cogent
education

*Corresponding author: Felix Omal, Ali Mazrui Centre for Higher Education Studies, School of Education, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa
E-mail: omalfelix@gmail.com

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT | RESEARCH ARTICLE

The relationship between confidence in institutional values and student participation in leadership: A case of comprehensive universities

Felix Omal[1]* and Beatrice M'mboga Akala[2]

Abstract: Key drivers of major changes in the post 1994 South African higher education transformation has been due to the increased involvement of university students in the university leadership and governance. However, strife for increased participation has often resulted into tension between the university student organizations and the university leadership. This has often made university students as institutional stakeholders re-question their faith and confidence in institutional values in fostering university transformation and change. This paper argues that relationships between these two factors are fundamental to these processes; quality student participation in leadership and confidence in institutional values. The paper makes use of the concept of culture within a micro-political framework to generate models of good governance within such stakeholder institutional environments. The study relied on data collected through documents, interviews and surveys. In its conclusion, the paper calls for the professionalization of stakeholder governance practises in stakeholder governed university environments.

Subjects: Higher Education; School Leadership, Management & Administration; Sustainability Education, Training & Leadership; Education Policy & Politics

Keywords: university governance; university council; participation in leadership; confidence in institutional values; comprehensive universities

1. Introduction

This paper is examining the relationship between stakeholder participation in leadership and confidence in institutional values and to understand what this means for effective governance. In the post 1994 South African higher education dispensation, the driver for change was the demand to increase the disempowered stakeholder access to equally participate in leadership and governance. For this to happen, the state policy of cooperative governance was incepted. Under the notion of cooperative governance, institutions were expected to create conditions and

PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

Whereas South African higher education has undergone great transformation since the fall of apartheid, a lot of emphasis has been placed on attaining equity and equality for the formerly marginalized groups in accessing and succeeding in higher education. Shifting the debate to governance structures in university Councils opens another avenue of engaging with transformation within leadership structures. The findings of a case study that was conducted at a comprehensive university is testimony to how university leadership structures have not transformed substantially. The findings indicate that, although the democratic spaces in university Councils have opened up for crucial stakeholders such as student leaders to participate in key decision-making processes; they are limited in participating effectively because of stringent governance structures that have not changed completely. The paper suggests the strengthening of students' participation, trust between stakeholders be built and all stakeholders to embrace the transformation agenda fully.

cogent·oa

cogent ⋅⋅ education

practices that would foster different institutional stakeholders in spite of their differences to be able to participate in the leadership and governance their institutions (Council on Higher Education [CHE], 2004). However, the implementation of this state policy has been characterized by difficulty and different interpretations that have affected its success. According to different independent assessor reports commissioned by the department of education, the major causes of governance challenges laid in the processes of implementation that led to governance dysfunctionality (Department of Education [DOE], 1999; University of Transkei, 1998).

However, we argue that two aspects are critical to this process. Firstly, the participation in leadership and confidence in institutional values and secondly, the relationship between these two aspects are critical for effective governance. Good governance is closely related to how different institutional stakeholders are able to sustainably participate in leadership and governance of their various local university institutions. This in turn instils stakeholder confidence in the university institutional values that underpin the university's governance structures.

Conclusions arrived at in the paper are drawn from data collected from documentary sources available in the public media, interviews and surveys. The paper is structured as follows; the first part of the paper examines governance challenges across post 1994 South African universities. The second part presents the conceptual framework that, research methodology, data analysis and results. The third part discusses conceptualization of governance and the last part concludes by calling for greater professionalization of governance best practices. We believe that the suggested model will improve governance practices in strongly stakeholder governed university councils. We have also identified areas of possible further research and policy implications.

2. University stakeholder governance in the post 1994 South African comprehensive universities

2.1. The emergence of comprehensive universities

As part of the processes of bringing about transformation in the various South African higher educational institutions, there was a re-categorization of universities (Council of Higher Education [CHE], 2004). Currently, the South Africa higher education landscape has 11 universities, 6 universities of technology and 6 comprehensive universities (Bunting & Cloete, 2010). The universities that existed in the former homeland areas and were instrumental in the creation of the apartheid state had to be reconfigured and renamed (Asmal, 2002). Some of these institutions were turned into comprehensive universities and universities of technology. Universities of technology offer mainly vocational or career—focussed diplomas and Bachelor of technology degrees (B.Tech.) which serve as a capping qualification for diploma graduates. They offer also limited numbers of masters and doctoral programmes. Comprehensive universities today offer both vocational and degree programmes to the university students (Department of Education [DOE], 2004).

Nevertheless, these state inspired policy conversions and integrations did not address certain projected stakeholder expectations and dreams. Over the years, these institutions have become institutional stakeholder battle grounds and proxies for stakeholders. This is so especially against those who are perceived to be responsible for the 1994 stakeholder inexorable unfulfilled promises and expectations (CHE, 2004). As a result, the institutional governance bodies across these universities namely; the university council, Senate and institutional forums are sandwiched between satisfying stakeholder expectations at constituency and institutional levels (CHE, 2004; Hall, Symes, & Luescher, 2002).

2.2. Cooperative governance; the transformation of stakeholder governed university councils

The introduction of cooperative governance policy in post 1994 as part of the key means to spearhead transformation of higher education institutions has played a critical role in the introduction of stakeholder dynamics in the governance of universities (Department of Education [DOE],

1997). According to Freeman (1984), stakeholders are defined as "any group or individual who is affected by or can affect the achievement of an organization's objectives" (Freeman, 1984, p. 46). The term "stake" can simply be described as a share, interest or investment that a certain party attributes to an entity (Freeman, 1984).

A fundamental impact of the institutional cooperative governance policy has been the massive institutional stakeholder drive to become part of the leadership and governance of the universities. This has had fundamental influence on how the universities are run at the level of the university councils. The policy has led university councils to be inclusive, responsive and diverse. Their vision and purpose have had to include various external and internal stakeholders in the governance of the universities. External stakeholders have included the state, business, special interest groups, community leaders and donors. Internal stakeholders have included various categories of university staff and students.

The different key drivers of this institutional policy, the council for higher education (CHE, 2004) in transformational mode laid out the responsibilities of the university council, senate and institutional forum in bringing about effective university governance. It stated that the university council is responsible for the university governance. The university senate is responsible for the academic affairs of the university. The institutional forum is responsible for guiding of the university governing council on the university transformation process (CHE, 2004). This tripod governance structure was supposed to work together but the university senate and institutional forum to report to the university council through the different committees of the university council.

The inability of the CHE to specify to the different university councils how this tripod university governance alliance is expected to work together to bring about the different processes of institutional transformation from the university council level proved problematic. The CHE expected the different university governing bodies in conjunction with the other governance bodies in the tripod alliance in the different university contexts to figure this out on their own (CHE, 2004). This lacunae could have led to incoherencies in implementation strategies and practices across university councils.

The university governance processes post 1994 have been characterized by continuous conflicts and differences of different magnitudes at all levels of the university council, university senate and institutional forum (CHE, 2004). We reiterate that the process of nominating stakeholder representatives into the university councils across stakeholder driven universities has been politicized. University councils have become political arenas to drive stakeholder agendas, ends and means (National Higher Education Summit, cited in Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2015).

2.3. The challenges of the transformation of stakeholder governed university councils

Owing to the factors stated previously, university governing bodies have struggled in handling the different stakeholders' expectations. Different institutional stakeholders were sent to the university councils with stakeholder agenda which situated them in direct confrontation in the university councils against university management over stakeholder issues. Institutional stakeholders had decided to use the university councils as stakeholder forums to front their issues which were not the original mind-set of the university councils in their inception. In this paper, we consider two critical challenges; firstly, stakeholder participation in university leadership at the level of the university council and secondly, stakeholder confidence in institutional values (National Higher Education Summit, cited in Kezar et al., 2015).

2.4. The contestations around stakeholder participation in leadership

The first major causality of increased stakeholder politicization of the university council has been due to the distrust of certain stakeholders considered partisan to the university governance process. The first causalities of this process were non-teaching staff and university students across the university councils in the former historically black universities. These categories were denied access to critical key committees of the university council and even holding key positions in the university councils (Department of education reports on the University of the North, 1997). It was assumed that certain

university stakeholders ought to be excluded from the processes for the university council to work in these university contexts (Department of education reports on the University of the North, 1997).

In addition, the independent assessors' reports present aspects of institutions whose university councils have not carried out their mandate effectively, and whose relationship with Vice-Chancellors, and management had all but broken down. Moreover, there are instances reported of university councils having abdicated their responsibility of governing to powerful interest groups, or, in the case of one institution, to the Vice-Chancellor (Department on Education reports on University of Kwa Zulu-Natal, 2011; University of the North, 1997).

2.5. The low stakeholder confidence in institutional values

The second challenge of the stakeholder governed university councils was the consistent crisis of stakeholder confidence in the institutional values that underpinned the running of the universities. Institutional values within each particular South African higher education institution are based on White Paper (1997) and the goals of higher education transformation (CHE, 2004). They include accountability, responsibility, access, equity, democratic ethos and human rights education, diversity, efficiency and participation. Clearly, the cumulative stakeholder crisis in the institutional governance processes was as a result of different circumstances. The independent assessor reports commissioned by the Department of Education cited incidences of large executive committees of councils that mirrored university councils, and therefore its parent problems. Presumably, they only acted in emergencies and in regard to routine administrative matters. But primarily its function was as a clearing house for recommendations from senate and other committees of council prior to their consideration by full council. Another area of discord arose from cases of lack of cooperation between university councils and their senior executives. Therefore, the university councils were left with no practical ability to implement its policies (Department on Education reports on university of Fort Hare, 1999; Department of Education [DOE], 1998).

In brief, we have shown that comprehensive universities faced two fundamental challenges, stakeholder participation in leadership and confidence in institutional values. We maintain that the relationship between these two aspects is critical for the transformation of the university governance process across these institutions. Effective participation across the different internal governance structures of the university council by the different disempowered institutional stakeholders like the university staff, non-teaching staff and the university students is critical for improved governance practises. Confidence is a by-product of effective sustainable participation.

3. Conceptual mapping

This paper uses the concept of structure as an organizing framework from a multi-theoretical approach to explore the relationship between student participation in leadership and confidence in institutional values. The notion of structures as an organizing concept was developed from a unique form of a micro-political framework drawn from the work of several scholars such as Blasé Bourdieu, Rousseau and Foucault. Blasé, (1998) theorises micro-politics, Bourdieu (1996) writes about species of social capital whereas Rousseau (2011) conceptualized the notion of social contract. Foucault's (1991) concept of "circuits of power" located within social critical sociological perspectives foregrounds interests, power and power relations as mediators and sometimes drivers of human interactions (Cross & Naidoo, 2011, p. 518).

These organizing concepts rooted in the conflict of social action are useful analytical tools to argue that: (i) University councils within their particular institutional contexts each have a unique governance pact between different stakeholders represented at the university council to bring about improved university governance practices. The attributes of improved effective university governance are drawn from White Paper (1997) on the goals of higher education transformation (CHE, 2004). Drawing from Rousseau's (2011) notion of social contract, an institutional governance pact is a

binding agreement stipulated within institutional statutes. These statutes have terms and conditions that define the stakeholder governance behaviour and practices in the university council.

(ii) University councils are composed of individuals or groups with different forms of social capital. Social capital refers to the stakeholder networks of relationships with benefits like access to funding, power and influence (Bourdieu 1996). Due to competing stakeholder expectations, the nature of work done by the university council does require a specific group of individuals who are able to apply their independent minds to critical debates on key stakeholder issues facing the university in order to give it a niche for improving governance practises.

(iii) The paper argues that the processes of how different stakeholders became part of the university council eventually determine how they function in the university council. This is pre-mised on Foucault's (1991) notion of governmentality (governmentality refers to forms of influ-ence that regulate individual or institutional behaviour).

(iv) Blasé' (1998) notion of micro-politics has been utilized to argue that the kinds of interactions between individuals and stakeholder groups have strong influences on how individuals become part of the university council.

We have identified four major analytical models that are available in the higher education governance field. These are: bureaucratic–rational, collegial, political and garbage can or symbolic (Baldridge, 1971; Baldridge, 1983; Baldridge & Riley, 1977; Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Hardy, 1990). We therefore state that the kinds of micro-politics the university council privileges will determine the models of university governance that will be relied upon for effective governance. This will in turn determine the kinds of university governance structures in the university councils.

3.1. Key guiding question
The relationship between the university council and its different stakeholders is significant for effective governance. The purpose of this paper is to examine the extent to which the relationship between university student participation in leadership at the level of the university governing council and their confidence in institutional values that guide governance practises within the university governing council contribute to effective governance in a comprehensive South African university.

5. Methodology, data collection and analysis
This study was set to understand the lived experiences of the different stakeholder representatives in the university council and explore how their actions can be attributed as modes and forms of effective university governance in a comprehensive higher education institution. Data were collected through a sequential exploratory mixed methods research paradigm (Creswell, Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003) in a case study (Yin, 2003) of one comprehensive university in South Africa. Data collection entailed document analysis (Payne & Payne, 2004), face-to-face in-depth interviews (O'Leary, 2005) and surveys (Groves et al., 2004). The data from the institutional documents made available for this study and interviews were analysed using a thematic analysis approach (Bailey, 1994, p. 194). The interpretive paradigm was fundamental to these processes of data collection and analysis. It made possible to understand and interpret university council members' experiences of institutional govern-ance and describe how these affect institutional practices. Surveys were also used as part of triangulating the findings of the study in order to boost reliability

The first stage of survey data analysis after the data entry using SPSS format involved the use of descriptive statistics (Keith & Punch, 2009). It also involved the use of frequency distributions, means and standard deviations (variations). The next stage of the data analysis involved the use of correlations to explore if there are any relationships within the data. Using a Pearson moment correlation coefficient (Keith & Punch, 2009), all the theme items on the survey instruments were correlated against each other in this process. In this paper, we agree with McMillan and Schumacher's (2006) argument that in sequential exploratory mixed method research design,

the quantitative portion of the study assists in enabling of exploration of relationships found in the qualitative findings using in-depth information from the interviews. As such, the greatest part of the study was developed from the qualitative approaches to obtain a more detailed perspective on university council members' perceptions which are intangible and therefore cannot be measured in another way. By using quantitative approaches, the study sought to explore relationships that were forming from within the patterns of evidence in the qualitative data that could be used as emerging forms and modes of working effective governance in such comprehensive university contexts. The study had a lot of both qualitative and quantitative data generated. However, we are privileging the presentation of selected quantitative data on two variables that are key to the achievement of the processes mentioned above (student participation in leadership and confidence in institutional values).

A total of 331 useable survey forms were received from the students and staff from the university. The study had two separate survey instruments for the university students and the university members of staff. The survey included four major components (a) demographic information, (b) university council structures, (c) university council systems and (d) university council cultures. On a 5-point Likert-type scales (Keith & Punch, 2009) of [5 for very strongly agree; 4 for strongly agree; 3 for neutral/disagree or agree; 2 for strongly disagree; 1 for very strongly disagree] the participants were asked to indicate their perceptions of university council structures and processes as contributing to effective university governance on the item scales.

5.1. Presentation of results of this study
The results of this study will be presented in the form of the following key emerging themes: the composition of the university council, the relationships between the university council and its stakeholders. This will be followed by a discussion on emerging key implications for effective governance within such institutional contexts.

5.2. The composition of university councils
The South African Higher Education Statute stipulates that university councils have to be composed of a diversity of both internal and external stakeholders (DOE, 1997). Available institutional documents show that the university council is composed of different stakeholder representatives from different groupings within and outside the university as seen in Table 1. This stakeholder composition has numerous implications for the kinds of governance practises witnessed within such institutional environments.

Table 1. Showing the distribution of stakeholders in the university council	
Stakeholder groupings	**Number in the university council**
The senior executive management	4
Senate representatives	2
Convocation	2
Student representatives	2
Academic employee	1
Service employee	1
Administrative employee	1
Organized business/private sector	6
Appointees of the Minister of Education	5
Donor representation	2
Resource persons	3
Provincial representative	1
Municipal representative	1

The study found that two university student representatives are part of the university governing council. There are particular processes of how each of the different stakeholder representatives made it through to the university council. The university students are of the view that they were deployed to the university council by the students' organization body. This is seen in the response below:

> ....I became the SRC president through the organization which deployed me in this capacity I am having .The organization which is the ANC youth league decided to forward my name as the next incoming SRC president then I went there contested the elections and became victorious . Then how I became a member of council is that it's within the university HE policy that students must be represented by two members in the council. In my cabinet automatically the president of the SRC is a member of the council, and then we selected another member making it two members representing the student body. .... [Participant. 2]

This kind of perception affects how the university student leadership to the university council performs. The university council does not expect the different stakeholder groups to bring these ideological differences to the university. However, this is challenging for the university council and the different stakeholder representatives. This is seen in the response below:

> ...sometimes put on throw some a little hand grenades on the table which explode and you have to deal with it, we keep on telling guys that when you're in council you're a council member you're not there representing your constituency and you don't bring operational matters to council and when you put things on council it must be documented it must be part of the documentation and so on you can't just make wild allegations and say, you have to be responsible as a council member as well otherwise you can, can you can actually disgrace yourself in the process if facts are not researched....[Participant. 15]

In spite of this complexity, it is important to note that this is the very nature of stakeholder governance within such institutional environments that university governing councils have to grapple with to provide effective governance. This is seen in the response below:

> ....We do have people from different sectors and I think they are really, looking at their experience from where they are coming from. We also have got like chiefs on the council so when it comes to issues that like something to do with land how can I put it, to do with issues relating to chiefs and kings so those things sometimes we also get some advice, how we are supposed to go, we also have got people who are from [err] can I say big organizations and to me they are really you can see some of the people really they are people who are prepared to work not for the interest of individuals but for the interest of the institution, so I think the composition to be honest with you to me is well represented .... [Participant. 3]

The composition of the university councils is fundamental for the kinds of stakeholder governance practises we should expect. University governing councils that are incorrectly composed in terms of skills and representation are bound to struggle to provide effective governance.

Furthermore, these stakeholder representations vary from institution to institution in the South African higher education contexts. The different stakeholder constituents have a strong say on who represents them in the university council and its different committees. Despite this aspect, the diversity of the university council has several merits it brings to the university council, namely; platforms for partisan progressive stakeholder networks and caucuses. The different stakeholder networks within the university are fundamental in the decision-making processes of the university. The powerful caucuses determine the modes of governance by the university council, which is a critical factor in the legitimization of the university council as a major decision maker in the university.

5.3. The relationship between the university governing council and its stakeholders
The introduction of stakeholder governance as part of the transformation of the post 1994 South African higher education system has had several implications at national and institutional levels of

cogent · education

governance. At the national level, we have seen drastic moves on how the South African higher education system functions and how it operates. These changes have in turn affected through policy how institutions are expected to operate. Looking at the South African higher education system, there is evidence of diversity of institutions. Each of these institutions has responded differently to the changes recommended at the national level. At the institutional level, these changes have likewise affected how universities and governing bodies are expected to function. In this part of the paper, emphasis is on the institutional level with a focus on how the university governing councils have been affected by this process and how the university councils relate with its different institutional stakeholders on two key stakeholder fundamental aspects of confidence in institutional values and participation in leadership.

6. Confidence in institutional values

Confidence in institutional values that guide institutional governance is a product of several factors that identify the interactions between the university council and its different stakeholders; for instance, opportunities for representation and involvement. How the university students are represented in the university council is affecting their confidence in the leadership of the university governing council. Confidence in institutional values implies having a position of trust based on stakeholder social contract. The state policy of cooperative governance required university stakeholders to commit and agree to surrender their trust in the university council to meet their expectations in the university through effective sustainable governance. Thus, in post 1994 higher education dispensation, good stakeholder governance practise is being judged based on the ability to positively respond to stakeholder expectations as enshrined in the goals of higher education transformation.

The results presented in Table 2 (above) indicate that 41.5% of the participants have confidence in institutional values that underpin institutional governance of the university. 13.7% of the university students do not agree to the assertion that university students have confidence in institutional values that underpin governance of the university. Whereas 44.3% of the university students are undecided about the proposition that university students have confidence in institutional values that underpin governance of the university. This is to say that a majority of the participants are undecided if they have confidence in institutional values that guide the governance of the university. This is emerging as an area of concern and it needs further investigation because students are an integral constituency in university governance structures.

7. Participation in council leadership

In the post 1994 South African higher education dispensation, stakeholder governance was seen as the best form of governance that has the potential to transform higher education. This is depicted through the visible opportunities the former disempowered institutional stakeholders like the university students being able to effectively take part in institutional leadership. Participation in

Table 2. Showing university student perception on confidence in institutional values					
		Frequency	Per cent	Valid per cent	Cumulative per cent
Valid	Strongly disagree	14	5.5	5.5	5.5
	Disagree	21	8.2	8.2	13.7
	Neither disagree nor agrees	113	44.1	44.3	58.0
	Agree	71	27.7	27.8	85.9
	Strongly agree	35	13.7	13.7	99.6
	6.00	1	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	255	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		256	100.0		

cogent ⋅⋅ education

leadership implies having knowledgeable opportunities, spaces and positions to engage in key decision-making issues about key institutional stakeholder matters at the level of the university councils. Data have revealed that only two university representatives are included in the university council. We can deduce that the participation of students in key decision-making internal governance structures of the university councils remains minimalistic and therefore contested.

The results presented in Table 3 (above) indicate that 57.3% of the participants agree with the proposition that the university council provides opportunities and conditions for different university students to participate in the leadership of the university at the level of the university council. 20.4% of the university students do not agree with the proposition that the university council provides opportunities and conditions for the different university students to participate in the leadership of the university at the level of the university council. 22% of the university students are undecided regarding the proposition that the university council provides opportunities and conditions for the different university students to participate in the leadership of the university at the level of the university council.

Thus, what is emerging is that a majority of the university students agree with the proposition that the university council provides opportunities and conditions for the different university students to participate in the leadership of the university at the level of the university council. We attribute this response to the underrepresentation of students in the university council (only two representatives). It is worth disclosing the two students who participated in the study were student representatives in the university council. Although we acknowledge that this is a good start, however, the number is reminiscent of low participation and representation and is therefore negligible.

The mean and standard deviation are to assist in the interpretation of the relationship between the two variables in understanding effective governance (Table 4).

7.1. The relationship between university student confidence in institutional values and participation in university governance

Sustainable stakeholder confidence in institutional values that underpin effective governance in strongly stakeholder university councils is related to the forms of stakeholder participation in the university governance processes. In order for the university governing council to be in better position to provide effective governance, it needs useful stakeholder participation and confidence at critical times in the higher education field.

The results presented in Table 5 (above) show that at 0.01 level (two-tail test) there was positive low linear relationship between university student confidence in institutional values (m = 3.51; SD = 1.200) and participation in university governance (m = 3.3725; SD = 1.01487) is $r = 0.180$, $p \geq 0.01$, $n = 255$ with $r^2 = 3.24\%$. This implies that 3.24% of the variance for effective governance

Table 3. Showing student perception on participation in leadership in institutional governance					
		Frequency	**Per cent**	**Valid per cent**	**Cumulative per cent**
Valid	Strongly disagree	21	8.2	8.2	8.2
	Disagree	31	12.1	12.2	20.4
	Neither agrees nor disagrees	56	21.9	22.0	42.4
	Agree	92	35.9	36.1	78.4
	Strongly agree	54	21.1	21.2	99.6
	No selection	1	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	255	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		256	100.0		

cogent ··education

Table 4. Showing the mean and standard deviation for the variables university student confidence in institutional values and participation in university governance					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Student participation in leadership	255	1	6	3.51	1.200
Confidence in institutional values	255	1.00	6.00	3.3725	1.01487
Valid *N* (list wise)	255				

Table 5. Showing the relationship between university student confidence in institutional values and participation in university governance		Confidence in institutional values	Student participation leadership
Confidence in institutional values	Pearson correlation	1	.180**
	Sig. (two-tailed)		.004
	N	255	255
Student participation leadership	Pearson Correlation	.180**	1
	Sig. (two-tailed)	.004	
	N	255	255

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).

can be attributed to the relationship between university students' confidence in institutional values that guide university governance and the university council providing opportunities for the different university students to participate in leadership of the university at the level of the university councils. 96.76% of the variance for effective governance can be attributed to other variables not included in the study.

8. Discussion

There are probable reasons for this kind of relationships from the data collected through documentary analysis and interviews. The first reason is pegged on the minimal university student representation and participation in the university councils. Secondly, it can be assumed that the lack of adequate understanding of how the university councils operates is also a contributory factor. We therefore conclude that the inability to understand how the university councils operate is responsible for the ineffective participation in the university councils. This, according to Bourdieu's notion of social capital influences the extent to which an individual can indulge in key issues being deliberated in the councils (Bourdieu, 1996). Lack thereof of social capital has a strong relationship with how an individual may or may not necessarily contribute meaningfully in council debates. We also link the politicization of the university council processes that have made the university council vulnerable to factionalism and sectarianism to positive low linear relationship between university students' confidence in institutional values. While thinking about the low relationship, we can also refer to Bourdieu's (1996) uneven social capital social in the councils. The stakeholder networks of relationships with benefits like access to funding, power and influence under—privileges students' participation in this case.

In spite of these aspects that have proved critical for the low relationship between the two variables, the following issues (identified in the subsequent discussions) are fundamental in the reconceptualization of this relationship to improve effective governance in the strongly stakeholder governed university councils:

8.1. Professionalization of the stakeholder governance contract

The reality in stakeholder governed university councils is such that the different stakeholders from different stakeholder organizations and communities are conflicting (Department of Education

reports on the University of the North, 1997; DOE, 1998; University of Fort Hare, 1999; University of Kwa Zulu-Natal, 2011). They come with different orientations and ideologies which often affects how they function in the university councils. The recommitment to stand by the already exiting governance contract between the university council and its different stakeholders represented on the university council has significant potential to curtail the proliferation of stakeholder interest that could strain the effective professionalization of the university council and its ability to discharge effective institutional governance practices. This is in line with Rousseau's (2011) social contract which is an institutional governance pact which is a binding agreement stipulated within institutional statutes. The terms and conditions in the agreement define the stakeholder govern-ance behaviour and practices in the university council. Institutional governance pact is a binding agreement stipulated within institutional statutes. These statutes have terms and conditions that define the stakeholder governance behaviour and practises in the university council.

8.2. Strengthening of institutional governance processes

The presence of different stakeholders in stakeholder governed university councils with different orientations and value systems makes the university council vulnerable to conflicts of interests, competition for institutional power to influence decision making and stakeholder factionalism (CHE, 2004). There is need for the university councils to strengthen their internal governance structures so as to be able to provide effective governance under these conditions. The processes of strengthening internal governance structures as best practise implies ensuring these due processes act as checks and balances that encourage stakeholders' trust, faith, transparency, accountability and equal representation and access. These are the core values that undergird transformation as stipulated in the White Paper (1997).

8.3. Strengthening of institutional governance procedures

The effectiveness of the university council at arriving at critical decisions is dependent on the efficiency and efficacy of its due processes in place. Efficient due processes influence stakeholder trust and accountability. Not all institutional stakeholders are apparently comfortable with institu-tional due processes. There are instances where stakeholders are fed up and seeking other forms of redemption which has clearly been seen in campus protests. We argue that there seems to be an emerging connection between desperation to participate and stakeholder unmet expectations.

However, as recapitulated earlier, due to various reasons that have been discussed, not every stakeholder can participate at the highest decision-making level in the university council.

On the other hand, stakeholder differences and 'perceived' approaches to governance have led to restrictions being placed on the activities of certain stakeholders deemed not to be working for the general good of the university. These groups of stakeholders are accused of championing their individual stakeholder interests at the expense of the institutional goals and good (Castells, 2001; Kiel, 2010). We postulate that there are more creative ways of working difference rather than exclusion. In our view, Foucault's views (1991) on governmentality are applicable in influencing and regulating individual or institutional behaviour. In particular, it raises questions of firstly, what due systems are in place at the university council in conjunction with university management to respond to institutional stakeholder grievances, matters, issues and expectations to avoid escala-tions into violence and protests that dent institutional image, loss of lives and property in many instances . Secondly, why should institutional stakeholders (the university students and staff) always resort to university protests as a way to resolve stakeholder grievances instead of following through with the various institutional due processes the university leadership has put in place to govern the university? Thirdly, does the legitimization of these forms of stakeholder protests on university campuses tell us how to get hard matters resolved in institutional governance? Besides, efficient due processes make possible stakeholder participation in the different levels of decision-making processes that can bring an amicable level of stakeholder satisfaction. We however contend that grievances and protocols mitigate stakeholder reactions over unmet expectations.

In addition, well-organized grievances and protocols permit the cultivation of stakeholder trust in strongly driven governance higher education environments (Kezar & Eckel, 2004).

8.4. Representative skilled participation

One of the major successes of the state project on transformation of the higher education system has been the increased participation of the newly empowered institutional stakeholders into the different levels of the university governance processes. The basis for achievement this is associated with the governance opportunities for change made possible by the cooperative governance institutional framework (CHE, 2004; DOE, 1997). University governing bodies now have room to creatively craft models of participation that are fit for purposes within their institutional contexts and benchmark these in relation to the demands of the White paper of 1997. This is why university councils have governance options to choose who to work with and not to work with for the sake of achieving effective governance within their particular institutional contexts. This process encourages stakeholder trust, belonging, faith accountability, transparency and engagement as long as you seat on the council and ensure that you are not excluded.

Notwithstanding the above, it has been noted that in trying to avoid unnecessary stakeholder contestations, some university councils have limited participation of certain institutional stakeholders deemed hostile to university leadership (CHE, 2004). This aspect is not new as research indicates that stakeholder participation in different university governance processes is fluid due to nuanced institutional complexities (Maassen & Cloete, 2002; Olssen, 2007). On the other hand, having the right board composition under this kind of institutional framework is a formidable task as governing bodies have to often be on alert against stakeholder manoeuvring for legitimatization of dominate stakeholder interests. To make 'hay while the sun shines', it is vital for these forms of stakeholder contested participations to balance the interests of the universities first and then its stakeholders.

9. Conclusion and implications for good governance

This paper has examined the relationship between stakeholder participation in leadership and confidence in institutional values so as to understand what this means for effective governance. We argued that effective governance in strongly stakeholder governed university councils is related to the strength of the relationship between stakeholder participation in leadership and confidence in institutional values that underpin effective institutional governance across particular university contexts. Generally, the results have shown a weak relationship on the two imperatives. This kind of results have serious implications for the decolonization of the African university and further research. We have noted that the weak relationship does not mirror the goals of transformation envisaged post 1994 for the historically disadvantaged institutions. We have concluded that, in order to improve these relationships, the university councils need to strengthen their institutional governance processes, and strive for progressive representative skilled participation within the university governance process. The inherent limitations in this kind of research are potential learning grounds for more research through comparative studies on the same variables with different institutional contexts.

Author details
Felix Omal[1]
E-mail: omalfelix@gmail.com
ORCID ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8617-3150
Beatrice M'mboga Akala[2]
E-mail: Akalabetty@gmail.com
ORCID ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9106-4461
[1] Ali Mazrui Centre for Higher Education Studies, School of Education, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa.
[2] Teaching and Learning Dept. Faculty of Education, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Statement on Our Research Interests
Our research interests are in the nature of transformation that South African higher education has attained post-1994. We research and critique various aspects of redress policies and strategies in post-1994 with the view of elucidating on achievements and current challenges facing higher education. Our interests are mainly in the experiences of the formally marginalized groups that were excluded from higher education before 1994. Dr. Akala mainly researches social justice issues in relation to higher education policies

and gender equity in higher education. Dr. Omal's interests are in politics of higher education, institutional effectiveness, migration studies in higher education and human development. Internationally, while we recognize the positive steps taken towards achieving a non- racist, non- sexist and equal higher education; our current research focused on developing critical trans- formative African perspectives to university governance in a globalizing world. Through this lens, this research is an example of how the promise of a transformed South African higher education landscape is still a dis- tant dream.

Citation information

Cite this article as: The relationship between confidence in institutional values and student participation in leader- ship: A case of comprehensive universities, Felix Omal & Beatrice M'mboga Akala, *Cogent Education* (2018), 5: 1508546.

References

Asmal, K. (2002). *Statement on the transformation and reconstruction of higher education systems*. Pretoria: MoE.

Bailey, K. (1994). *Methods of social research* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Baldridge, J. (1971). *Power and conflict in the university*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Baldridge, J. V. (1983). Organisational characteristics of colleges and universities. In V. J. Baldridge & Deal (Eds.), *The dynamics of organisational change in Education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchon Publishing Corporation.

Baldridge, J. V., & Riley, L. G. (1977). *Governing academic organization*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Bensimon, E. M., & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning col- legiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education* (pp. 26-57). Baltimore Johns Hopkins University Press.

Blase, J. (1998). The micropolitics of education change. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *International handbook of educational change* (pp. 544–557). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The State nobility: Elite schools in the field of power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bunting, I., & Cloete, N. (2010). *Institutional types in higher education in South Africa*. South Africa: Centre for Higher Education Transformation.

Castells, M. (2001). Universities as dynamic systems of contradictory functions. In J. Müller, N. Cloete, & S. Badat (Eds.), *Challenges of globalisation: South African debates with Manuel castells* Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman. Higher Education Act, sta- tute of university of Venda Government gazettee Act no. 101 of 1997 Stat. (Department of Higher Education and Training 1997 1997).

Cloete, N., & Maassen, P. (2002). The limits of policy. In Cloete, Fehnel, Maassen, Moja, Perold, & Gibbon (Eds.), *Transformation higher education: Global pressures and local realities in South Africa* Cape Town: Juta. Is it Maassen and Cloete or Cloete and Maassen.

Council of Higher Education. (2004). *South African higher education in the first decade of democracy* (pp. 175– 185). Pretoria: CHE.

Creswell, J. W., Clark, V. L. P., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods Research. In social and behaviour research* (pp. 209–240). London: Sage.

Cross, M., & Naidoo, D. (2011). Peer review and the dilemmas of quality control in programme accred- itation in South African Higher Education: Challenges and possibilities. *In Higher Education Policy*, 24, 517– 534. doi:10.1057/hep.2011.13

Department of Education. (1997). Education White Paper 3: A programme for higher education transformation. *Government Gazette*, 386 (18207). Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. (1998). *Investigation conducted at the University of Transkei*. Report by Advocate T. L. Skweyiya S.C. (Appointed as Independent Assessor in terms of Sections 44 and 45 of the Higher Education Act, No. 101 of 1997). *Government Gazette*, 19501, 20 November 1998. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. (1999). *Investigation conducted at the University of Fort Hare*. Report to the Minister of Education, the Honourable S. M. E. Bengu by Emeritus Professor S. J. Saunders. *Government Gazette*, 19842, 12 March 1999. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. (2004). *Creating comprehensive universities in South Africa: A concept document*. Pretoria: Commissioned Report by Trish Gibbon.

Department of Education. (2011). *Investigation conducted at the University of Kwa-Zulu Natal*. The outcomes of the independent assessor's report on the Vaal University of Technology by Prof De Beer appointed by the Minister of Education in terms of Chapter 6 of the Higher Education Act, No. 101 of 1997. Pretoria: DoE.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87–105). Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stake- holder approach*. Boston: Pitman.

Groves, R. M., Fowler, F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2004). *Survey metho- dology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Hall, M., Symes, A., & Luescher, T. M. (2002). *Governance in South African higher education*. Research report pre- pared for the Council in Higher Education. doi:10.1044/1059-0889(2002/er01)

Hardy, C. (1990). Putting power into university govern- ance. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, volume VI*. New York, NY: Agathon Press.

Kezar, A., Chambers, A. C., & Burkhardt, J. C. (Eds.). (2015). *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement* (pp. 544–547). Wiley.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2004). Meeting today's govern- ance challenges: A synthesis of the literature and examination of a future agenda for scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(4), 371–399.

cogent • education

Kiel, G. (2009). *Challenges for university councils*. Paper presented at the Paper delivered to national conference on university governance, Melbourne.

McMillan, H, & Schumacher, S. (2006). Research in education; a conceptual introduction (6th ed.). New York: Longman, pp 5–67.

O'Leary, Z. (2005). *Researching real-world problems: A guide to methods of inquiry*. London: Sage Publications.

Olsen, J. (2007). The institutional dynamics of the European University. In M. Peter & O. Johan (Eds.), *University dynamics and European integration* (pp. 8–38). Dordrecht Springer.

Payne, G., & Payne, J. (2004). *Key concepts in social research*. London: Sage Publications.

Punch, K. F. (2009). Qualitative research design. In *Introduction to research methods in education*. Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK: Sage.

Rousseau, J. (2011). *Discourse on the origin and foundations of inequality among men*. (H. Rosenblatt, ed.). New York, NY: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.

Cogent Education (ISSN: 2331-186X) is published by Cogent OA, part of Taylor & Francis Group.

Publishing with Cogent OA ensures:

- Immediate, universal access to your article on publication
- High visibility and discoverability via the Cogent OA website as well as Taylor & Francis Online
- Download and citation statistics for your article
- Rapid online publication
- Input from, and dialog with, expert editors and editorial boards
- Retention of full copyright of your article
- Guaranteed legacy preservation of your article
- Discounts and waivers for authors in developing regions

Submit your manuscript to a Cogent OA journal at www.CogentOA.com