

# Kenyan Universities' Research: Repository Annex

Jane Wangari Wakarindi, (PhD)

Department of Education, Kiriri Women's University of Science and Technology, Nairobi Kenya

ORCID: iD- 0000-0001-9650-6599

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10411055>

Published Date: 20-December-2023

---

**Abstract:** This paper examines how research carried out in Kenyan Universities is safeguarded and disseminated. It highlights the challenges of sharing research information by the faculty in different universities in Kenya. Often, research in universities is contained and controlled within the individual universities with little sharing to the public outside the given universities. The problem is aggravated by the fact that few universities have repository centres and even where such exist the data is not in open access (OA), thus reducing exposure of the research to the world of other researchers. Besides, such scenario often leads to duplication of research which may hinder exploration to uncharted research landscapes. Consequently, this paper addresses the lacuna on lack of a unified universities' research storehouse in Kenya. Additionally, it suggests intervention avenues through which the Kenyan universities could address the gap. The research argues for the need to launch an academic data repository in which all researches in the universities would be collated and made available through open access data base (NOADB). The database could be modelled according to faculties such as Humanities, Sciences, Economics, and Education. In the NOADB, local and global researchers would easily and readily access research information in the different disciplines.

**Keywords:** open access (OA), national open access data base (NOADB), repository, annex.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Of necessity, research knowledge is fundamental in improving the growth of innovative research. Evidence exists of some Kenyan Universities effort to have repositories in their institutions. For instance detail from Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR) indicates that OpenDOAR has increased from 'two to twenty-six' placing Kenya the 'second-largest contributor of institutional repositories in sub-Saharan Africa after South Africa' (OpenDOAR, 9). Despite the view, data on the ground shows that only a few universities have digitized their repositories alongside others without repositories at all.

Failure to access data of research areas already over-trodden is likely to lead to buttressing the same paths due to ignorance of available research data in any given subject cum discipline. In their introductory section in the article *Underrepresentation of Developing Country Researchers in Development Research*, (Amarante et al. 2021, 1) quoting (Nunn 2019) posits that there is 'increased recognition that intimate knowledge of a country [s research] and ongoing presence there are likely to give a researcher special insights into the framing of research questions, the application of methodologies and interpretation of results.' The statement This underlines the importance of knowledge sharing, presenting it, making it 'present' in order to aid in increased insights into research by any researcher. Failure to establish means and ways to facilitate this sharing and exposure may curtail research development and innovation.

In Kenya little evidence exists to elucidate how postgraduate and staff research is represented in a collated database. The essence of this research is not only to excite the need for each university to develop a culture of saving research but most fundamentally, to pursue the interest and motivation to share research information as a way of ensuring its accessibility to as many researchers locally, regionally and globally.

The lacuna could likely be attributed to stereotypes, biases and prestige attached / self-assigned to universities. These misnomers contribute to fear and or arrogance (depending on the prestige continuum level attached to a university) to share researches done within each institution. As a result, there arise constrained focus, referencing, citations and / access by others not within the institution or admitted to a given individual institution's library(s). This article draws on the view of the Kenyan universities repository state after which it establishes from existing data the number of universities that have repositories. The information gathered is geared towards decision making for designing and establishment of a national merged repository centre or database to operate as an umbrella for staff and student researches that are carried out in individual universities in Kenya.

In an article in which they propose the establishment of an academic Open Access by researchers in Kenya, Wanyenda Chilimo posit that Kenyan Universities need to 'devise innovative ways of raising awareness about OA, and these universities should provide the environment, infrastructure, and capacity building needed to support the OA.' (Chilimo et al., 1) The current research proposes intervention measure through the establishment of Kenyan Universities' collated NOARDB for better improvement and positioning of Kenyan research.

Many universities in the country, examples of which will be outlined shortly, have started making small strides by establishing internal repositories. While this a commendable trend in the right direction, establishment of a national university research database that would broaden the research sharing avenue not only within the particular institutions but locally and globally is missing in the country. Meanwhile, interventions and sensitization of the significance of a repository should be made in universities that have not as yet started an institutional repository. To this end, Institutions could make it mandatory that researches carried out by students and the faculty in the university be deposited in the institutions' repositories. This insight has still not fully been realized. Recordings in Files in Kenya Academic Publishing and its Implication reports that 'of the few academic staff members who were aware of the existence of repository, they may not be conversant with the process of self-archiving'. This hints to a glaring research pandemic stricture, a lacuna that renders the research repository sector weak. To intervene, the universities that already have the digital repository within the institution should be persuaded to purposefully and deliberately unite in channeling researches produced within individual institutions to a national collated database of like-research among institutions.

## **2. RESEARCH FRAMEWORK**

To frame this paper into perspective is the Social Exchange theory as used by (Jihyun 2010, 1909-1922) quoting (Molm 1997, 11-43). The theory highlights on how Knowledge is shared and distributed in 'information intensive organizations' (Kim 2010, 1910; Hall 2003, 287). The theory further champions on importance of individual and groups associations relations to sharing knowledge. Molm identifies the key elements of the theory as actors (groups or individuals); resources; structure of exchange; and process of exchange (Kim 2010, 1910). Resources are said to be the 'currency of exchange, which can be tangible or intangible' (Kim 1910); and are viewed as outcomes generated by the exchange enterprise. The structure of the exchange, the theory stipulates, indicates the relationships that directly or indirectly sustain the exchange. Finally, the process of the exchange shows the nature of interfaces necessary to conduct the exchange.

(Kim 2110, 1911) quoting researches: (Constant, Keisler, and Sproull 1994); (Hall 2001); (Jarvenpaa, and Staples 2000); (Kankanhalli, Tan, and Wei 2005), show how the concepts of cost and benefits in the Social-Exchange theory supports factors that affect contribution of knowledge to repositories in institutions. These researches surveyed the contextual factors that encourage knowledge sharing, such as trust ad pro-sharing norms (Kim, 1911). The factors are relevant to the current study in the sense that in installing a Kenyan universities central open access repository structure, each institution -here translating as a group, need some assurance or some agreed working formula or exchange that would streamline the inputs, role and benefits that each would share in the enterprise. Such a model suggests emphasis on actors (universities and individuals depositing in the national annex database), perception of benefits accrued from such a transaction would act as a motivating factor as well as laying transparency policies that would encourage institutions to not only place incentives for the faculty to write but also catalyse the desire to archive their research works in the institutional repository as well as in

the collated database. (Nunkoo, and Ramissoon 2011, 1) postulate that ‘trust and power between actors are two central concepts in social exchanges.’ The interactive networking by the Kenyan universities would include trust and assurance of ownership (power) of the running and mostly, management of the national database is critical for the success of a research annex establishment. Besides the concepts make it easier to specify tangible and intangible benefits of assembled national research by making apparent the display of knowledge to the world of local and global researches.

### **3. THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This is a qualitative research that uses secondary data for examination of institutional reports, plans and reviews on production, storage, and dissemination of research data. The data collected provides a framework on which to observe, assess, compare and analyse the way institutions archive research and eventually suggest a model that would enable the universities in Kenya create a collated database in which all researches carried out in the institutions is stored for easy, systematized, organized, one-stop, all-in-one access point’ supermarket’ or silos called the National Open Access Research Database (NOARDB). The NOARDB would become for the researchers a destination Centre with its attractions, lure and assurance that once inside, one is able to see, present and presented, research data that satisfy their different tastes. The knowledge management framework as suggested by (Sabharwal 2021) responds rightly to this qualitative research in the understanding the repository diversity in management of researches produced and the endeavour to sustain the same in diverse universities in Kenya. The framework acknowledges the uniqueness of different institutions and their desire to devise their own ways of archiving research as well as offering an opening where, while respecting institutional mandate, also create clear connectedness of relationships among institutions (universities) for sustainability and continuity of research. The eventual gain is that the NOARDB can become a site of recognition and national research heritage in Kenya.

### **4. WHAT IS A REPOSITORY DATABASE ?**

Repository has variously been defined. The Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (1070) defines repository as a ‘place where things are stored or may be found, esp. a warehouse or museum’. (Jones 2007, 3) pegs his definition of repository on 1982 Oxford Concise Dictionary that defines repository as a ‘safe place to put something {and expect} that there will be a method of finding it’. (Sabharwal 2021, 2) quoting (Crow 2002, 16) defines repository as a ‘digital archive of the intellectual product created by the faculty, research staff, and students of an institution’. Crow further opines that it is a ‘set of services . . . for the management and dissemination of digital material created by the institution and its community members.’ Envisioned in these definitions is the crucial engagement with place; warehouse, archive, service basically designed as a haven from which management and dissemination of intellectual product created by members of an institution would be accessed without barriers.

The Kenyan university’s perception of repository is observed from the various definitions given by different institutions in the country. For instance, Kenyatta University Institutional Repository that is housed in the Postmodern Library, indicates that the digital repository is an archive which ‘collects, preserve and disseminates scholarly information to Kenyatta University as well as global community’ (<https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/>). I gathered from the Library Brochure that the university also centre’s at enhancing ‘optimum utilization of available resources’ <https://library.ku.ac.ke/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Library-Brochure-2021.pdf>. The repository is organized in groups or communities which are further broken into disciplines and levels of materials found within disciplines in the institutions. The various definitions relevantly attest to the possibility of creation of a university research merger as is proposed in this research. The warehouse would help promote and fulfil the university’s foresight of ‘adopting technologies that will make information resources accessible to university community in an efficient and effective manner’ (ibid). The community would not be limited to the home institution members’ eyes only but endeavour to break the institution’s boundaries in sharing widely and creating visibility for both the research and the researcher.

While there is effort by Kenyan universities to have Institutional Repositories (IR) as evinced by research by (Chilimo 2017, 8) who reports that certain universities in Kenya have mandated that the members of their institutions ‘self-archive and deposit their scholarly articles in the IR’, the awareness has not been widely embraced by a majority universities as will be seen by the number of universities with IR. The scenario is captured on Table 1. Column 3, showing universities without repositories. Adding these to the universities that have IR and possibly there being no deposits made is indicative of a dire need for even greater sensitization. Owing to many universities failure to install IR in their institutions complicates the matters further.

Chilimo quoting (Bjork et al. 14); (Gargouri et al. 2013); (Xia et al. 2012); (Gargouri et al. 2012); (Gargouri et al. 2010, 8) rightly record there is evidence that a good policy on OA can improve ‘positive effect on the rate of repository content accumulation and self-archiving.’ This is further supported by the data below from Repository University Journal as at June 2021. The challenge is aggravated by the fact that policy is not enough but compliance is. I concur with (Chilimo 2017, 8) that ‘policy implementation and [but] company compliance is more complicated’. I argue that having repositories policies is not enough, though I concede the importance of their formulation. What would advance the effort is the operationalization of a local unified database that would effectively showcase research in the universities. This gap would be filled by a centralized database that would intensify cohesion of the otherwise less access-systematized research. Each university should ensure quality of researches produced in their institutions. The effectiveness of such censoring would be enhanced by first collating the researches in the IR from which source mechanism would be put in place to ensure quality of what is passed on to the central national database. Just as there is need to establish the data, there appears to be necessity to strengthen sensitization policies for both institutional repositories as well as the institutions participation in national repository data saving modes.

The following sections explore the repository information of 61 Universities in Kenya as retrieved from the Repository University Journal as at June 2021. I examine the data endeavouring to reveal the outstanding position of repository situation in Kenyan Universities. The data is placed here under three categories namely: Universities with Digital Repository; Universities with Un-Digitized Repository; and Universities without Repository. Comparisons are made, analysis done, and conclusions drawn on the basis of the data presented on the following schedules.

Out of the 61 universities in the country the following have home grown repository within institutions. Among them are those with Digitized Repositories and therefore are open access while there also are those that can only be accessed physically through a walk in the institutions- thus labelled Un-Digitized Repository. The third category highlights on the universities without any form of repository. The order of naming of the university is random and is geared to only exposing the repository detail.

### ***The Repository status in Universities in Kenya***

Kenya has over 64 Universities both public and private. After assessing the repositories at the universities in Kenyan the data accessed indicates that not all universities have repository centres within their institutions. The data on Table 1 indicates that only 15 universities have digitized repositories; 24 have un-digitized repositories and 22 universities have no repositories at all. As can be observed from the data, the universities with the digitized repositories accounts for only about a quarter of the total universities in Kenya.

### ***The state of the repositories in universities in Kenya***

A close examination of the data in table 1. Shows that a good number of universities have repository within their institutions. An almost equal number of universities have no repositories at all and only a few are digitized. The revealed situation begs the attention of researchers’ need to sensitize the intuitions on the importance of repository and OA repositories in particularly. The libraries’ should be the first centres where the venture could commence. The institutions could begin by setting up sections within departments in which a research has been carried out. From the departments’ resource centres the data could be collated and set up into a central database within the main library. Alternatively, an independent department could be set up in universities and be charged with the mandate to collect the researches in the individual university and assemble it in the institution’s repository database. It is this last repository data saving mode that my main interest lies.

The data assembled at the institutional repository could further be shared to a universities’ national open access central database that would contain all academic researches done in the country’s universities. Kenya lacks a resource centre of this stature and nature. The central site could serve to curtail most of the challenges I addressed at the introductory part of this paper. The introduction of such a site could develop other ripple advantages which could include exposure of researchers to the world of research; having a work being cited by many people all over the world; and save the documents from ‘rotting’ or gathering dust in university’s shelves where its visibility is greatly limited. Moreover, the unified database would expedite action, reaction and growth of the research through reviews and timely criticism that I envision is central to research’s advancement in any country.

### **A Merged Research Repository National Open Access Database (NOARDB): A Grand Idea**

No universities' research merger exists in Kenya nor does a national research warehouse exist: controlled or otherwise established. Every university tends / seems to hold custody of researches done within their institutions' borders. (Ratanya 2017, 2) reporting on (Musakalia 2010) underlines the need to 'foster creativity and innovation by way of publishing scientific findings and accessing the research of others through Open Access initiatives'. To this end significantly, all researches done in different universities in Kenya would be assembled to reach a vast range of researchers all over the world through the NOARDB nexus. Rather than push on with the current constrained and restrained access, the database would include both published and unpublished titles of theses and dissertations and staff researches generated in institutions. The NOARDB as a system clears the barriers even further by providing a leverage from which researchers from all walks of life- what is called in this paper, the colourless community, from different institutions particularly in Kenya would see their own and other's scholarly works.

The kind of resource engine proposed should be colourless, an all genre embracing accommodating database, so that it resembles a supermarket model where all research-wares in the university is assembled onto individual shelves but under the same roof- the NOARDB. The database would open up sustainable research dialogues in Kenya in particular, Africa and world in general. The idea is in concurrence with (Sabharwal 2021, 143) position that of necessity, institutions' repository interests could translate to broader national interests with universities relationships generating, in their multiplicity, cross-sustaining repository data to satisfy the NOARDB. Acknowledging (Sabharwal 2021, 145) assertion and emphasis on the essentiality of setting, 'norm, standards policies and expectations', similar approach should be adopted in setting the NOARDB in the country so that the participating institutions get an interactive forum for performance. The NOARDB should offer a boost to the existing institutional repositories as well as offering an alternative way of research archival. The institutions' collaboration is significant in the sense that it enhances the common interests as state (Sabharwal 2021), and (Mayernik 2016) indicating how such a direction leads to 'increased visibility, accessibility, discoverability (of scholarly activity), intellectual diversity, prestige and reputation'. The suggested model could work in Kenyan research landscape as well as offer an international appeal in regard to sharing research output.

Similar in support of improved database, Sabharwal overemphasizes on the need for institutions repositories to up their game by augmenting support and skills for sustainability of such schemes. The assumption of this study is that the Kenyan universities will see the need to adopt similar strategies of establishing a unified platform- NOARDB- under which information will be accessed, and disseminated in bulk for optimization of research development and archival in the country. While the institutional repository is crucial for collection of individual institutional researches, the same would service the new more interactive national interface that 'spans a single technological platform [and the collected researches in the NOARDB would operate as connected but] separate domains that otherwise would remain data silos' (Sabharwal 2021, 148).

In entering the proposed collaborative undertaking, the participants need put in place governing structures as suggested in the social interactive theory. Institutions require to agree on the nature of researches being shared in terms modalities of quantity and quality of research each institution generates, prohibitions and rules of access by member universities and those outside the circle of contributors. The assertion by Sabharwal that 'different knowledge transfer can accommodate individuals and teams working in physical and virtual collaboration spaces' (Sabharwal 2021, that 151), remains relevant to this research. The current proposal assumes a similar commitment with knowledge engagement whose implication is a positive turnover towards growth of research output and visibility not only locally but regionally and globally.

#### ***Benefits of the NOARDB***

The NOARDB features out as an avenue for sharing and enhancing increase in research repository and access in Kenyan universities for the database's universal impact. Researchers in Kenya have hailed the need for support for OA mechanisms as reported by Chilimo and co-authors noting that 'majority researchers in Kenya agree with the general principles and advantages afforded by OA.' (Chilimo 2017, 7) They justifiably recommend that both Postgraduate and staff researchers be empowered as ambassadors for campaign awareness of OA and by extension showcase the NOARDB. Policies should be created to ensure the national database give clear guidelines on the storage and access of the research output in Kenya. There is no known evidence to indicate that such mechanisms and / policy of nationally collated research exists in Kenyan universities to govern research. Lack of such a strategy has led to stunted research output, growth and access in the country.

The shortcoming could be alleviated by embarking on a greater sensitization mission and putting programs in place to encourage universities to collaborate in assembling research in support of the NOARDB venture in order to avoid research marginalization. The NOARDB creates an opportunity for universities in Kenya to own this strategic mode that improves researchers' capacity to appreciate own and others' work.

There is possibility for the NOARDB to catalyze and motivate institution's researchers to appreciate the need to deposit their work in the IR due to all the ripple benefits attached to the NOARDB, particularly the increase of visibility- the 'being seen' by a larger population in the scholarly world. The database would stimulate university members to write and publish since their presence in the public would also boost their prestige through their works being cited and being part of the statistic of the published. The research nexus would also increase the researchers desire to deposit their researches to their IR not because of a mandatory requirement but because of the informed awareness and willingness to promote knowledge-sharing policies and processes. It is in this respect that every institution in Kenya should make it their responsibility to launch awareness campaigns within individual departments' resource centres, the faculty and at the institutional level. The institutions' library staff would take advantage to showcase their mandate to educate their customers- the faculty and students, of the need to self-archive and, the institutions to furtherance the effort by depositing the said researches in the NOARDB. Research remains just that if it is not read, critiqued or commented on by other researchers as has become the fate of most researches produced in individual Kenyan universities. The research would gain more credence and vigour when it is exposed, made accessible and viewable by a larger population of researchers. Citations on the existing researches would lead to research growth that is otherwise limited by subjecting research to storage only in Individual university libraries. The NOARDB offers a portal that acts as a magnifying glass for strategies that could synergize and safeguard national and world library of research.

The current proposed data setting could be a response to the yet realized proposal by Chilimo and co-authors in 2021 that 'bibliometric studies should be conducted to analyse the publication output of academic researchers and determine the extent of OA adoption in Kenya'. The current research findings' hail the benefits of OA to address the noted gap by providing information on the manner in which research at the university is handled as well as providing evidence that re-energizes the universities stakeholders to address strategies that could safeguard research and its dissemination. The NOARDB bridges the gap, serving as a reference Centre to teaching research and exhibiting universal influence on research.

#### ***Modalities of Sustainability of NOARDB***

Tandem to Kim's model of social-exchange principles, research maintenance costs (if any) could be shared among the participating universities to ensure sustainability of the project. Crucially, it is institution's social responsibility to pull together for success of the project's viability. There could be created a pool of money for the venture. A proposal could be made to donors and funders who would be willing to support the enterprise of research's preservation, archival, dissemination and visibility. Policy could be drafted on charges and sharing mandates. The research depositing coordination and management modalities should be made as friendly and as flawless as possible in operationalizing the exercise.

Chilimo quoting (Nwagu 2009, 85) advances that in universities where research coordination is poor or non-existent and there is no authoritative list to guide researchers on where to publish [deposit it], 'the likelihood that young scholars or others will resort to predatory outlets will be very high'. (Chilimo 2017, 16) In the case of the NOARDB, the-would be depositors in the database will lack a base motivation to deposit their research output or do so in not-so-upgraded outlets. In this effect, the NOADB will not only just be a database for the sake of a database, but as reports (Sabharwal 2021, 139) quoting (Kennan, and Cole 2008, 12) that institutional repositories and OA, here modelled as NOARDB, are 'more than a technological information system . . . [but have to be] connected into a far bigger and more heterogeneous information system . . .' The NOARDB importance will be underlined by such indicators as willingness of institution to save their institutions research on the database, and sensitizing their institution, members, both the faculty and the students to develop a sustainable culture of storing their research in the institution's repositories which in turn will systematically be directed to the NOARDB.

#### **Some Foreseeable Challenges and Interventions**

One likely challenge that could arise is from the already existing reluctance of faculty members to archive their researches in institutions' repositories. The other reason points to the lack of proper sensitization by institutions on the staff's need to archive. The challenge is normally aggravated by the fact that institutions are not willing to invest time and money to facilitate awareness campaigns due to the perception that the greater benefit of research lies with the researchers and not

institutions. But, repository should be considered when rating universities performance in relation to other universities within and outside the country. The motivation would in turn motivate institutions to support their faculty and students in showcasing their work in the NOARDB. By supporting the NOARDB, the institutions will contribute to attainment of high levels of participation in the nexus of knowledge creation and organization; preservation, verification; disbursement; and sustainability of the innovative system through institutions feeding the database with their research output.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

This research has portrayed the challenges facing Kenyan universities regarding research repositories' archiving. Though effort has been observed in establishment of universities' institutional repositories, majority of universities have no repositories. The data examined shows that the distribution of repositories veer to fewer repository centres in most universities in Kenya with over 22 universities having no institutional repository in their premises. The trend is indicative of universities' failure and / reluctance to (re)direct major attention to repository as a crucial aspect of research preservation and access. A research warehouse where retention and dissemination of information is housed is important for furtherance of knowledge and national development. The dismal presentation of universities in Kenya with OA repositories is markedly worrying particularly in the current digital era of globalization of research. The rate shows a dire need to engage the university's stakeholders, particularly the library managers in university libraries to take up the challenge to sensitize both the faculty and the students of the benefits of doing research, publishing as well as depositing researches in the NOARDB. In the meantime, the universities that have no established repository should be encouraged to first create their local / individual inbuilt repositories before eventually being admitted to the grand universities' national repository-merger contributors' list for realisation and sustainability of NOARDB. Collated database will be useful at a glance to researchers, institutions managers, and policy developers in different sectors. Information on peripheralised but necessary fields of research will be established; the under-generated information areas of key research interests in the country will be recognized; research funders with specific focus on given areas of interests will target the database for reference of research need; avoidance of duplication of knowledge within different universities will be enhanced to allow for growth of novel research through blocks of existing knowledge. NOARDB will also open up researches done in the local universities to vast readers, afford greater research citations and greater opportunity for knowledge sharing and increase wider impact on research placed in universities' shelves but rarely accorded the attention it deserves.

## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS

As a way forward, research should be carried out to trace reasons why faculty members and students of different universities in Kenya have not placed their researches in the institutional archives. A comparative study also need to be carried out to establish the establishment levels of repositories in public and private universities in Kenya. Information should be sought in research to examine repository discrepancy between public and private institutions. A research should be conducted on why most universities in Kenya have no institution repositories of any mode in their institutions. Further research to find out other modalities should be done to emphasize the need for research growth, besides the current proposal of NORDB.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to Divine Fu, the Chair, ASAA2022 Organising Committee and Director, HUMA- institute for Humanities in Africa for offering me the ASAA2022 IDRC scholarship for Women to cover the conference registration fees for conference attendance from 11-16 April 2022. The conference was co-hosted by HUMA- the Institute for Humanities in Africa at the University of Cape Town in South Africa under the theme "Africa and the Human: Old Questions, New Imaginaries". This offer made it possible for me to present this paper under the title, "Research in Kenyan Universities: Repository Annex" during the conference.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Adela, J., and Barbara, D. (2019). Data Sharing in Social Sciences: Case Study on Charles University, Information Literacy in Everyday Life. 556-565, 10.1007/978-3-030-13472-3\_52.
- [2] Amarante, V., Ronelle, B., Grive, C., John, C., Anna, K., Andrew, M., and Julieta, Z. (2021). Underrepresentation of Developing Country Researchers in Development Research, Applied Research Letters. 1. DOI:10.1080/13504851.2021.1965528.

- [3] Arjun, S. (2021). Institutional Repository Engagement Framework: Harnessing Resources, Structure, and Process for Strategic Plan support in Higher education. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, 33, 137-155.10.1080/1941126X.2021.1949150.
- [4] Applehans, W., Alden G., and Greg, L. (1999). Managing Knowledge: A Practical Web-based Approach. Addison-Wesley Information Technology Series. *International Kindle Paperwhite*.
- [5] Bjork, B-C. (2014). Open Access Subject Repositories: An Overview. *Journal of the Association for the Information Science and Technology*, vol. 65, pp. 698-706.
- [6] Chilimo W, Aggrey A, Ajwang N, Walter O, and Mary M, (2017) Adoption of Open Access Publishing by Academic Researchers in Kenya. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, vol. 49, no.1, pp. 103-122. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.49.1.103>.
- [7] Constant D, Sara K, and Lee S, (1994) What's Mine is Ours, or Is It? A Study of Attitude about Information Sharing. *Information Systems Research*, 5 (4), 223-251.
- [8] <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23010604>
- [9] Files\\Kenya\\Adoption of Open Access in Kenya - § 1 reference coded [0.57% Coverage] Reference 1 - 0.57% Coverage
- [10] Hall H, (2003) Borrowed Theory: Applying Exchange Theories in Information Science Research. *Library and Information Science Research*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 287-306.
- [11] Jarvenpaa S, and Staples, S, (2000) The Uses of Collaborative Electronic Media for information Sharing: An Exploratory Study of Determinants. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, vol.9, no.2/3, pp. 129-154.
- [12] Jihyun K, (2010) Faculty Self-Archiving: Motivations and barriers. *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology issue*, 61, 1909-1922.<https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21336>.
- [13] Kankanhalli A, Bernard TCY, and Kwok KW, (2005) Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation. *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 29, 1, pp. 113-143.
- [14] Kennan MA, and Fletcher C, (2008) Institutional Repositories as Portents of Change: Disruption or Reassembly? Conjectures and Reconfiguration. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 45 (1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/meet.2008.1450450252>.
- [15] Kenyatta Library Brochure, (2021) (<https://library.ku.ac.ke/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Library-Brochure-2021.pdf>). Kenyatta University Repository website: <https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/>
- [16] Meyernik MS, (2015) Research Data and Metadata Curation as Institution Issues. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, vol.67, no. 4, pp 973-993. <https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/asi.23425>.
- [17] Molm LD, (1997) *Social exchange and Power. In Coercive Power in Social Exchange*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [18] Nunkoo R, and Haywantee R, (2011) *Power, Trust, Social Exchange and Community Support*. Britain: Annals of Tourism Research. <https://images.app.goo.gl/LttxeSemeLfJ74YA>.
- [19] Nunn N, (2019) Innis Lecture: Rethinking Economic Development. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 1349- 1373. <https://doi: 10.1111/caje.12406>.
- [20] Nwagwu WE, and Allam A, (2009) Building Open Access in Africa. *International Journal of Technology Management*, vol. 45, no. ½, pp. 82-101.
- [21] Ratanya FC, (2017) Institutional repository: access and use by academic staff at Egerton University, Kenya. *Library Management* vol. 38, no. 4/5, <https://doi: 10.1108/LM-02-2017-0018>. Downloaded on 08 April 2017, at 07:21.

**Table 1. Universities with Digitized, Un-Digitized and No Repository.**

	<b><u>Universities with Digital Repository</u></b>	<b><u>Universities with Un-Digitized Repository</u></b>	<b><u>Universities without Repository</u></b>
1.	Moi University – Moi University Digital Repository	Jomo Kenyatta University – Jomo Kenyatta Repository	Gretsa University
2.	University of Nairobi - University of Nairobi Digital Repository	Daystar University – Daystar University Repository	Karatina University
3.	United States International University Africa – USIU-AFRICA Digital Repository	Egerton University – Institutional Repository	Chuka University
4.	Kenya Methodist University – Digital Repository	Kabarak University – KABUSpace Repository	Kibabi University
5.	Strathmore University – Digital Repository	Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology - (JOOUST Repository)	Multimedia University
6.	Dedan Kimathi University of Technology – Digital Repository	KCA University – Institutional Repository	Kisii University
7.	Catholic University of Eastern Africa – CUEA Digital Repository	Mt Kenya University – Institutional Research Repository	Kiriri Women of Science and Technology
8.	Machakos University – Digital Repository	Maseno University – Maseno University Repository	Laikipia University
9.	KAG East University – Digital Repository	Pwani University – Institutional Repository	Africa International University
10.	Management University of Africa – Digital Repository	Meru University of Science and Technology – MUST Repository	Adventist University of Africa
11.	South Eastern Kenya University – Digital Repository	Murang’a University of Technology – Institutional Repository	Amref International University
12.	Umma University – Umma University Digital Repository	Zetech University – Institutional Repository	Garissa University
13.	The East African University – digital Repository	African Nazarene University – Institutional Repository	Great Lake University
14.	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology – MMUST Digital Repository	Rongo University – Institutional Repository	International Leadership University
15.	University of Eldoret – Digital Repository	St Paul’s University - Institutional Repository	Lukenya University
16.		The Technical University of Kenya – TUKenya Institutional Repository	Pan Africa Christian University
17.		Taita Taveta University – Dspace Repository	Riara University
18.		The Cooperative University of Kenya – CUK Repository	The Presbyterian University of East Africa

19.		Technical University of Mombasa - Institutional Repository	Scott Christian University
20.		University of Kabianga Institutional Repository	RAF International University
21.		Embu University - Institutional Repository	Pioneer International University
22.		Kirinyaga University – DSpace Repository	Kenya Highlands University
23.		Maasai Mara University - Maasai Mara University Institutional Repository	
24.		Catholic University of Eastern Africa-Repository	
	<b>TOTAL: 15</b>	<b>TOTAL: 24</b>	<b>TOTAL: 22</b>

#### **Author’s Biographical Details:**

My name is Jane Wangari Wakarindi (PhD.) in African Literature. Degree attained at the University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa. My area of research is in Young Adult Literature with a specific focus on Young Adult fiction in Kenya. In the research I examine the terrain of the YA literature in Kenya in relation to award –winning fiction texts in JKPL and the Burt Award groups between 2005 and 2015. I interrogate the contribution of the different stakeholders in evincing young adult genre in the country. I hold a Master of Arts (Literature) degree from Kenyatta University, Kenya. My project was based on “The Journeying Motif” in Brathwaite’s trilogy *The Arrivants* where I endeavoured to trace the arrivants’ circulatory psychological migration and journeys from the Caribbean to Africa, back and forth. I am also a teacher by profession having graduated from Kenyatta University with a Bachelor of Education (B.ED English/Literature) degree. I am currently a Lecturer of Literature at Kiriri Women’s University of Science and Technology. I have taught at other different Universities in Kenya: Kenyatta University as a Tutorial Fellow, Mt. Kenya University and The Presbyterian University of East Africa on part time basis. I also have teaching experience in both high and primary schools, having worked as a teacher in different schools in Kenya.