Lecturers' Perceptions on the Democratization of Open Science in Kenya: Case of Two Private Christian Universities in Nairobi County, Kenya

Dr. Nason Vundi
St. Paul's University

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to investigate university lecturers' perceptions of democratisation in Open Science (OS) in Kenya, focusing on schools from 2 Private Christian Universities in Nairobi County, Kenya. While embracing the tenets of OS, there is a need for more conversation about how to collectively level the scientific landscape and ensure every emerging scientist from the Global South has an equal opportunity to their counterparts in the Global North. In that regard, the world should be moving towards the establishment of a scientific infrastructure that is openly accessible, inclusive, innovative, reflexive, flexible, and integrative in conducting research and sharing and disseminating knowledge across the globe. Without clear regard and principles to guide scientific internationalisation and collaboration between the Global South and North, the establishment of international research infrastructure may remain a pipe dream. In history, Europe and the United States of America (USA) prioritize their interests above all forms of global cooperation; therefore, they seek to maintain economic, political, cultural and scientific control over other nations of the world. Viewed through neocolonial lenses, OS may be viewed as a neocolonial strategy by the former colonial powers and the new superpowers to establish a new world order by flooding the world with Eurocentric ideas, scientific 'knowledge' and innovations to expand their economic, political and cultural interests. The study adopted a descriptive study design; data were collected from senior lecturers in the Department of Social Sciences in the 2 universities using a structured questionnaire. Data was analyzed and presented using tables showing frequencies and percentages. Interpretations and conclusions were drawn from the major findings, and recommendations for further research were made.

Key Words: Open Science, Knowledge, Open Access, Research Data, Research Software, Dissemination

Introduction

OS is a more recent approach to research and scientific practices (Maedche et al., 2024). In particular, OS incorporates: cooperative research initiatives, adoption of newer methods of knowledge dissemination through digital technologies, collaborative or joint efforts in the research process, sharing of research outcomes, and wider access to new knowledge beyond the traditional scientific community (Nzweundji et al., 2022). While the world continues to celebrate OS for breaking through many of the traditional barriers to scientific research, one core concern is whether the field is fair to all participants and ensures global equity (Morrato et al., 2015). A growing body of literature documents that the research journey in the Global South is faced with major hurdles. For example, most of the institutions of higher education in the Global South have faced many

barriers such as: limited research infrastructure, inadequate technology and internet connectivity fundamental for seamless participation in OS initiatives, lack of access to advanced computing resources required for sharing, collaborating and archiving of research findings (Chuan-Pen et al., 2025; Krishna, 2020; Onyebinama, 2024).

The push for equity in OS practices is to ensure that, globally, all stakeholders enjoy enhanced access, productivity, reusability, efficiency, transparency, and the benefits of research. However, the possibility of an even field may be challenging, as there is already a burgeoning literature confirming the dominance of the flow of knowledge, especially from the Global North (GN) to the Global South (GS). For example, the GN has historically been the leading in knowledge production, setting the agenda for research, overall funding of research and publication, especially in high-index journals. Compared with the GS region, the GS region has improved greatly in participation and contributions to research and publication (Pinfield, 2025). However, unlike in the GN, GS faces diverse challenges including limited access to resources and funding, weak infrastructure, and notable barriers in language, unequal research collaborations with other partners, and finally, little recognition of research output from GS (Zaidi et al., 2022), In an attempt to level the ground regarding for the purposes of balancing OS, scholars and researchers especially GS are contesting the obvious dominance and influence in knowledge from their counterparts from GN. For that matter, scholars and researchers from GS are contextualizing and focusing on the knowledge and experiences of local communities' realities. Additionally, rather than replicating knowledge from outside, those from GS have sought to overcome the historical power imbalance between them and GN by recognizing knowledge produced within institutions in the GS and by practicing academia in the region (Huang & Soete, 2025). Finally, researchers and scholars in the larger GS are putting extra efforts to overcome the hurdles inhibiting them from publishing in high-ranking journals in the Global North. For example, adapting and conforming to the GN writing style in order to penetrate the Global North journals and thus putting their works in the global space (Krishna, 2020). Therefore, the actualization of OS takes different initiatives; for example, in the European Commission, through the European Open Science Cloud, their initiatives included promotion of open access to research publications and data and enhancement of the participation and inclusivity in research. For example, the stakeholders include: local citizens and communities, scholars, academicians and the industry (Fell, 2019). In that regard, to effectively

promote OS, the United States of America (USA) has undertaken various initiatives, such as removing any restrictions like financial or administrative factors hindering access to scientific research and data. By thus USA has effectively enabled all people to access research findings and data irrespective of their association, affiliation or financial means (Scotti et al., 2025). Consequently, OS has greatly impacted the entire scientific ecosystem and landscape. For example, it has influenced access initiatives, more community participation and engagement, inclusivity, transparency and collaboration in the research process and productivity globally.

Although Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) has been active in democratisation of OS implementation and process, the needs in the region are unique (Mwelwa et al., 2020). For instance, SSA has limited access and availability of e-infrastructure, a shortage of relevant skills, an acute lack of incentives to carryout meaningful research, and a notably lower global standing in relation to high-quality scholarly journals (Motshegwa, 2025). Hence, implementing OS in SSA requires initiatives such as supporting research sharing, capacity-building training for scholars and researchers in relevant skills, and the development of appropriate support policies (UNESCO, 2022). Additionally, SSA requires strong organizations like the Open Research Africa. Such organisations are essential for the empowerment of researchers; for instance, those in early-career development, whether researchers or scholars (Mwelwa et al., 2020). According to (Lasebikan et al.,2025), OS platforms are critical in the promotion and sustenance of open research practices, especially using them as a platform for displaying various types of articles, exhibiting pathways for career development frameworks and opportunities, resources for policymakers, and relevant training for meeting the unique researchers' needs in the SSA. In fact, SSA needs greater visibility and accessibility in the global academic arena to influence the democratisation of the OS process.

SSA is a fast and diverse region; therefore, to improve the efficiency of OS implementation, there is a need for more integrated and coordinated efforts across the entire region (Idowu et al., 2023). For greater efficiency and practicality, aligning OS initiatives with national needs and enhancing dialogue among all relevant stakeholders (Pototsky and Will, 2020). Good practices in OS should be based on reasonable investment in relevant infrastructure and the development of relevant guidelines, OS processes, and practices. For instance, although a country like Kenya is in its initial stages of OS growth, it is reasonably involved in the process. Hence, Kenya has taken major steps

toward implementing open access publishing (Wilson et al., 2023). In this regard, researchers are encouraged to use platforms such as Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID) (Weng'ua et al., 2018). Against this background, there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate Kenya's initiatives in attaining OS and consequently its democratization, for example, the development and usage of organizations such as Kenya Education Network Trust (KENET)and National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) to drive OS (Kamau et al., 2018). Nevertheless, the country faces lots of teething problems. For instance, the country lacks relevant policies, infrastructure, and adequate funding, and, finally, most researchers in SSA exhibit low awareness and lack relevant skills (Omutoko et al., 2023).

What is OS?

Efforts to precisely define OS face diverse challenges, especially in the Global South (Grand, 2015). For example, the phenomenon is partly new, and the challenging local realities like insufficient technological infrastructure and inadequate capacities (Grand, 2015). Defining open science faces challenges like the broad scope of practices (Wilson et al., 2023). Additionally, as OS is relatively new, there is no formally accepted definition of the phenomenon. Therefore, additional definitions are still under consideration (Motshegwa, 2025; Lasebikan et al., 2025). In essence, the phenomenon of OS denotes the umbrella of methods, tools, platforms, and practices that aim to enhance accessibility, transparency, reproducibility, and reliability in research processes (Michael et al., 2023). OS has also been defined as a global movement that aims to enhance free access to scientific research, publications, open methodologies, outcomes, and data without any foreseeable hindrances, such as financial or political. The purpose of OS is to promote quality processes and quality in research with regard to enhanced transparency, participation, collaboration, good practices, open sharing, and reproducibility in the context of open research. The definition adopted in this paper is by (Maedche et al., 2024), who define OS as an umbrella term that,

> ''…combines various movements and practices aiming to make multilingual scientific knowledge openly available, accessible and reusable for everyone, to increase scientific collaborations and sharing of information for the benefits of science and society, and to open the processes of scientific knowledge creation, evaluation and communication to societal actors beyond the traditional scientific community''

The definition adds weight to other definitions by stating that OS is not a single term but rather a more inclusive construct that combines diverse movements and practices to create more

multilingual scientific knowledge that is openly available, accessible, and reusable for everyone in society. Instead of the traditional way of doing science, the OS framework enables greater scientific collaboration and information sharing for the benefit of science and society. Thus, the open processes of scientific knowledge creation, evaluation and communication to increased actors beyond the reserve of small traditional scientific community entails wider sharing of open scientific knowledge, open access, open data, open source, open methodology, open educational resources, and accelerated open dialogue and open engagement with other relevant actors in the wider society (Maedche et al., 2024). The European Union (EU), as elaborated by Ramjoué (2015), defines OS as an approach that seeks to increase transparency in research processes and enhance the accessibility, usability, and collaboration in scientific research. Therefore, as a scientific process, OS is built on strong principles such as cooperative work, open dissemination of knowledge, improved accessibility, and the reusability of research output globally.

Unlike in the Global South, governments within the EU have made OS their main or core agenda. For example, they stridently promote and embrace OS as the foundation for research policy and value. At the same time, the higher education landscape in the EU encourages the universities to be in the forefront in matters of OS, and the implementation of OS practices as the basis of research policy priority and framework, democratization of OS through free accessibility of research findings and data, heightened cooperation, engagement, collaboration and innovation (Orest et al., 2025). The common elements in all the definitions of OS are: open practices, transparency, accessibility and usability of scientific research, engagement of citizens and communities, global sharing of knowledge in record time, and improved solutions to complex global problems (Banović, 2020; Moradi & Abdi, 2023).

Democratization of OS

In a nutshell, democratization of OS is about opening to scrutiny and usability the scientific process. In the end, there is increased accessibility, inclusivity, and transparency; the process, in short, allows a wider participation of stakeholders in research, and increased scientific influence in society, far beyond the small scientific community (Mielkov, 2023). Therefore, the democratisation of the OS seeks to address challenges to the implementation of OS principles. For example, in the Global South, most upcoming researchers and scholars lack adequate resources

and relevant training. Such impediments may compromise research rigour and quality and, in the end, fail to contribute to the global community. By interacting with other stakeholders, researchers present their work for scrutiny and evaluation; such steps are fundamental to controlling the quality of research output, reducing bias, and enhancing communication. The phenomenon of OS is a recent movement that seeks to break traditional barriers. For example, financial and legal barriers hinder broader sharing, enhanced visibility, accessibility, reusability, and wider dissemination of research outputs. According to UNESCO (2022), OS aims to encourage good scientific practices and knowledge, to open dialogue with other knowledge creators and systems, and to engage societal actors beyond the smaller traditional scientific community through initiatives such as sustained, collaborative, inclusive, and open scientific infrastructures. Thus, in a nutshell, OS treats knowledge like one of the public goods. The sustained availability of knowledge enhances human well-being globally (Guédon, 2019, p. 25). History has shown that human survivability and resilience in the advent of emergent pandemics like COVID-19 and the devastation from climate change in the future are embedded in the continued opening up of knowledge, acquiescent sharing of research data, open dissemination of research results, and the research process. Therefore, with the practice of OS, all stakeholders have unlimited access to an open infrastructure for rapid responses to emerging threats to human life and safety, environmental threats, and the networking and sharing of ideas, knowledge, information, lessons, and experiences with other actors across the globe.

Perceptions of OS among university lecturers in the Global South

Generally, lecturers in the Global South have mixed enthusiasm and cautiousness about OS (Isbell & Kremmel, 2024). For example, they perceive OS as a useful tool for enhanced research collaboration, access to research, and the sharing of research knowledge. However, they are concerned about domination and potential exploitation by researchers from the Global North, given the inequities between the two blocs (Gebril & Bali, 2024). Therefore, perceptions of OS and practices vary, with many lecturers reporting a positive attitude (Msonde et al., 2024). For instance, OS undoubtedly leads to increased access, employability and wider sharing and dissemination of knowledge and data (Le et al., 2025). As a matter of fact, OS cannot be overemphasized because it has redefined the process of scientific research, sharing, access and the society's role in the production, application and use of new knowledge from research (Mwangi et al., 2023).In that regard, with the advancement of information technology, stakeholders such as

researchers and academics have unconventional ways of assessing, publishing, and disseminating research outcomes to other interested and relevant citizens (Guzman, 2025). Against this background, most university lecturers in the Global South are positive about the implementation of OS and perceive the process as valuable for the research ecosystem and the broader educational infrastructure (Martinez et al., 2018). In fact, OS practices are currently well-suited to institutions in the Global North, but the efforts of institutions in the Global South and their optimism about integrating the OS movement into their research ecosystems are notable. Thus, for greater efficiency in adopting OS movement fully, their concerns and inherent challenges they face need rapid, in-depth responses to expedite their collaboration, sharing, access, participation, and engagement with the rest of the world, particularly in the Global North.

Challenges of implementing OS processes in the Global South

The Global South has, from the outset, shown commitment to supporting OS (Umbach, 2024). For example, it launched the African Open Science Platform (AOSP) as a pan-African initiative to advance open science practices in the Global South (Krishna, 2020). However, the new outfit faced myriad hindrances, including a lack of political will and incentives, inadequate resources and funding, and weak, irrelevant policies (Chakravorty et al., 2022). Even basic requirements for an OS's functioning may be unavailable; for example, important institutions lack policies, procedures, and supporting infrastructure essential to the necessary practices in an OS. Despite researchers in the Global South's willingness to engage with and participate in the OS, they lack a full understanding of its functioning and benefits, as well as the essential tools for OS platforms (Chuan-Peng et al., 2025). OS in the Global South lacks integration, inclusiveness and diversity, unlike in the Global North (Rodrigues, 2021). According to Turba et al. (2025), there is a distinct disparity in internet access and digital literacy between researchers in the Global South and those in the Global North. Against this background, those in the Global South have limited access to digital tools and platforms infrastructure; in that regard, it is difficult for researchers from the two spheres collaborate, share, and engage effectively in OS practices (Ross-Hellauer, 2022). For instance, the lack of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) infrastructure in the Global South compromises faster knowledge transfer and sharing, as well as wider collaboration among researchers and other societal actors in OS practices across the globe (Herra & Maharaj, 2025). Ordinarily, ICT facilitates rapid data analysis and efficient management of large scientific

datasets, which are essential for effective research practices. Therefore, without universal access to ICT in the Global South, researchers cannot openly share data and methods, and it is impossible to widely and efficiently promote peer review and validation (Le et al., 2025). Fundamentally, without a strong ICT framework, collaborative and parallel research approaches are impossible, and the challenges of big data processing and analysis often faced by researchers in the Global South are not to be overlooked. Consequently, there is limited research infrastructure in the Global South, and an acute shortage of qualified data managers (Msonde et al., 2024).

Methodology

This study investigated university lecturers' perceptions of democratisation in Open Science (OS) landscapes and practices at 2 selected private Christian universities in Nairobi County, Kenya. Given that kind of research focus, the researcher preferred a mixed research design because data from such methods are more appropriate, as they provide a comprehensive understanding of complex phenomena by integrating quantitative and qualitative data. The combination offered the researcher a wealth of insights and enhanced the reliability of findings, especially through the validation of qualitative data. Moreover, the researcher gained deeper context and explanations of the statistical results from the quantitative data. The study's findings are more credible because they are empirically grounded and confirmed by the study participants during the study and during the dissemination of the findings.

Design

The study adopted a descriptive research design; this research method seeks to observe, describe, and document the characteristics of a situation, population, or phenomenon, but does not necessarily manipulate variables. To gather data, a descriptive method uses observational methods such as surveys, questionnaires, interviews, and sometimes rankings. The researcher considered the research design appropriate for exploring trends and patterns, thereby enabling a clear and comprehensive picture of the overall situation regarding OS. A mixed research method was used in data collection, thereby enhancing the reliability of findings and the realization of the study objectives. Therefore, mixed methods helped to merge the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative data. That helped to deepen the researcher's understanding of the complex phenomenon

of the lecturer's perception of the democratisation of the OS landscape in 2 Christian Private Universities in Nairobi Central Business District.

Population and Sampling

The study adopted a descriptive survey design and was conducted among 2 Christian Private Universities in the Nairobi Central Business District. The target population for the study was 57 full-time faculty members drawn from 3 randomly selected schools out of 5. A sample of 20 subjects was randomly selected from the target population; additionally, the researcher selected 9 subjects from the sample for the Focus Group Discussion as the source of qualitative data.

Table 10: Target Population and Sample

Schools selected	Number of faculty members	sample selected
School of Theology	13	5
School of Education & Social Sciences	20	7
School of Business & Leadership	24	8
Total	57	20

The table shows how the population was accessed, and how the sample was randomly selected from each of the 3 schools.

Validity and Reliability

The researcher ensured validity by assessing the research instrument to ensure that it measured the intended construct. For example, the measurement of theoretical constructs includes coverage of aspects such as coverage, relevance, and suitability. In that regard, after the pilot study, the researcher subjected the instrument's results to statistical comparisons to evaluate whether the measurement instrument achieved its intended goals, purpose and accuracy. Confirmatory Factor Analysis methods were employed for that purpose. To measure reliability, the researcher used the test-retest method, administering the same test measuring the same construct at different times. Achievement of consistency indicated higher reliability. For the qualitative data, the credibility of the findings was enhanced through triangulation: the researcher collected data from various sources and different locations. Comparison was made to check whether similar patterns emerged. Finally, the findings were read to the participants to confirm whether they accurately reflected their experiences and perspectives.

Data Analysis

To analyse the quantitative data, the researcher began by organising and cleaning the data. That entailed removing errors, missing values, and other inconsistencies. All patterns and trends were observed, extracted and interpreted. The emerging insights were presented through tables and figures. Moreover, the researcher used the findings to support or fill gaps from literature review. In analyzing the qualitative data, the researcher prepared the data by organising and transcribing it. Then the data was coded and categorized by identifying key themes and patterns. The themes were developed and interpreted, giving attention to the relationships and what they meant. The findings were represented and communicated. During data analysis, the researcher gave special attention to key themes, content, discourse, and narrative analysis. In reporting, the respondents were given anonymous identities.

Ethical Considerations

The participants gave the researcher their informed consent after being taken through the nature of the study. They consented to participate in the study with full knowledge of possible risks. The researcher undertook responsibility for protecting participants' personal information by maintaining the privacy of their data. For example, all the respondents' data was securely stored. Additionally, their true identity was hidden by assigning them anonymous identities. Moreover, the participants were protected from any potential risk. The researcher disseminated the study findings and the benefits accrued to all participants, for example, innovative ideas. The participants were randomly selected, ensuring each had an equal chance of being selected. Finally, besides disseminating the research findings, the researcher was open to the participants about data usage and storage.

Findings

Research Question 1: What is the importance of OS in research?

The respondents agreed that the open science research movement was important (70%), while (20%) were not sure and (10%) did not believe OS was workable in Africa. The findings of the study are significant because the implications of practicing OS are fundamental for the growth and development of the scholarly community globally (Krishna, 2020). For example, the OS promotes greater transparency, reproducibility, and unlimited worldwide dissemination (Fell, 2019). That

makes the research output beneficial to the whole world, guaranteeing inclusivity in both research consumption and productivity (Chun-Peng et al., 2025).

The summary of the lecturers' perceptions about the importance of OS in research is shown below.

Table 02: Importance of OS in research

Perceptions on the importance of OS	frequency	Percentage
OS research movement is important	13	70
Not sure about the importance of OS research	5	20
Did not believe OS was important in research	2	10
Total	20	100

The respondents were positive that OS is the way to go for future research and scholarly work. When the respondents were probed more on what could be done to those who were hesitant to embrace OS more in research, one of the respondents said (MT 05) commented,

By increasing awareness and support, all the scholars will embrace OS in their research. But personal efforts are not enough. Each semester, more exposure should be done to popularize OS. Finally, there is a need for more support; for example, a more modern data centre and investment in faster and more stable internet. (MT 05).

Research Question 2: What are the reasons for low participation in OS in research?

Low participation in OS in research was evident among the lecturers; however, not all causes of this low participation were directly linked to OS. For example, (45%) of the respondents attributed their low participation to heavy workloads, while (30%) blamed the high cost of publication of the journal articles. The findings are significant because, to spur lecturers' efforts in publications, a review of their workload is critical. Therefore, while other hindrances to the use of OS exist, the lecturers' workload should be reduced, and perhaps more time allocated to research work (Lasebikan et al., 2025). This was better expressed by one of the respondents (NJ 77) who commented,

It is very challenging to find adequate time to publish an article or conduct meaningful research. We teach, supervise, and mentor students, review curriculums, set and mark CATs, examination, attend training and seminars. We have very short holidays or leaves; sometimes it is a break to mark the exams. Personally, I have 2 unfinished journal articles that have been sitting on my table for the last 2 semesters. I am willing to finish the article, but I absolutely do not have adequate time to clear it. (NJ 77).

Table 3: Reasons for low participation in OS in research

Reasons for low participation	Frequency	Percentage
Concerns about personal data privacy	1	5
High financial costs of publishing	6	30
Too heavy workloads	9	45
Low trust in open science	2	10
Low awareness in OS	2	10
Total	20	100

Research Question 3: What are the challenges hindering democratization of OS in research?

The democratisation of Open Science in the research movement was seen as the ideal action in the scholarship community (95%), as a way of promoting accessibility, equity, open processes that are accountable and replicable. However, the possibility of realising the goal of democratisation of OS was seen as difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. For example, (30%) cited high financial cost as an impediment to democratisation. The finding was significant because the high cost of publication locked some scholars out, preventing them from sharing their ideas with the world. Moreover, the lack of participation in OS meant the scholars of the Global South were being locked out of the process, leaving the platform dominated by scholars from the Global North; this was viewed as a threat to the democratisation of the OS (Krishna, 2020). Further comments on the impacts of the high cost of publication on democratization of OS were elaborated by (KY 45),

Democratisation of OS will remain a dream because of the high cost of research and publication. For example, universities are unable to invest in research, they cannot invest the 2% of their income in research as the Commission of Education requires them to do. Even countries in the Global South cannot fund research. Developing countries are fully locked out of participation in the democratisation of the OS, and as long as it remains dominated by the developed countries, democratization efforts and processes are impossible. (KY 45). A lack of backup for research, such as an outdated data centre, was seen as significant (25%). The significance of such findings was that the lack of a modern data centre compromised research. For example, it would slow the research process, lead to inaccuracies due to outdated insights, and ultimately result in low-quality research due to unreliable data. The consumption of such research is too low because decisions and policies cannot be based on findings that are not trusted (Huang & Soete, 2025; Msonde et al., 2024; Moradi & Abdi, 2023).

Table 4: Challenges hindering the democratization of OS in research?

Hindrances towards democratization of OS in research	Frequency	Percentage
Low performing internet	4	20
Lack of up-to-date data center	5	25
Domination by the North	5	25
High cost for publishing in journals	6	30
Total	20	100

The issues hindering the democratisation of OS are complex; they range from a lack of technological infrastructure, high costs of publication, and the dominant presence of scholars and researchers from the Global North, whose contexts differ and are more favorable to them. For the democratisation of OS to be realized, the specific context of scholars and researchers in the Global South must be considered. For instance, inequalities, lack of access to funding, little representation and technological backwardness (Msonde et al., 2024; Lawal et al., 2021).

Conclusion

This paper investigated university lecturers' perceptions of democratisation in Open Science (OS) in Kenya, focusing on 2 Private Christian Universities in Nairobi County. The respondents agreed that the open science research movement was important (70%), while (20%) were not sure and (10%) did not believe OS was workable in Africa. The findings of the study are significant because the implications of practicing OS are fundamental for the growth and development of the scholarly community globally (Krishna, 2020). Therefore, due to low participation in OS in research among the lecturers, not all causes were directly linked to OS. For example, (45%) of the respondents attributed their low participation to heavy workloads, while (30%) blamed the high cost of publication of the journal articles. The findings are significant because, to spur lecturers' efforts in publishing, a review of their workload is critical. There was consensus that democratisation of OS was fundamental in promoting accessibility, equity, open processes that are accountable and replicable. However, the possibility of realising the goal of democratisation of OS was seen as difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. For example, (30%) cited high financial cost as an impediment to democratisation. The finding was significant because the high cost of publication locked some scholars out, preventing them from sharing their ideas with the world. Moreover, the lack of participation in OS meant the scholars of the Global South were being locked out of the process, leaving the platform dominated by scholars from the Global North; this was viewed as a threat to the democratisation of the OS (Krishna, 2020).

Recommendations

The purpose of this paper was to investigate university lecturers' perceptions of democratisation in Open Science (OS) in Kenya, focusing on schools from one Private Christian University in Nairobi County, Kenya. The study had the following research questions:

1) What is the importance of democratization of OS in research?
2) What are the reasons for the low participation of researchers in the democratisation of OS in research?
3) What factors hinder democratization of OS in research?

The study makes the following recommendations:

1) More awareness needs to be created about the democratization of OS to enhance the practice of good research
2) Governments in the developing countries need to address the factors responsible for low participation in the democratization of OS in researchers in democratization
3) Stakeholders in research like scholars and development partners to address factors hindering democratization of OS in research

References

Banović, J. (2020). The Future of Science – Open Science and Open Data. Infotheca. 20. 47-55. 10.18485/infotheca.2020.20.1_2.3.

Chakravorty, N., Sharma, C., Molla, K., Pattanaik, J. (2022). Open Science: Challenges, Possible Solutions and the Way Forward. Proceedings of the Indian National Science Academy. 88. 10.1007/s43538-022-00104-2.

Chuan-Peng, H., Xu, Z., Lazić, A., Bhattacharya, P., Seda, L., Hossain, S., Jeftic, A., Özdoğru, A., Amaral, O., Miljkovic, N., Ilchovska, Z., Lazarevic, L., Bao, H., Ghodke, N., Moreau, D., Elsherif, M., Mullanvathukkal, C., Ghai, S., Carneiro, C., Azevedo, F. (2025). Open Science in the Developing World: A Collection of Practical Guides for Researchers in Developing Countries. 10.31234/osf.io/7ubk2_v1.

Fell, M. J. (2019) 'The Economic Impacts of Open Science: A Rapid Evidence Assessment', Publications, 7/3: 46. (Google Scholar)

Gebril, A., & Bali, M. (2024). A Global South perspective on Open Science in language assessment: A response to Winke. Language Testing, 41(4), 886-891. https://doi.org/10.1177/02655322241260121

Grand, A. (2015). Open science. Journal of Science Communication. 14. 10.22323/2.14040302.

Guédon, J. C., Kramer, B., Laakso, M., Schmidt, B., Šimukovič, E., Hansen, J., Patterson, M. (2019). Future of scholarly publishing and scholarly communication: report of the Expert Group to the European Commission.

Guzmán, A., Acosta, S., Dagne, C. (2025), "Evaluation of the carbonated front in concrete samples subjected to non-regular wetting-air drying cycles.", Revista ALCONPAT, 15 (1), pp. 3– 49, DOI: https://doi.org/10.21041/ra.v15i1.732

Herrera, M., Maharaj, G,. (2025). Promoting Equity Between the Global North and Global South in Entomological Research. Current Opinion in Insect Science. 69. 101357. 10.1016/j.cois.2025.101357

Huang, C., & Soete, L. (2025). Reconciling open science with technological sovereignty. Economics of Innovation and New Technology, 1–15.

Idowu, Ayobami & Aigbavboa, Clinton & Oke, Ayodeji. (2023). Barriers to digitalization in the Nigerian construction industry. 10.35490/EC3.2023.196.

Isbell, D. R., &Kremmel, B. (2024). Open Science practices in language assessment: Introducing the special issue. Language Testing, 41(4), 697–702. https://doi.org/10.1177/02655322241264092

Kamau, A., Kibuine, M., Mugambi, N.(2018). EFFECTIVENESS OF STRATEGIC DRIVERS ON PERFORMANCE OF SELECTED CHANNELED PRODUCT ICT FIRMS IN NAIROBI, KENYA. Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management. 5. 10.61426/sjbcm.v5i3.806.

Krishna, V. (2020). Open Science and Its Enemies: Challenges for a Sustainable Science–Society Social Contract. Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity. 6. 61. 10.3390/joitmc6030061.

Lasebikan, N., Oladoyinbo C., Walser D., Kaninjing, E. (2025) Understanding the needs of African researchers involved in implementation and dissemination science ecancer 19 1862

Lawal, B., Rafi, A., Idris, B., Joseph, A. (2021). Perceptions of academics in Nigerian higher education institutions on graduate attributes in computing disciplines that are desirable for employability and entrepreneurship in Nigeria. Global Journal of Engineering and Technology Advances. 8. 019-027. 10.30574/gjeta.2021.8.1.0097.

Le., H., & Hoang, L,. (2025). The perceptions of lecturers about the application of e-learning in the process of organizing teaching activities at universities. 10.31893/multiscience.2025585.

Maedche, A., Elshan, E., Höhle, H., Lehrer, C., Recker, J., Sunyaev, A., Sturm, B., Werth, O,. (2024). Open Science. Business & Information Systems Engineering. 66. 1-16. 10.1007/s12599-024-00858-7.

Martínez, C., Cotte P., A,. (2018). Knowledge and Perceptions of Open Science among Researchers—A Case Study for Colombia. Information. 9. 292. 10.3390/info9110292.

Michael G. B., Josefin S., Dominique G. R., Alfredo, S., Eli S.J. T., Tomas B,. in(2023). Open science. Current Biology https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2023.05.036

Mielkov, Y,. (2023). THE PARADIGM OF OPEN SCIENCE AND DEMOCRATIZATION OF THE RESEARCH ACTIVITY OF UNIVERSITIES. PARADIGM OF KNOWLEDGE. 3. 10.26886/2520-7474.3(57)2023.4.

Moradi, S., Abdi, S,. (2023). Open science-related policies in Europe. Science and Public Policy. 10.1093/scipol/scac082/7069603.

Morrato, E.H., Rabin, B., Proctor, J. (2015). Bringing it home: expanding the local reach of dissemination and implementation training via a university-based workshop. Implementation Sci 10, 94. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-015-0281-6

Motshegwa, T,. (2025). The African Open Science Platform: Implementing the African Open Science Vision. Open Conference Proceedings. 5. 10.52825/ocp.v5i.1427.

Msonde, S., Mariki, B., Kanyuma, L,. (2024). Faculty Adoption of Open Science and Their Practices Towards Data Sharing in Tanzanian Health Universities. The International Information & Library Review. 56. 1-18. 10.1080/10572317.2024.2409600.

Mwangi, K., Mainye, N., Ouso, D., Esoh, K., Muraya, A., Mwangi, C., Naitore, C., Karega, P., Kibet R., Gilbert, M., Sebastian,. Mutisya, J., Mwangi, E., Mgawe, C., Miruka, S., Kibet, C., Bungei, J,. (2021). Open Science in

Kenya: Where Are We?. Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics. 6. 10.3389/frma.2021.669675.

Mwelwa, J,. Boulton, G., Wafula, J., Loucoubar, C,. (2020). Developing Open Science in Africa: Barriers, Solutions and Opportunities. Data Science Journal. 19. 31. 10.5334/dsj-2020-031.

Nzweundji, J., Ahmed, N., Carnicelli-Filho, S., Fernandez R, D.,Narita, V., Rios, R., C. (2022). Open Science -For Whom?. Data Science Journal. 21. 1-8. 10.5334/dsj-2022-001.

Omutoko, L., Amugune, B., Nyawira, T., Inwani, I., Muchoki, C., Masika, M., Omosa-Manyonyi, G., Kamau, C., K'Apiyo, L., Jaoko, W,. (2023). Strengthening research ethics oversight in Africa: The Kenyan example. South African Journal of Bioethics and Law. 16. 19-22. 10.7196/SAJBL.2023.v16i1.199.

Onyebinama, C., Okere, O., Ayo-Olafare, F., Chima-James, Ng.(2024). Open science and academic libraries in Africa. Library and Information Perspectives and Research. 6. 249-261. 10.47524/lipr.v6i1.250.

Orest, K., Stepura, T., Korytska, O. (2025). Practices of Open Science Ecosystem Building in the EU. Проблеми сучасних трансформацій. Серія: економіка та управління. 10.54929/2786-5738-2025-17-02-01.

Pinfield, S. (2025). Achieving Global Open Access The Need for Scientific, Epistemic and Participatory Openness. Routledge, New York.

Pototsky, P.C., & Will, C., (2020). Conservation research output in sub-Saharan Africa is increasing, but only in a few countries. Conservation research capacity. Cambridge University Press on behalf of Fauna & Flora International doi:10.1017/S0030605320000046

Ramjoué, C. (2015). Towards Open Science: The vision of the European Commission. Information Services & Use. 35. 167-170.

Rodrigues, R. (2021). Downside up: Science matters equally to the Global South. Communications Earth & Environment. 2. 10.1038/s43247-021-00171-1.

Ross-Hellauer, T., Klebel, T., Bannach-Brown, A., Horbach, S. P., Jabeen, H., Manola, N., Metodiev, T., Papageorgiou, H., Reczko, M., Sansone, S. A., Schneider, J., Tijdink, J., & Vergoulis, T. (2022). TIER2: enhancing Trust, Integrity and Efficiency in Research

through next-level Reproducibility. Research Ideas and Outcomes, 8, e98457. https://doi.org/10.3897/rio.8.e98457.

Scotti, K., Jiao, C., Gainey, M., Bongiovanni, E., Slayton, E. (2025). Charting open science Landscapes: A Systematized Review of US Academic Libraries' Engagement in Open Research Practices. 10.31219/osf.io/uwcfk_v1.

Turba, R.,Thoré, E., Bertram, M., Bridg, H., Shafiei Sabet, S., Gamboa, M., Ríos-Orjuela, J., Takola, E., Capa S., Jose, F., Ana C., Marín, C., (2025). Global North-South science inequalities due to language and funding barriers. 10.5281/zenodo.14902147.

Umbach G. (2024). Open Science and the impact of Open Access, Open Data, and FAIR publishing principles on data-driven academic research: Towards ever more transparent, accessible, and reproducible academic output? Statistical Journal of the IAOS. 2024;40(1):59-70. doi:10.3233/SJI-240021

UNESCO (2022). An introduction to the UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science. UNESCO Canadian Commission for UNES. DOI: https://doi.org/10.54677/XOIR1696

Zaidi, I., Amir, R., Student, M. E., & Bhatia, H. K. (2022). Benefits and Barriers to Open Educational Resources (OERs): Preservice Teachers' perception. The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning,

Weng'ua, F., Rotich, D., Kogos, E,. (2018). The role of Kenyan universities in promoting research and scholarly publishing. South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science. 83. 10.7553/83-2-1705.

Wilson, K., Baleela, R. P., Heila, van D., Martie., P. D. (2023). E-book on Open Science in Africa.