the university administration understood student communication to a great extent at 6(10.6%), to a moderate extent at 6(10.2%), to a small extent 20(35.1%) and not all at 25(43.9%). These findings demonstrate that Daystar University administration generally did not understand the communication that came from students, a fact that may have led to the strikes.

Crisis Response Strategies Used

This section endeavored to identify the crisis response strategies Daystar University management embraced. Findings are depicted in Table 4.23.
Table 4.23: Crisis Response Strategies Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>F/ %</th>
<th>Very great extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortification</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evade responsibility</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce offensiveness</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective action</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results revealed that mortification was employed to a small extent at 21(36.8%), to a moderate extent at 6(10.5%), to a great extent at 7(12.3%) and was never employed at 23(40.4%). Also, respondents stated that the denial strategy was employed to a great extent at 57(100%). Similarly, the respondents stated that the management evaded responsibility at 53(93%). The university management also endeavored to reduce offensiveness to a great extent at 44(92.6%) and to a moderate extent at 13(22.8%). Lastly, the university management took corrective action to a great extent at 36(83.7%), to a moderate extent at 7(12.3%), to a small extent at 10(17.5%) and not all at 4(7%). The findings demonstrate that in responding to the crisis, the University administration embraced more the denial, evading responsibility, reducing offensiveness than corrective action strategies and mortification.

Evaluation of Crisis Response

This part inquired from respondents how they evaluated the Daystar University's crisis response during the 2017/2018 crises. Results are presented below.
Table 4.24: Evaluation of Crisis Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings depicted in the Table 4.24 show that 26(45.6%) of the respondents evaluated the crisis response as good, 16(28.1%) as bad and 15(8.8%) did not know how to evaluate the crisis. The 26(45.6%) was arrived at by adding the good and very good categories. These findings that less than half (45.6%) appreciated the crisis management while 28.1% or close to a third said it was bad.

Summary of Key Findings

This study’s findings indicated that the student strike was caused by different factors including random fee hikes at 47(82.5%), the need for the resignation of the vice chancellor and lack of value for money at 12(60%), poor student-management consultation at 36(63%), poor leadership at the university at 36(63%), lack of transparency at 37(64%) and poor facilities at the university at 38(66.6%). Other causes were lack of consultation by the administration with students at 7(35%), autocratic management at 8(40%), and restriction on the transfer of credits by students.

Regarding how communication was used to manage Daystar University crises, 36(63.2%) of the respondents appreciated that communication was used through employment of different channels to pass on messages. According to the respondents face to face communication and Social Media scored the highest at 71.9 and 57.9%
respectively, followed by written communication which stood at 56.2% and the mainstream media scoring 49%.

The respondents also appreciated that in any crisis management effective communication helps to reduce and contain harm, 11(19.3%), regarding communication helping providing specific information to stakeholders about the crisis, 43(75.4%) of the respondents agreed. 39(68.4%) said that it was helpful in managing image and perception, 31(54.4%) indicated that communication was used to initiate and enhance recovery, 33(57.9%) of the respondents said that communication was used to explain and justify actions. Concerning the communication effectiveness, the findings reveal that social media seems to be the most effective channel at 66%, followed by face to face at 63% then use of phone at 50.8%

Summary

This chapter has given the research findings in detail as the respondents provided, summarizing and presenting the data in a manner that can be understood. Data was organized and presented in tables in accordance to the study objectives. The analyzed data forms the basis on which chapter five will be presented providing discussions, conclusions and recommendations including areas for future research.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion of the research findings, conclusions drawn from the study and recommendations made by the study. The study sought to examine the role of communication in crisis management in institutions of higher, a case of Daystar University students’ strike. It attempted to determine the causes of Daystar University crises of 2017 and 2018, examine how communication was used to manage Daystar University crises and to establish the effectiveness of communication during the crises. The three objectives of the study founded this discussion.

Discussions of Key Findings

Causes of Daystar University Crises of 2017 and 2018

The first objective was to determine the causes of Daystar University crises of 2017 and 2018. The study found that the student strike was caused by different factors including random fee hikes at 47(82.5%), the need for the resignation of the vice chancellor and lack of value for money at 12(60%), poor student-management consultation at 36(63%), poor leadership at the university at 36(63%), lack of transparency at 37(64%) and poor facilities at the university at 38(66.6%). Other causes were lack of consultation by the administration with students at 7(35%), autocratic management at 8(40%) and restriction on the transfer of credits by students at 10%. These findings concur with those of Kamanyi (2012) who found that cases of students’ strike originated from students' rights violations, lack of avenues for dialogue. This denotes that effective communication geared to addressing students’ grievances and respect of their rights could avert unrest in learning
institutions. In other studies, by Nyabisi (2012) and Bowen & Rebecca (2012) found that one of the major reasons for conflict and unrest in learning institutions was misunderstanding, which is often caused by autocratic administration where students do not have the liberty to air their views. Such leadership create situations where students may have no way of expressing their frustrations, hence leading to disruptive behaviour.

Similarly, in studies conducted by GOK (2008), Kindiki (2009), UNICEF (2009) and Mule (2011), most students interviewed after incidences of unrest in schools attributed their actions to the administration’s high handedness and absence of consultation between and school administration and students when decision are made. As a result, there have been increased emphasis for good governance in learning institutions by adopting a structure that allows students to participate in decision making and governance. From the findings in table 4.13 the strike could not have been averted predominantly due to unresolved issues regarding students’ welfare since the year 2011 scoring the highest at 45.5%.

Bakhda (2011) study on the importance of communication in learning institutions found that open communication is an integral part of successful management and may help in relaxing tensions between students and management. Findings from Figure 4.4 revealed that in order to improve communication at Daystar University, 76% of the respondents stated that proper communication has to be adopted, while 24% stated that the university administration should be prompt in providing feedback to student’s grievances. Bakhda’s study recommended that proper communication should be as clear and timely to avoid being misunderstood and enhance seamless interactions. Such communication should be
networked between the school administration, teachers, workers, students and parents (Bakhda, 2011).

How Communication was Used to Manage Daystar University Crises

The findings revealed that in managing the crisis, different channels of communication were deployed, though to various extents. Face to face communication scored the highest at 71.9%, a form of communication considered to triumphs in any engagement. Social media was next scoring 57.9%, written communication at 56.2% and main stream media scoring 49%. That notwithstanding, 68.3% disagreed that information received from the university was adequate. Slightly more than fifty percent (52.5%) of the respondents disagreed that they were usually consulted to give advice matters that affect them. Moreover 63.1% of the respondents disagreed that the communication procedures at Daystar University were easy to follow. Regarding whether the university administration responded to student complaints, 75.5% said they did not. Finally, 54.4% of the respondents indicated that feedback on issues usually delayed.

The findings above demonstrate that respondents hold unfavorable perceptions concerning crisis management during the 2017/2018 crisis. This is on the basis that the disagree category scored the highest percentage in every statement. Griffin (2012) identified poor communication as a major source of student turbulence in universities and colleges. The author further observed that most studies done have blamed students’ unrest in the universities on poor communication. The Ministry of Education profoundly emphasizes on the use of effective strategies to deal with causes of students’ unrest. Such strategies include open communication democratic management of learning institutions and participatory decision-making which may act as checks to unwarranted students’
unrest. The findings also concur with those of Anthonissen (2008) that the approach adopted in handling a crisis should be tactful in being both effective and timely through communication. This will assuredly protect the organization’s stakeholder relationships and consequently image. Hence, Daystar University administration should embrace timely communication and dialogue strategy to enhance effective communication.

In addition to this, results depicted in Table 4.21 show that the university administration did not understand student’s communication at 43.9%. Hence, this misunderstanding among other reasons might have led to the students strikes. Kiboiy (2013) study on dynamics of student unrest concluded that in the absence of effective communication, issues and problems affecting students which would otherwise be understood by the students create some intolerance and results to great consequences. The findings concur with those of Bakda (2011) that communication should be as clear as possible, promptly given without delay to avoid being misunderstood. Such communication should be networked between all stakeholders for communication effectiveness to be achieved.

Furthermore, the respondents were also asked on the role of communication in crisis management. The findings revealed that 63.2% of the respondents stated that communication helps to reduce and contain harm. More than seventy percent (75.4%) of the respondents indicated that communication helps in providing specific information to stakeholders and 68.4% reported that communication was helpful in managing image and perception. Close to half (54.4%) indicated that communication was used to initiate and enhance recovery. Moreover, 57.9% of the respondents reported that communication was used to explain and justify actions. Indicating that majority of the respondents appreciated
the role of communication in crisis management. Affirming Sturges (2013) sentiments that central to crisis management is an organization’s effective communication.

Effectiveness of Communication During the Crises

Any communication presupposes call and response using certain communication channels. Hence, from the findings, the respondents stated that face to face communication channels was effective at 63.1% whereas in written messages close to fifty percent (49.1%) reported that it effective. Further, 50.8% of the respondents indicated that phone calls were effective and 66.6% of the respondents reported that social media was effective. Slightly more that forty percent (42%) respondents said that the mainstream media was effective. These findings demonstrate that social media seemed to be the most effective channel at 66%, followed by face to face at 63%.

Westmyer et al. (2012) stated that effectiveness means that goals set for the communication interaction are fulfilled. Thus, a channel is perceived to be effective when it allows the organization to either send information or to receive responses from the recipient of that information. Moreover, effectiveness of communication depends on high efficiency, speed and reliability of the communication channel. More than sixty percent (66.6%) of the respondents reported that social media was highly effective may be due to its promptness, availability and advantages to reach the greater student population. Face to face communication was next at 63.1% followed by written communication scoring 49.1%.

Seeger et al. (2008) stated that effectiveness of crisis communication is determined by how crisis communication helps to reduce and contain harm, provide specific information to stakeholders, initiate and enhance recovery, manage image and perceptions
of blame and responsibility, repair legitimacy, generate support and assistance, explain and justify actions, apologize, and promote healing, learning and change. From this study, the respondents appreciated the role of communication in crisis management, in that it helps to reduce and contain harm at 63.2%. Also 75.4% of the respondents were in agreement that communication helps in providing specific information to stakeholders. Moreover, 68.4% of the respondents reported that communication helps in managing image and perception and 54.4% agreed that communication can be used to initiate and enhance recovery. Similarly, 33(57.9%) of the respondents indicated that communication can be used to explain and justify actions, apologize and promote healing, 14(24.5%) were in agreement, to learn and change at 26.2%.

Similarly, Argenti (2012) observed that the deployment of a successful crisis communication strategy at the beginning of a crisis is integral in accepting responsibility and relaying information urgently, consistently and truthfully to the public. In regard to the study, there were different communication strategies/approaches used to varying extent. The results revealed that mortification was used by 40.4% of the respondents. Denial strategy was employed at 100% and evading responsibility by 93% of the respondents. The university management also endeavored to reduce offensiveness to 92.6%. Lastly, the university management took corrective action to 83.7%. The findings demonstrate that in responding to the crisis, the University administration embraced more the denial, evading responsibility, reducing offensiveness than corrective action strategies and mortification.

Agenti (2012) affirmed that putting in place an effective crisis communication strategy is essential as values like openness, honesty and sincerity are key in an effective crisis management strategy. Anthonissen (2008) indicated that the approach adopted in
handling a crisis should be tactful in being both effective and timely through communication. This will assuredly protect an organization’s image. The public look at an organization by the approach it adopts in handling a crisis. The respondents were of the opinion that open and consultative strategies should be embraced by management to avert any student strike in future. 52% of the respondents suggested regular communication between university management and students, 41% were of the opinion that frequent forums be held where university management and student body consult on issues affecting students and 7% respondents suggested that barazas be used to address student strikes.

Bakhda (2011) cited that learning institution successful crisis management is dependent on open communication/dialogue especially in relaxing tensions between students and management. Hence, these are some of the factors that the respondents felt hindered effective communication at Daystar University. The findings in table 4.20 show that 84.3% of the respondents were in agreement that effective communication was hindered by mis-information. Close to eighty five percent (84.7%) reported of the respondents agreed that effective communication was also hindered by communication breakdown, delayed feedback at 89.4%. Respondents further indicated that fear of administration was a hindrance to effective communication at 85.9%.

Lastly, more than ninety percent (91.2%) of the respondents reported that the fear of repercussions was also a hindrance effective communication. This data indicates that Daystar University had serious communication problems with all the variables in the aforementioned table scoring over 80%. This affirms Bakhda’s (2011) study which indicated successful crisis management in learning institutions is dependent on open communication/dialogue especially in relaxing tensions between students and
management. Hence, seamless communication at Daystar University can only be achieved when such factors are addressed.

Attribution theory posits that people make judgments’ about the causes of events based upon the dimensions of locus, stability, and controllability (Weiner, 2010). According to Wilson (2010), the dimension of locus assesses whether the cause for an event is in the actor (internal) or in the situation (external). The study found that the student strike was caused by different factors including random fee hikes at 82.5%, the need for the resignation of the vice chancellor, poor student-management consultation at 63%, poor leadership at the university at 63%, lack of transparency at 64% and poor facilities at the university at 66.6%. Other causes were lack of consultation by the administration with students at 35%, autocratic management at 40% and restriction on the transfer of credits by students at 10%. Hence, the causes of this crisis were external factors; this implies that the respondents were of the opinion that the situation (Poor leadership, poor facilities and lack of consultation) resulted to the student unrest.

The dimension of stability analyses whether the causes of a crisis have always been existing (stable) or vary from time to time and context (unstable). From the findings, the respondents thought the strike could not have been averted since the university administration was dictatorial at 18.1%, money had already been misappropriated at 36.4%, the vice chancellor was not approachable at 3(27.3%) and since 2011 students’ issues remained unaddressed scoring the highest at 45.5%. Hence, the causes of this strike were always present and if addressed the strike could have been avoided thus, dimension stable.
Controllability dimension evaluates whether the actor can influence the causes to determine the outcome of an event (controllable) or the causes are beyond the actor’s influence (uncontrollable.) From the findings, in responding to the how the strike could have been averted the respondents were of the opinion if there were regular meetings with students were held 35.3% and if the broken hostels and facilities were repaired at 23.5% or 14.7% of the respondents indicated the strike could have been averted by ensuring accountability in the use of university funds and 29.4% by addressing students’ grievances. The respondents were of the opinion that the administration could have resolved these issues hence, dimension controllable.

Whereas SCCT prescribes crisis response strategies to institution crisis managers, Coombs (2007) found that the primary responses to crises in SCCT form three groups: deny, diminish and rebuild. Each of these strategies helps the organization get its side of the story into the media. After all, how the crisis is framed in the media will determine how the organization’s public’s view the situation (Sturges, 2013). The study’s data revealed that there were different communication strategies/approaches used however, to varying extent. Mortification was never employed at 40.4%. Denial strategy was used to 100% while evading responsibility at 93%. The university management also endeavored to reduce offensiveness at 92.6%. Lastly, the university management took corrective action to a great extent 83.7% hence, a clear indication that the Daystar University management focused on primary crisis response strategies to mitigate the crisis.

Conclusion

The study made the following conclusions:
This study found out that the strikes were occasioned by poor or lack of student-management consultation on key issues affecting students. Hence, the study concludes that channels of communication that provide effective dialogue between management and students are key in averting constant strikes in learning institutions. Moreover, decision-making in Daystar University was not as participatory and inclusive. The students and management who formed the main stakeholders were not involved in major university decision making. This is evidenced by the finding that management was autocratic and hence students demanded the sacking of the vice chancellor.

Modes and channels of communication were mainly top-bottom from the results analyzed and, therefore, not showing open communication which is really the standard model of communication in modern management. Student barazas were not encouraged as a way of reducing tension in the university. This is evidenced by the findings which showed that 30(52%) of the respondents suggested that there be regular and frequent forums between the university management and student body on students’ welfare.

More than half appreciated the role of communication in crisis management, in that it helps to reduce and contain harm at 63.2%. Also, at 75.4% of the respondents were in agreement that communication helps in providing specific information to stakeholders. Moreover, 68.4% said that communication helps in managing image and perception among other. Hence, that study concludes that during a crisis, communication is key in helping reduce harm, disseminate information, managing image and perception and initiating and enhancing recovery

Recommendations

The study made the following recommendations:
Findings showed that Daystar University had serious communication problems with all the variables scoring over 80% that is at 84.3%, the respondents were in agreement that effective communication was hindered by mis-information. At 84.7% respondents agreed that effective communication was hindered by communication breakdown. The findings also show that 89.4% respondents agreed that delayed feedback hindered effective communication. Respondents further indicated that fear of administration was a hindrance to effective communication at 85.9%. Lastly, 91.2% of the respondents were in agreement that the fear of repercussions hindered effective communication. Hence, there is need for Daystar University administration to embrace more open communication/dialogue with their students. In this way the students will vent out their issues and frustrations and the administration will be able to take note of and respond to them instantly.

Findings captured in Table 4.8 show that 52% of the respondents suggested that there be regular communication between university management and students, 41% suggested that frequent forums be held where university management and student body consult on issues affecting students and 7% respondents suggested that barazas be used to address student strikes. Therefore, it is paramount decisions affecting students should be arrived in open forums through involvement of the students in decision-making, a fact that was found to be a problem.

Moreover, findings shown in Table 4.13 revealed that a majority of the respondents were of the opinion that the strike could not have been avoided due to prolonged issues that go unaddressed. That is, since 2011 student grievances have not been addressed scoring the highest at 45%. If the issues had been addressed upon presentation then the strike could be avoided. Thus, the university administration should always seek to address
students’ grievances upon presentation to avoid student unrest which more often lead to losses and interfere with the learning program. Moreover, findings in Table 4.13 revealed that a majority of the respondents were of the opinion that the strike could not have been avoided due to prolonged issues that go unaddressed. That is, since 2011 student grievances had not been addressed scoring the highest at 45%. If the issues had been addressed upon presentation then the strike could be avoided. Thus, the university administration should always seek to address students’ grievances upon presentation to avoid student unrest which more often lead to losses and interfere with the learning program. Furthermore, since it was found that mis-information, communication breakdown and delayed feedback hindered effective communication; the university management should consider putting in place communication mechanisms that facilitate accurate and timely communication between students and management. This will sustainably address the barriers and student strikes at Daystar University may be a thing of the past.

Regarding crisis management strategy, Table 4.22 illustrates that there were different crisis management strategies/approached used however, to varying extent. The results revealed that mortification was never employed at 40.4%. Denial strategy was employed at 100% while evading responsibility at 93%. The university management also endeavored to reduce offensiveness at 92.6%. Lastly, the university management took corrective action at 83.7%. The findings demonstrate that in responding to the crisis, the University administration embraced more the denial, evading responsibility, reducing offensiveness and corrective action strategies. Consequently, in the event of a crisis, the study recommends that the university should effectively employ appropriate crisis management strategies including mortification, reduction of offensiveness and taking of
corrective action so as to reduce and contain harm as well as help manage image and perception.

Recommendations for Further Research

The findings indicated that there was a serious communication problem since all the variable scored over 80%. Hence, the study suggests that there need for further research on messages that were used during the strike.

This study suggests further research be done in this area of students’ unrest in a much broader geographical area involving various learning institutions so that the findings may be compared and a policy on students’ unrest be developed to assist university administrations curb this crisis in university system in Kenya. Further studies could also be done on the role of students’ leaders in influencing affirmative action in institutions of higher learning.
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APPENDICES

Background Information

Appendix A: Questionnaire for Students

My name is Grace Dhahabu Birya, a student at Daystar University undertaking a Master’s degree in Communication. The purpose of this survey is to find out the role of communication in crisis management in institutions of higher learning. Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary, confidential and your name will not be connected to any of the results. Please read each question carefully and rate your level of agreement with each statement by choosing the answer that most closely represents your opinion.

Do you agree to participate in this survey Yes [ ] No [ ]

Section A: Background Information

Please tick (√) in the appropriate bracket or answer as required.

Qn1. What is your age?

Below 20 years [ ] 21-30 years [ ] 31-40 years [ ] 51 years and above [ ]

Qn2. What is your gender? Male [ ] Female [ ]

Qn3. What is your highest level of education?

Degree [ ] Masters [ ] PhD Ass Professor [ ]

Qn4. What is your occupation?

Employed [ ] Unemployed [ ] Self-employed [ ] Student [ ] Others [ ]

Section B: Causes of Daystar University Crisis

Qn5. Could the Daystar University students strike of 2017 and 2018 have been averted?

Yes [ ] No [ ] I don’t know [ ]
a. Explain you answer in Q5.

Qn6. What were the causes of Daystar University student strike of 2017 and 2018?

Strongly agree (SA), Agree (A) Neutral (N) Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>DSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consultation from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor leadership style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random fee hikes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qn7. Did the involvement of Post graduate students in the strike influence the closure of the institution?

Yes [ ] No [ ] I don’t know [ ]

Qn8. Was the students’ strike of 2017-2018 effective (In that it solved students’ grievances?)

Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. Explain your answer in Q8 giving one example.

Section C: Role of communication in Crisis management

Qn9. What channels of communication were used by the Daystar University administration in managing 2017-2018 crisis?
Qn10. Were the above channels useful in solving the crisis. (To mean it addressed students’ grievances.) Provide a short explanation for each response below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels</th>
<th>Extent of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written message (SMS Notices)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (Emails, WhatsApp, Twitter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main-Stream Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qn12. Indicate your level of agreement with the statements below regarding the role played by communication from the administration in crisis management?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce and contain harm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide specific information to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate and enhance recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage image and perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain and Justify actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologize and promote healing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn and change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Communication Effectiveness in Crisis Management

Qn13. Were the channels of communication used by student leaders effective? (In disseminating information to fellow students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels</th>
<th>Very great Extent</th>
<th>Great Extent</th>
<th>Moderate Extent</th>
<th>Small Extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face (Baraza)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication (Text)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (Emails, Whatsapp, Daystar Oracle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qn14. Please tick the appropriate column that represents your perception during the crisis

Strongly agree (SA), Agree (A) Neutral (N) Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD).
The quality of information received from the university was Adequate

I was consulted to give advice on matters that affect me

The communication procedure at Daystar University was easy to follow

The administration responded to student complaints during the crisis

The feedback on issues was delayed

Qn15. What factors hinder effective communication at Daystar University? (Tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Misperception
B Communication breakdown
C Delayed feedback
D Fear of administration
E Fear of repercussions

Qn16. Are you aware of the Daystar University Communication Plan?

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

Qn17. In your own opinion what communication strategies can be put in place to address students’ unrest at Daystar University in future?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
Qn18. To what extent did Daystar University administration understand students’ communication?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very great extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Explain your response in Qn18 (a)

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

Qn19. Indicate the extent to which the following Crisis Response Strategies were used by Daystar University Management during the 2017 and 2018 crisis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Very great extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evade responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce offensiveness (challenge the accuser)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective action (Promise change and prevent a repeat of the action)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortification: Admit guilt, Ask for forgiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qn20. How do you evaluate the Daystar University’s crisis response during crises?
Very good [ ] Good [ ] Don’t know [ ] Bad [ ] Very Bad [ ]

Thank You
Appendix B: Questionnaire for Management

My name is Grace Birya, a student at Daystar University undertaking a Master’s degree in Communication. The purpose of this study is to examine the role of communication in crisis management in higher learning institutions, a case of Daystar University. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, confidential and your name will not be connected to any of the results. Please read each question carefully and rate your level of agreement with each statement by choosing the answer that most closely represents your opinion.

Do you agree to participate in this survey? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Section A: Background information

Please tick (√) in the appropriate bracket or answer as required.

Qn1. What is your age?
Below 20 years [ ] 21-30 years [ ] 31-40 years [ ] 41-50 years [ ]
51 years and above [ ]

Qn2. What is your gender?
Male [ ] Female [ ]

Qn3. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
Degree [ ] Masters [ ] PhD [ ] Ass Professor [ ] Professor [ ]

Qn4. What is your position in Daystar University?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Section B: Causes of Daystar University Crisis

Qn5. From the list provided below, please indicate the causes of Daystar University student unrest of 2017 and 2018? Tick all that apply.

a) Administration lack of Consultation with Students [ ]

b) Dilapidated Facilities [ ]

c) Need for the Vice Chancellor to resign [ ]

d) Poor student-management communication [ ]

e) Autocratic management [ ]

f) Lack of value for money (The fees students pay) [ ]

g) Lack of Transparency [ ]

h) Restrictions on the transfer of credits by students [ ]

i) Others

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Qn6. In your opinion, why did the council suspend Daystar University Unions? Tick One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They questioned management’s integrity and demanded release of forensic report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They supported students in the strike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C: Role of Communication in Crisis Management

Qn7. Describe the formal channels through which you receive important information from Daystar University?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

Qn8. What would you like to see done to improve communication at Daystar University so that we reduce crises?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

Communication Effectiveness in Crisis Management

Qn9. How do you evaluate Daystar University Management’s crisis response during the students’ strike?

Very good [ ]   Good [ ]     Don’t know[ ]     Bad [ ]
Very Bad [ ]

Explain your answer above (Qn9)
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
Qn10. What channels of communication were used in solving the student strike crisis?

a) __________________________

b) __________________________

c) __________________________

Qn11. What Factors Hinder Communication at Daystar University? (Tick all that apply)

a) Mis-information []
b) Communication breakdown []
c) Delayed Feedback []
d) Fear of repercussions []

Qn12. In your own opinion, what communication strategies can be put in place to address students’ unrest at Daystar University in future?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Communication Effectiveness in Crisis Management

Qn9. How do you evaluate Daystar University Management’s crisis response during the students’ strike?

Very good [ ] Good [ ] Don’t know [ ] Bad [ ] Very Bad [ ]

Explain your answer above (Qn9)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Qn10. What channels of communication were used in solving the student strike crisis?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

Qn11. What Factors Hinder Communication at Daystar University? (Tick all that apply)

a) Mis-information [ ]

b) Communication breakdown [ ]

c) Delayed Feedback [ ]

d) Fear of repercussions [ ]

Qn12. In your own opinion, what communication strategies can be put in place to address students’ unrest at Daystar University in future?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

Thank You
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