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ABSTRACT

The role of student leaders in school administration in Kenya and other parts of the world is increasingly becoming more complex because of the changes in technology, society, culture, encroachment of democracy and emerging issues such as child rights, human rights, HIV/AIDS and drugs. This has brought about the participatory role among the Board of Governors, the teachers, students and parents. This calls for a need to balance roles shared in school governance between the administration, teachers and prefects to ensure its effectiveness. However, the increase in the number of cases of indiscipline among students in public secondary schools, manifested in the burning of schools and even loss of life, raises questions on the role of prefects in the governance of schools. It was in this light that the researcher embarked on determining the role of prefects in the governance of Public Secondary Schools in Machakos Central Division. The study employed the survey research design. The target population was the twenty four (24) Public Secondary Schools in the Division. A sample size of twelve (12) schools was randomly selected through stratified sampling to ensure fair representation of the various categories of schools found in the Division. The respondents were the twelve (12) principals, twelve (12) deputy
principals, thirty six (36) teachers, sixty (60) prefects and two hundred and ten (210) students to total to three hundred and thirty (330) respondents. However, one school from the target population was picked for a pilot study. The researcher specifically developed separate questionnaires for principals, deputy principals, teachers, prefects and students to suit each type of respondent and administered them personally. For qualitative data, descriptive statistics entailing means, frequencies and percentages were utilized. The study revealed that the, prefects are appointed by administrators, teachers and students jointly (77.8%), teachers alone (22.2%), administrators alone (8.1%) and teachers alone (13.5%). Several attributes are used in selecting prefects; academic performance (11.1%), good behaviour (11.1%), discipline (11.1%), leadership qualities (11.1%), communication skills (22.2%) or a combination of all the above (33.3%). The major roles of prefects include; areas of study (11.1%), supervising duties in school (33.3%), monitoring students (22.2%) and assisting the administration in management (22.2%). The study concluded that; school use different criteria of appointing prefects depending on the culture of the school and the prefects are prepared through training, seminars and prefects symposia.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0. Introduction

The researcher carried out the study on the role of prefects in the governance of Public Secondary Schools in Central Division of Machakos District. This chapter presents the background to the problem, statement of the problem and outlines the study’s objectives, purpose, research questions as well as assumptions. The limitations, delimitations, significance of the study will also be given. Finally, the theoretical framework and operational definition of terms will close the chapter.

1.1 Background information

The title prefect has been used differently over the years. This section looks at its meaning from ancient Roman times to the Present in academics. A ‘prefect’ (from Latin Praefectus; perfect participle of praeficere: “make in-front” i.e. put in charge) is an official of various different types; the equivalent in military terms would be “front line troops”. Prefects were officials in ancient Roman times and more recently in British and Commonwealth schools. In the school setting, the term ‘prefect’ applies to a student with leadership qualities selected by the school authority or by students and given certain powers to control and guide other students (Free Dictionary, 2010).

In some schools in the past, prefects were so powerful that they could run the school outside the classroom, and in some cases they would administer corporal punishment but this has since been changed. Today, prefects are representatives of the student body and embody the best in student qualities that a school has to offer. They are charged with supervisory roles over other students in and outside the classroom. In classes, they control noise during private study and maintain the general hygiene. Outside the classroom, prefects control activities such as games, clubs and societies, supervise communal work within
the compound, oversee the organization and life of students in dormitories, and ensure that those concerned serve meals well and on time.

According to Okumbe (2001), the involvement of prefects in educational leadership has been mainly due to their closeness to their colleagues in the classroom, dormitories and dining hall. Another reason why students are given leadership roles is to impart participatory leadership skills that they would need in both their working and social environments after leaving school. All public schools in Kenya have prefects. A few private schools such as Strathmore do not have prefects but they have put in place other measures, such as employing extra support staff to execute most of the prefects’ duties and responsibilities. In good performing schools such as Starehe Boys Centre, prefects are so efficient and effective that the role of teachers is limited to teaching and carrying out other academic duties. They are managers in practice if not by name.(Griffin, 1996).

In many British and Commonwealth schools, prefects are usually students in their senior grade. They have considerable power and effectively run the school outside the classroom. For example, in Hornsby High school (Hornsby Girls School, 2010) there is a Prefectoral Board, which is a body of the school made of carefully selected proficient senior students. The prefect body is a government and it checks on the school. The prefects have some sort of authority over other students. The prefects in this school have their duties, responsibilities, special rights in which they are allowed to punish students who behave contrary to the rules and regulations. However, they are sometimes restrained where a case is beyond their context wherein is referred to the school administrator. In conjunction, the school has the Student Representative Council (S.R.C.), which is the mouthpiece of the students. The council is made up of elected representatives and it works in cooperation with the prefect body.

In St. Georges High School (Georgeshal -P.Schools 2010), an English International school in America, all prefects help to supervise young pupils while they work at lunchtime and provide an additional pair of eyes for teachers at
break time. The prefects act as ambassadors and diplomats for the school; guiding guests around the school with open friendliness. Its prefectural structure is made up of a head boy, 4 senior prefects and 4 ordinary prefects. The prefects meet regularly to organize events. The roles of the prefects at St. Georges High School include: To be role models for other pupils; to promote the ethos of St. Georges High School; to maintain the standards of discipline; to attend school events and prefects meeting when required and to ensure all students adhere to full school rules and regulations.

In essence, each school is unique and has its own rules and regulations, which the prefects uphold as they influence the other students to adhere to them. Traddords (1990), a case study of democratization of Wolves Hampton Grammar School in Britain called for sharing power in schools. Lwehabura (1993) says that students who were empowered to take responsibility for making educational decisions and for the consequences of those decisions perform well in their examinations.

Secondary schools in Africa have regularly experienced violent student disturbances. Harber and Dadey (1993) used evidence from Nigeria and Kenya to argue that schools where students were not involved in decision-making or were never consulted whenever important decisions were being made, resorted to violence to vent their frustrations and disagreements. Harber and Dadey (1993) research found out that the students council enabled the problems to be discussed before they got out of hand. They noted that successful principals used participatory structures to avoid violence stemming from students. It was here that prefects came in as a link between the students and the school principals. Even though the role of prefects in governance of schools seemed to be entrenched in Tanzanian schools, this could not be said to be true about prefects in public secondary schools in Machakos Central Division in Kenya.

Wanjiru (1999) carried out a study on students’ involvement for democratic participation in decision-making process in Nairobi Province. She
found out that participatory management need to be evolved, developed and adopted in schools. Shikami (2006) in a paper on evaluation of prefect-ship in school management and education in Kenya aimed at identifying the major constraints to school management and the role of prefects in influencing high discipline in Kenyan schools. He recommended that an empirical research on prefects and school management be carried out.

Munyao (2003) in his study of the challenges posed by adolescent to the management of secondary schools in Machakos District found out that school administrators are often under pressure while handling students. The study recommended that the administrators undergo regular in-service training on human development to understand adolescent behavioural trends in schools. The study concentrated only on the challenges faced by the school administrators (principals) without putting into consideration the role of prefects in the governance of secondary schools, an aspect that shall be considered in this study with reference to public secondary in Machakos Central Division.

The MOE task force, investigating the cause of unrests in school (Republic of Kenya, 2010) found out that there were no particular criteria used in selecting prefects. The task force observed that, more often than not, students were not involved in the selection of prefects; there is always a possibility of appointing unpopular prefects, thus rendering them ineffective in administration. It is about ten years since the study was carried out; today the situation might have changed, thus this study sought to find out the role of prefects in school governance in Machakos Central Division.

Okumbe (1998) viewed school as a social system because it has people (members) who should interactively and harmoniously work together to achieve common organizational goals. The school is a social system because it has students, prefects, teachers and administrative staff as sub-systems, all working in a coordinated and interdependent manner to achieve common school goals.
These various groups carry out clearly defined roles as assigned by the school administration. To facilitate co-ordination, organization and harmony, a school has a hierarchical system of authority as follows: principal, deputy principal, heads of departments, teachers, prefects and finally students. Prefects occupy the lowest rank in the schools’ hierarchical system of authority. However the lowest rank is not necessarily inferior. In an organization, according to the social system theory, there are no inferior and superior ranks. Rather, the various sub-units, despite wielding different levels of power and authority, carry out unique but complementary roles to achieve the system’s goals. Thus the malfunctioning of one sub-unit, such as the prefectural body, will negatively affect the functioning of the entire school and the achievement of educational goals.

Other than the need for a hierarchy of authority in an organization, Mbiti (1974) gives four other elements of proper administration in an organization. These include the need to clearly spell out the aims of the organization, need for unity of command, need for co-ordination and finally division of labour. In the division of labour, different people must be given different jobs according to their skills. It helps to determine who is responsible for what. This ensures that work proceeds quickly and smoothly. Hence, job description and job specification are considered in the division of labour. So what is the job description and specification of prefects in governing a public school? To get an answer to this question prompted the researcher to carry out this study.

Okumbe (1998) and Ozig (1987) assert that an organization must have a definite structure and a system for providing leadership. However simple the organization may be, there must be provision for various ranks within the system to enhance performance of sub-units and the entire system. Kyungu (1999) recommends that, for a school to perform well there must be evidence of good leadership. In most cases, prefects play an important leadership role of linking the students with the teachers. Thus any organizational group facing a common task
or problem will need to identify functions to be performed by certain sub-groups, because no one individual or sub-group can do everything. In the secondary school system, prefects are student leaders who act as a bridge between the administration and students. This bridging function facilitates a conducive environment for learning. They assist the administration to see to it that rules and regulations are followed to promote learning. Prefect positions appear in administrative hierarchical systems of all secondary schools in Kenya. The reason for this is that prefects bridge the administrative gap between the teachers and students.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Students’ involvement in the governance of schools is crucial since most decisions made in the school affect them in one way or another. When students are encouraged to take part in the governance of their school, they learn to cultivate a democratic attitude; the right attitude to work; and a sense of belonging to both school and society. They also learn to be self-directing, responsible and law abiding individuals. Proper school governance demands involvement of students in decision-making through their representatives, but what is found on the ground is that students are not involved in making decision on what directly affects them. Thus the study sought to know the areas in which students are involved in to ensure proper governance of their school and how the prefects are selected and appointed to participate in these areas of school governance.

1.2.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the role of prefects in the school administration; areas in which they were involved in administration as they carried out their roles with particular reference to their leadership needs; decision-making; communication; their appointment mode; training needs for purposes of bringing harmony to the school; and good governance.
1.3 Objectives of the Study
The study was guided by the following objectives:

1. To examine the criteria for appointing prefects in public secondary schools.

2. To establish the role of prefects.

3. To determine the programme for the prefect preparation on leadership roles.

4. To establish the extent of involvement of prefects in the governance of the school.

1.4 Research Questions
The following research questions were derived from the research objectives to guide the study:

1. How are the prefects appointed in public secondary schools of Machakos District Central Division?

2. What is the role of the prefects in public secondary school governance?

3. What methods are used in the training of prefects?

4. In which areas, are prefects involved in the administration of a public school?

1.5 Significance of the Study
The study findings will be helpful to educationist such as principals in preparing young people for leadership roles in future. Prefects are future societal leaders and an early training in school would enable them to take leadership roles in their future life. The findings will also be of immediate benefit to the Ministry of Education (MOE) in formulating policies governing prefect systems in public secondary schools.
The study findings will sensitize principals and others concerned with prefect matters on the importance of addressing the needs of the prefects. This is because addressing the needs will enable the prefects to carry out their roles effectively, which will in turn improve discipline and academic performance.

The study findings will add knowledge to the already existing stock of knowledge about the role of prefects. They will also form a base on which other researchers can develop their studies. The study findings will give the prefects more insight regarding their role in governance of public secondary schools.

The study findings have highlighted factors that would contribute to the improvement of the prefect system in public secondary schools. They will also lead to the improvement of implementation of an effective and efficient prefect system in public secondary schools. This will be useful to the school administration.

1.6 Assumptions

In conducting this study, the following assumptions were made:

i) That the administration, teachers and prefects gave their opinions uninfluenced and as honestly as possible.

ii) The respondents (prefects, students, teachers, principals and deputy principals) were informed of prefecture roles to enable them not only to cooperate but also to provide reliable responses.

iii) That the responses were true and adequate to facilitate the drawing of conclusions in the study.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

The use of diverse data collection techniques is very important in providing a clear understanding of any research issue under investigation. This study used only questionnaires to obtain data on the role of Prefects in the governance of Public Secondary School in Machakos Central Division.
Time and finance also restricted the study to only public secondary schools in Machakos Central Division. However, the researcher ensured quality work.

1.8 Delimitations of the Study/Scope

The researcher confined his study to public Secondary Schools in Machakos Central Division. The study sample included only the teachers, prefects, students and administrators who were considered particularly because the study revolved around the issue of prefects, which in one way or another touched on all of them by focusing on aspects of school governance involving prefects.

1.9 Theoretical Framework

The Social Systems Theory provided the theoretical underpinning for the study. Social Systems Theory is a theory that attempts to describe, explain and predict organizational behaviour. The general system theory is based on the work of a biologist, Ludwig Von Bertalanify: from a biological standpoint, an organism is an integrated system of interdependent structures and functions.

An organism is constituted of cells and a cell consists of molecules, which must work in harmony. Each molecule must know what the others are doing. Each one must be capable of receiving messages and must be sufficiently disciplined to obey. According to the Social Systems Theory, all organizations are systems comprised of different units or parts, which are interrelated and, interdependent in carrying out their activities, are all geared towards attainment of common goals. These different units are known as sub-systems.

Subsystems are the interdependent interacting elements of a system, that need to function in a coordinated way so that the entire system functions properly to achieve its goals. A system gets its inputs from the larger societal environment (supra system). From the supra system, the school gets students, teachers, resource materials, finances and so on. The system transforms the inputs into finished products. For example, a school produces a changed person with skills, knowledge and values to enable him/her to contribute positively to self and
society. Okumbe (1998) points out that the social systems theory was developed from the social theory to explain social changes and human interaction in organizations.

Since organizations are a collection of individuals or people who come together to perform specified tasks geared towards the attainment of common goals, they are referred to as social systems. Thus, schools are social systems. They have principals, teachers, support staff and prefects who carry out various tasks towards the major purpose of enhancing student learning.

Subsystems have distinct properties both in specialization and scope of responsibilities but there is no single subsystem that is superior or inferior to others. All subsystems perform unique but complementary roles to attain the common goals of the system. Thus, even if the principal occupies a higher position than prefects who are in the lowest rank of the administrative hierarchy, the role of prefects is not inferior to that of the principal. They all perform various but interrelated tasks in an interdependent manner to achieve high levels of school discipline and the consequent educational goals. It is, therefore, important that school administrators appreciate and recognize the role played by prefects regardless of their position in the administrative hierarchy.

The malfunctioning of an organ in a human body will negatively affect another organ or even the whole body. Since a system is a set of interdependent and interacting elements, a change at any one point will eventually trigger off a chain of events that will have an impact on the entire system.

This spillover effect is referred to as, the concept of multiple causation where one unit causes reactions, which spread to the entire system affecting all its operations or part of them. Thus, a change in the functioning of the prefect system will have an effect on the stakeholders. That is why school unrests caused by ineffective prefect systems may lead to destruction of school property, or even loss of human life.
The managerial subsystem, the principal, plays the role of, among other things, coordinator, planner, controller and facilitator of activities of the entire system to ensure efficiency. The principal would have to define clearly the goals of the school; and the role of each individual or group towards the attainment of this goal. He should carry out a division of labour and delegate responsibilities accordingly. Job descriptions will have to clearly show the scope of responsibilities to avoid conflicts and role ambiguity in carrying them out.

Thus, principals should put in place good communication systems in schools to ensure a smooth two-way flow of information to all prefects, students, and teachers and support staff. They should also facilitate the setting up of the School Code (Rules and Regulations) to ensure order and tranquility in schools, act with impartiality and train prefects to make them competent in their work and clearly define their roles to avoid any role conflict or ambiguity.

It is because of the above reasons that the Social Systems Theory was suitable for this study. This is because schools are social system with subsystems such as the prefect subsystem, which requires proper coordination, training, role clarity and healthy relationship with the school administration and students to enable it to carry out its role effectively.
1.10 Conceptual Framework

Figure 1.1: The place of prefects and other stakeholders in school governance

The Conceptual Framework Model shows a link between the school management, represented by the school principal and teachers, the prefects and the students and how they relate with each other to bring about good governance in the school.

The school management supervises students and prefects in their duties, shares school policies with them, seek their views on the changes to be made in the school routine and how the students would like to spend their leisure time. The management also gives guidance to the students and prefects on the schools
vision and mission and communicates school decisions to them on time it also helps in selection and training of prefects.

The prefects act as a link between the students and the management of the school. They are selected from among the students, trained to perform their duties, given some authority, supported and guided continuously in order to perform their duties effectively in line with the schools vision and mission. A trained and motivated prefect body in turn guides and supports students in adhering to school rules and regulations. The prefects also help the students in talents discovery by leading them in various fields such as Games, music, Drama, Clubs and societies. They also maintained discipline and silence in classroom so that learning could take place well.

The students on their part are at ease with their prefects, they share their grievances with the prefects who in turn channel them to the management. They also seek guidance and assistance from the school management and contribute to the school decisions that affect them.

The outcome of the relationship between the school management, prefects and students should have the following outcomes: it should lead to effective participatory school governance by students and their leaders; it should ensure personal, social and intellectual development of the student community; it should create order and harmony in the entire school system and will enhance excellent academic performance; and also create a disciplined and responsible students body.
1.11 Operational Definition of Significant Terms

Public school - in this study, Public school refers to the category of school where teachers are employed by the government through the Teachers Service Commission.

Punishment - is the deliberate denial of some human rights inflicted by those in authority.

Discipline - refers to training that produces obedience or teaching that produces good quality of mind and character among students.

Governance - refers to the process of controlling and directing human behaviour in a school setting or in the running of a school.

Good character - in this study, the term good character will be used to refer to a student who is disciplined, clean and trustworthy and one to whom duties can be delegated and who will execute them maturely.

Authority - shall be used to refer to the power given to prefects by the school administration.

Principal - applies to a teacher with overall administrative responsibilities over the school.

Prefect - applies to a student with leadership qualities selected by the school authority or by students and given certain powers to control and guide other students.
**Role** - is a duty or responsibility. For the purpose of this study, the term role shall be used to refer to duties of prefects in relation to school governance.

**Selection mode** - selection refers to making a choice. This study used the term to refer to the manner in which prefects were selected to the office in the school.

**Teacher** - refers to a member of the teaching personnel in a public secondary school.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents an up to date review of the literature on the role of prefects in school governance. The literature was sourced from relevant professional journals, published and unpublished thesis and published educational reports. These studies have helped the researcher to identify the knowledge gap and to justify the need to carry a research in Machakos Central Division.

2.1 Leadership

Patterson (1993) defines leading as the process of influencing others to achieve agreed upon purposes for the organization. Leadership not only makes or breaks the success of countries, but also organizations and the teams within those organizations. Being a good leader means being a mix of many different things and, interestingly, having many conflicting attributes as well. For instance, leaders should be ambitious, with desire to excel in their chosen field, but at the same time, the best leaders work not for themselves, but for the good of others in the organization.

Therefore, while leaders may be powerful, they need to put the needs of others before their own interests. Okumbe (2001) asserts that students have been involved in educational management in their own schools since time immemorial. He says that their involvement in educational leadership had been due to closeness to the colleagues in the learning environment. The other reason for their involvement in leadership roles is to impart participatory leadership skills, which they would need in both their work and social environments after leaving school.

While acknowledging the importance of prefects as school leaders, Otieno (2001) highlights what he considers as the role of prefects in schools as follows: prefects give directions to other students whom they are leading; they are responsible for setting the pace of activities for other students on a daily basis in
order to attain the set objectives. Prefects are responsible for getting things done: motivating and inspiring other students to ensure good performance in all school activities. This includes getting students interested in doing whatever they are doing and doing it without having to be pushed. Prefects also develop other students as well as themselves by ensuring that their talents are developed and put to good use. This is done by delegating some of their duties to other students. Every prefect represents a group or groups of students at his/her area of responsibility.

2.1.1 Prefects Appointment, Training and Responsibilities

The prefect system gives a good opportunity for student participation in school management. The school principal should thus ensure that there is a functional prefect system that acts as a link between the school administration and the students. Otieno (2001) says that many schools rely on teachers to appoint prefects with little or no student participation. He says that the time has come for more democracy in line with changes all over the world. Thus, students who should be allowed to participate in choosing their prefects should identify a credible prefect system.

Okumbe (2001) agrees with Otieno’s views about the appointment of prefects. He explains that in the appointment of prefects, it is more appropriate to allow them to hold democratic elections which enables the management to acquire prefects or student leaders who will help the organization meet its objectives. However, he is quick to caution that the election of student leaders should be guided by the overall organizational effort. After the appointment of student leaders, Okumbe (2001) argues that it is of paramount importance that such leaders be thoroughly inducted by the management on their roles and the boundaries within which they should operate. He says that constant leadership seminars for them should be an in-built programme in an educational organization so that student leaders’ administrative skills are further sharpened.
Frequently prefects find themselves in an awkward situation because they are selected or appointed without any initial training on leadership roles. This problem is compounded further if no proper training and/or guidance is given after appointment. It is now generally agreed that training in leadership roles enhances effective school administration and that days of ‘great man theories’ are no more. The great man theories insist that leaders are born not made, that leaders have inborn traits that make them great leaders.

However, due to dynamic changes in society, technology and so on, training is now emphasized. Kyungu (1999) claims that for a prefect to be accepted by students, the school leadership must facilitate his/her leadership through training, provision of a prefect’s handbook, and proper delegation of duties/responsibilities. He further says that, once appointed by the school authority or elected by the pupils, prefects should undergo an initial induction course to familiarize themselves with their roles and limitations. Such induction should familiarize them with government policies especially the legal Notice Number 40/1972 of the Education Act on the Regulation of School Discipline. Further training should be conducted as the need arises.

Therefore, although Kyungu insist on training, it is not clear in which areas of school management prefect need training, who should carry it out, the manner in which it should be carried out and by what methods. It is on this basis that the researcher embarked on this study.

In most schools, the training of prefects is conducted by the deputy principals, principals, or both. Griffin (1994) indicates that Starehe Boys Centre and school use some form of ‘apprenticeship’ or mentoring where a prefect to be, is, put under guidance of a senior prefect. Thus, the school has an equivalent of the ‘on-the-job’ training for prefects. Kyungu (1999) further says that as a leader, a prefect should have the following qualities: respect, good observer of school rules, a positive attitude towards his/her duty, be optimistic/inspired to lead, visionary, responsible, honesty, loyalty,
punctuality, courtesy and acceptability. However, these personal attributes are not necessarily inborn or inherent. In fact most of them are acquired through administrative leadership training, which is usually highly formally organized.

Otieno (2001) highlights the leadership skills that each prefect requires to develop:

**Planning** – a prefect looks into the future and identifies activities that are desirable. This involves setting goals and determining the sequence in which activities are to be carried out.

**Organizing** – this includes assembling and arranging resources required to accomplish a certain task. As regards students, the prefects give them tasks they are able to perform.

**Directing** – this includes guiding the activities of students to ensure that they are in line with the set objectives. The prefects give specific instructions and examples of how to actually perform the required activities. This entails supervising the students.

**Coordinating** – this is where the prefects harmonize activities of various groups and ensure that the results achieved are complementary to each other.

**Controlling** – this requires that the prefects do regular periodic checks to assess progress of activities and get feedback.

Okumbe (2001) is quick to point out that the school management ought to be aware that student leaders are both part of the educational management as well as the integral part of studentship. Thus, student leaders should be careful not to get so much involved in their administrative duties at the expense of their prime duty of learning.
2.2 Communication channels within a school system

Ozigi (1971) says that the prefect system, serves as one of the communication channels between the pupils and the school administration. He points out that the prefect system is one of the most effective ways of involving pupils directly in the administration. Thus, the procedures of communication are a two-way flow of information from top to bottom and bottom-up involving prefects. This goes in line with Max Weber’s Theory of Bureaucracy.

In the top-down instruction, authority rests in the highest office (school Principal) which ensures that information flows from the principal’s office down through the various levels of hierarchy (teachers and prefects) to the students. Thus, the principals set the pace and standards for school management, while the prefects implement the programmes. In the bottom-up communication or feedback mechanism, there is a relay of feedback on all aspects of administration through the various levels up the hierarchy (prefects and teachers) from students. This ensures a complete link between the staff and students as well as enabling the principal to obtain information for evaluation of managerial objectives.

The school rules and regulations bind the various ranks of the hierarchy of authority and ensure order. These rules and regulations are formal and must be adhered to. The prefects are used to enforce them among students. This is coordinated and maintained by the school administration. The school administration would thus emphasize the adherence to the discipline code (formal school rules and regulations) and the laid-down procedures of communication.

Within the formal set-up of school rules and regulations, a school is supposed to have a Prefects Handbook, which is a set of rules to guide the conduct of prefects while carrying out their roles to ensure harmony and smooth communication between the school administration and students.

However, if such rules and regulations were absent or not adhered to, then the prefects would find carrying out their roles difficult. Furthermore, if there was
a breakdown in communication between the various organs of the school, then the functioning of the prefect body would also be jeopardized. For instance, this may lead to disciplinary problems in schools. More often than not, communication from prefects to other students is intended to inform and persuade them in order to produce results. Inability to disseminate information correctly would cause misinformation, confusion and frustration, which would lead to poor implementation of instructions.

Prefects need to be effective listeners. This is because they receive information from teachers and students. Effective listening involves concentration and understanding in order to get a mental grasp of the facts clearly. Carlos (1993) gives the following suggestions for effective communication: the message must be clear; it must be straightforward and logical. It must be complete and must provide all needed information. It must be concise, brief and correct and must avoid exaggerations, generalizations or conclusions.

2.3 Decision-Making within a school setting

Principals of schools have for a long time considered themselves as custodians of critical organization elements, decision-making, organizational structure, information and personnel. However, as Lunenberg (1992) puts it, with empowerment, these critical elements are more likely to become collegial decision-making, consultative framework, shared information and increased group processes. The rationale for school empowerment as process used to facilitate student-centered decisions based on the proposition that decisions should be made at the lowest possible level.

Chapman (1988) says empowerment of prefects requires recognition, authority, responsibility and commitment necessary to sustain improvement. Three basic philosophical foundations that support prefect’s empowerment as an effective management process include, change should be student-centered and therefore decisions should be made as close to the student as possible. Change
requires ownership that comes from the opportunity to participate in definite change and the flexibility to adapt to individual circumstances, and knowledge is power, effective decisions require good and timely information.

Blumberg (1969) speculates that where efficiency depends on continued coordination and interaction of persons, a decision produced by the three groups (administrators, teachers and students) will always be superior to one produced by even the most capable of individuals.

Administrators and teachers should be flexible and resourceful in meeting prefects needs, maintain a supporting environment for prefects learning, and provide facilitative leadership. Prefects should also be actively engaged in the educational process. According to Griffin (1994) the role of students in schools has been limited, teachers often handpick student leaders and this often results in resentment from the rest of the student body.

These leaders would be seen as spies who cannot be trusted to communicate the student’s wishes. Therefore, communication breakdown would begin at the level of students talking to their peers and this gradually would transcend to the ability of students to communicate with their teachers. What eventually could emerge is a very poor or lack of communication between those who form the bulk of the school population and their managers.

Students are in unique position to make positive contribution to the improvement of the educational programmes and to the operation of a more effective school system. The participation of students in decision-making should be considered part of the educational process. As appropriate to the age of students, class or school governments, organizations such as student councils and a student board of education may be formed to offer practice in self-governce and to serve as channels for the expression of student ideals and opinions.

School management should take into consideration student opinions in establishing policies, which directly affect programmes, activities, privileges and
other areas of student concern. Students feel accepted and loved if they are given a chance to participate in decision-making in the school concerning their welfare.

Sergiovanni (1995) states that principals who involve prefects in decision-making on matters concerning their welfare face fewer problems as compared to those who do not. Baker (2000) states that student’s involvement in decision-making, helps to develop their leadership skills and ability to plan. In the long run, such students can come up with ideas that might help the smooth running of the school. Sergiovanni (1995) also states that involving students in decision-making creates a sense of ownership to the students. The students feel that the school is part of them and therefore do everything possible to boost and maintain the reputation of the school.

The morale of students in all activities is boosted when they are involved in decision-making. The principal of Kamama Secondary School in Eastern Province in an interview with the Standard Newspaper of 7th June 2005 says: ‘For students in a school to be disciplined, students, teachers and parents should be involved in decision-making.” He says that at his school, students are consulted when decisions are made. He cites a case where before the school bought a school bus the views of the students were sought. He says the students were unanimous that the idea was good and thus the school went ahead and bought the bus. He concedes that involving students in such matters makes them feel responsible

### 2.4 School Discipline

Principals are confronted with perpetual problems of carrying out the incompatible roles of counselling and disciplining students. The counselling role deals with the provision of support, encouragement and advice to students whereas the disciplinary role deals with the dispensing of punishment, reporting to law enforcement agencies suspected illegal activities, and expulsion.

With the decline of the influence formerly exerted by other institutions such as churches and the family, schools almost solely are left with the task of
nurturing and educating the young. According to Hinkcox and Jacobson (1996), the lack of coherent social values, changing moral ethics and complex social problems, students are vulnerable to adverse influences that distort their altitudes towards study and discipline.

Discipline is a term derived from the word disciple: disciples of Jesus were his pupils who followed his instructions obediently. They learned to do and follow what their Master told them in respect to the Kingdom of God. The word became applicable in the school sense to mean ‘obedient follower of the teacher’. Presently, the word discipline is used to mean maintaining order in the school or any other institution or organization. It is sometimes used to mean punishment.

Muthamia (2000) says to discipline is to shape or mould the identity of a child, often by example, at times by insistence on certain actions or modes of behaviour expected to be adhered to and occasionally admonishing the child to reinforce the method. Discipline is largely the responsibility of the principal.

If the principal is a lax disciplinarian, the control of the teachers and prefects over students throughout the school is slack and perhaps ineffective. However, in most secondary schools, the deputy principal is the head of the disciplinary committee in charge of discipline and prefects: he/she supervises them in their duties and controls punishment given. The prefects system is very important in the maintenance of student discipline in the school. The prefects are close to the students and therefore deal with discipline cases at the grassroots level. They are the bridge between the staff and student community. Prefects can thwart even planned strikes. Otieno (2001) gives the following pieces of advice as regards the role of prefects with reference to discipline: all prefects should take collective action whenever they come across cases of indiscipline; prefects involved in school outings are responsible for the discipline of the party and that classroom discipline is important for effective learning; and class prefects should ensure that students maintain silence while in class.
Consequently this study sought to establish whether the role of prefects in controlling discipline enhanced the governance of Public Secondary schools in Machakos Central Division.

2.5 Other Works on Prefects Governance in Schools

Wanjiru (1999) carried out a study on students’ democratic participation in decision-making process in Nairobi Province. She used a cross-sectional survey design to gather data from a sample of students and teachers. The study used a questionnaire for students and focused group discussion with teachers. She found out that participatory management needs to be evolved, developed and adopted in schools. The study did not involve the prefects and principals. There was only questionnaires and focused group discussion for students and teachers, respectively. Therefore, this study used both questionnaires for prefects, principals, deputy principals and teachers.

Shikami (2006) in a paper on evaluation of prefecture in school management and education in Kenya aimed at identifying the major constraints to school management that must be addressed in order to develop democratic structures for the proper administration of school programmes. He also sought to examine the role of prefects in influencing high discipline, which finds itself at a crossroads since the ban of corporal punishment in Kenyan schools. To gather information, he carried out an analysis of reported cases of unrest in the media. Shikami recommended that there was need to carry out an empirical research on prefects and the school management. However he did not carry out an empirical research on prefecture in school management. Thus, this study carried out an empirical research to find out the real role of prefects or areas in which prefects are involved in governance of public secondary schools in Machakos Central Division.

Munyao (2003), in his study of the challenges posed by adolescents to the management of secondary schools in Machakos district, found that school administrators were often under pressure in handling students. The study
recommended that the administrators undergo regular in-service training on human development to understand better the adolescent behavioural trends in schools. The study concentrated only on the challenges posed to the school administrators (principals) without putting into consideration the role of prefects in governance of secondary schools, an aspect that was considered in this study with reference to public secondary in Machakos Central Division.

Wang’eri (1986) carried out a study of discipline problems affecting schools in Thika. The objective of the study was to find out the cause of indiscipline among students in secondary schools in Thika. The sample consisted of three principals of the three secondary schools in Thika. The study found out that indiscipline incidents of violence that included the burning of school property, beating up of prefects and other students were rampant in schools. The researcher only dealt with three principals of the three secondary schools where incidences of indiscipline in schools occurred. The sample did not include prefects and teachers. The study found out that students beat prefects. It did not seek to find out how students, through their prefects, were involved in school governance.

The MOE task force, investigating the cause of unrests in school (Republic of Kenya, 2010) found out that there were no particular criteria used in selecting prefects. The task force observed that more often than not, students were not involved in the selection of prefects: There was a possibility of appointing unpopular prefects hence rendering them ineffective in administration. Ten years have elapsed since the study was carried out. Currently, the situation has probably changed and this study set to find out the role of prefects in school governance in Machakos Central Division.

From the review of the related literature mentioned above, it was clear that prefect system was one of the most effective ways of involving students directly in the governance of a school. However, in the appointment of the student’s representatives (prefects), few schools involved the students in electing their
leaders. In most schools, teachers handpicked prefects and did not train them for their leadership roles that they were expected to play.

2.6 Summary

Otieno and Okumbe are of the view that it is very important to involve prefects in school governance. Okumbe says that, their involvement in educational leadership has been due to their closeness to their colleagues in their learning environment. As regards the appointment of prefects, Otieno and Kyungu say that students must be given an opportunity to choose their prefects and, once they are elected, they should be trained to gain the skills required for the leadership position.

Ozigi (1971) says that prefects act as a link between the school management and the students’ body thus facilitating communication between the two. Sergiovani (1995), on the other hand, states that school principal should involve prefects in decision-making on matters that affect the students’ welfare. Baker (2000) adds that students’ involvement in decision making helps them to develop leadership skills and the ability to plan.

The reviewed studies by MOE Task force (2001), Wanjiru (1999), Munyao (2003) Shikami (2000) all dealt with matters related to the school management in different parts of Kenya. There was, however none of the reviewed studies that addressed the issues of the role of prefects in school governance with reference to Public secondary Schools in Machakos Central Division. The reviewed studies did not also seek to find out the criterion used to select prefects, and the level of authority given to prefects.

Wang’eri (1986) used a sample that was by far too small. This study used a sample that is big enough i.e. 330. Shikami only used the media without carrying out an empirical data collection. However, this study borrowed from Wanjiru (1999) as far as methodology is concerned. Therefore, this study addressed these gaps.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This study was designed to investigate the role of prefects in the governance of public secondary schools in Machakos Central Division. It provides the specific strategies or procedures to the data collection and analysis encompassing: the research design; study locale; the target population; sampling technique; research instrument and their validity and reliability; piloting; data collection procedures; and the plan for the analysis of data.

3.1 Research Design

This was a descriptive study adopting survey research design to assess the role of prefects in public secondary schools governance in central division of Machakos district. According to Orodho (2004), survey research design describes the nature of the phenomena and examines actions as they are.

3.2 Study Locale

The researcher purposively identified Central Division of Machakos District as the study site. Central Division was chosen as a location for this study because unlike other parts of the Machakos County it is home to the various types of public secondary schools namely: boarding, day and boarding, and mixed schools that informed the study. The district town, situated in the division, is seventeen kilometers from the Machakos junction, which is off the Nairobi-Mombasa Highway. The Division neighbours Kathiani Division to the north, Kajiado District to the south, Mwala Division to the east and Nairobi province to the west.

3.3 Target population

Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) define a population as an entire group of individuals, events, or objects having common observable characteristics. This study was carried out in public secondary schools only in Machakos Central Division. There are twenty four (24) public secondary schools in this division.
according to the Machakos District statistics office. Of the twenty four schools, ten are mixed day, six are mixed day and boarding, four are pure boys boarding, and four are exclusively girls boarding schools.

According to the Machakos Teachers Service Commission office, the Division has twenty four (24) principals, twenty four (24) deputy principals, and three hundred and sixty (360) teachers. The total prefect population for these schools was approximately six hundred (600). The total public secondary school students body in the division was ten thousand (10,000) of whom about two thousand and one hundred (2100) were the student opinion leaders. The opinion leaders were purposively chosen to be included in the study because they understood the prefects’ duties.

Therefore, the target population for this study was the twenty four (24) principals, twenty four (24) deputy principals, three hundred and sixty (360) teachers, about six hundred (600) prefects and two thousand one hundred (2100) students. This made approximately three thousand one hundred and eight (3108) as the target population.

3.4 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

Best and Kahn (1998) define a sample as a small proportion of a population selected for observation, analysis and sampling as a method of selecting subjects for study in a way that the individual selected represent the larger group from which they were selected.

Machakos Central Division had twenty four public secondary schools and four categories of schools. Category A: girls’ boarding secondary schools of which there were four (4) in the division. Category B: boys’ boarding secondary schools of which there were four (4) in the division. Category C: mixed day schools of which there were ten (10) in the division. Category D: mixed day and boarding schools of which there were six (6) in the division
The researcher used stratified sampling. The population of schools was subdivided first into four strata, that is A, B, C and D. He used a proportional allocation method to calculate the number of schools each stratum was to contribute to the sample size. Of the 24 public schools in the division the researcher obtained a sample size of twelve public schools across the four strata. A sampling fraction was first calculated by dividing 12 by 24 to get 0.5 as the Sampling fraction (f). Then each category of the population was multiplied by this fraction to obtain the corresponding category of the Sample of schools. Category A (4*0.5) to get two (2) school, Category B (4*0.5) to get two (2), Category C (6*0.5) to get three (3) schools and category D (10*0.5) to get five (5) schools. The sub samples were then added together to give a sample size of twelve Public schools.

Gay (1992) states that a sample size of 10% of the target population is considered minimum, while a sample of 20% is required for smaller population and 30% for statistical analysis. Thus 10% of the 600 anticipated prefects were chosen to give 60 prefects, 10% of the 360 teachers was chosen to give 36 teachers and 10% of 2100 students to give two hundred and ten 210. All the twelve principals and twelve deputy principals were purposively chosen. The total number of respondents was therefore twelve (12) principals, twelve (12) deputy principals, thirty six (36) teachers, sixty (60) prefects and two hundred and ten (210) students to yield three hundred and thirty (330) respondents.

Each of the twelve schools included in the sample were allocated an equal number of teachers, students, and prefects respectively. Thus, each school contributed three teachers of the required thirty six (36), five (5) prefects of the required sixty (60) prefects and eighteen (18) students of the required two hundred and ten (210). The researcher used the lottery technique of the simple random sampling method to select the required five (5) prefects in each school by first determining the number of prefects in each school and then preparing a number of small pieces of paper equal to the number of prefects in the school. He
then wrote a symbol “Yes” in the five of the small papers, folded them, placed them in a container, mixed them well and then allowed each prefect in the school to pick one piece at a time. In this case, the five prefects who picked a “Yes” were included in the study. The lottery technique of the simple random sampling method was also used to select the three teachers in each school to be included in the study. The number of teachers in each school was determined, and then small pieces of papers of the same size shape and colour equal to the number of teachers prepared. A symbol “Yes” was written on the three pieces of papers. All the papers were folded, placed in a container, mixed well, and then each teacher was allowed to pick one piece. In this case, the three teachers who picked a “Yes” were included in the study.

The same technique was used to select the number of students opinion leaders required in each school. The number of students opinion leaders was determined, and then small pieces of papers of the same size shape and colour equal to the number of students opinion leaders prepared. A symbol “Yes” was written in eighteen of the pieces of papers. All the papers folded, placed in a container, mixed well, and then each student was allowed to pick one piece. In this case, the eighteen students who picked a “Yes” were included in the study.

3.5 Research Instruments

The researcher used a questionnaire to collect data. The questionnaire was preferred in this study because those who took part in the study were literate and well able to answer the items asked adequately. The questionnaire was made up of four categories of structured questions. Category A contained questions for the school principals. This enabled the researcher to obtain information related to demographic data such as gender, age, qualifications, experience, school type and enrolment, types and causes of indiscipline and the role of prefects in school discipline and general governance.
Category B was for deputy principals. This questionnaire helped the researcher to get information concerning the role played by the disciplinary committee, involving students and the role of prefects in school discipline. Category C enabled the researcher to get information from the teachers on how they involved prefects in school discipline. Category D helped the researcher to obtain information from prefects in the administrative areas in which they were involved and to show their role in enhancing public secondary school governance.

3.6 Piloting the Instruments

The questionnaires were piloted in one Public Secondary School which was not included in the final study.

3.6.1 Validity

Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) defined validity as the accuracy and meaningfulness of the inferences, which is based on the research results. It is the degree to which the results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the phenomena under study. The validity of the instruments is determined through the content validity of the instrument. Content validity is concerned with whether or not a test or measuring instrument is representative of the full content of the thing under study. Thus, the questionnaire developed included almost all items on the role of prefects in the administration of public schools. In this study, the validity of the instruments chosen was verified through piloting the instruments in the one public secondary school not included in the study in the division.

3.6.2 Reliability

According to Orodho, reliability of an instrument is the consistency in producing a reliable result. The test-retest technique was used to assess the reliability of the research instrument. The questionnaire was administered twice to the same group of subjects. A two-week period was allowed between the first test and the second one. The coefficient of stability (test-retest) method was used
to estimate the degree to which the same results could be obtained with a repeated measure of the same concept in order to determine the reliability of the instrument.

The following steps were followed in determining the reliability of the instrument,

i. The developed questionnaire was given to about 20 identical respondents not included in the study sample

ii. The completed questionnaires were scored or analyzed manually.

iii. The same questionnaires were given to the same respondents after a period of two weeks

iv. The completed questionnaires were again scored manually.

A comparison of answers made in (ii) and (iv) were analyzed.

From the two respondents (ii and iv), Pearson coefficient correlation was employed to compute the correlation coefficient in order to establish the extent to which the contents of the questionnaires were consistent in eliciting the same responses every time the instrument was administered. A correlation coefficient (r) of 0.75 was gotten and considered high enough to judge the reliability of the instrument.

3.7 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher obtained a research permit from the Office of the President before administering the questionnaires in the field. A copy was presented to the District Education Office (DEO) in Machakos Central Division where he was also given written permission from the DEO’s office allowing him to visit sampled schools. The principals of the participating schools were contacted before the commencement of the study through a letter of introduction. A brief introduction was made to the respondents before administering the questionnaire
with a view of explaining the questionnaire. The researcher personally distributed and collected questionnaires to the sampled schools after answering for final analysis.

3.8 Data Analysis

Data based on research questions were analyzed using statistical package for social science software program (SPSS). Descriptive as well as inferential statistics was used to analyze the information. Frequencies mean and standard deviations were obtained. A correlation analysis was used to test the significance of the correlation between the schools and the criteria of choosing prefects.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This study assessed the role of prefects in the governance of public secondary schools in Machakos Central Division. The study sought to examine the criteria for appointing prefects, the role of prefects, determine the program for the prefect’s preparation for leadership roles and establish the extent of involvement of prefects in the governance of the school. The sample comprised of twelve (12) principals, twelve (12) deputy principals and thirty six (36) teachers, sixty one (61) prefects and two hundred and thirteen (213) students. The respondents gave answers on the role of prefects, criteria of selection and suggestion on how to improve the prefects’ body. A questionnaire was used as the main research tool, whereby the respondents were given time to answer and return the questionnaires. All the respondents who were given questionnaires returned them promptly. However some questions were unanswered and they were treated as un-responded to.

The different schools were recruited because different schools have different cultures regarding the prefects’ body. The different schools also have different requirements for prefects depending on the magnitude of the administration affairs.

The head teachers were recruited into the study comprising of a higher percentage of females than males with varied experience. However the majority of the head teachers had worked for 11-15 years. The education levels of the head teachers were also considered which was noted to be mostly degree or higher. A good percentage had a master’s degree. The experience and qualification of the head teachers were important indicators of the style of management. Gender may also influence the style of management.

The study included the following schools; girls boarding 6 (50%), boys boarding 3 (25%) and mixed boarding 3 (25%). The study respondents comprised
of 4(33.3%) male head teachers and 7 (58.3%) female head teachers. Some of the head teachers 4 (33.3%) had worked for 5-10 years teachers, another portion (33.3%) had worked for 11-15 years. Other head teachers 2 (16.7% in each case) had worked for less than five and more than 15 years. The head teachers were mostly between the ages of 35-39 years (33.3%), 40-44 years (33.3%) and those above 45 years formed 16.7%. Most of head teachers 7 (58.3%) are degree holders, 3(25%) are masters degree holders and 2 (16.7%) are diploma holders (Table 4.1).

4.1 Demographic characteristics of the study population

The researcher sought to know the distribution of demographic information of administrators which included sex, age and level of education and length of service. The information was useful in order to know the type of respondents the researcher was dealing with. The findings are represented in table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Demographic Factors of Principals and Deputy Principals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Population</th>
<th>Demographic Factors</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Counts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non respondent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above 45 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. ED/B. SC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>as a principal</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above 15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy principals</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-44 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>as deputy principal</td>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents comprised of 5(41.7%) male and 7(58.3%) female deputy principals. The deputy principals had served in position for varied number of years; 7(41.7%) had worked for less than 5 years, another 5 (41.7%) had worked for 5-10 years and 2(16.7%) had worked for 11-15. All the deputy principals in the study population had a qualification of bachelors’ degree. The deputy principals were of varying ages; 3(25%) were between 30-34 years, 5(41.7%), were between the ages of 35 to 39 and 4(33.3%) were between 40 to 44 years (Table 4.1). Age of the administrators affects decision making in many ways. Young administrators may be very conversant with current events but may make hasty decisions. While older administrators may not be very conversant with current events but may make well informed and thought decisions. This is also related to the fact that they are dealing with youths who might engage in different vices.

The deputy principal is a very instrumental administrator in a school, especially in matters relating to discipline. Most of the schools rely on the deputy principal to co-ordinate discipline in schools. Hence their experience and qualification can reflect on discipline in any given school. The deputy principals who participated in this study depicted high levels of qualification and experience in managing discipline in their schools.
Demographic Factors of Teachers

The demographic factors of teachers were also sought and the findings were indicated in table 4.2 below.

Table 4.1: Demographic Factors of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic factors</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Counts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 and above</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Ed/B. Sc</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 20(54.1%) male teachers and 17(45.9%) female teachers in the study population. The teachers were of varying ages. The highest percentage 14(37.8%) of the teachers was above 36 years of age, 10(27%) were between 31 to 35 years of age, 6(16.2%) were between 26 to 30 years and 7(18.9%) were between 20 to 25 years of age. Most of the teachers 16(42.4%) had a qualification of degree, 8(22.4%) had a qualification of masters and above, 13(35.1%) had a diploma. (Table 4.2) The teachers are the most important pillars in supporting the administration as direct link with the students. With reference to the results above, the teachers were highly qualified and capable of maintaining discipline in schools. The older teachers were more experienced and better adapted with management issues than younger teachers even though they had the same academic qualification.
Demographic Factors of Students

The factors that were sought by the researchers included gender, form or class and age of the students and the table 4.3 below shows the findings.

Table 4.2: Demographic Factors of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic factors</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Counts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>12-13 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-16 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-19 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 20 years</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents comprised of 113(53.1%) male students and 100(46.9%) female students. The students belonged to different classes; 42(19.7%) were form ones, 57(26.8%) form two, 49(23%) form three and 65(30.5%) form four. Among the students, 58(27.2%) were between 12 and 13 years, 60(28.2%) were between 14 to 16 years, 42(19.7%) were between 17 and 19 years and those above 20 years comprised 53(24.9%; Table 4.3). The demographic factors of students are important in the proper school management because students at different levels and ages present varied attributes that have a major implication in the management of a school. Opinions of governance of a school from the students also depend on the level of their age and the form or class the students are in. The
majority of the students were in the ages between 14 and 19 years. However there were very young and very old students.

4.11 Attendance of KESI Management Seminars

All the principals sampled said they attended the KESI management seminars. For deputy principal, 8(66.7%) attended KESI management courses while 4(33.3%) of them did not attend the seminars (Figure 4.1). This is a clear indication that most of the secondary school administrators had been trained in management and was capable of managing the student body properly. The training equipped the administrators with the necessary skills needed in the management of schools and dealing with discipline issues.

The researcher sought to know whether the administrators had attended management courses and the findings were as shown in figure 4.1 below.

Figure 4.1: Attendance of KESI management seminars by deputy principals
One of the reasons cited for the poor performance of educational systems in Kenya as well as in many developing countries is the weak managerial capabilities in those systems (Eshiwani, 1993). Perhaps this realization is what led the Kenyan government to establish KESI. This provides the school managers with an opportunity to be inducted into their positions.

4.2 Appointment of Prefects and Criterion of Selection

In most schools, 9(77.8%) principals reported that the appointment of prefects was done jointly by administrators, teachers, outgoing prefects and students. In 3(22.2%) of the twelve (12) schools, the appointment was done by teachers (Figure 4.2). Teachers however had varying views on who appoints prefects; 8(24.0%) said it was administrators, 3(11.4%) said it was teachers, 5(15.8%) said it was outgoing prefects, 4(12.3%) said it was students, and 11(36.6%) said it was jointly by administrators, teachers, outgoing prefects and students (Figure 4.2).

The researcher was interested in establishing the criterion that was used in selecting prefects in Machakos Central Division Public Schools. The participants were asked on the criterion commonly used in selecting prefects and findings are indicated in figure 4.2 below.
Appointment of prefects was done through many ways depending on the schools’ culture. In most schools the appointments were done jointly by administrators, teachers, outgoing prefects and students. It was also noted that another larger percentage of the schools appointed prefects using outgoing prefects. The mode of appointing prefects ensured right prefects selection and also built confidence of students on their prefects’ body. Decision making was considered to be done jointly by the students, teachers and parents in order to ensure discipline in the school. All the parties felt responsible if all the stakeholders were involved in appointing prefects. Okumbe (2001) however argues that students should be left to elect their leaders. He further contends that prefects should be taken through an induction if the objectives of the administration are to be achieved. The findings also differed with those of Otieno (2001) which were that appointment of prefects was solely done by teachers.
The criterion of selection used by teachers, deputy principals and principals in selecting the prefects was also considered and the findings are as shown in the figure 4.3 below.

**Figure 4.3: Criteria used by Principals in Selecting Prefects**

Among the study sample, 8(66.7%) of the principals used a combination of attributes (academic performance, personality and good behavior) to select prefects. However, 4(33.3%) of the principals used academic performance as the only criterion to select prefects (Figure 4.3).
The deputy principals gave out their views on the criterion used to select prefects as shown below.

Figure 4.4: Criteria used by Deputy Principals in Selecting of Prefects

Some of the deputy principals 3(25%) used a combination of attributes to select prefects. The combination of attributes used by the deputy principals included academic performance, good behavior, discipline, leadership qualities and good communication skills. However others, 2(16.7% in each case) used any of the following attributes; academic performance, good behavior and communication skills (Figure 4.4). It can be concluded that the criterion used in selection of prefects encompasses many attributes which is a positive criteria. This is evident from the fact that the largest percentage of the respondents used a combination of attributes to select the prefects. However the judgment of a good
leader may not be commensurate to their actual performance. The other challenge might be the level of acceptability by the fellow students.

The various attributes used by teachers in the selection of prefects are shown in Figure 4.5 below.

**Figure 4.5: Criteria used by Teachers in Selection of prefects**

A portion of the teachers 5(13.8%) used personality, 16(41.7%) good behavior, 5(13.9%) popularity and 11(30.6%) used a combination of attributes (personality, good behavior). The teachers however singled out popularity as the only attribute that is not used in selecting prefects (Figure 4.5).

Various attributes were used in selecting prefects. The principals, deputy principals and teachers looked at different attributes. However it was observed that a larger percentage looked at many attributes and not only one. The attributes
included academic performance, good behavior, discipline, good leadership qualities and good communication skills. The attributes of the prefects could create a positive image towards the students. Choosing the right prefects could assist the administration in achieving the school objectives. Studies showed that if wrong prefects were chosen they ended up getting involved in indiscipline cases (Wang’eri, 1986). Kyungu (1999) agreed that as a leader, a student should have the following qualities; respect, obedient to school rules, posses’ positive attitude towards his or her duties, be optimistic/inspired to lead, have a vision, responsible, honest, loyal, punctual, courteous and acceptable.

4.2.1 Qualification and Academic Performance of the Prefects

The researcher was interested in getting to know the attributes used when selecting prefects and the findings are summarized in the figure 4.6 below.

**Figure 4.6: Qualification for Becoming a Prefect according to prefects**

Prefects were required to state the qualifications of becoming prefects. A larger proportion (34.3 %) of the students noted that physical strength was the qualification for becoming a prefect. Other prefects stated the criteria as:
academic (31.9%), expert talent in co-curricular activities and a combination of the above mentioned criteria (6.1%; Figure 4.6).

The average performance of the prefects was sought and the figure below shows the level of academic performance of prefects selected.

**Figure 4.7: Average Performance of the Prefects**

The prefects, who were chosen, had varying average grades. Among the prefects, the lowest percentage (19%) scored grade D- and D+ while (24.6%) scored A- and above. Another percentage (24.6%) scored between B- and B+. The highest portion (31.8%) of the prefects scored grade C- to C+ (Figure 4.7). Among the schools studied therefore, the prefects who were appointed had average performance in academics. They are therefore expected to have the
potential of guiding other students. This will also go a long way in building the confidence of other students in their leadership.

In assessing the qualification of prefects, several characters were considered as indicated in figure 4.7. This is encouraging because by doing so an all round students is chosen who can contribute to administration. However as much as the qualities are considered the prefects need to be introduced to aspects of management through training.

It is therefore evident that the students who were chosen as prefects were those who were performing well. A very small percentage that performed poorly was chosen. A student who is performing well in class is more likely to make informed decisions in leadership. They may also act as role models in performance, and other students will be challenged to work harder.

### 4.2.2 Relationship Between type of School and the Appointment of Prefects

Table 4.4 Relationship Between the type of School and the Appointment of Prefects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection of prefects</th>
<th>Girls Boarding</th>
<th>Boys Boarding</th>
<th>Mixed Boarding</th>
<th>Mixed Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of prefects</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing prefects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the above</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P <0.05, Pearson correlation=0.424
The relationship between the type of school and the method used in appointing prefects was sought. It was observed that in the Girls Boarding, prefects were appointed jointly by the administration, teachers, outgoing prefects and students (75%). However, some schools (25%) used only the administrators to appoint the prefects. In Boys boarding it was observed that the prefects were largely (45.5%) appointed by the students themselves. A similar percentage (45.5%) of the Boys boarding appoints prefects jointly, that is the administration, teachers, outgoing prefects and students. A smaller percentage (9.1%) of the Boys Boarding, prefects are appointed solely by administrators. In mixed Boarding schools, the largest percentages (92.3%) of the schools appoint prefects using the students. A small percentage (7.7%) of the mixed (boys and girls) boarding schools, prefects are appointed jointly, that is administrators, teachers, outgoing prefects and students. It was further observed that mixed day schools used varied ways of appointing prefects. The largest percentage (47.1%) use teachers, 35.3% use outgoing prefects, 11.8% use administration and 5.9% use students. There was a statistically significant correlation (r=0.424; P<0.05) between the type of school and the way in which prefects are appointed. This implies that there are different cultures associated with the types of schools which influence the appointment of prefects. This may also be linked to the requirement of the schools in administration. Some schools have a huge number of students and prefectorial posts which require a lengthy process of appointing them (Table 4.4).
4.3 Role of prefects and the Authority Given to Them

Table 4.5: Role of Prefects According to Principals, Deputy Principals and Prefects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study group</th>
<th>Roles of prefect</th>
<th>Counts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Being in charge of areas of study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervising duties in the school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both duties above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Monitoring students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Assist administration in management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervising duties in the school compound</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directing students especially in discipline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All the above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects</td>
<td>Mediators between students and staff</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring that rules and regulations are followed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of the role of prefects in the governance of the schools was also sought. All the principals said that the prefects were included in the governance system of the school. The prefects were involved in being in charge of areas of study (16.7%) and supervising the performance of other students (33.3%) or both (50%). All the principals noted that the prefects were empowered to punish other students (100%). Deputy principals also confirmed that the prefects were involved in such areas as monitoring students (25%), assisting the administration in management (8.3%) and directing students in matters of discipline (25%; Table 4.5).
Prefects were also asked to outline the authority they were accorded. Prefects reported that they played a role as mediators between students and staff (47.5%) and ensured that rules and regulations were followed (52.5%). The prefects had the authority to punish (39.3%), rebuke (36.1%) and (24.6%) could recommend students for suspension and any other punishment (Table 4.5; Figure 4.8).

**Figure 4.8: Authority given to prefects**

![Authority given to prefects](image)

In all the schools, prefects were included in the school governance system. The prefects were involved in a number of governance roles such as supervising duties and ensuring that rules and regulations were followed. They were also given authority to punish wrong-doers. This was in line with the findings of Shikami (2006), that prefects are mostly involved in enforcing discipline in schools. Schools lacking a strong prefect body are faced with problems of instilling discipline (Wang’eri 1986). This however, raises the question of the competence of the prefects in instilling punishment and the consequences of punishing fellow students.
4.3.1 Preparation of Prefects for their Roles and Privileges

All the principals noted that the prefects were trained in their roles as prefects. They were trained in such areas as leadership, guidance and counselling (16.7%), conducting seminars (16.7%), communication skills (16.7%) and how to handle discipline (16.7%; Figure 4.9).

Figure 4.9: Areas in which prefects are trained
The ways on which the prefects were trained and prepared for their roles were sought from the deputy principals. The results are shown in the Figure 4.10 below.

**Figure 4.10: Ways through which prefects are prepared for their roles**

The deputy principals noted that the prefects were prepared for their roles through training (11.1%), seminars (11.1%), prefects’ symposia (11.1%) and a combination of all the above methods 66.7%, (Figure 4.10).

Generally, prefects were trained before taking up their roles as prefects. They were trained in such areas as leadership roles, handling discipline, communication skills and conducting seminars. This was done through general training, prefects’ symposia and seminars.

Training was important in inducting prefects into their roles. This concurred with the findings of Okumbe (2001) that it was of paramount importance that prefects go through induction into their roles and be shown boundaries within which they were to operate. Kyungu (1999) asserted that for a prefect to be accepted by students, the school leadership had to facilitate his/her leadership.
through training, providing the prefect with a prefect’s handbook and the proper
degregation of duties/responsibilities. Hence the major part of training prefects has
been emphasized but the levels of adaptability after the training have to be
monitored. Training should be detailed and focused on new challenges coming up
in school administration.

The opinions on the types and privileges given to prefects were sought
from the principals and the responses are indicated in the table 4.6 below

Table 4.6: Whether Privileges are given to prefects and the types of
privileges given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Counts</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether privileges are given to prefects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which privileges are given</td>
<td>Special trips and uniforms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special meals during meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A combination of the above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most 8(66.7%) of the principals were of the opinion that prefects should be
given privileges. However, 4(33.3%) of the schools do not offer extra privileges
to their prefects compared to 8(66.7%) that do. The privileges offered included
special trips and uniforms 2(25%), special meals during their meetings 3(37.5%).
Some schools offer special meals and uniforms, as well as special meals during
their meetings 37.5% (Table 4.6)

There seems to be general agreement that the prefects should be given
privileges. This may be associated with the need for motivation as is the practice
in most organizations. Prefects in most cases are performing voluntary work which has no pay and hence need to be motivated to work. Privileges may, however not go well with other students, who may feel left out since the prefects are seen to be favoured.

4.3.2. Effects of Removing Prefects from the School Administration

Opinion on the effects of removing prefects from the school administration was sought from teachers and deputy principals and the results are tabulated in Table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7: Teachers and Deputy Principal’s Opinion on the Effect of Removing Prefects from School Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study group</th>
<th>Effects of removing prefects</th>
<th>Counts</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy principals</td>
<td>Laxity in duty performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication break-down</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unreported indiscipline cases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All the above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Indiscipline</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration and students will lose touch</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty in the flow of programme</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All the above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effects of removing prefects from the school administration system were sought from deputy principals and teachers. The deputy principals noted that if prefects were removed from the school administration structure, there would be laxity in duty performance by other students (11.1%), truancy (11.1%), communication breakdown (22.2%), unreported indiscipline cases (22.2%) or all
the above mentioned (33.3%). The teachers, on the other hand, noted that if the prefects were removed from the school administrative structure, there would be indiscipline (29.7%), administration and students would lose touch from each other (27%), difficulties in the flow of programmes (18.9%) or a combination of all the above (24.3%; Table 4.7).

All the study groups were in agreement that the prefect body should not be removed from the schools administration system. If the prefects were removed cases such as laxity in duty performance would increase. They also cited cases of truance, communication breakdown, unreported discipline cases, indiscipline and hard flow of programs.

4.3.3 Shortcomings of Prefects

Opinions about the shortcomings of prefects in performing their duties were also sought from principals and the deputy principals. The results are tabulated below.

**Table 4.8: Shortcomings of Prefects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study group</th>
<th>Shortcomings of prefects</th>
<th>Counts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy principals</td>
<td>Issues never disclosed to the administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefects being involved in indiscipline cases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overreacting to issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All the above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Fear to execute the duties due to security reasons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failure to balance their work with academics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative secrets are leaked to the students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All the above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non respondent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Student-prefect conflict</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of seriousness towards their duties</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of knowledge in some leadership areas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All the above</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principals indicated that the prefects had the following shortcomings: fear of executing their duties due to security reasons (33.3%); failure to balance their roles with academic work (25%); and the leaking of administrative secrets (25%). Other principals (8.3%) observed that the prefects had the combination of all the shortcomings above. The deputy principals observed several shortcomings in the prefects. They noted that there were issues prefects never disclosed to the administration (25%); prefects were involved in indiscipline cases (8.3%); poor communication (25%); and overreacting to issues (8.3%). It was further noted that in some schools the prefects showed all the above mentioned shortcomings (33.3%). Teachers further noted shortcomings such as student-prefect conflict (27%); lack of seriousness towards their duties; and lack of knowledge in some leadership areas. In some schools teachers observed that prefects showed all the above-mentioned shortcomings 37.8% (Table 4.8).

Prefects were found to have several shortcomings in executing their duties. They were found to have fear for their security in performing. They also had difficulties balancing their class work with their leadership roles. This adversely affected their performance in class. A major shortcoming that could affect the prefects’ body was their involvement in indiscipline cases. The prefects were intended to instill discipline hence their involvement in indiscipline cases created an impediment in achieving discipline. Some of these shortcomings such as fear are often compounded by traumatizing experiences of prefects, for example, being molested by other students (Wang’er, 1986). Prefects in most schools have also been found to misuse the privileges accorded to them. The privileges may make them feel as being intrinsically superior to the other students.
4.4 Opinions on How to Improve the Prefect Body

The opinions of the principals, deputy principals teachers and students on the ways of involving prefects in enhancing school governance were sought. Their responses are shown below

**Figure 1.11: Ways of Involving Prefects to Enhance School Governance**

. The principals suggested that prefects should be empowered (16.7%); be invited to important meetings (16.7%) and be enlightened on their jobs (33.3%). The principals (8.3%) further observed that all the above strategies can be used to enhance the involvement of prefects in public secondary school governance (Figure 4.11).
Deputy Principals suggested several ways of improving the prefectural team in order to make it contribute more to governance of the school. Some of the methods that they suggested include informing prefects on the culture of the school (22.2%); having open forums with the teachers (55.6%); and instilling loyalty to their school (11.1%). The deputy principals gave several recommendations on how to improve the prefects’ body. These included: recognition (8.3%); regular meetings with the authorities (33.3%); guidance and
counseling (8.3%); recruitment (8.3%); reprimanding them when they go wrong (8.3%); or a combination of all the above methods (33.3% see Figure 4.12 above).

**Figure 4.13: Teachers Recommendations on how to Improve the Prefect Body**
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Teachers recommended that to improve the prefect body, prefects should be rewarded for the good work they do (16.7%). They further suggested that the prefects should be trained (19.4%) and be given support from the administration (16.7%). Other teachers (47.2%) suggested that all the above-mentioned should be provided to improve the body (Figure 4.13).
Students were, however, of a different opinion on how the prefect body could be improved. The students recommended that prefects should be chosen according to leadership skills (16%). The students suggested that they be treated the same as other students (14.1%). They were of the opinion that the prefects should respect other students (21.1%). Surprisingly, most of the students suggested that prefects should be chosen by teachers (43.7% see Table 4.9).

Prefects have been involved in areas of administration that have provided a positive contribution. Teachers observed that involvement of prefects in supervision of duties (38.9%) gave a positive contribution. Another area was punishing vernacular speaking students (22.2%) and decision-making (27.8%). Other teachers mentioned that the prefects have contributed positively in all the above-mentioned areas (11.1% see Figure 4.13).

Table 4.9: Recommendations from Students on How to Improve the Prefect Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Counts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chosen according to leadership skills</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be treated the same as other students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should respect other students</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be teachers choice</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the above</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several suggestions were given on how to improve the prefect body. The suggestions included: empowering prefects and inviting them to important meetings and enlightening them about their job as prefects. Others included having open forums with teachers, making them loyal to their school, guidance and counseling, and regular meetings with the authorities. Teachers were of the opinion that the prefects needed to be rewarded for their good work.

The students were of a different opinion regarding the improvement of the prefect body. They contended that prefects ought to be chosen according to leadership qualities; be treated the same as other students and that should respect other students. However, there are far-reaching reforms which need to be made to improve the prefect body in order to avert the frequent indiscipline cases that have been occurring. The reforms that suggest the replacement of the prefect body with

---

**Figure 4.14: Areas in which Prefects Have been Involved in and Have Provided a Positive Contribution**
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the student council are highly welcome. This will ensure the students choose their leaders and have responsibility over the leaders they choose.

4.4.1 Performance of the Prefects in their Prefectural Duties

The study also sought to know how the prefects had been performing in the past. It was observed that most teachers felt that the prefects had been performing minimally (32.1%). Some teachers (35.9%) observed that the majority of the prefects reported back to them. Another portion of the teachers were of the opinion that the prefects were fairly effective (16.8%). However, 15.2% of the teachers felt that the performance of the prefects was very minimal. See (Figure 4.15).

Figure 4.15: The Extent to which Prefects are Effective in Performance of their Duties

According to teachers, the prefects were performing minimally in the past. That implied that the prefect body required a lot of restructuring in order to make it efficient. Proper mechanisms need to be put in place regarding the selection and
appointment as well as the mandate of the prefects. The mechanisms will go a long way in helping the prefects in executing their duties well. Studies (e.g. Wangeri 1986) have revealed the poor performance of prefects as being one of the causes of indiscipline in schools. The prefects have even been reported as being involved in drug and substance abuse.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

This study sought to analyze the role of prefects in the governance of public secondary schools in Machakos Central Division. It employed both quantitative and qualitative approaches. It was carried out in a sample of twelve (12) schools in the division. Questionnaires were used to collect data from the principals, deputy principals, teachers, prefects and students. The sample was comprised of twelve (12) principals, twelve (12) deputy principals, thirty six (36) teachers, sixty one (61) prefects and two hundred and thirteen (213) students.

The data was presented using descriptive statistics methods. The study sought to examine the criteria for appointing prefects in public secondary schools. It also sought to analyze the roles of the prefects as well as the programmes for the preparation of prefects for these roles. Most of the reviewed studies had focused on matters relating to management in schools. However, the studies had not addressed issues concerning the roles of prefects in school governance.

The study comprised a sample that was representative of all the various categories of schools. That is, girls and boys boarding, mixed boarding schools, as well as day schools. The principals who participated in the study had considerable experience in matters of administration. The sample of principals also comprised highly qualified individuals. The deputy principals were also experienced, having worked for a couple of years and they were highly qualified. The teachers were similarly highly qualified with at least a diploma while some had attained a master’s degree in their field.

The administrators in the schools had attended KESI (Kenya Education Staff Institute) management courses; therefore, they were well prepared for their roles as administrators. KESI inducts educational staff into their roles as administrators.

The study also sought to outline the criteria used to appoint prefects. The majority of the principals reported that the prefects were appointed jointly by
administrators, teachers, outgoing prefects and students. However in a number of schools the prefects were appointed solely by the administrators. This depicts a worrying trend because of the tendency of some students to reject the prefects when they are imposed on them by the administration. It would therefore, be more effective if the selection process was more democratic. Schools have built certain cultures for the process of appointing prefects. Various attributes were also used to decide whom to appoint as a prefect. A combination of attributes were used to appoint prefects. These included academic performance, good behaviour, discipline, good leadership qualities and good communication skills. In appointing prefects, their academic performance took precedence. Most of the prefects who were chosen were those who performed well academically.

In the study the criteria of appointing prefects in the various categories of schools was considered. The criteria of choosing prefects were significantly different within the different categories of schools. The prefects played many important roles in the management of schools. The roles include student supervision, being in charge of academic areas, monitoring students, monitoring discipline, and mediating between students and staff. All the principals and deputy principals concurred that the prefects played important roles and should not be removed from the school governance system. The prefects were prepared through training and seminars before they took up their positions as prefects. The preparation however should be more structured and thorough for them to fit well in their roles.

The study sample confirmed that the prefects enjoyed privileges as an appreciation for their work. The privileges include: special trips, uniforms, and special meals during meetings. However, offering privileges was criticized as making prefects feel more special compared to other students. Indeed, this could be one of the reasons for the rampant indiscipline in schools. The prefects were also found to have short-comings. These included; involvement of prefects in indiscipline cases, over-reacting to issues, and poor communication.
Several opinions were given on how to improve the prefect body. Some of the suggestions included their involvement in important meetings, and enlightening them. It was also suggested that the prefects be rewarded for their good work, trained and given enough support for their good work. More far-reaching suggestions included treating prefects the same as other students to avoid creating disharmony.

The study analyzed the past performance of prefects in their duties. It was revealed that the students had been performing minimally in their duties. They were, however, fairly effective in some duties compared to others. The teachers suggested proper restructuring of the prefect body to enhance its performance.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on findings of this research, several conclusions were reached. The study findings revealed that schools used different criteria of appointing prefects depending on the culture of the school. The major criteria used included academic performance, good behaviour, discipline, good leadership and personality.

Prefects played major roles in the administration of public secondary schools in Machakos Division. The roles of prefects included supervising students in their performance of duties, giving punishment, mediators between students and teachers and ensuring that rules were followed. Prefects were prepared for their roles in several ways. These included training, seminars and prefect symposia. The prefects were also inducted through meetings with the authorities. They were also involved in some governance issues of the schools in the division. The prefects were, however, not involved in mainstream governance of the schools. They were mainly mediators between teachers and students.

The study findings have painted a clear picture of the process of administration involving prefects. There is every indication that the prefects play a very important role in the administration of public secondary schools. However
some gaps still exist in employing proper prefect appointment procedures and training. The feelings of the students are that a more democratic process of appointing prefects should be employed. Good character, academic performance, one’s personality and popularity were used as criteria of selecting prefects in Machakos Central Division public schools, the most popular criterion being good character.

5.3 Recommendations
Having investigated the role of prefects in the governance of public secondary schools in the Machakos Central Division, the following recommendations were made;

The school administration (principals and deputy principals) should put in place an appropriate prefect selection system that enables students to fully participate in it democratically by avoiding undue influence of the administration on whom should be selected by the students. This can be done by allowing one or two weeks of nominations and campaigning by the students. Teachers and school administrators should only come in to approve the selection.

Administration should opt for well integrated prefect selection criteria based on good character, personality, academic performance and popularity while involving students, outgoing prefects, teachers and administrators. This can be achieved by ensuring that prefects selected are balanced in terms of all the above qualities. If the candidates chosen do not fully qualify on all these factors, the administration should initiate an in-house induction.

School administrators should introduce prefects governing systems that regulate prefects from over-extending their authority. This may be done by teachers supervising their activities.

The administrators should come up with a proper school governance system that enables prefects to participate in decision-making process and
especially in matters that concern students through active involvement in various meetings such as school committee meetings, Parents Teachers Association (P.T.A), entertainment and guidance and counselling.

The school administration should ensure that each prefect is given a prefect’s hand book that defines the policies on the forms of authority and roles of prefects to serve as reference while undertaking their duties.

5.4 Recommendations for further study

The main objective of this study was to assess the various areas in which prefects are involved in, and how they facilitated student’s participation in governance of their school. The study also set to find out the criteria used in the selection of secondary school prefects and how it affected their effectiveness. In the course of the study certain areas were identified which need further investigation. The following areas are suggested for further research.

1. The Impact of Involving Prefects in the Governance of Secondary Schools.

Prefects have always been involved in the governance of secondary schools and have been treated as an integral part in that governance because they serve as a link between the students and the administration. The extent of its involvement should be investigated especially in terms of their contributions in their supervisory role and decision making.

2. Reasons why Prefects are Partially Involved in the Governance of Secondary Schools.

The school administration (BOG, PTA and Teachers) have taken it upon themselves to formulate and implement policies that concern the general governance of their schools neglecting the crucial role that can be played by the prefects. Therefore, an investigation need to be undertaken to understand why this is so.
3 How secondary Schools Can be Offered Appropriate Leadership Training.

Prefects are selected or appointed and expected to execute their duties without prior training. Prefects are potential future leaders and, armed with appropriate leadership skills, may be able to offer effective governance within and outside the school. It is for this reason why I recommend further research on the need for their appropriate leadership training.


The National students’ leadership conference was started in the year 2009 in Kenya with the aim of providing a safe and supportive environment which encourages students to explore their academic and career interest while developing leadership skills for their success. Three years later, has this objective been realized? Therefore, an investigation needs to undertaken on its impact in secondary schools governance
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PREFECTS

This questionnaire is designed to gather general information about yourself and your role as a prefect in your school. Please be frank and honest in your response. All the responses will be treated with utmost confidence.

SECTION A: PREFECTS’ DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Instruction: Please place a tick (✓) on the items that apply to you unless a different direction is given.

1. Type of school
   a) Girls boarding [ ] b) Boys boarding [ ]
   c) Mixed boarding [ ] d) Mixed day [ ]

2. Your gender
   a) Male [ ] b) Female [ ]

3. In which form are you?
   a) One [ ] b) Two [ ]
   c) Three [ ] d) Four [ ]

4. Experience as a prefect
   a) One year [ ] b) Two years [ ]
   c) Three years [ ] d) Four years [ ]

5. How old are you?
   a.) 12 – 13 years [ ] b) 14 – 16 years [ ]
   c) 17 – 19 years [ ] d) 20 years and above [ ]
6. What is the average grade that you normally attain in academic performance?
   a) A- and above [   ]  c) C- to C+ [   ]
   b) B- to B+ [   ]  d) D- to D+ [   ]

7. Tick your title appropriately
   a) Head Prefect [   ]  c) Dining Hall Prefect [   ]
   b) Games Prefect [   ]  d) Boarding Prefect [   ]
   e) Cleaning Prefect [   ]

Any other (Specify)________________________________________

SECTION B: CRITERIA OF APPOINTING PREFECTS

8. What skills and qualifications are sought in selecting a prefect?
   a) Academic qualification [   ]
   b) Physical strength [   ]
   c) Expert talent in co-curriculum activities [   ]
   d) All of the above [   ]

9. Who selects prefects in your school?
   a) Administration [   ]  b) Teachers [   ]
   c) Outgoing prefects [   ]  d) Students [   ]
   e) All of the above [   ]

10. What is the criterion for selecting prefects in your school?
    a) Academic performance [   ]  b) Personality [   ]
    c) Good behaviour [   ]  d) Popularity [   ]
11. Which of the above is your favourite criterion and why?

12. How often do you have prefects’ meetings?
   a) Weekly [ ]    b) Fortnightly [ ]
   c) Monthly [ ]   d) any other (specify)________________

13. Does the head teacher attend your meetings?
   a) Yes [ ]      b) No [ ]

14. As a perfect, do you have any privileges in the school?
   a) Yes [ ]      b) No [ ]
   b) If yes, outline them here.___________________________
   c) If ‘no’, why do you think you are not given any privileges.

15. Should prefects be involved in the way the school is managed?
   a) Yes [ ]      b) No [ ]

16. What are the recommendations that you can put forward to improve the prefect system in your school?

SECTION C: PREFECTS INVOLVEMENT IN GOVERNANCE

15. Should prefects be involved in the way the school is managed?
   a) Yes [ ]      b) No [ ]

16. What are the recommendations that you can put forward to improve the prefect system in your school?
17. What role do you play in your school?
   a) Carrying out day to day duties [  ]
   b) Ambassadorial role such as representing students in PTA meetings, holding talks with the school management [  ]
   c) Being a role Models such as leading by example [  ]
   d) Any other (specify) ________________________________

18. Was your role explained to you upon selection as a prefect?
   a) Yes [  ]   b) No [  ]

19. What role do you play in your school?
   ________________________________

20. Which form of authority are you given as a prefect?
   a) To punish [  ] b) To rebuke [  ]
   c) Any other, specify ________________________________
Appendix II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

This questionnaire is designed to gather general information about yourself and your role as a student in your school. Please be frank and honest in your response. All the responses will be treated with utmost confidence.

SECTION A: STUDENTS DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Instruction: Please place a tick (✓) on the items that apply to you unless a different direction is given.

1. Type of school
   a) Girls boarding [ ]
   b) Boys boarding [ ]
   c) Mixed boarding [ ]
   d) Mixed day [ ]

2. Your gender
   a) Male [ ]
   b) Female [ ]

3. In which form are you?
   a) One [ ]
   b) Two [ ]
   c) Three [ ]
   d) Four [ ]

4. How old are you?
   a) 12 – 13 years [ ]
   b) 14 – 16 years [ ]
   c) 17 – 19 years [ ]
   d) 20 years and above [ ]

5. What is the average grade that you normally attain in academic performance?
   a) A- and above [ ]
   b) B- to B+ [ ]
   c) C- to C+ [ ]
   d) D- to D+ [ ]
SECTION B: CRITERIA OF APPOINTING PREFECTS

6. What skills and qualifications are required before one is appointed a prefect in your school?
   a) Academic qualification [ ] b) Physical strength [ ]
   c) Expert talent in co-curriculum activities [ ]
   d) All of the above [ ]

7. Who selects prefects in your school?
   a) Administration [ ] b) Teachers [ ]
   c) Outgoing prefects [ ] d) Students [ ]
   e) All of the above [ ]

8. What is the criterion for selecting prefects in your school?
   a) Academic performance [ ] b) Personality [ ]
   c) Good behavior [ ] d) Popularity [ ]
   e) Other (specify) ________________________________

9. Which of the above are your favourite criteria and why?

SECTION C: PREFECTS INVOLVEMENT IN GOVERNANCE

10.) Should prefects be involved in the way the school is managed?
   a) Yes [ ] b) No [ ]

11. What are the recommendations that you can put forward to improve the prefect system in your school?
Appendix III: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE TEACHERS

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Instructions: Please put a tick (√) in brackets against the appropriate answer.

1. Type of school
   a) Girls boarding [ ] b) Boys boarding [ ]
   c) Mixed boarding [ ] d) Mixed day [ ]

2. Your gender
   a) Male [ ] b) Female [ ]

3. How long have you been a teacher in this school?
   a) Less than 5 years [ ] b) 5 – 10 years [ ]
   c) 11 – 15 years [ ] d) More than 15 years [ ]

4. How old are you?
   a) 20 – 25 years [ ] b) 26 – 30 years [ ]
   c) 31 – 35 years [ ] d) 36 years and above [ ]

5. What is your level of education?
   a) Certificate [ ] b) Diploma [ ]
   c) Bachelor’s degree [ ] d) Masters and above [ ]
SECTION B: INVOLVEMENT OF PREFECTS IN SCHOOL GOVERNANCE

This section is designed to gather information on the extent of involving prefects in the school administration (governance). Indicate the correct option as correctly and as honestly as possible. Put a tick (✓) against each of the given numbers, which best describe your answer.

6. Who appoints prefects in your school?
   a) Administrator [ ]  b) Teacher [ ]
   b) Outgoing prefects [ ]  c) Students [ ]

7. What is your criterion of selection and appointing of prefects?
   a) Academic performance [ ]  b) Personality [ ]
   c) Good behaviour [ ]  d) Popularity [ ]
   e) Other (specify) ________________________________

8. Do you train prefects for their role?
   a) Yes [ ]  b) No [ ]
   If yes, in what areas?

9. (i) In your opinion, should prefects be given extra privilege over the rest of the students.
   a) Yes [ ]  b) No [ ]

   (ii) Does your school offer prefects any privileges?
   a) Yes [ ]  b) No [ ]
(iii) If yes in (ii) above, enumerate the privileges given to prefects in your School____________________________________________

10. Are the prefects in your school empowered to punish others students?
   a) Yes [ ]  b) No [ ]

11. (i) Do you involve prefects in the governance of your school?
   a) Yes [ ]  b) No

   (ii) If yes, in which areas? Please explain
____________________________________________

SECTION C: OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Instructions: Please respond by filling in the spaces provided after every item.

12. What levels of authority do you give prefects in your school?

13. In your opinion what would be the effect of removing the prefects in your school?
   a._______________________________________________________

14. What have been the shortcomings of prefects involvement in your school?
   _________________________________________________________

15. Give Suggestions on how the prefect system can be improved to enhance prefect participation in governance of secondary schools
   _________________________________________________________

16. Identify and describe some of the areas where you think prefects’ involvement in the management of your school has helped to make it better.___________________________________________________
17. Identify areas in which you think your students could be more actively involved in school management.

_____________________________________________

18. To what extent are prefects effective in the performance of their duties in your school?

_____________________________________________

Thank you for your cooperation
Appendix IV: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DEPUTY PRINCIPALS
SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.

Instructions: Please put a tick (√) in brackets against the appropriate answer.

1. Type of school
   a) Girls boarding [ ]  b) Boys boarding [ ]
   c) Mixed boarding [ ]  d) Mixed day [ ]

2. Your gender  a) Male [ ]  b) Female [ ]

3. How long have you been a deputy principal?
   a) Less than 5 years [ ]  b) 5 – 10 years [ ]
   c) 11 – 15 years [ ]  d) More than 15 years [ ]

4. How old are you?
   a) 30 – 34 years [ ]  b) 35 – 39 years [ ]
   c) 40 – 44 years [ ]  d) 45 years and above [ ]

5. What is your level of education?
   a) Certificate [ ]  b) Diploma [ ]
   c) Bachelor’s degree [ ]  d) Masters and above [ ]

6. Do you/have you ever attended KESI courses on educational management?
   a) Yes [ ]  b) No [ ]
SECTION B: INVOLVEMENT OF PREFECTS IN SCHOOL
GOVERNANCE

7. What are the roles of prefects?

8. Upon what criteria do you base the appointment/selection of prefects?

9. How do you prepare prefects for their roles?

10. What procedures of communication are used in your school?

11. How do you ensure that the school discipline code is adhered to?

12. What are some of the major discipline problems that your school faces?

13. How are the prefects involved in maintenance of school discipline?

SECTION C

Open-ended questions

Instructions: Please respond by filling in the spaces provided after every item.

14. In your opinion what would be the effect of removing the prefect body in your school?
15. What have been the shortcomings of prefects in your school?

________________________________________________________________________

16. Suggest recommendations that can be used to improve prefect’s body in your school.

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix V : QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

SECTION A

This questionnaire is meant to gather general information about yourself and your school for the purpose of this study only. Please be frank and honest in your response. All responses will be treated with confidentiality.

Instruction: Please put a tick (√) in the brackets against the appropriate answer.

1. Type of school
   a) Girls boarding  [  ]  b) Boys boarding  [  ]
   c) Mixed boarding  [  ]  d) Mixed day  [  ]

2. Your gender
   a) Male  [  ]  b) Female  [  ]

3. How long have you been a principal?
   a) Less than 5 years  [  ]  b) 5 – 10 years  [  ]
   c) 11 – 15 years  [  ]  d) More than 15 years [  ]

4. How old are you?
   a) 30 – 34 years  [  ]  b) 35 – 39 years  [  ]
   c) 40 – 44 years  [  ]  d) 45 years and above [  ]

5. What is your education level?
   a) Certificate  [  ]  b) Diploma  [  ]
   c) Bachelor’s degree  [  ]  d) Masters and above [  ]

6. Category of your headship
   a) District  [  ]  b) Provincial  [  ]
c) National [ ]  d) International [ ]

7. Do you/have you ever attended KESI courses on educational management?
   a) Yes [ ]  b) No [ ]

SECTION B

This section is designed to gather information on the role of prefects in the school administration (governance). Indicate the correct option as correctly and honestly as possible. Put a tick (✓) against each of the given numbers which best constitute your answer.

8. Who appoint prefects in your school?
   a) Administrator [ ]  b) Teacher [ ]
   b) Outgoing Prefects [ ]  d) Students [ ]
   e) All of the above [ ]

9. What is your criterion of selection and appointing of prefects?
   a) Academic performance [ ]  b) Personality [ ]
   c) Good behavior [ ]  d) Popularity [ ]
   e) Other (specify) _________________________________

10. Do you train prefects for the role?
    a) Yes [ ]  b) No [ ]

    If ‘yes’ in what areas? ________________________________

11. (i) In your opinion should prefects be given extra privilege over the rest of the students.
(i) Does your school offer prefects any privileges?

a) Yes [ ]  b) No [ ]

(ii) If yes in (i) above, give the privileges given to prefects in your school

(iii) If yes in (ii) above, give the privileges given to prefects in your school

12. Are the prefects in your school empowered to punish others students?

a) Yes [ ]  b) No [ ]

13. (i) Do you involve prefects in the governance of your school?

a) Yes [ ]  b) No [ ]

(ii) If yes, in which areas? Please state

SECTION C

Open-ended questions

Instructions: Please respond by filling in the spaces provided after every item.

14. In your opinion what would be the effect of removing prefects in your school?

15. What have been the shortcomings of prefects’ involvement in your school?

16. Suggest better ways of involving students in enhancing Public Secondary governance

17. How do you think the prefectural system in your school can be improved in order to contribute more in the governance of the school?
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Michael Wambua Muli,
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Policy and Curriculum studies,
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P.O. Box 43844 – 00100, Nairobi.

To The Head teacher,

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN YOUR SCHOOL

I am a post-graduate student at Kenyatta University currently out on research. The research is on the role of Prefects in Governance of Public Secondary Schools in Central Division of Machakos District, Kenya.

I humbly request you to allow me to involve you, your teachers and prefects in the study.

I assure you that all the information given will be used solely for this research purpose and will be confidential.

Yours faithfully,

Muli Michael Wambua
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The Permanent Secretary,
Ministry of Higher Education, Science & Technology,
P.O. Box 30040,
NAIROBI

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FOR MULI MICHAEL WAMBUA
REG.NO E55/CE/10501/2007

I write to introduce Muli Michael Wambua who is a Postgraduate Student of this University. He is registered for a M.ED degree programme in the Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies in the School of Education.

Mr. Muli intends to conduct research for a Thesis project entitled, "The Role of Prefects in the Governance of public Secondary Schools in Machakos Central Division".

Any assistance given will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

JOHN M. ODONGI
FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL
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Committed to Creativity, Excellence & Self-Reliance
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Kenyatta University,
P. O. Box 43844,
NAIROBI

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “The role of Prefects in the Governance of Public Secondary Schools in Machakos Central Division”, I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Machakos District for a period ending 30th November, 2010.

You are advised to report to the District Commissioner, the District Education Officer, Mombasa District before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two copies of the research report/thesis to our office.

P. N. NYAKUNDI
FOR: SECRETARY/CEO

Copy to: The District Commissioner
Machakos District
The District Education Officer
Machakos District