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Decentralization and democratization in educational administration involves participatory management where by all members make and respect decisions by all those who are interested in the organization thus; students, teachers and parents. In Kenya a number of documented administrative flaws in secondary schools have been positively attributed to the absence of teachers, students and parents’ participation in school management. The main purpose of this study was to identify the factors that affected students’ involvement in secondary school administration in Teso North Sub-County Busia County, Kenya. The objectives of the study included ascertaining how age and professional experience of school Principals affected students’ involvement in administration of public secondary schools; assessed communication channels between prefects and school administrators. The study also endeavored to assess the extent of prefects’ involvement in public secondary school administration and lastly the study investigated the perception and attitude of Principals and teachers towards prefects’ authority in public secondary schools administration. This study would be significant to the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) and the school administration in improving students’ involvement in school administration. The research employed a descriptive survey design which was concerned with the generalized statistics that resulted when data was abstracted from respondents. Out of 25 public secondary schools 21 were sampled. The researcher used questionnaires, interview schedules and observation schedules to collect data. Reliability of the instruments was determined by piloting the instruments and validity was enhanced by requesting the lecturers of Kenyatta University to examine content validity. With a target population of 1351, sample technique used was simple random sampling to select respondents from these groups: namely Principals, Deputy Principals, student prefects and purposive sampling for District Quality Assurance and Standards Officer (DQASO) totaling to a sample size of 433 respondents. Data analysis was done by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis was used to analyze data. The findings were presented through descriptive statistics by use of frequencies, tables, graphs and pie-charts. The findings from the field revealed that students’ participation in decision making in school administrative areas that do not directly concern them was viewed as problematic to school administrators and teachers. School administration felt insecure in involving prefects in administrative matters and they deemed them minors, immature and lacked expertise and technical knowledge needed. Prefects on the other hand felt sidelined by school administration and were not empowered. The study concluded that school administration professional experience had an effect on prefects’ selection and involvement in school administration. The Principals still embraced the authoritarian leadership in school administration. Communication channels were not availed or inadequate in most of the schools. The study recommended that: There was need for experienced administrators to be inducted in school administration regarding prefect’s involvement; they also needed to fully involve prefects in school administration especially in election of their own leaders. There was need for the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology to monitor the implementation of set policies on prefect involvement in secondary school administration. Further studies were recommended for a similar study to be carried out in other categories of schools like private schools and also need for MoEST to evaluate its role in reinforcing student involvement in school administration matters.
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BOM : Board of Management
DQASO : District Quality Assurance and Standards Officer
KSSHA : Kenya Secondary School Heads Association
KSSSC : Kenya Secondary School Student Council
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NCST : National Council for Science and Technology
PTA : Parents Teachers Association
SPSS : Statistical Package for Social Sciences
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TSC : Teachers Service Commission
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The concept of participatory management was the brainchild of the behavioral science movement. The basic tenet of this movement was to look at members of an organization as important players in the running of that organization without whose involvement it's efficient and effective functioning of its administration maybe hampered (Chamber, 1997). Participatory management which had its main principle on the delegation of authority and function at all hierarchical levels, allowed for the participation of all organizational components (Gin, 1989).

According to Ndambuki (1996), Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory of 1976 proposed that human beings had a hierarchy of needs. Any needs assessment begins and ends with the user. Therefore, any decision taken, especially those that directly and immediately concern them, without their inputs, was bound to face indifference or outright disregard. Thereby, blotting out the much needed conducive and enabling environment for effective learning. Psychological needs are the most potent of all needs. An individual who is deprived of the basic needs would not be motivated to do something. That meant if the needs were not satisfied, the internal mechanism in man would energize and direct the behavior of the individual towards satisfying them.

In Kenya a number of documented administrative flaws in secondary schools had been positively attributed to the absence of teachers, students and parents' participation in school management (Lodiaga, 1995). Practical examples were manifested in the various forms of students' unrest, deteriorating discipline, poor students' learning achievement especially in national examinations, staff job
dissatisfaction as portrayed by the high level of staff turnover, inadequate resources and facilities and students’ non-completion of study cycles (Commonwealth Secretariat, 1994).

In the recent past, Kenya has had a wave of instability and animosity in schools which had witnessed negative incidences including loss of human life. This left one wondering what really caused the breakdown in order. Times have changed and the society was quite enlightened with youths exhibiting complex behaviour patterns which needed to be addressed time and again (Lodiaga, 1995). Principals occupied a vital position of leadership as they led their teams of teachers, prefects, other students, non-teaching staff, parents, school committees, government officers, sponsors, etc. towards the accomplishment of educational goals which, to a large extent, depended on proper school administration (Duze, 2007).

Decentralization of decision making as part of participation management adopted the basic premise participation by all members of an organization to generate and make possible the acceptance of decisions by all those who were interested (Gin, 1989). Also democratization of education administration as an aspect of participatory management referred to the increased respect for the students, parents, teachers as individuals, greater opportunity for freedom, independence and initiative in thought and conduct (Hanson, 1995). Mbae (1994) concurred with the above sentiments when he noted that an emphasis on democratic leadership had not always characterized the preparation of educational administrators. This stemmed from the realization that for students, parents and teachers’ involvement in school to bear fruit the Principals should be facilitators of participatory administration. Ability to deal with many people
who had a stake in the running of the school was an important administration competence. People were best managed using a consultative style which encouraged listening to divergent views, sharing of experiences and participatory decision making. People felt a sense of ownership when they participated in the management of a school. The school as an institution was an organization of people who inhabited it and came together on the basis of declared interest and purpose which they found reasonably compatible (Mbae, 1994).

Aggrawal (2004) added that while student representatives may not participate in matters relating to the conduct of examinations, evaluation of student performance, appointment of teachers and other secret matters, their participation should be ensured in all other academic and administrative decisions taken by everybody. This however confines students involvement to specific areas of school life giving the impression that the schools commitment should not be taken seriously and it also limits the possibilities of experimental learning.

In a critical review of school management in developing countries, Telteg-Enyo (1997) noted that the practice of appointing Principals before they were given enough training in school administration was unrealistic. He further stressed that a good classroom teacher may not necessarily be an effective head teacher. Telteg-Enyo (1997) called for the inclusion of the following in the training for Principals; parental participation in school management, students’ involvement and teacher consultation in staff meetings.
Like other African countries, Kenya, had not expended much effort to promote the democratic ideals envisaged in participatory management through teachers, students and parents' involvement in school administration Mbae (1994) concluded this in his study about Nigeria which was more or less the same as in Kenya. The study found that secondary schools Principals were authoritarian and even autocratic in their administrative tendencies.

Holme (1993) observed that there was a loss of amicable interaction between students, teachers and the school administration. Olembo (1997) concurred with Holme (1993) and noted that general absence of a culture of freedom and dialogue at the secondary school level may be seen in the rising cases of gross indiscipline and the Principals' inability to arrest the situation. Such short-comings had been associated with the authoritarian leadership styles some Principals had adopted. In this it was assumed that students only had a legitimate interest in student specific issues and also had no right to decide for themselves the issues in which they wanted or do not want to be involved.

According to (Dockings, 1989) who suggested that in school, discipline was central to creating an environment that was conducive to serious learning. It was a very essential component in the effective management of any organization. It was also a significant aspect in establishing an orderly system that creates the conditions under which learning took place and which allowed the aim and objectives of the school to be achieved. Being an important component of human behaviour, discipline not only helped to regulate people's reactions to various situations; but also their relationships with others (Ng'ang'a, 2003).
Quite often, local media reported this as attributed to Principals’ autocratic management. The Aduda (1997) in Daily Nation reported that many secondary schools were poorly managed. The Principals were dictatorial, corrupt and had no time for parents, workers, students and fellow teachers. They run schools like their own chiefdoms. School board members work away from their schools and may not be aware of what really went on there. Some Principals mistreated and humiliated other teachers, workers and even parents in front of their students. Instead of calling for regular meetings of Board of Management (B.O.M) and Parents Teachers Association (PTA) some run institutions single handedly. Nyamongo (1995), acknowledged this when he reiterated that schools which instituted some form of participation by students in administration enjoyed a relatively smooth administrative tenure with fewer students related administrative problems. Njozela (1998) pointed out that Principals and other stakeholders should not underestimate the contributions of students especially if they were given the opportunity to develop their skills and their level of maturity. According to Orlosky (1984), schools were essentially humanistic organizations as compared to other industrial enterprises and thus there was need to involve all the human components of the school in decision-making if any meaningful success was to be achieved. Ki-zerbo (1990) supported the same view when he argued that students should be given more freedom and greater opportunity to participate in decision making as a democratization of the school aspects. Proponents of school democracy viewed indiscipline in school as a direct result of failure of school authorities to involve, students in decision making. Huddleston (2007) concurred with this where he felt students should be involved in all areas of school life. The range of activities that made up the work of a school were categorized
in different areas like rules, curriculum, management, development among others and one expected students to have opportunities for involvement in all.

Failure of the administration to acknowledge the level of maturity of students and to involve them in meaningful dialogue had received criticism not only from students but also from the general public. The foregoing observations indicated that an administration that seriously encouraged dialogue, addressed problems and sought solution from other members of the school community, such as B.O.M, teachers, students and parents and at the same time provided some degree of freedom among students to participate in decision-making averted such incidents (Gathenya, 1992). For effective management of schools Principals tended to embrace the changes in the society and involved students’ prefects in the administration of the school to enhance performance.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
As schools become increasingly ethically, academically and socially complex organizations, an explicit expectation was that all who work within them would make active contribution to development of effective school management through high quality professional practices. Wangeri (1989), asserted that if the majority of prefects were selected based on clear guidelines and given the authority by teachers and Principals in the schools would always choose to contribute effectively to the management of schools, within cultures of collective purpose. Students are recipients of final decisions (Sushila and Bakhda, 2006) hence the recommendations made by them may be very constructive and if approached in the right manner would work positively. In this way student tendencies of rejecting decisions imposed upon them
by school administrators would change to ownership and acceptance. Calls for inclusions of students in the decision-making structure in schools have led to various attempts by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology to put in place structures for inclusion for example the formulation of Kenya Secondary School Student Council (KSSSC) formed in 2009 with a view to making secondary school governance more participatory. In these arrangement students interests would be adopted in the administration of schools. However, despite this move by the government, not much research has been conducted to find out the factors that would affect students' involvement in administration of secondary school since the formulation of student councils. In Teso North Sub-County there were several secondary schools which had students' unrest resulting to burning of school property and disruption of learning activities. It was in this light that this study aimed at finding out the factors that affected students' involvement in public secondary school administration with a view to filling the knowledge gap between theory and practice in participatory secondary school administration. The study examined whether certain criteria were set to guide appointment of prefects who were then incorporated in the school administration which could lead to effective solutions to students' problems. This study attempted to bridge the knowledge gap by seeking answers to the following research questions: (i) Was there any significant role of the Principals' age and years of professional experience in determining the level of involvement of students' in public secondary school administration; (ii) Was there any significant form of communication channels between student prefects and the school administration in public secondary schools; (iii) Was there any significant involvement of student prefects in public secondary school administration in Teso North Sub-County; and (iv) Was there any significant relationship between the
Principals’ and teachers’ perception and attitude towards students’ authority and their involvement in public secondary school administration.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify factors affecting students’ involvement in public secondary school administration in Teso North Sub-County, Busia County in Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

1. To determine whether demographic information (age and professional experience) of Principals affected the involvement of students’ in public secondary school administration.

2. To assess the communication channels between prefects and the administration in public secondary schools administration.

3. To assess the extent to which the prefects in Teso North Sub-County were involved in public secondary school administration.

4. To establish Principals’ and teachers’ perceptions and attitudes towards prefects authority in involvement in public secondary schools administration.

1.5 Research Questions

1. Did the Principal’s demographic information (age and professional experience) affect the prefects’ involvement in public secondary school administration?

2. How did the communication channel between prefects and the administration assist in the administration in Public Secondary Schools?
3. What was the extent to which prefects in Teso North Sub-County were involved in public secondary school administration?

4. What were the Principals' and teachers' perception and attitude towards prefects' authority in involvement in public secondary school administration?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study would be useful to Principals of secondary schools in improving students' involvement in school administration, due to the revelation that the Principals' demographic information affected the level of students' involvement in school administration. It thus recommended refresher courses for Principals on students' involvement in school administration, teacher consultations, staff meeting and parental participation in school management. The study may help in improving school discipline and consequently lead to improved examination performance. The results of this study would also be useful to Universities and Teacher Training Colleges in imparting knowledge and skills to their trainees on students' involvement in school administration. This could lead to effective school management. Other educators would also use the findings in educational seminars and workshops. Finally, like any other study, the findings would replenish the data bank on students' involvement in public secondary school administration.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

Some respondents misinterpreted some questionnaire items while completing the questionnaires. This limitation was addressed by conducting personal interviews, which may also be inhibited by time limitations, issues of anonymity (and possibly confidentiality). Some respondents about 0.1 percent did not complete the
questionnaires as accurately as possible, considering that they were carrying out their daily duties. In addition, two respondents provided answers that were subjective; to suit their interest hence being biased. The affected questionnaires were removed from the final study findings. School administrators for instance were hesitant to give information freely due to legal implications. The Principals were informed of the importance of cooperating with the researcher in this study since lack of students’ involvement in school administration negatively affected the society as a whole. They were also assured that strict confidentiality would be observed in dealing with their responses.

1.8 Delimitations of the Study
The study was only conducted in Teso North Sub-County, Busia County which may not represent the remaining parts of Kenya. The study also focused on only public secondary schools not private which could be employing different students’ involvement approaches.

1.9 Basic Assumptions
The study based on the following assumptions;

1. The respondents (Principals, teachers and prefects) gave accurate responses to the questionnaires.

2. The Principals were sufficiently informed about the concept of participatory management and are in a position to adequately respond to the items in the questionnaires.

3. The selected study subjects were a representative of the target population.
1.10 Theoretical Framework

This study approached this concept from the Social Systems Theory. This Theory dealt with a bounded set of elements (subsystems) and activities that interacted and constituted a single social entity as explained by Hoy and Mickel, (1992). The study on factors affecting student’s involvement in public secondary school administration depended on the school as a social system within which there were a series of sub-systems, which interacted with its environment. A school as a system could be conceptualized as being comprised of departments, such as: BOMs, PTAs, students’, teachers and support staff among others which formed the sub-systems. Each sub-system had to relate to others and to the whole and yet keep its own individual identity. The Social System Theory further stated that in an organization setting, it was the group more than an individual that was of real use to the administration. The degree of student’s involvement in public secondary school administration would depend on the factors such as school management that espouses an administrative practice that recognized other members of the school, students being among them.

The first step towards participatory management would be the formation of groups such as students’ body (Council), PTA and BOM. In the Social Systems perspective the interaction and relationship between BOM, students, teachers, and PTA, should be relatively orderly and cohesive for effective achievements of school goals. Their relationship should be characterized by value consensus, solidarity, co-operation, integration and acceptance of legitimate authority (Hoyle, 1986).

For participation to be realized (Shaeffer, 1992) identified two prerequisites to be met. First, the members of the organization must be motivated to participate by opening channels of communication through indicators like suggestion boxes, open barazas,
meetings among others. However, motivation cannot be realized without the need for participation being seen as a genuine and conscious effort from school administration. This was made possible through involving students in decision-making not just in petty issues of school but also in matters concerning co-curricular activities, choosing student’s representation democratically, discipline cases in relationship to school rules and regulations that govern students. In addition, the students should be exposed and sensitized on their needs and rights through active participation in certain administrative instances in school management.

According to Ogeno (1993), decisions made through a joint venture should be viewed by all groups as representation of what transpired and should be appreciated by stakeholders who should feel they were part of the outcome. Further, he added that, participation must provide a changing experience, perceived as meaningful to avoid disillusioning participants. Hence, there must be some degree of power equalization, between different groups in an organization.

The theory related to the current study on factors affecting students involvement in public secondary school administration in the way Summers and Johnsons (1995), explained that power equalization increases communication among the stakeholders students inclusive, in bid to improve commitment, support of school goals, leading to better performance.

Drury and Levin (1994) added that at the school level, Principals were key figures in fostering shared governance within the school. Hence by sharing responsibility and authority, they increased accountability for programmes performance. The Social
Systems Theory summarizes the objectives of the study on factors affecting students’ involvement in public secondary school administration as it advocates for Participatory management in education. Hence, it called for clarification of the legal status of students in management. However, a right to participate in school administration by students should not be interpreted as freedom from rules and regulations of the school. Furthermore, a call for consensus in decision-making should not be interpreted as a call for majority rule.

1.11 Conceptual Framework

This study was guided by the conceptual framework in figure 1.1 below, which was used to explain the interrelationship between the variables. A conceptual framework is a model of presentation where a researcher conceptualized or represented the relationships between variables in the study and showed the relationship graphically or diagrammatically (Orodho, 2005). Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) argues that independent variable attempted to indicate the total influence in the study. The conceptual framework below showed the relationship between the independent variables such as the demographic factors of principals affecting students’ involvement in public secondary school administration which the indicators included: age and professional experience of school principals and its impact on school involvement of prefects in administration and age of prefects. The role of the government in assessing the communication channels between student prefects and administration whose indicators included the presence of suggestion boxes the number of barazas held and lastly students’ involvement in administrative decision-making such as staffing, counseling and co-curricular and curricular activities. The above variables would influence the dependent variables that were reflected in
students' involvement in public secondary school administration. In the presence of intervening variables that needed to be taken into account as they operationalised the variables for they modified research findings. The details of the variables and their indicators were summarized in Figure 1.1:

Independent Variables

✓ Demographic information (age and professional experience)
✓ Communication with students’
✓ Extent of prefects involvement in administration
✓ Attitude of principals and teachers towards prefects authority

Dependent Variables

Prefects involvement in school administration

Intervening Variables

School environment, parental approval


Figure 1.1 Conceptual Framework of the Study
1.12 Operational Definition of Terms

**Principal:** Refers to a person or body of persons responsible for the management and conduct of a school.

**Teacher:** Refers to a person whose job is teaching especially in a school appointed by Teachers Service Commission.

**School:** Refers to an institution registered under the Basic Education Act, 2013

**Private School:** Refers to a school established, owned or operated by private individuals, entrepreneurs and institutions.

**Student/pupil:** Refers to a person enrolled as a pupil or students in a school as stipulated in CAP 211 of the Laws of Kenya.

**Teachers Service Commission:** Refers to a Commission – established by Section 3 of the Teachers Service Commission Act.

**Administration:** Refers to the organization of the internal arrangements of the school in the light of previously determined goals.

**Management:** Refers to the running of an institution through organizing, planning, directing and controlling of operations.

**Decision-Making:** Refers to the act of reaching the final choice of alternative of course of action to take whether by one individual or by consensus in a group.

**Participatory Management:** Refers to a system of administration which requires an administrator to involve all members in organizational decision-making process

**Principals’ characteristics:** Refers to the personal inborn and acquired characteristics of a Principal such as age and professional experience.

**Students’ involvement:** Refers to students’ participation in all aspects of school life and decision making in all activities.

**Effective management:** Refers to the smooth and harmonious running of an institution or a school.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter reviewed related literature on the following objectives: Demographic information (age and professional experience) of Principals and how it affected the involvement of students in public secondary school administration, communication channels between student prefects and principals in the administration of public secondary schools, the extent to which prefects are involved in public secondary school administration and Principals’ and teachers’ perceptions and attitudes towards prefects authority in public secondary schools administration.

2.2 Demographic Information of Principals and how it Affected Student Prefects’ Involvement in Public Secondary School Administration
Mwiria’s (1999) study findings portrayed pupils, teachers and parent participation in school decision making as limited to the extent from the choice of options available to them. However, the study did not include other variables such as age and professional experience of Principals and how they influenced prefects’ involvement in secondary school administration. Olembo, Wanga and Karanja, (1992:169) showed that age played a role in the Principals’ leadership practice. It had both physical and psychological effects on one’s behavior. They noted that age may affect Principals’ memory, understanding and adaptability to extrovert instructional and administrative functioning. As retirement approached a leader had no interest in the schools physical development based on this premise that young Principals may be more enthusiastic to improve the existing conditions and had the strength to lobby for funds and services for improvement. Prager (1993) acknowledged that there were ideas where leaders
perceived their leadership problem in a unique way on the basis of their background, age, gender, knowledge and experience. She further noted that the leaders behaviour in any given instance was influenced greatly by the many forces operating within his or her own person.

For decades, Principals had been strong authority figures at local school level. Today prevailing views of leadership suggested that the Principals role should not be to direct others but to create a school culture in which decisions are made collaborating such ‘facilitative’ leadership exercised power of substantial magnitude occurred as parents, teachers, students and members of the public become more involved in the management of a school (Murphy, 1991).

Murphy (1991), argued that the initiative to facilitate a greater involvement of parents, teachers, students and members of the public in school affairs and to encourage schools to become more independent was a leadership crisis of the contemporary society. As schools become more autonomous, Principals and school directors were expected to function as professional entrepreneurs and educational futurist with visions of schooling tomorrow. Schools and school systems had always attracted many creative and innovative individuals. However, traditional personnel management practices denied these educators access to managerial and administrative positions (Murphy, 1991). These individuals often referred to as the “old guards” continued to be the backbones of most school systems. He further noted that if a leadership crisis was to be avoided, existing personnel management, procedures and practices must be appraised critically. Studies of leader’s behaviour that included administration, personal characteristics indicated that Principals gender and
conceptual complexity affected their behaviour (Mbaabu, 1993). This study attempted to fill this gap.

2.3 Communication Channel between Prefects and the Administration in Public Secondary Schools

Fielding and Rudduck (2000), stated that there were many silent or silenced voices - students who would like to say things about teaching and learning but who don't feel able to without a framework that legitimates comment and provided reassurance that teachers would welcome their comments and not retaliate. They further stressed that attempts to define student participation in decision making referred to token consultation with students over such matters as school uniform, or how to reduce littering. However, if democratic culture was to prevail, students should be enabled to understand why things are done as they are and able to voice their views about change and to have those views heard.

The major advantage of consultative decision making and delegations of responsibility was seen as promotion of co-operation and understanding among the various parties. Sergiovanni (1994:16) argued that schools should be purposeful communities in which firmly held core values permeating every aspect of the school organization. The wide range of policy types showed that students contributed to policy making in the Canadian schools. They included: Students' representation on school councils and students' councils, on school improvement. They participated in students/teacher advisory programmes and in round table discussions, representation on District Boards as non-voting trustees, school accreditation programmes. Students also made written submissions to the department of education, they consulted with
teachers and school administration, and they produced their own television shows concentrating on students' issues and students' protests (Bush, 2003: 101).

One of the characteristics noted by Critchleys (1999), research findings as common in all successful school was an atmosphere of shared planning and decision-making. He further noted that the involvement of students in policy-making in the Canadian school systems was restricted to providing policy-makers with information. The report further recommended that students should not just be sources of information on policies but be included to serve on policy-making committees as voting members. The role placed by the society on the school was very important so much that according to Okumbe (1998), the school should be viewed as a processing device or a laboratory for democracy. The administrators who are also instructors should therefore be ready to practice democratic leadership style in schools. Students would in turn emulate some practice on leaving school. This eventually enhanced a more democratic society. Peters (1976), noted that the Principals must delegate and should not even try to know all that was going on in the school.

Greg (1989:20) noted that traditionally, schools and school systems had been controlled and managed by a professional bureaucracy where by decisions concerning the organization were made near the top of the pyramidal power structure and were filtered down to the departments concerned. This bureaucratic structure conceded individuals within the system as well as those affected by its decision, to be incapable, unqualified or uninterested in contributing to the organizations decision making process.
Mbaabu and Karanja (1992) made two important observations; first, that the head teacher was in a position to influence and be influenced, and second, that their interactions to individuals was one aspect of their relationship which affected other relationships. These two observations consequently were the principle forces that impinged on leaders in any given instance and that tended to determine their tactical behavior in relation to subordinates (Holmes, 1993).

As managerial and administrative responsibilities were shared with other people, school leaders found themselves in an environment where one of their primary functions was to motivate groups (Murphy, 1991). At the building level the Principals were the key figures in fostering shared governance within the school, they not only increased responsibility and authority in school programmes, curriculum and personnel decisions, but also increased accountability for students and programme success. Similarly, they must be excellent team leaders and delegators (Sparkling, 1994). On the other hand, Sergiovanni (1994:5) whose concept of community encompassed most of the dimension of climate identified relationship as significant. He noted that in a true school community, relationships were based on shared values rather than bureaucratic roles, resulting in individuals who cared, listened, understood, respected others and were honest, open and sensitive. He conceded that Principals needed to begin by using bureaucratic authority but must ultimately build relationships based on professional and moral authority.

Klug (1989) noted that school leaders influenced levels of motivation by shaping the schools instructional climate, which in turn shaped the attitudes of teachers, students, parents, and the community at large toward education. He further noted that by
effectively managing this aspect of a school culture, Principals increased students, parent and teacher motivation and indirectly impacted on learning gains.

Wangeri (1986) carried out a study of discipline problems affecting secondary schools in eleven schools in Thika. From the study it was concluded that students were rarely involved in the formulation of school rules. The study revealed that in all the schools the Principals, Deputy Principals and members of the teaching staff made the rules. It was clearly indicated that Principals rarely involved students' in school decision-making for their own reasons; moreover students were not consulted in the formulation of rules affecting them. Sifuna (2000) noted that a major factor in the existence of strikes and riots in many African secondary schools is the problem of lack of communication between layers of school hierarchy. This lack of effective communication comes with an attempt to operate a bureaucratic organization in a setting where congruent norms of behaviour are not sufficiently developed. Attempts to improve communications through bulletins, assemblies, suggestion boxes, school magazines and student councils were quite welcome since they make the bureaucratic machinery run more smoothly.

Githiari (1998) stated that students at the secondary level mostly expected their needs satisfied. The students at this level underwent a period of storm and stress, unlike their counterparts pupils in primary school who were at a more conformative age. The secondary school students therefore needed an opportunity given to them to voice their views and ensured justice was done to all of them regardless of their status in the school. He further indentified acceptance of Principals to the use of elaborate communication system and dialogue as of utmost benefits to both administration and
students. This was suggested to be done through the approval of Principals and the need of specific days during a school term where students and school administration met and shared views openly concerning the running of their school.

As schools became increasingly ethically, academically and socially complex organization expectations were that all who work within them made an active contribution to the development of effective schools through high quality professional practice. From the studies there was persuasive evidence that majority of teachers and students in schools would always choose to contribute fully to the development of more effective schools within cultures of collective purpose that valued them and the quality of their contribution (Vivian, 2003:137).

The autocratic leadership style in public schools reportedly seemed to be the cause of indiscipline problems in many secondary schools which lead to poor academic performance in National Examinations. Desire for students to be involved in the school administration had also risen due to the students and parents exposure and knowledgeable. The parents discussed various issues with their children who made them know their rights. There were school clubs in many secondary schools and other lobby groups which informed students of their rights also. Hence the students were aware of human rights abuse, child abuse and generally they knew their rights (Duze, 2005). Mbiti (1974) observed that many teachers had been given leadership without any formal preparation for it. This meant that lack of managerial and leadership skills resulted into poor school administration, which likely contributed greatly to the lack of students’ involvement. Effective communication was important in school administration as information was shared with all students.
To ensure effective and successful management, the school head teacher needed not only be innovative, resourceful and dynamic, but also interactive with people both within and outside school. These included the staff, students, parents, and members of PTA and many other members of the community all of whom needed to be brought into decision making processes (UNESCO, 2004). For the purpose of achieving success as a manager, the head teacher must have created an environment for participatory democracy in the running of the school. Students were an important aspect of the school management partnership. Students were in closer touch with each other through peer interaction (student prefects) than the staffs were with them, especially in boarding system. No schools could succeed without involving students’ prefects in some of the decision-making process (UNESCO, 2004) and even in the general school management.

Griffins (1993:67), reported that at Starehe Boys Centre most of the day-to-day organization and discipline of the school outside the classroom was done by prefects. They did it extremely well, leaving the teacher free to concentrate on academic duties. As just one example, the cleanliness of the Centre drew praise from every visitor. The cleaning was done by the boys, in accordance with a master drawn by senior prefects before term opens-a plan which divided grounds and buildings into portions. These made a fair allocation of boys to each portion and named prefects supervised them. No adult was involved at all and the system worked perfectly well, term after term, year after year.

Mbae (1992) observed that the organizational structure of the school must be democratized to allow meaningful participation of students in all school matters.
Students must be involved in the decision-making levels in all democratic processes of the school. He further stated that students must be encouraged to participate fully in management of their own affairs. Most importantly, they must be made to see that rights and responsibilities merge together and in all cases it must be recognized that democracy was a matter of practice, not theory and the best way to teach students to be democratic was to allow them to practice it.

Ogeno (1993) observed that practice of discipline in schools should be in terms of the freedom of the individual child. This could only be made possible if school rules were made with the interest of the learners at heart. He pointed out that the learners should be participants in the initial period of formulation of the rules. He also noted that the educational management styles should adopt a sense of authority and responsibility to the advantage of the learner and should respect the principles of democracy.

2.4 Students' Involvement in School Administration in Public Secondary Schools in Teso North Sub-County.

In a study conducted in urban schools in the state of Minnesota USA by Miller (1989), concluded that a substantial number of students did not feel that they were involved in the school decision-making processes. This went to counter the principle of participation, which asserted that the effectiveness of participation was realized where members feel that their influence was to some extent exerted and reflected on outcome. The study further revealed a strong desire by the students to be involved in important decisions at all times. The main areas of participation were found to be discipline, co-curricular activities and counseling duties.
Critchley (1999) in Bush 2003 undertook a study on the role of students in educational policy in Canadian school systems. The study was conducted at the school, district and departmental levels across Canada. He used questionnaires and document analysis as the methods of data gathering. His respondents included students, Principals and Directors of Education. From the data obtained on the perception of stakeholders on students' involvement in education policy making in Canadian school systems there was observed positive regard for students' participation. The respondents even suggested that students should be given a more formal role to play in the policy-making process. According to Bush (2003), students brought a positive practical point of view to policy development discussions. The study by Critchley (1992) in Bush 2003 indicated policies where students were involved in advising on policies dealing with school attendance, school time tabling, school fees, and students' dress code, supported the school discipline because they had a say in it. Their readiness to respect the organization of the school leads to the development of a new kind of relationship between the students and the teachers. There was mutual trust and interdependence and the staff and students worked better and appreciated one another's problems. As the students went through the school they saw in it life pattern of guidance in society. Webber (1981) reported similar findings in a study on students' satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the school administration in Illinois High Schools. This was due to the fact that the school administrators used participation to achieve their own ends.

A study by Pallet (1991) sought to document correlation between the involvements choices of secondary school students and their academic success and personal
satisfaction with the education programme. The instruments that were used to measure the involvement patterns and predictions were the Students Option Assessment (SOA). Subjects were ninth grade students in a 1989 high school setting. Stepwise regression and Spearman rank correlation studies were conducted using the self-report hours of involvement. The findings included strong positive correlation between high levels of involvement to schools organization programs, activities and improved grade point averages.

Every society has put immense responsibilities on the school. The reasons for this were that society was the major source from which the school received human and material resources. Society had a direct link to the school in that it had to have input in what was offered to the students during learning. The same society was the main consumer of school outputs. When the above ideas were considered, one realized that what society desired was that its citizenry should be appropriately reflected in the school (Powers and Powers, 1984).

Peters (1976) observed that Principals were the experts in all aspects of life and work of their schools. They were in charge of teaching, finance, accounting and recruitment. They must also control a diverse staff and a varied batch of students and moreover, mediate their institution and its personnel to wider community. The responsibility of Principals was to see that law and order prevailed. Not only was the responsibility of overall discipline the most important of the Principals charges, it was also one that he could not avoid and delegate. A Principal would be inspirational or there would be none, and if he/she failed in these respects, no other virtue would be of much value and kept the job under false pretences.
Prager (1993) noted that until very recently (1990s) the destiny of most schools was shaped by the autocratic decisions made by whoever was in command. Similarly, the achievement of many educational institutions had been found to be influenced by the leadership style of the management and administration team. The most effective leaders had been those individuals who were able to adapt their style of leadership behavior to the needs of the situation and the followers. She further noted that the leaders' behavior in any given instance was influenced greatly by the many forces operating within his or her own person.

Vivian (2003) on the leadership in cultures of school pupils' contributions in school administrations in Israel noted that the concept of one person with mastery of all school functions, curriculum, finance, personnel, assessment, external relations and site management with a detailed knowledge of statutory requirements was demonstrably obsolete. Leaders, who were acknowledged as individuals made positive contributions, would be successful and effective in cultures in which shared trust and mutual respect were central to all. Schools were to be successful and effective where the following principles were practiced routinely, not hereby exported through professional and collegial values. They included praise culture, team membership, professional growth, job security, comfortable work environment, recognition of personnel contribution, celebration of collective achievement, acceptance in self and others.

According to Vivian (2003) the complex qualitative and unpublished nature and interpersonal relationships between leaders and followers stimulated further study and research. It was clear during the early phase of the research that the power of
followers was a highly significant determinant in the existence of genuine leadership which had to be earned from others. With these insights earlier attitudes found in the literature on leadership discussing followers as powerless, unthinking, sheep-like, conformist; appeared to be entirely misconceived.

In Africa, Mwiria (1995) carried out a study in Eritrea on the challenges and constraints to effective primary schools management practice both at central and school level; the study revealed that, pupils were only involved in the making of decisions related to sporting activities, selection of monitors, and evaluation of teachers and identification of students in need of financial help as opposed to decisions related to academic curriculum. The directors interviewed reported that they found it particularly undesirable to involve pupils in the making of decisions touching on disciplinary cases. On parental involvement the study indicated that all the school directors did called for meeting of all parents with children in their schools and also invited parents to school open days. He noted that students' involvement in school administration had some positive aspects because students became more responsible when it came to the use of school property and were likely to be more committed to school activities such as co-curricular activities and also provided the information which helped in the promotion of good practices in school administration.

Based on a research on strategic intervention for quality improvement in South African schools by Christie and Potterson (1998), they noted that active involvement of students in discipline process was viewed as central to having long-lasting results. They added that co-creating discipline solutions contributed to ownership for the students which was a catalyst for long-term responsible behaviour.
In Nigeria a study on students and teachers participation in decision making in secondary schools indicated that to effectively attain an enabling environment for teaching and learning in secondary schools, Principals as the school administrators must possess a high level of imagination, vision and initiative as they exercise their authority in making decisions. This would demand that students among other stakeholders should be involved in decision making as much as the situation allows (Duze, 2007). She also noted that if school Principals continued with their autocratic leadership style, there was a likelihood that the benefits of participatory decision making would continue to elude the schools.

Okumbe (1998) defined management as the process of designing, developing and effecting organizational objectives and resources so as to achieve the pre-determined organizational goals. There had always been some form of management of organization since the ancient times of building the Egyptian Pyramids. But with the emergence of large industrial organizations of the industrial revolution there arose the need for the development and systematic study of management of rising up organizations. According to Okumbe (1998), Human Relations Theorists believed that there would be work performance efficiency if all the workers were included not only in the production section but even in the decision-making process. He further observed that an effective leadership style allowed for greater organization flexibility and responsiveness to environmental changes providing away to coordinate the efforts of diverse groups within the institution and facilitating membership and personal satisfaction.
According to the National School Health Policy (2009), on responsibilities of the child, students included who are the future of the country and should therefore be brought up into responsible adults. Every child should have a responsibility towards his/her family, society and the state. Therefore, they should be guided to work for cohesion of the family, serve their national community, and preserve and strengthen the spirit of dialogue, consultation and independence.

Kisangu (1990) noted that the school administration very often practiced tyranny in the name of discipline, they tried to confine students’ behaviour and to influence their way of thinking by the use of rules and other bureaucratic controls. The assumption being that allowing student’s greater say in the running of their own affairs was seen as a threat to the administration. Moreover, in the same study 71 percent of the school directors interviewed stated that they did not involve students in decision-making because involving students would make them over-confident and proud.

With coming of independence in Africa the advent of democracy in society saw the position of the school gain prominence. In Africa’s continent the 1960’s had the enrolment going up just like everywhere else in the world, students’ involvement in school administration become noticeable from different people’s opinion. There was already an attitude on who was in control. The adults were to be in control of the young at all times, so that “A good child was the one who did what he/she was asked to do without question. A bad child was the one who went against or questioned established rules” (Mbiti, 1974:77) such inconsideration of students’ opinion and views was an old scheme of discipline which was autocratic. This in many ways acted as an obstacle in solving of conflicts in schools leading to students strikes. Students
produced from such schools were also deprived of democratic ideas and practice. Eshiwani (1993), said that schools discipline must be maintained at all times because it was only when there was discipline that proper learning could be expected to take place. Griffins (1996) likewise supported the above view by saying that good discipline brought good results in every field of school endeavors.

2.5 Principals and Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes towards Prefects

Authority in Public Secondary Schools Administration

Fielding and Rudduck (2000), described what students had to say about teaching and learning which may be feared as personally challenging or as threatening to the institution. A strategy of the fearful was to limit student comment to aspects of school life which were seen as relatively safe or which do not have significant impact on the work of adults within the school, but what students talked about injustices that they experienced or observed in the school usually they had no power to act on at the time. Secondary school management was a collective responsibility and it was expected that school administration, teachers and students corporate for effective execution of the same. Jeasen and Walker (1989) noted that the important internal forces that affected leaders were their value system, how strongly they felt that individuals should have shared in making the decisions which affected them, the relative importance that they attached to organizational efficiency, personal growth of subordinate and organizational profits. Mcmanus, (1989) expressed that Principals played a critical role in determining the stakeholders contributions and effective implementation of polices in a school set up. This depended on the attitude they hold towards them, if they believed the stakeholders are crucial partners then they would widen action space.
Duze, (2007) on the same issue recommended that school Principals should avoid making sole and emotional decisions that were detrimental to optimum goal attainment. Principals needed to gather all available data or information concerning a matter to be decided upon from the ideas, knowledge, opinions, and suggestions of their students and other members of the school and should make them understand that their inputs count in making administrative decisions. This way, the prevalent autocratic decision-making process in schools would be cast aside and school systems would begin to enjoy the benefits entrenched in participatory decision-making.

The processes of administration are carried out within specified areas of operation in a school setting. Specific activity areas defined the tasks that an educational administrator performs. The Principal as chief administrator in the school and other educational administrators at various levels had each of the following task areas: (i) Curriculum and instruction; (ii) Students’ personnel. This included determining goal and purposes, designing and developing courses, organizing learning activities promoting changes and improvements in curriculum and instruction, supervising teaching-learning activities. There were services to students to keep them healthy and motivated to learn. They included; administering admission and attendance services, organizing classes, maintaining students’ records, reporting students’ progress, guidance and counseling, maintaining students’ discipline and supervising students’ activities, ensuring students are healthy and provision of proper nutrition.

The purpose of participation was to open up the decision making process without irrevocably separating it from responsibility for making sure that educational objectives were made. In this case Principals should return to their function of
approving decisions and policies, students or teachers consulted do not have final authority over decisions to be enacted (Powers, 1984). A Principal should exercise caution as to how and when to allow for participation, in essence participation should not be construed to mean the involvement of students teachers and parents in all decision-making instances in the school. The Vroom and Yelton model (1993) had provided the following guidelines, on how participation should be utilized: (i) Where an administrator does not have information to solve a problem alone; (ii) Where the nature and dimensions of the problems are unclear; (iii) Where the group members shared the leaders goal in solving a problem; (iv) Where the decision or problem at hand was more important to the students, teachers or parents; and (v) Where students, teachers and parents had strong desires to exercise their own judgment.

Participatory management ensures, higher quality decisions, because they were made by groups instead of individuals. Jensen and Walker (1989) argued that it increased communication among the stakeholders, including B.O.M, Principals, parents, community and students. Drury and Levin (1994) stated that participatory management contributed to intermediate outcomes which in turn had the potential to lead to better students’ achievement. The four outcomes were increased efficiency in use of resources, increased professionalism of teachers, implementation of curriculum reform and increased community engagement. The researcher concurred with the above findings and that was why the study had to be carried out in Teso North Sub-County, Busia County.

According to the Basic Education Act, 2013 of the Laws of The Republic of Kenya, the B.O.M was empowered to manage the institution’s affairs in accordance with the
rules and regulations governing the occupational safety and health. The Principal or person acting in that capacity was the Chief Executive of the B.O.M. The Principal performed some of the management functions in an effort to implement educational policies. He/she planned, coordinated, directed and controlled the school programmes to ensure that the goals of the school were achieved. The Principal also combined his knowledge in management skills and dynamic leadership to effectively and efficiently implement the schools programmes. This would only be possible if students are involved in the programme decision.

Eshiwani (1993) in support of this view on the role of the head teacher said: "In order for the head teacher to succeed in their work they should therefore possess knowledge in management. However, this was not always the case. Sometimes good classroom teachers were appointed to the position of Principals without formal training in management and this led to a lot of managerial problems."

According to Gatheya (1992), students were more likely to cooperate with their school directors and prefects if they were happy with the school environment in which they operated. It was the responsibility of the Principals to make every effort to ensure that students feel comfortable and happy within the environment of the school in order to enhance good students' achievement.

He further argued on the same matter, that secondary school students had been known to take responsibilities vested on them with scruples of adults although they were not adults in the real sense. This made their involvement in school management look quite easier. For any efforts on students' involvement in school administration to bear
fruit the Principal should be a facilitator of participatory administration in school. Muchiria (1998) in his study concluded, that when students were encouraged to take part in school administration, they learnt to cultivate democratic attitudes, right attitude to work and a sense of belonging to both the school and the society. The school created a platform for airing students' opinion on matters that affected their welfare with students' involvement as youth speak out.

Siringi (2010) in the Daily Nation during the 35th Kenya Secondary School Heads Association (KSSHA) annual conference where secondary heads were urged to give their students a greater say and recognize their contributions and enormous talents of young people in the running of institutions. However, this right to play a role in decision-making must be balanced with responsibilities. Wangeri (1986) asserted that if the majority of prefects were selected based on clear guidelines and given the authority by teachers and Principals in the schools they would always choose to contribute effectively to the management of schools, within cultures of collective purpose.

2.6 Summary of Literature Review

School administration was a participatory process involving various stakeholders in the community. All the members of an organization were important players in the running of that organization without whose involvement in an organizations administration may hamper its efficient and effective management. The role of students in the leadership of the school was recognized in educational administration in the world over. This was a role that had not been implemented in many areas. Effective administration of the school was in consultation with subordinates and
students working with and through them. It was suggested from the literature review that school Principals should delegate their responsibilities to school members and involve students in matters that were relevant and of importance to them. Studies have shown that leader-member relationship contributed to the success in the school. Working through these people in the school, educational organizational objectives become possible to achieve. How students viewed their Principals’ leadership styles determined whether to cooperate with the school administration or not. Many a time students had resorted to unrest to protest against dictatorships and autocratic leadership styles. Decisions taken by anybody at all can have short and long-term effects on the lives of those concerned. When all concerned are not sufficiently involved in decisions that affect them directly or indirectly, the implications could be far-reaching for educational system and society. This study provided more knowledge on the areas where students needed to be involved in administration for effective management and whether characteristics of Principals such as age and professional experience contributed to the level at which they involved students in the administration of the school.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter discussed research design, area of study, study population; sampling techniques sample size and, research instruments, procedure and methods of data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

The study employed a descriptive survey research design. Descriptive survey research designs are used in preliminary and exploratory studies to allow the researcher to gather information, summarize, present and interpret for the purpose of clarification (Orodho, 2002). Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) on the other hand gave the purpose of descriptive research as determining and reporting the way things are. Borg and Gall (1989) noted that descriptive survey research is intended to produce statistical information about aspects of education that interest policy markers and educators. The design was preferred as a result of financial constraints; and focused on data rather than theory. In this case, it was possible to administer the data collection tools to the respondents in their workstations or classrooms, which was relatively easy and played a great role in increasing the response rate. This design was chosen because of its flexibility in the field. It enabled the researcher to collect as much information from the respondents as possible within the shortest time possible and reported the way things are without manipulating any variables. Questionnaires were issued to Deputy Principals with ease and collected on completion and the interview with Principals followed.
3.2 Study Area

The study area was carried out in public secondary schools in Teso North Sub-County, Busia County in Kenya. The Sub-County borders Busia on the West and Teso South on the South both Sub-Counties in Busia County, Bumula and Cheptais Sub-Counties of Bungoma County on the East and North respectively. Teso North and South Sub-Counties were divided by the Great North Road running from Bungoma to Malaba. The Sub-County was basically inhabited by the Ateso community. The main crops grown were tobacco, maize, millet and cassava. There was also large scale and small scale traders given the Sub-County’s proximity to the Kenyan Malaba border town. Singleton (1993), advised that the ideal setting for any study should be easily accessible to the researcher and should be that which permits instant rapport with the informants. Teso North Sub-County was chosen because it was within reach by the researcher. The Sub-County had a total of 25 public secondary schools in which there was two (1) girls’ day, two (2) girls’ boarding, no boys’ day school, two (2) boys’ boarding and 20 mixed day secondary schools. The Sub-County had a total enrolment of 3,261 boys, 2,832 girls, among them 1300 student prefects, 99 male teachers and 43 female teachers (Sub-County’s Education Office, 2009).

3.3 Target Population

Target population was defined as all members of a real or hypothetical set of people, events or objects to which a researcher wishes to generalize the results of the research study (Borg and Gall, 1989). According to Orodho (2005), a target population constituted all the items or people under consideration in any field of inquiry. The study population consisted of 1 (one) District Quality Assurance and Standards
Officer (DQASO), 25 Principals, 25 Deputy Principals and 1300 prefects in public secondary schools in Teso North Sub-County (Ministry of Education Science and Technology, 2009). Therefore the total population for the study was 1351.

3.4 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

3.4.1 Sampling Techniques

Sampling means selecting a given number of subjects from a defined population as representative of that population. Any statement made about the sample should also be true of the population (Orodho, 2002). Simple random sampling technique was used to select Principals, Deputy Principals and prefects. The study used simple random sampling technique as it offered each and every item in the population an equal chance of inclusion in the sample (Orodho, 2005). The researcher used purposive sampling technique to get one (1) DQASO officer. Purposive sampling was used as it involves selecting samples using set criteria (Orodho, 2005).

3.4.2 Sample Size

Orodho (2009) observed that due to limitations in time, funds, and energy, a study can be carried out from a carefully selected sample to represent the entire population. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) postulates that in most social sciences research studies, a sample study of at least 30% of the population is a good representation. Therefore this study used at least 30% and above of every category of population selected as shown in Table 3.1. Out of 25 Principals 21 were sampled, out of 25 Deputy Principals, 21 were sampled, and out of 1300 student prefects, 390 were sampled and one DQASO was selected through purposive sampling. For this study from 1351 members of the target population, the researcher used proportional sampling to select the 433 respondents. Table 3.1 presented the data.
### Table 3.1 Showing the Target Population and Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Number sampled</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Prefects</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQASO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1351</strong></td>
<td><strong>433</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Researcher, 2009*

### 3.5 Research instruments

The study adopted the following three main research instruments.

1. **Questionnaires**

The questionnaires were important for this purpose in order to obtain comparable responses. According to (Kombo and Trompe, 2006), a questionnaire measures likelihood of straight, even, blunt answers. Orodho (2005) stressed that a questionnaire enables the researcher to preserve respondents' anonymity and allows greater uniformity in the way questions were asked and thus ensured greater compatibility in the responses. The researcher was able to get in depth information from respondents within a short period. This was superior to an interview because social communication operates strongly in a face of situation that may prevent the person from expressing what he/she feels to be socially or professionally unacceptable views. The questionnaires contained both closed and open items.

a) **Questionnaire for Deputy Principals**

The questionnaire for Deputy Principals was designed to elicit information on involvement of students in secondary school administration for effective management
of secondary schools. Part one of the questionnaire elicited demographic data and personal data. The second part was designed to elicit respondents' views on prefects' involvement in school administration. This part of the questionnaire was designed on a 5 Likert rating scale. On each item respondents were required to indicate their views on prefects' involvement in school administration. The administrative areas covered were curriculum and instruction and students' personnel. Part three of the questionnaire consisted of open ended items with other aspects of the school administration that were not addressed in part one and two. This was shown in Appendix 4.

b) Questionnaire for student Prefects

The questionnaire for student prefects was developed to elicit data on their involvement in secondary school administration within their schools. Part I of the questionnaire elicited demographic data of the respondents. Part II elicited data on respondents' views on their involvement in public secondary school administration. This part of the questionnaire was designed on Likerts ratings scale method of attitude measurement (Likert, 1970). On each item the respondents were required to indicate their views on their involvement in public secondary schools administration. Part III of the questionnaire consisted of open-ended items dealing with other aspects of school that were not addressed in part one of the questionnaire. This was shown in Appendix 3.

2. Interview Schedule

According to (Orodho, 2009), an interview is an oral administration or an interview schedule. In this study the interview questions were used in order to find out the activities student prefects are involved in and the challenges that Principals
experience while involving students in administration. Unstructured interviews were used as guides with a general plan that the interviews followed collection of data. Because of the open nature of unstructured interview probing was commonly used to get deeper information.

a) Interview Schedule for Principals

Interview schedules were used to guide interviews conducted with Principals on factors affecting students’ involvement in secondary school administration. The schedule contained items covering all objectives of the study. It was aimed at gathering views and feelings of the Principals on student prefects’ involvement in secondary school administration. The Principals were taken through an in-depth interview schedule to establish prefects’ role in public secondary school administration, described the processes used in selection of the prefects and its value to secondary school administration. The schedule consisted of 8 structured and unstructured items on the selection of prefects in secondary school administration and their involvement. It also consisted of frequency of checking prefects’ suggestion boxes and the effectiveness of interventions on the issues raised. The open-ended items of unstructured questionnaires gave the interviewer more freedom to probe beyond the answers. This was shown in Appendix 5.

b) Interview Schedule for The District Quality Assurance and Standards Officer (DQASO)

The DQASO was interviewed to get data on the level of prefects’ involvement in secondary school administration within the Sub-County. The schedule consisted of structured and unstructured items on the selection of prefects in secondary school administration and their involvement. The open-ended items of unstructured
questionnaires gave the interviewer more freedom to probe beyond the answers. The method was also interactive and enabled the researcher to cover the phenomenon under investigation in great depth (Mwanje, 2001). The interview aimed at establishing the DQASOs opinion on prefects’ involvement in school administration. This was shown in Appendix 6.

3. Observation Schedule

This method implies the collection of information by way of own investigation without interviewing the respondents (Orodho, 2005). The observation schedule had items to be observed by the researcher that enhanced students’ involvement in secondary school administration. The items to be observed included students Council office/Prefects meeting room, presence and situation of suggestion boxes, prefects duty rota and students notice board. This was shown in Appendix 2.

3.6 Pre-testing/Piloting

Before actual data for the study was collected, the researcher piloted the questionnaires and interview schedules in four (4) public secondary schools in Teso North Sub-County as follows: One boys’ Boarding school, one girls’ Day school, one girls’ Boarding, one Mixed Boarding and Day school which were not included in the final study population. From each of the four secondary schools four (4) Principals, four (4) Deputy Principals and 40 student prefects were randomly selected for the pilot study. Therefore the pilot study participants were 48 members who were within the required cases for conducting statistical analysis as recommended by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003). The piloting ensured clarity and sustainability of the language used. According to Orodho (2009), pilot study is a mini experiment designed to test
logistics and gather information prior to a larger study, in order to improve the latter's quality and efficiency. The purpose of this pre-testing assisted to find out any weaknesses that were contained in the instruments. The piloting also enabled the researcher to ascertain the validity and reliability of the instruments. The data was compiled, analyzed by use of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) programme of computing. The results were then used to revise the instruments ambiguities and irrelevancies which were then corrected, to enhance validation of instruments.

3.6.1 Validity of Research Instruments

Validity refers to the extent to which research instrument could accurately be interpreted and generalized. In other words validity is the degree to which results obtained from analysis of data actually represents the phenomena under study. Validity is a non-statistical method used to validate the content employed in the questionnaire (Orodho, 2005). Best and Khan (2005) suggested that validity of instruments is asking the right question framed from the least ambiguous way. Kombo and Tromp (2006) emphasized that validity is the degree to which test measures what is supposed to measure. The validity of the instruments was sought from the supervisors and lecturers in the Department of Education Planning and Management Kenyatta University in charge of the study and other leading experts in the field of research. The aim was to determine whether the items were adequate in content and logically arranged. They were requested to examine the research tools for content validity, the researcher incorporated in the instruments input from the graduate research supervisors before being administered.
3.6.2 Reliability of Research Instruments

Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yielded consistent results or data after repeated trials (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The researcher employed the test retest method of estimating reliability. This was carried out by piloting the instruments in four public secondary schools in Teso North Sub-County according to their strata. The same instruments were administered to the same respondents after a week. The results were obtained and the data was coded and analyzed by the use of SPSS instrument of data analysis. The relationship between the results of the test retest in the study was compared using the Pearson product moment correlation co-efficient in order to establish the extent to which the contents of the questionnaire were consistent in eliciting the same responses as suggested by (Orodho.2005). It was determined by the use of Cronbach’s Alpha a general form of Kinder-Richardson (K-R) 20 formulae according to Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) to assess inconsistency in a more reliable manner. The following formula was used to calculate reliability:

\[
KR = \frac{(K-R)S^2 - ES^2}{(S^2)(K-1)}
\]

KR = Reliability coefficient of internal consistency

K = Number of items used to measure the concept

ES^2 = Variance of all scores

S^2 = Variance of individual items

The results showed a correlation coefficient of 0.85 score which was considered high enough to judge that the instruments as reliable for the study.
3.7 Data Collection Procedures

A research permit was obtained from the National Council of Science and Technology (NCST) before embarking on the study. This permit authorized the researcher to carry out field work. Subsequent clearance to carry out the study was obtained from the Sub-County Education Officer, Teso North Sub-County, Busia County and visits to various schools were subsequently made. The population sample for this study was 433 respondents sampled from public secondary schools in Teso North Sub-County. The respondents comprised of Principals, Deputy Principals, student prefects and DQASO. The study employed a descriptive survey research and this enabled the data to be analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative data analysis for this study. The timely readiness of research instruments was crucial. Therefore the research made sure that the research instruments were completed and readily available. Piloting was an important prerequisite. Therefore the researcher made sure that before data collection all the instruments were pre-tested.

The Principals who constituted the respondents were institutionally based implying that the heads of the selected schools automatically participated in the study. The researcher directly administered the questionnaires to respondents. The interviews were conducted immediately after the questionnaire had been administered. The interviews took place in the office of the school Principals, Deputy Principals and DQASO.
3.8 Methods of Data Analysis and Presentation

Data analysis refers to examining what has been collected in survey or experiment and making deductions and inferences. It involved uncovering underlying structures, extracting important variables, detecting any anomalies and testing any underlying assumptions Orodho, (2009). Data was analyzed using qualitative and quantitative methods. Gray (2004) observed that qualitative data provides rich descriptions and explanations that demonstrate the chronological flow of events as well as often leading to chance findings. Quantitative data was subjected to coding (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). Coding was done to convert data into numerical form to check and avoid loss of information. Code books for questionnaires were constructed where numbers were assigned to the subjected responses and classified into categories (Orodho, 2003).

Data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), and presented in tables of frequencies (f) and percentages (%) and means, pie-charts and graphs. Qualitative data was compared and grouped according to sub themes and was used to elaborate various findings of the quantitative data. This was then interpreted to come up with findings and draw conclusions about the study in secondary schools. Gray (2004) observed that qualitative data provided rich descriptions and explanations that demonstrated the chronological flow of events as well as often leading to chance findings. Key issues arising from qualitative data were summarized and used in assisting to understand the quantitative data obtained. The data analyzed were used to write the report on the basis of the objectives of the study.
Table 3.2 Summary of Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objectives</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine whether demographic information (age and professional experience) of Principals affected the involvement of students in public secondary school administration.</td>
<td>Demographic information (age and professional experience).</td>
<td>Prefects involvement in school administration</td>
<td>Pearson correlation coefficient and descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess the communication channels between prefects and the administration in public secondary schools.</td>
<td>Communication with students.</td>
<td>Prefects involvement in school administration</td>
<td>Description statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess the extent to which the prefects in Teso North Sub-County were involved in public secondary school administration.</td>
<td>Extent of prefects involvement in administration.</td>
<td>Prefects involvement in school administration</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish Principals' and teachers' perceptions and attitudes towards prefects authority in public secondary schools administration.</td>
<td>Perception and attitude of Principals and teachers towards prefects authority.</td>
<td>Prefects involvement in school administration</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2013
3.9 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

(a) Logistical Considerations

The research involved a lot of funds in terms of making trips to the selected schools in Teso North Sub-County which has a rough terrain and schools were far apart. Also funds were used in terms of printing, typing, binding, consultations and photocopying. In such circumstances it was advisable to tighten the budget in order to maximize the expenditure without distorting the whole exercise. The factor of time was very crucial since the distances between the schools were far and also accompanied by poor terrain. The scope of this study allowed for 100% collection of data, because it was my duty working station. The study entailed involvement of Principals and their deputies and student prefects and DQASO. This therefore required clearance from the Education Supervisors for the researcher to carry out research on factors affecting students' involvement in secondary school administration. Research assistants were involved in administration of the questionnaires especially for the prefects and hence needed facilitation. In the event a questionnaire was not completed it entailed making phone calls to find out about the progress.

(b) Ethical Considerations

The Ethical considerations in this study were enhanced by the respondents being informed of the purpose and importance of the study so as to make voluntary and informed decision as they took part in this study. They were assured of respect of their views and confidentiality on any information they gave related to the study on ‘Factors that Affected Students’ Involvement in Public Secondary School Administration in Teso North Sub-County, Busia County.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter was divided into two main sections. Section one presented demographic data for the respondents. The second section presented the results of the study which were organized along the research questions of the study. The research question would be first posed and then the data relating to that research question would be presented. This would be followed by a summary statement of the conclusion of the study in regard to the question.

4.2 Research Question One: Does the Principals Demographic Information (professional experience and age) affect the Student Prefects Involvement in Public Secondary School Administration?

4.2.1 Demographic information (professional experience) of the Principals and Deputy Principals
The study selected 21 Principals and 21 Deputy Principals of public secondary schools who were interviewed to generate the data. The duration the Principals had stayed in their stations was reported using descriptive statistics and the findings showed that 12 (56.2 percent) out of 21 Principals interviewed had been in their stations between two to three years. While 8 (30.1 percent) had been in their stations between four to six years and only 1 (4.8 percent) reported they had been in their stations for over seven years. This indicated that the Principals had stayed in their stations long enough to influence student prefects involvement in school
administration. The Deputy Principals were asked the same questions and their responses were similar to what the Principals had reported. That is out of the 21 Deputy Principals sampled only 10 (47.7 percent) had been in their stations between two to three years, 8 (35.1 percent) reported they were there between four to six years and lastly 4 (9.1 percent) reported that they had been there for more than seven years. The school Principals and their deputies had been in their schools long enough to influence students' involvement in school administration hence, empowering the prefects in decision making.

4.2.2 Demographic Information (age) of the Principals.

The researcher wanted to find out whether the demographic information (age) of the Principals affected students' involvement in school administration. The age of the Principals were as shown in Figure 4.1
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Source: Researcher, 2013

Figure 4.1 Demographic Information (age) of the Principals
According to Figure 4.1, the majority 11 (52.4 percent) of the Principals reported that they were between 36 and 50 years, while 8 (38.1 percent) indicated that they were 51 and above years and only a small number of 2 (9.5 percent) Principals indicated they were between 25 and 35 years. This implied that most Principals were in the middle age bracket. Hence they were well grounded in the organization and gave accurate information on the research topic. These findings conformed to Richard (2007) who suggested that with maturity school managers should be more wise and knowledgeable on school administration to determine the running of school, decision making on students and staff development and other facilities. The researcher concurred with the literature review. The researcher then having found out the age of the Principals in the sampled schools went ahead to find out from the students and the Deputy Principals whether this had any bearing on the administrators involving student prefects in school administration. Table 4.1 showed the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Prefects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2013
From Table 4.1 on opinion of Deputy Principals and student prefects on whether age of Principals affected the involvement of students in Decision Making in schools and the results indicated that out of the 21 Deputy Principals, majority 18 (85.7 percent) indicated that the age of the Principals had a lot of bearing on the student prefects involvement in school administration. While a very small number 3 (14.3 percent) reported that the Principals age had no bearing. Students’ responses were similar to those of the Deputy Principals as an overwhelming majority of students 268 (78 percent) out of 350 reported that the age of the Principals had a lot of bearing on the prefects involvement in school administration in their schools and only 82 (22.0 percent) prefects reported that the age of the Principal had no bearing. These findings then indicated that the age of the Principals therefore had an influence on the prefects’ involvement in school administration as indicated by the findings from the deputies and the student prefects. This translated to the fact that older Principals had less involvement of the prefects in school administration despite the fact that they knew the schools very well and were in a position to involve the prefects in decision making in school administration. The researcher wanted to find out whether the age of the prefects mattered in their choice of prefect involvement in school administration. Figure 4.2 represented the age of prefects.
Figure 4.2 Age of the Student Prefects Involved in Administration of Public Secondary Schools

According to Figure 4.2, on age of the student prefects involvement in school administration of public secondary schools, majority of student prefects in the sampled schools 194 (56.5 percent) out of 350 indicated that the age of the prefects was a big issue when it came to prefects involvement in school administration since most prefects involved were in the age category of 20 and above years. While 105 (30 percent) prefects reported they were of 15 to 20 years who were involved in matters of administrations in schools and only 51 (14.3 percent) indicated that they were of age 15 and below and involved in school administration. Indeed from these findings the age of the prefects mattered when it came to choosing of prefects in a school. Schools preferred mature students to younger ones as prefects. The findings are not in agreement with Wangeri (1986) who asserted that if the majority of prefects were selected based on clear guidelines and given the authority by teachers and Principals in the schools they would always choose to contribute effectively to the management of schools, within cultures of collective purpose. The researcher was in agreement with the literature review as lack of clear criteria in prefects’ selection could lead to ineffective solutions to student problems as a result of poor leadership.
4.3 Research Question Two: How did Communication Channels between Student Prefects and School Administration (Principals) Assist in Public Secondary School Administration?

4.3.1 Using Suggestion Boxes in Schools

Principals of schools were expected to establish and maintain communication channels to empower students in their school environment, to raise concerns, grievances and access support concerning administration of schools and academics. Students were expected to utilize suggestion boxes to freely express their feelings and views about school issues. According to the guidelines in school policy on management of public schools, all schools were required to avail these boxes in places where they were easily accessible to students. Also according to The Basic Education Act, 2013 there should be promotion of the protection of the right of the child to participation, protection, development and survival. The researcher therefore sought to find out whether this facility was available in school. Table 4.2 represents the responses on the availability of suggestion boxes in schools.

Table 4.2 Availability of the Suggestion Boxes in Schools as Reported by Deputy Principals and Student Prefects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Prefects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2013
According to Table 4.2, the majority 18 (85.7 percent) out of the 21 Deputy Principals used in this study indicated that suggestion boxes were available in their schools and a small number 3 (14.3 percent), reported that they were not available. Surprisingly, the students report was quite different as the majority of students 250 (71.4 percent) out of 350 reported that suggestion boxes were not available in their schools and only 100 (28.6 percent) reported that they were available. Unfortunately for the school administrators the observation report carried out from the field was similar with the student prefects’ position that the availability of the crucial communication tool was inadequate. This reflected laxity on the part of some Principals to comply with that requirement, of providing suggestion boxes for their schools. A characteristic of a responsive school was to take serious involvement of students in school matters. This study revealed that there was insufficiency of this facility in most schools. These study findings were in agreement with what (Shaeffer, 1992) who stated that for participation to be realized two prerequisites should be met. First, the members of the organization must be motivated to participate by opening channels of communication through indicators like suggestion boxes, open barazas, meetings among others. Motivation cannot be realized without the need for participation being seen as a genuine and conscious effort from an administration. This was made possible through involving students in decision making not just in petty issues of school but also in matters concerning Co-Curricular activities, choosing student’s representation democratically, discipline cases in relationship to school rules and regulations that govern students. Second, the students should be exposed and sensitized on their needs and rights through active Participation in certain administrative instances in management.
Prefects and students were expected to use the suggestion boxes to communicate to the teachers on the matters concerning management of the school or issues that affected them either directly or indirectly. The study went out to further ascertain whether the suggestion boxes were functioning so as to assess the effect on prefect's involvement in management of the schools. Figure 4.3 represented students' responses on use of suggestion boxes.

**Figure 4.3 Student Prefects' Response on the Use of the Suggestion Boxes**

Figure 4.3 on student prefects’ response on the use of the suggestion boxes indicated that an overwhelming majority of 265 (75.1 percent) out of 350 prefects in this study had never made use of the suggestion boxes to express themselves probably because they were not availed. Only 51 (14.9 percent) prefects reported having used suggestion boxes and a negligible number 34 (10.0 percent) reported they always made use of suggestion boxes. The implication of this finding was that, students
rarely communicated with their teachers on administration issues. This was because, suggestion boxes that were to be used as a tool of communication were either missing or where they were available, they were rarely put to good use by the students probably because action by administrators was never connected to them. This was a serious reflection on the communication process. It meant that students’ rarely gave opinions on issues dealing with administration since though some boxes were available in schools, few students made use of them. These findings were in disagreement with Githiari (1998) who indentified acceptance of Principals to the use of elaborate communication system and dialogue as of utmost benefits to both administration and students. This was suggested to be done through the approval of Principals and the need of specific days during a school term where students’ and school administration met and shared views openly concerning the running of their school.

Once students wrote letters or notes expressing their feelings or fears about their academics and school administration, it was vital that they get their response within the shortest time possible. The researcher conformed to the literature review. This study further sought information from the Deputy Principals on how frequent they accessed suggestion boxes to address students’ views and issues and gave a feedback. The results were reported in Figure 4.4 below.
Figure 4.4 Frequency of Accessing the Suggestion Boxes to Read Students’ Views on Issues of School Administration

Figure 4.4 above reflected the frequency of accessing suggestion boxes by Deputy Principals to get students’ views on administration of the school affairs. Out of the 21 Deputy Principals who were interviewed only 1 (4.3 percent) reported that they opened suggestion boxes to read students’ views weekly followed by 4 (18.2 percent), who reported they opened fortnight and 6 (23.8 percent) reported opening per term. A greater number 10 (44.7 percent) reported they never did it. This meant that even when students wrote their views to administrators they were rarely accessed by teachers and especially the Deputy Principal who were the link between the students and the staff. Secondary school students’ therefore needed an opportunity be given to them to voice their views and ensured justice was done promptly to all of them regardless of their status in the school. The findings did not conform with Githiari (1998) who identified acceptance of Principals use of elaborate communication system as of utmost benefits to both administration and students. This could be done

Source: Researcher, 2013
through the approval of Principals on specific days during a school term. Hence, students and school administration met and shared views openly concerning the running of their schools affairs. The researcher concurred with the idea of having elaborate communication between students and administration to minimize on misunderstanding and reduce unrest of students within the school.

4.4 Research Question Three: What was the Extent to which student Prefects in Teso North Sub-County were Involved in Public Secondary School Administration?

Prefects' involvement in Public Secondary Schools administration was very important since it was believed that they assisted academic and social development by advising students on matters that dealt with running of the school and provided the link between the administrators and students. According to the Basic Education Act, 2013 Section 4 (1) there should be promotion of good governance, participation and inclusiveness of parents, communities, private sector and other stakeholders students inclusive in the development and management of basic education. The researcher therefore wanted to find out the extent to which students are involved in management of school programmes. The findings were reported in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3 Student Prefects’ Involvement in the Running of Administrative Programmes in the School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head Teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Researcher, 2013

From table 4.3 above nearly half 183 (52.3 percent) out of 350 of the prefects reported that students did not actively participated in administrative programmes while 167 (47.7 percent) indicated that they were involved. On the same matter of administrative programmes out of 21 Principals interviewed a greater number of 15 (71.4 percent) reported that they allowed students to participate while only 6 (28.6 percent) indicated that they did not involve students. Similarly, a majority of Deputy Principals of 17 (81 percent) out of 21 agreed that student prefects were allowed to participate while only a small number of 4 (19 percent) felt they did not allow students to participate in administrative programmes. The disparity in percentage response between prefects and teachers reflected the conflict between the two sides as students felt cheated out of decision making while teachers would like to guard their authority. The teachers seemed to subscribe to the proverbial philosophy that given an inch of ground, students would thereafter take a mile by asking to participate in all
areas of decision making even those considered confidential. The figures however, pointed to involvement of students in those welfare issues like monitoring the adherence to bells and noisemaking in class during preps time among others which were considered safe for the students to be involved as they affect them directly. These findings were not consistent with Critichley’s (1992), who indicated that students should be involved in advising on policies dealing with school attendance, school timetabling. Having established the extent of students’ involvement in administrative programmes the researcher sought to find out whether prefects were involved in matters of finances in school and the responses were shown in table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4 Student Prefects’ Involvement in Deciding on Financial Matters in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial activities</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Payment of Levies</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing school Property</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Fees</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the Above</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


From table 4.4, student prefects’ involvement in deciding on financial matters in school showed that student prefects were rarely involved in deciding on the financial matters of the school. For out of 350 prefects interviewed a majority of 204 (58.3 percent) reported none involvement in all the choices given in financial matters. This was followed by 78 (22.3 percent) who reported that they were involved in matters
dealing with purchasing school property and another number 33 (9.4 percent) and 22 (6.3 percent), reported that they were involved in making decisions about mode of payment of levies and increasing of fees respectively. A smaller number, 13 (3.7 percent) reported that they were involved in all of the above activities about finances. The findings implied that students were mainly involved in the purchase of those items that they used. These findings did not agree with several literature reviews, Huddleston (2007) who felt that students should be involved in all areas of school life. He further suggested that there was a tendency among some administrators to define the issues which affect students quite narrowly to playgrounds, toilets among others when students should be consulted in all areas and be given a leeway in forming committees. Also Lori (1995) who recommended the team approach to administration to change prefects’ attitude towards school leaders and this made them more committed to school goals to enhance effective management.

The researcher further sought to find out the extent to which students’ were involved in management of discipline in schools. The researcher therefore asked the respondents to state the ways in which they handled offenders in their schools. The findings were reported in table 4.5, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefects Involvement in Discipline Cases</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deal with the problem at their level only</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with the problem but report to the teacher</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with the problem but forward to the administration</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with the problem but forward to the Senior Prefect</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Researcher, 2013*
The responses from Table 4.5 on student prefects' involvement in matters of discipline in schools showed that 99 (28.3%) out of 350 prefects reported that they dealt with issues of punishment and forwarded to teachers, while another 91 (26.0%) reported they dealt with the problems and forwarded to the administration these issues included petty offenses like neatness, sanitation, among others. This was followed by 58 (16.6%) who stated that they dealt with the problems and forwarded to senior prefects while 55 (15.7%) reported that they handled the problems alone at their level and however only 47 (13.4%) reported all of the above applied for them. These findings did not conform to Griffins (1993), who affirmed that at Starehe Boys Centre most of the routine day-to-day organization and discipline of the school outside the classroom was done by prefects leaving the teacher free to concentrate on academic duties. For instance, the cleanliness of the Centre drew praise from every visitor and this was an area where prefects were empowered to handle. Eshiwani (1993), also observed that schools discipline must be maintained at all times because it was only when there was discipline that proper learning could be expected to take place. Further, Students were more likely to cooperate with their school Principals and prefects if they were happy with the school environment in which they operated (Gathenya, 1992). The researcher agreed with the literature review as students should not passively receive instructions and behave in accordance to the instructions from teachers. The study further sought information on the way student prefects' handled discipline issues in their schools especially serious cases and table 4.5 showed the responses.
In Table 4.5 above a majority of 135 (38.6 %) out of 350 prefects reported that they were hardly allowed to deal with cases related to punishing student. Only 58 (16.6 %) reported that they were allowed moderately to deal with cases that involved suspension and serious cases that involved expulsion were rare and only 47 (13.4 %) reported that they were highly involved. However, 110 (31.4 %) reported that they were not at all involved in meting out punishment to students. This therefore meant that in cases of suspension and expulsion prefects were hardly involved because they touch on the rights of the students. This was in line with Government of Kenya (GOK), (2001) which reported that many secondary schools in the past had been involved in strikes hence, The Basic Education Act 2013 Section 3 (p) of the Laws of Kenya, that states elimination of gender discrimination, corporal punishment or any form of cruel and inhuman treatment or torture. Section 35 (1), (3) of the same Act states that pupils should be given appropriate incentives to learn and complete basic
education. Subject to this the Cabinet Secretary may make regulations to prescribe expulsion or discipline of a delinquent pupil for whom all other measures had been exhausted and only after such a child and parent or guardian had been afforded an opportunity of being heard. The researcher further sought to find out whether students were involved in decision making about involvement in community service like cleaning, visiting the sick and community education among others. The responses were as shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 Student Prefects' Involvement in Decision Making about Community Service in the School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prefects</th>
<th>Deputy Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Responses from Table 4.6 above, on student prefects' involvement in decision making about community service in school indicated that only 70 (20.0 percent) out of 350 prefects reported that they were always involved. This was followed by 79 (22.6 %), who said that they sometimes got involved and the majority 201 (57.4 %) reported that they did not get involved in matters concerning community work. Similarly out of 21 Deputy Principals interviewed from the sampled schools, only 4 (19.0 %) reported that prefects were always involved in decisions about community service, followed by 6 (28.6 %) who reported that sometimes they involved prefects and a majority of 11
(52.4 %) reported that they never involved prefects in decision making about community service in the school. The findings from both prefects and Deputy Principals were in agreement that students’ involvement in decision making on issues dealing with community work was minimal. These was in disagreement with Muchiri (1998), who had reported that when students were encouraged to participate in the school administrative matters they learnt to cultivate democratic attitudes towards work and had a sense of belonging in the society. This was made possible through the process of delegation starting from the Deputy Principal down to the prefects. The findings were also in disagreement with the National School Health Policy (2009), on responsibilities of the child, students included who are the future of the country and should therefore be brought up into responsible adults. Every child should have a responsibility towards his/her family, society and the state. Therefore they should be guided to work for cohesion of the family, serve their national community, preserve and strengthen the spirit of dialogue, consultation and independence. The researcher was in agreement with the literature review because students should be made aware of their responsibilities in the society.

The researcher went further to find out whether the prefects were involved in decision making in other crucial management areas that were in school activities such as: affairs of Guidance and Counseling (G and C), staffing and Co-Curricular activities. Table 4.7 represented responses on prefects’ involvement in crucial management areas in school.
Table 4.7 Prefects’ Involvement in Decision Making in Crucial Management areas of School Activities like G and C, Staffing and Co-Curricular Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Curricular issues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Deputy Principal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing issues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Deputy Principal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G and C issues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Deputy Principal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2013

According to Table 4.7, majority of the respondents 250 (71.4 %) out of 350 prefects indicated that they always got involved in decisions about Co-Curricular activities, 39 (11.1 %) indicated that they sometimes got involved in making decisions while 61 (17.6 %) reported that they did not get involved in matters concerning Co-Curricular. The same question was put to Deputy Principals of the sampled schools and their responses were as followed out 21 interviewed only 4(19.1 %) reported that prefects
were always involved in decisions about Co-Curricular, followed by 7 (33.3 %) who reported that prefects were never involved and the majority 10 (47.6 %) reported that prefects were sometimes involved in decisions about Co-Curricular activities in the school. These findings implied that most prefects were therefore involved in decision making about Co-Curricular activities perhaps because this were matters touching on students welfare. though some schools flouted this requirement and students were coerced to participate in certain activities and not others of their choice.

On the issue of staffing the response was quite different as all 350 (100 %) prefects in this study responded that they were never involved. All the 21(100 %) Deputies Principals were categorical that prefects were never involved in matters of staffing. This implied that prefects were excluded in decision making in certain administrative tasks in order to safeguard the teachers authority. Teachers were answerable to the Teacher Service Commission (TSC) the body that deals with matters of staffing. These findings concurred with Mwiria (1995), in his study on prefect's involvement on staffing matters which he concluded that it was particularly undesirable to involve pupils in the making of decisions touching on the teachers.

The issue of Guidance and Counseling was rather different as a greater number of prefects 197 (56.3%) out of 350 indicated that they were never consulted on matters concerning Guidance and Counseling, followed by 135 (38.6%) who reported that, they were sometimes involved and a small number 18 (5.1%) reported as always being involved. Out of the 21 Deputy Principals when asked to comment on this, only 4 (19.1%) reported that prefects were always involved in decisions about Guiding and Counseling, followed by 7 (33.3 %) who reported that prefects were never involved.
and the majority 10 (47.6 %) reported that prefects were sometimes involved in decisions about Guiding and Counseling in the school. These findings were in agreement with Mwiria (1995), who carried out a study in Eritrea on the challenges and constraints to effective primary schools management practice at school level. The study revealed that, pupils were only involved in the making of decisions related to sporting activities, selection of monitors, and evaluation of teachers and identification of students' in need of financial help as opposed to decisions related to academic curriculum because of fear of making prefects lack respect for their teachers in a school where discipline was rare.

The study sought to find out from prefects the mode of choosing prefects in their schools. Their responses were presented in Figure 4.6 below.

![Selection of Prefects in Public Secondary Schools](image)

**Source:** Researcher, 2013

*Figure 4.6 Selections of Prefects in Public Secondary Schools*
In Figure 4.6, a majority of prefects 188 (53.7%) out of 350 in this study indicated that Selection of prefects in their schools was by teachers only followed by 73 (20.9%) who indicated that Selection was done by Students’ only and 51 (14.6%) reported that Selection was by Students and teachers while a small number 38 (10.8%) reported that outgoing prefects selected the incoming prefects as they did not get involved at all in matters concerning selections of prefects. This therefore meant that the teachers selected prefects of their choice regardless of students’ interest indicating that students lacked the necessary expertise to warrant their involvement in prefect selection alone. The researcher sought to find out the mode of voting for the prefects and the responses were as followed in Table 4.8, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Mode of Voting for the prefects by students’</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns followed by secret Ballots only</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns followed by vetting from teachers</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns followed by Secret Ballots then vetting from teachers</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers voting among themselves</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Researcher, 2013

In Table 4.8, on the mode of voting for prefects by students, a majority of 134 (36.6%) out of 350 prefects in this study indicated that the mode was by campaigns followed by vetting from teachers and only 73 (22.0%) indicated that election of prefects was carried out by campaigns followed by secret ballot. Other 109 (31.4%)
indicated that election was done by campaigns followed by secret ballot then vetting from teachers, while a small number 34 (10.0 %) reported that Teachers only decided on the choice of prefects without involving students. From these findings it was clear that prefects campaigned and those who passed were again vetted by teachers. This did not agree with a study by Kibunja, (2004) on school students' attitudes to Principals’ participatory leadership style in public secondary schools in Kikuyu division, Kiambu district in Kenya, where the study recommended that students must be made aware on how to elect or to be elected to serve on various decisions making committees through sessions like the Guidance and Counseling and students participation manual to integrate students participation with a sense of responsibility.

4.5 Research Question Four: What were the Principals’ and Teachers’ Perception and Attitude Towards Prefects’ Authority in Involvement in Public Secondary School Administration?

Students’ were expected to be free to air their views through school barazas and learn to be responsible. The school also created a platform for airing students’ opinion on matters that affected their welfare, which enabled students to speak out freely. The researcher wanted to find out whether prefects were allowed to conduct public meetings in which they reported the issues touching on students’ welfare to the school administration. The findings were as reported in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9 Frequency of Having Open Air Meetings to Discuss General School Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Prefects</th>
<th>Deputy Principal</th>
<th>Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per week</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per fortnight</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per month</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per term</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2013

Results from Table 4.9, indicated a majority of 124 (35.4%) out of 350 prefects reported that they never held meetings in schools to discuss issues concerning them, followed by 93 (26.5%) who indicated that they sometimes held ‘barazas’ per term and 73 (20.9%) indicated it was per month. While 38 (10.9%) reported they held meetings once per fortnight and a very small number of 22 (6.3%) indicated that they held barazas per week. The same question was put to the Deputy Principals of the sampled schools. Their responses were as followed, none of the Deputy Principals interviewed indicated their schools never held barazas in schools, the majority 7(33.3%) reported that they held barazas once per term, followed by 6 (28.6 %) who indicated they were involved in holding barazas per month and per fortnight respectively. And a very small number 2 (9.5 %) reported that this happened once per week. The same question was put to the Principals of the sampled schools and their responses were as followed, none of the Principals interviewed indicated their schools never held barazas in schools, a majority of 7 (33.3%) reported that they held barazas
once per week, followed by 5 (23.8%) who indicated they were involved in holding barazas per month and per fortnight. And a very small number 4 (19.1%) indicated this happened once per term. This meant that prefects in most schools were not allowed a free hand in handling school matters as the administration still had an upper hand in prefects’ decision on their leadership in schools which implied that the prefects are still at the mercy of the school administration. This did not agree with (Siringi, 2010) who reported in Daily Nation during the 35th Kenya Secondary School Heads Association (KSSHA) annual conference in which the Principals were urged to give their students a greater say and recognize their contributions and enormous talents of young people in the running of institutions. However, this right to play a role in decision-making must be balanced with responsibilities. These findings also did not agree with Summers and Johnsons (1995), who explained the way power equalization increased communication among the stakeholders students inclusive, in bid to improving commitment, support of school goals, leading to better performance. (Drury and Levin, 1994) also explained that at the school level, Principals were key figures in fostering shared, governance within the school. Hence by sharing responsibility and authority, they increased accountability for programmes performance.

The prefects were further asked to explain how satisfied they were with prefects system functioning in their schools and their responses were displayed in Figure 4.7 below.
As depicted in Table 4.7 above, a small number of the prefects 47 (13.4%) out of 350 reported that they were highly satisfied with the prefect system in their schools while 58 (16.6%) reported that they were satisfied and a great number 135 (38.6%) indicated being Dissatisfied with the prefect system in their schools while 110 (31.4%) reported Not Sure about functioning of prefect system in their school. These findings therefore, meant that the teachers had complete control of the student prefects’ involvement in prefect systems and functions in the school. This was not in line with the European School Union (ESU) (2009), which stated that the role of students was particularly central when discussing, integrating student’s involvement in the management of teaching and learning, which in the end largely depended on the interaction of the teachers and students. The researcher concurred with the literature review on integration of all participants in the management of the school for all to have a sense of belonging and ownership.
4.6 Interview Schedule for informants

4.6.1 District Quality Assurance and Standards Officer (DQASO)

The information from the DQASO interview revealed that a majority of the schools about 18 (85.7%) involved the student prefects in activities such as sanitation, maintaining cleanliness, adherence to the school bells and formulation and implementation of school rules among others. Rarely were student prefects involved in school fees, budgets, discipline of staff, interviewing of staff, and formulation of nature of punishment for students among others. It was taken like students should participate in matters affecting them directly and discussions should be left to the experts who were teachers for students lacked the necessary expertise. In majority 18 (85.7%) of the schools teachers were majorly involved in the process of prefect selection leaving out students choices.

4.6.2 School Principals

Principals interviewed a majority of them 17 (81%) out of 21 indicated that prefects in their schools were appointed by teachers but only a small number 4 (19%) reported that prefects were elected by fellow students and teachers vetted them. This implied that teachers still had an up hand in prefect leadership in the schools. The Principals interview on the activities for the students concurred with those of the DQASO as majority of them 18 (85.7%) stated that students should only be involved in those welfare issues that concerned them directly. This was because teachers needed to guard their authority as students are still immature and needed a lot of guidance. This confirmed that most of the schools were very authoritarian and the overall result was encouraged dependence rather than independence.
4.7 Observation Schedule

With the observation schedule 12 (57.1%) of the schools did not have prefects meeting rooms which meant prefects rarely met as team with the administration to discuss the running of the institutions. A few of the schools 9 (42.9 %) had the rooms allocated to the prefects but inside the rooms there was no indication of any meeting taking place as some were converted to keep the broken chairs and desks. Suggestion boxes were only available in 15 (71%) out of 21 schools and most of these were placed near the Deputy Principals offices or near the staff room. This discouraged students from using them since they would fear to be victimized by the teachers who may see them drop notes in the boxes. For the student notice boards, a few 5 (23.8%) schools had availed them though some were permanently locked with padlocks and others were in bad states. This implied that students could not freely access the student notice boards just like the rest of the notice boards and air their views without alerting the administration.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This study was aimed at finding out factors that affected students' involvement in Public Secondary School Administration in Teso North Sub-County, Busia County. This chapter is divided into the following sub-sections namely: Summary of research findings, conclusions drawn and recommendations based on the conclusions and were presented below.

5.2 Summary of the Study Findings.

The summary of research findings are presented according to the research questions stated in chapter one.

Findings from Research Questions

5.2.1 Did the Principal's Demographic Information (Age and Professional Experience) Affect Student Prefects' Involvement in Public Secondary School Administration?

The findings showed that:-

i) Twelve (56.2 percent) out of 21 Principals interviewed had been in their stations between two to three years. While 8 (30.1 percent) had been in their stations between four to six years and only 1 (4.8 percent) reported they had been in their stations for over seven years.

ii) Out of the 21 Deputy Principals sampled only 10 (47.7 percent) had been in their stations between two to three years, 8 (35.1 percent) reported they were
there between four to six years and lastly 4 (9.1 percent) reported that they had been there for more than seven years.

iii) The majority 11 (52.4 percent) of the 21 Principals reported that they were between 36 and 50 years, while 8 (38.1 percent) indicated that they were 51 and above years and only a small number of 2 (9.5 percent) Principals indicated they were between 25 and 35 years.

iv) On opinion of Deputy Principals and student prefects on whether age of Principals affected the involvement of students in Decision Making in schools and the results indicated that out of the 21 Deputy Principals, majority 18 (85.7 percent) indicated that the age of the Principals had a lot of bearing on the student prefects involvement in school administration. While a very small number 3 (14.3 percent) reported that the Principals age had no bearing.

v) Students' responses were similar to those of the Deputy Principals as an overwhelming majority of students 268 (78 percent) out of 350 reported that the age of the Principals had a lot of bearing on the prefects involvement in school administration in their schools and only 82 (22.0 percent) prefects reported that the age of the Principal had no bearing.

vi) On age of the student prefects involvement in school administration of public secondary schools, majority of student prefects in the sampled schools 194 (56.5 percent) out of 350 indicated that the age of the prefects was a big issue when it came to prefects involvement in school administration since most prefects involved were in the age category of 20 and above years. While 105 (30 percent) prefects reported they were of 15 to 20 years who were involved in matters of administrations in schools and only 51 (14.3 percent) indicated that they were of age 15 and below and involved in school administration.
5.2.2 How did the Communication Channel between Prefects and the Administration Assist in Administration of Public Secondary Schools

i) The majority 18 (85.7 percent) out of the 21 Deputy Principals used in this study indicated that suggestion boxes were available in their schools and a small number 3 (14.3 percent), reported that they were not available. Surprisingly, the students report was quite different as the majority of students 250 (71.4 percent) out of 350 reported that suggestion boxes were not available in their schools and only 100 (28.6 percent) reported that they were available.

ii) On student prefects’ response on the use of the suggestion boxes indicated that an overwhelming majority of 265 (75.1 percent) out of 350 prefects in this study had never made use of the suggestion boxes to express themselves probably because they were not availed. Only 51 (14.9 percent) prefects reported having used suggestion boxes and a negligible number 34 (10.0 percent) reported they always made use of suggestion boxes.

iii) The frequency of accessing suggestion boxes by Deputy Principals to get students’ views on administration of the school affairs. Out of the 21 Deputy Principals who were interviewed only 1 (4.3 percent) reported that they opened suggestion boxes to read students’ views weekly followed by 4 (18.2 percent), who reported they opened fortnight and 6 (23.8 percent) reported opening per term. A greater number 10 (44.7 percent) reported they never did it.
5.2.3 What was the Extent to which Prefects in Teso North Sub-County were involved in Public Secondary Schools Administration?

i) Nearly half 183 (52.3 percent) out of 350 of the prefects reported that students did not actively participated in administrative programmes while 167 (47.7 percent) indicated that they were involved.

ii) On the same matter of administrative programmes out of 21 Principals interviewed a greater number of 15 (71.4 percent) reported that they allowed students to participate while only 6 (28.6 percent) indicated that they did not involve students. Similarly, a majority of Deputy Principals of 17 (81 percent) out of 21 agreed that student prefects were allowed to participate while only a small number of 4 (19 percent) felt they did not allow students to participate in administrative programmes.

iii) Student prefects’ involvement in deciding on financial matters in school showed that student prefects were rarely involved in deciding on the financial matters of the school. Out of 350 prefects interviewed a majority of 204 (58.3 percent) reported none involvement in all the choices given in financial matters.

iv) This was followed by 78 (22.3 percent) who reported that they were involved in matters dealing with purchasing school property and another number 33 (9.4 percent) and 22 (6.3 percent), reported that they were involved in making decisions about mode of payment of levies and increasing of fees respectively. A smaller number, 13 (3.7 percent) reported that they were involved in all of the above activities about finances.

v) On student prefects’ involvement in matters of discipline in schools showed that 99 (28.3%) out of 350 prefects reported that they dealt with issues of
punishment and forwarded to teachers, while another 91 (26.0) reported they dealt with the problems and forwarded to the administration these issues included petty offenses like neatness, sanitation, among others. This was followed by 58 (16.6%) who stated that they dealt with the problems and forwarded to senior prefects while 55 (15.7%) reported that they handled the problems alone at their level and however only 47 (13.4%) reported all of the above applied for them.

vi) A majority of 135 (38.6%) out of 350 prefects reported that they were hardly allowed to deal with cases related to punishing student. Only 58 (16.6%) reported that they were allowed moderately to deal with cases that involved suspension and serious cases that involved expulsion were rare and only 47 (13.4%) reported that they were highly involved. However, 110 (31.4%) reported that they were not at all involved in meting out punishment to students.

vii) On student prefects’ involvement in decision making about community service in school indicated that only 70 (20.0 percent) out of 350 prefects reported that they were always involved. This was followed by 79 (22.6%), who said that they sometimes got involved and the majority 201 (57.4%) reported that they did not get involved in matters concerning community work. Similarly out of 21 Deputy Principals interviewed from the sampled schools, only 4 (19.0%) reported that prefects were always involved in decisions about community service, followed by 6 (28.6 %) who reported that sometimes they involved prefects and a majority of 11 (52.4 %) reported that they never involved prefects in decision making about community service in the school.

viii) Majority of the respondents 250 (71.4%) out of 350 prefects indicated that they always got involved in decisions about Co-Curricular activities, 39 (11.1%)
indicated that they sometimes got involved in making decisions while 61 (17.6%) reported that they did not get involved in matters concerning Co-Curricular. The same question was put to Deputy Principals of the sampled schools and their responses were as followed out 21 interviewed only 4 (19.1%) reported that prefects were always involved in decisions about Co-Curricular, followed by 7 (33.3 %) who reported that prefects were never involved and the majority 10 (47.6 %) reported that prefects were sometimes involved in decisions about Co-Curricular activities in the school.

ix) On the issue of staffing the response was quite different as all 350 (100%) prefects in this study responded that they were never involved. All the 21 (100%) Deputies Principals were categorical that prefects were never involved in matters of staffing.

x) Guidance and Counseling was rather different as a greater number of prefects 197 (56.3%) out of 350 indicated that they were never consulted on matters concerning Guidance and Counseling, followed by 135 (38.6%) who reported that, they were sometimes involved and a small number 18 (5.1%) reported as always being involved. Out of the 21 Deputy Principals when asked to comment on this, only 4 (19.1%) reported that prefects were always involved in decisions about Guiding and Counseling, followed by7 (33.3 %) who reported that prefects were never involved and the majority 10 (47.6 %) reported that prefects were sometimes involved in decisions about Guiding and Counseling in the school.

xi) A majority of prefects 188 (53.7%) out of 350 in this study indicated that Selection of prefects in their schools was by teachers only followed by73 (20.9%) who indicated that Selection was done by Students’ only and 51
(14.6%) reported that Selection was by Students and teachers while a small number 38 (10.8%) reported that outgoing prefects selected the incoming prefects as they did not get involved at all in matters concerning selections of prefects.

xii) On the mode of voting for prefects by students, a majority of 134 (36.6%) out of 350 prefects in this study indicated that the mode was by campaigns followed by vetting from teachers and only 73 (22.0%) indicated that election of prefects was carried out by campaigns followed by secret ballot. Other 109 (31.4%) indicated that election was done by campaigns followed by secret ballot then vetting from teachers, while a small number 34 (10.0%) reported that Teachers only decided on the choice of prefects without involving students.

5.2.4 What were the Principals’ and Teachers’ Perceptions and Attitudes towards Prefects Involvement in Public Secondary Schools Administration?

i) A majority of 124 (36.4%) out of 350 prefects reported that they never held meetings in schools to discuss issues concerning them, followed by 93 (26.5%) who indicated that they sometimes held ‘barazas’ per term and 73 (20.9%) indicated it was per month. While 38 (10.9%) reported they held meetings once per fortnight and a very small number of 22 (6.3%) indicated that they held barazas per week.

ii) The same question was put to the Deputy Principals of the sampled schools. Their responses were as followed, none of the Deputy Principals interviewed indicated their schools never held barazas in schools, the majority 7 (33.3%) reported that they held barazas once per term, followed by 6 (28.6 %) who
indicated they were involved in holding barazas per month and per fortnight respectively. And a very small number 2 (9.5 %) reported that this happened once per week.

iii) The same question was put to the Principals of the sampled schools and their responses were as followed, none of the Principals interviewed indicated their schools never held barazas in schools, a majority of 7 (33.3%) reported that they held barazas once per week, followed by 5 (23.8 %) who indicated they were involved in holding barazas per month and per fortnight. And a very small number 4 (19.1 %) indicated this happened once per term.

iv) A small number of the prefects 47 (13.4%) out of 350 reported that they were highly satisfied with the prefect system in their schools while 58 (16.6%) reported that they were satisfied and a great number 135 (38.6%) indicated being Dissatisfied with the prefect system in their schools while 110 (31.4%) reported Not Sure about functioning of prefect system in their school.

5.2.5 Findings of Interview Schedule

i) The information from the DQASO interview revealed that a majority of the schools about 18 (85.7%) involved the student prefects in activities such as sanitation, maintaining cleanliness, adherence to the school bells and formulation and implementation of school rules among others. Rarely were student prefects involved in school fees, budgets, discipline of staff, interviewing of staff, and formulation of nature of punishment for students among others

ii) In majority 18 (85.7 %) of the schools teachers were majorly involved in the process of prefect selection leaving out students choices.
iii) The Principals interview on the activities for the students concurred with those of the DQASO as majority of them 18 (85.7%) stated that students should only be involved in those welfare issues that concerned them directly.

5.2.6 Findings of Observation Schedule

i) With the observation schedule 12 (57.1%) of the schools did not have prefects meeting rooms which meant prefects rarely met as team with the administration to discuss the running of the institutions. A few of the schools 9 (42.9%) had the rooms allocated to the prefects but inside the rooms there was no indication of any meeting taking place as some were converted to keep the broken chairs and desks.

ii) Suggestion boxes were only available in 15 (71%) out of 21 schools and most of these were placed near the Deputy Principals offices or near the staff room.

iii) For the student notice boards, a few 5 (23.8%) schools had availed them though some were permanently locked with padlocks and others were in bad states.

5.3 Conclusion

5.3.1 Determined whether Demographic Information (age and professional experience) of Principals Affected the Students’ Involvement in Public Secondary School Administration:

Most of the Principals were mature enough and had long professional experience with the schools sampled and could easily involve the prefects in school administration. According to the findings school Principals did not involve prefects in administration issues and therefore they embraced authoritarian leadership which had a negative impact on student prefects’ involvement. Based on their age and professional
experience also school Principals simply ignored the prefects’ contribution in administration. Prefects on the other hand were limited in the involvement in school administration based on teacher–students’ relation. This prompted most prefects to be unable to function as per the responsibility vested on them in running the school.

5.3.2 Assessed the Communication Channels between Prefects and the Administration in Public Secondary Schools

The communication channels between the prefects and the school administration were not quite smooth as crucial communication tools like suggestion boxes were missing in most schools and where they were available they were rarely accessed by the students or opened by the school administration. Students were expected to utilize suggestion boxes to express freely their feelings and views about school issues. In most of the schools where suggestion boxes were availed were placed near the Deputy Principals office who also happened to be in-charge of discipline. Following this situation the students were never free to access the tools. Also in some schools issues raised by the students were not well or fully handled by the school administration and this further discouraged students to continue using the tools. Students in some cases were expected to append their names on the issues they have raised and for fear of victimization by the teachers; students opted not to use the availed suggestion boxes. According to the guidelines in school policies on management of public schools, all schools are required to avail these boxes in places where students can access them freely without fear. Open air meetings were rarely held between the students and school administration as indicated by the findings. The school administration felt insecure involving prefects in administrative matters implying lack of prefects’ empowerment. While prefects on the other hand felt sidelined in school
administration as they were not given proper channels through which they could air their issues.

5.3.3 Assessed the Extent of Prefects in Teso North Sub-County Involvement in Public Secondary schools Administration

From the findings the students’ involvement in secondary school administration in Teso North Sub-County was low. Most schools partially involved prefects in school administration. This meant that prefects in most schools were not allowed a free hand in handling school matters as the administration still had an upper hand in prefects’ decision on their leadership in schools which implied that the prefects are still at the mercy of the school administration. The principals did not involve prefects in school administration issues for they did not trust prefects’ involvement in decision making in school administration matters which implied that schools were run by the school administrators alone. Prefects lacked the empowerment from the administrators for they felt insecure with them having any knowledge on these issues and hence prefects could not effectively participate school administration.

5.3.4 Established Principals’ and Teachers’ Perceptions and Attitudes towards Prefects Authority in Public Secondary Schools Administration

The school Principals and teachers still had an influence on the prefects’ leadership. They compromised prefects and selected their own choices. The school Principals did not empower the prefects to exercise their leadership skills freely.

The school administration still had a hand in prefects’ decision making on students’ leadership; hence, the prefects were under the control of the school administration.
That meant student prefects were compromised in the sense; that those vetted for the positions were the school administration choices. Students’ issues through prefects were influenced by administrators to suit the school administration and not the students’ needs. The school administrators and teachers therefore did not trust in the authority vested in the prefects to fully allow them participate in school administration.

Based on the study findings, it was concluded that students and prefects were not involved in school administration as required and this impacted negatively on the smooth running of the institutions.

5.4 Recommendations

The following recommendations were made based on the findings and the conclusions of the study:

i) There was need for administrators to be inducted in school administration as regarded prefect involvement in school administration. Formation of students’ councils should be encouraged in all the schools to create a platform of students airing their views and opinions. However, a right to participation in school administration by student prefects should not be interpreted as freedom from rules and regulations of the school.

ii) The administrators’ perception about the students involvement in school administration should be boosted by allowing students to openly air their views in barazas, open days and assemblies. Suggestion boxes should be availed in all schools in appropriate places where prefects and students can access them freely without fear of being implicated by the administration or teachers. Also the
boxes should be promptly opened by teachers and issues raised by students addressed promptly and appropriately to encourage continuous use by all students.

iii) The study also recommended that school Principals should fully involve students in school administration especially in election of their own leaders and other issues concerning administration to have a smooth running of the institutions where information flowed in all directions. Principals can create positive attitudes towards the school administration by being role models and actively be involved in creating awareness about all in school being valued, hence no fear.

iv) There was need for the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology to put in place policies for monitoring and follow up mechanisms on functioning of schools especially students and prefects' involvement in public secondary school administration to counter the negative perceptions and attitudes towards the latter's involvement in school administration and empowerment. Schools should utilize set feedback on their administration and take advantage of positive attitudes of some of the students to encourage them to participate in school administration.

v) The school Principals should endeavor to adhere to the Basic Education Act, 2013 to ensure prefects were allowed to participate and encouraged to have independent critical thinking, cultivate skills, disciplines and capacities for reconstruction and development in secondary school administration.
5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

The following suggestions were made based on research findings and conclusions:

- The study was restricted to Public Secondary schools in Teso North Sub-County and the researcher recommended that another study can be carried out in other categories of schools like private secondary schools.

- A thorough study needed to be carried out on the role of Ministry of Education, Science and Technology in Monitoring and evaluating the students’ involvement in secondary school administration and enforce the set guidelines to avoid unrest among students.
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APPENDIX I: LETTER OF TRANSMISSION

WALEMA, BARNETT
KENYATTA UNIVERSITY,
P.O BOX 43844 NAIROBI
Date ................2013

TO THE TEACHERS
C/O
SUB-COUNTY EDUCATION OFFICER,
TESO NORTH Sub-County
P.O BOX 42, AMAGORO.

REF: PERMISSION TO CARRY OUT A RESEARCH ON THE TOPIC:
FACTORS THAT AFFECT STUDENTS’ INVOLVEMENT IN PUBLIC
SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

I am a student of Kenyatta University, undertaking a Masters of Education degree. I am carrying out a research entitled, *Factors that Affect students’ Involvement in Public Secondary School Administration in Teso North Sub-County Busia County*, Kenya. The study involves administering questionnaires and interview schedules to the principals, Deputy Principals and the prefects. I kindly request you to allow me to administer the questionnaires to enable me to obtain data for the study.

Yours faithfully,

WALEMA, BARNETT N.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Things to observe</th>
<th>Available ( ) Not Available( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students’ council Offices</td>
<td>Available ( ) Not Available( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects Meeting Room</td>
<td>Available ( ) Not Available( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion box</td>
<td>Available ( ) Not Available( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records in Students’ office of their activities</td>
<td>Available ( ) Not Available( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records in Administration office showing Prefects Duty Rota.</td>
<td>Available ( ) Not Available( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Notice Board</td>
<td>Available ( ) Not Available( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PREFECTS

The purpose of this research is to establish the Factors that Affect students' Involvement in Public Secondary School Administration in Teso North Sub-County Busia County, Kenya. Your responses on these questions will be of help for this study will be treated with a lot of confidentiality. Please, indicate the correct option as honestly and correctly as possible.

SECTION A

Background Information

Demographic and other characteristics of respondent

1. Please indicate your chronological age in years by ticking in the appropriate box provided below
   
   12 – 14 [ ]
   15 – 18 [ ]
   19 – 21 [ ]
   22 and Above [ ]

2. Indicate below, your class
   
   Form 1 [ ]
   Form 2 [ ]
   Form 3 [ ]
   Form 4 [ ]

3. What is the category of your school?
   
   Girls’ day [ ]
   Girls’ boarding [ ]
   Mixed day [ ]
   Boys’ boarding [ ]
   Boys’ day [ ]
4. a) The following statements are an expression on certain aspects of school management. Beside each statement is a 5 point scale from which you are to select your most appropriate feeling to the statement. Put a tick (✓) on one of the five alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge gained in prefect involvement is important to schools goals</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefects involvement assists in discipline of the schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining subject areas for individual students’ e.g. choice of subjects a student’s is to specialize in, scares most prefects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is advisable for a head teacher to hold discussions with prefects during the making of the academic timetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) In case where a note is placed in the suggestion box whose content head teacher does not agree to, the author (students’) should be punished

**Communication between Administration and Prefects Enhances Students’ Involvement in Administration:**

5. Are suggestion boxes available in your school .............................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................................................................................

6. Do you write letters or suggestions about issues concerning the school administration? .................................................................

..................................................................................................................................................................................

7. Frequency of Having Meetings to Air Fellow Students’ Views

a) Are there special days in your school when the students’ prefects and school administration come together and discuss matters affecting the school?

Yes [ ] No [ ]
b) If yes in a) above approximately how many times a week, month or terms do such meetings take place? Fill in the approximate times in the box provided below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Briefly explain how such meetings are conducted

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

9. For the following statements put a tick (✓ ) against the alternative you feel is most appropriate

a) What is the degree of students’ participation in the selection of prefects in your school?
   No participation [ ]
   Some informal participation [ ]
   Strong consultation [ ]
   Actual election [ ]

b) What criteria does your school use to elect or appoint the prefects in your school?

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................


c) In your opinion, what is the amount of participation which prefects have in the organization and running of the school?
   Should be greatly increased [ ]
   Is not much as desirable [ ]
   Is much as desirable [ ]
   Is somewhat more than desirable [ ]
d) How much do prefects participate in the running and organization of your school?

- A great deal [ ]
- A moderate amount [ ]
- Only a little [ ]
- Almost None [ ]

e) What benefits do you get by involving students’ in the administration of your school?

Extant of Prefect Involvement in Public School Administration

10. a) Students’ Involvement in Decision Making in Crucial Management areas of School Activities like G&C, Staffing and Co curricular Activities: ..............

b) Do your Prefects Participate in Choosing Evaluating and Monitoring of Academic Programmes? .................................................................

11. In your school is it acceptable to have prefects leading you in participation in school and community communal labor decision e.g. students’ to have a say in activities that school and school neighborhoods can work together in.

If yes, how frequent do Prefects in your school get Involved in Decisions in Community service in the school. (Choose one)

- Always [ ]
- Sometimes [ ]
- Never [ ]
12. Students’ Involvement in Decision Making in Crucial Management areas of School Activities like G&C, Staffing and Co curricular Activities:

a) Co-curricular issues (please tick one)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Staffing issues (please tick one)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) G&C issues (please tick one)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The following table shows some of the ways of choosing prefects in schools. How do Students’ choose their Prefects in your school? (please tick one)

| Selection by teachers only |   |
| Selection by Students’ only |   |
| Selection by teachers and Students’ |   |
| None of the Above |   |

14. The following table shows some of the modes of voting prefects in schools. How do Students’ vote for their Prefects in your school? (please tick one)

| Campaigns followed by secret Ballots only |   |
| Campaigns followed by vetting from teachers |   |
| Campaigns followed by Secret Ballots then vetting from teachers |   |
| None of the Above |   |
15. State how Prefects in your school are Involved in matters of punishment in Schools.

**Prefects’ involvement in discipline cases (please choose one)**

- Deal with the problem at their level only  [ ]
- Deal with the problem but report to the teacher  [ ]
- Deal with the problem but forward to the administration  [ ]
- Deal with the problem but forward to the Senior Prefect  [ ]
- All of the above  [ ]

**School Administrations and Teachers’ Perceptions on Prefects Authority in public Secondary Schools Administration**

Knowledge gained by prefects’ participation in school administration is of importance to the students’ after school

16. Dialogue in school between prefects and the head teacher is of benefit to the organization and running of the school and should be allowed through developed communication channels do you agree YES/ NO (Please tick one)

Briefly State why? ............................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................

17. In which other areas do you think prefects need to be consulted before decisions are made? ............................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................

**Thank you for your cooperation**
APPENDIX IV: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DEPUTY PRINCIPALS
IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The purpose of this research is to establish the Factors that Affect student' Involvement in Public Secondary School Administration in Teso North Sub-County Busia County, Kenya. Your responses on these questions will be of help for this study will be treated with a lot of confidentiality. Please, indicate the correct option as honestly and as correctly.

SECTION A

Background Information

Demographic and other characteristics of respondent

1. Please indicate your chronological age in years by ticking in the appropriate box provided below
   - 25 and below [ ]
   - 26 - 35 [ ]
   - 36 - 45 [ ]
   - and Above [ ]

2. What is the category of your school?
   - Girls' day [ ]
   - Girls' boarding [ ]
   - Mixed day [ ]
   - Boys boarding [ ]

Communication between Administration and Prefects Enhances Students’ Involvement in Management:

3. a) Are suggestion boxes available in your school
   b) Do you write letters or suggestions about issues concerning the management?

4. Frequency of Having Meetings to Air Fellow Students’ Views
   a) Are there special days in your school when the students’ prefects and school administration come together and discuss matters affecting the school?
      Yes No
b). Approximately how many times a week, month or terms do such meetings take place? Fill in the approximate times in the box provided below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Briefly explain how such meetings are conducted ..............................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................

5. For the following statements put a tick ( ) against the alternative you feel is most appropriate

a) What is the degree of students’ participation in the selection of prefects in your school?
   No participation [ ]
   Some informal participation [ ]
   Strong consultation [ ]
   Actual election [ ]

b) What criteria does your school use to elect or appoint the prefects in your school?

..........................................................................................................................................


c) In your opinion, the amount of participation which prefects have in the organization and running of the school?
   Should be greatly increased [ ]
   Is not much as desirable? [ ]
   Is much as desirable? [ ]
   Is somewhat more than desirable [ ]

d) How much do prefects participate in the running and organization of your school?
   A great deal [ ]
A moderate amount [ ]
Only a little [ ]
Almost None [ ]

e) What benefits do you get by involving students’ in the administration of your school?

Extend of Prefect Involvement in Public School Administration.

6. What is the extent of Students’ Involvement in Decision Making in Crucial Management areas of School activities like G&C, Staffing and Co-curricular.

7. Do your Prefects Participate in Choosing, Evaluating and Monitoring of Academic Programmes?

8. In your school is it acceptable to have prefects leading you in participation in school and community communal labor decision e.g. students’ to have a say in activities that school and school neighborhoods can work together in. Yes/No (Please tick one).

If yes how frequent do Prefects in your school get Involved in Decisions in Community service in the school. (Choose one)

Always [ ]
Sometimes [ ]
Never [ ]
9. Students’ Involvement in Decision Making in Crucial Management areas of School Activities like G&C, Staffing and Co-curricular Activities:

a) Co-curricular issues (please tick one)
   - Always [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Never [ ]

b) Staffing issues (please tick one)
   - Always [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Never [ ]

c) G&C issues (please tick one)
   - Always [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Never [ ]

10. The following are some of the ways of choosing prefects in schools. How do Students’ choose their Prefects in your school? (please tick one)
   - Selection by teachers only [ ]
   - Selection by Students’ only [ ]
   - Selection by teachers and Students’ [ ]
   - None of the Above [ ]

11. The following are some of the modes of voting prefects in schools. How do Students’ vote for their Prefects in your school? (Please tick one)
   - Campaigns followed by secret Ballots only [ ]
   - Campaigns followed by vetting from teachers [ ]
   - Campaigns followed by Secret Ballots then vetting from teachers [ ]
   - None of the Above [ ]
12. State how Prefects in your school are involved in matters of discipline cases

- Deal with the problem at their level only [ ]
- Deal with the problem but report to the teacher [ ]
- Deal with the problem but forward to the administration [ ]
- Deal with the problem but forward to the Senior Prefects [ ]
- All of the above [ ]

13. School Administrations and Teachers’ Perceptions on Prefects Authority in public Secondary Schools Administration

The following statements are an expression on certain aspects of school management. Beside each statement is a 5-point scale from which you are to select your most appropriate feeling to the statement. Put a tick ( ) on one of the five alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge gained in prefect involvement is important to school goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects involvement assists in discipline of the schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining subject areas for individual students’ e.g. choice of subjects a student’s is to specialize in, scares most prefects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is advisable for a head teacher to hold discussions with prefects during the making of the academic timetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Dialogue in school between prefects and the head teacher is of benefit to the organization and running of the school and should be allowed through developed communication channels
15. How satisfied are you with the way the prefect system functions in your school?
   Highly Satisfied [ ]
   Fairly Satisfied [ ]
   Highly unsatisfied [ ]
   Fairly unsatisfied [ ]

16. In which other areas do you think prefects need to be consulted before decisions are made?

   .....................................................................................................................
   .....................................................................................................................
   .....................................................................................................................
   .....................................................................................................................

Thank you for your cooperation
APPENDIX V: INTERVIEWS FOR PRINCIPALS IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The purpose of this research is to establish the Factors that Affect student' Involvement in Public Secondary School Administration in Teso North Sub-County Busia County, Kenya. Your responses on these questions will be of help for this study will be treated with a lot of confidentiality. Please, indicate the correct option as honestly and as correctly.

Demographic and other characteristics of respondent

1. Please indicate your chronological age in years by ticking in the appropriate box provided below
   25 and below [ ]
   26 -35 [ ]
   36-45 [ ]
   46 and Above [ ]

2. What is the category of your school?
   Girls’ day [ ]
   Mixed day [ ]
   Boys boarding [ ]

3. How are prefects in this school appointed/selected?

4. What are some of the activities the prefects in this school are involved in?
5. To what extent are the students’ involved in school administration in this school?

6. In your own opinion what are the best ways to punish a students’ who has made a mistake in this school?

7. State the most important tasks that you think an effective principal should perform to enhance students’ involvement in school administration.

8. In your own opinion, what are the characteristics of a good principal who can effectively involve students’ in school administration?

   State the problems that you experience in performing

9. Which tasks are related to your role of involving students’ in school administration in your school?

Thank you for your cooperation
APPENDIX VI: INTERVIEWS FOR DISTRICT QUALITY ASSURANCE AND STANDARDS OFFICER

The purpose of this research is to establish the Factors that Affect student's Involvement in Public Secondary School Administration in Teso North Sub-County Busia County, Kenya. Your responses on these questions will be of help for this study will be treated with a lot of confidentiality. Please, indicate the correct option as honestly and as correctly.

Demographic and other characteristics of respondent
1. Please indicate your chronological age in years by ticking in the appropriate box provided below
   25 and below [ ]
   26–35 [ ]
   36–45 [ ]
   46 and Above [ ]

2. How many public secondary schools do you have in the following categories?
   Girls' day [ ]
   Boys' day [ ]
   Mixed day [ ]
   Mixed Boarding [ ]
   Boys boarding [ ]
   Girls' Boarding [ ]

3. How are prefects in these schools appointed/selected? .............................................................

4. What are some of the activities that prefects in these schools get involved in? ..................................
5. To what extent are the students' involved in school administration in these schools?

6. In your own opinion what are the best ways to punish a students' who has made a mistake in these schools?

7. In your own opinion, what are the characteristics of a good principal who can effectively involve students' in school administration?

8. What are some of the challenges that Principals experience while involving the student prefects in school administration?

Thank you for your cooperation
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