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ABSTRACT

The extent to which teachers participate in decision-making is a determining factor on their job motivation. The way principals relate with teachers is important in management of schools. Shared governance is identical to participative decision-making and it affects the stability of the school. The purpose of this study was to assess the influence of secondary school teachers’ participation in decision-making on their job motivation in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties. Study objectives were to find out the decision-making styles used by principals, examine extent to which secondary school teachers are involved in decision-making, determine the level of teachers job motivation and determine the relationship of teachers participation in decision-making and their job motivation. Shared decision-making theory and motivation-hygiene theory were employed to explain influence of participation decision-making on job motivation. The study used descriptive design which embraced both quantitative and qualitative approach. The target population consisted of 277 principals and 9,108 teachers totaling to 9385. A sample size of 496 respondents comprising of 111 principals and 385 teachers were used in the study. This study population represented 5.3% of the target population. Study schools were stratified, and then random sampling with proportional allocation was employed to select the respondents. A semi structured decision-making questionnaire for teachers and interview guide for principals were used to collect data on participatory decision-making styles and level of motivation. This followed piloting which was done to test the tools and necessary adjustments made to achieve objectives of the study. Cranbach’s alpha was used to ascertain reliability of instruments while content validity of instruments was determined by specialists in Education Administration. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics which included generating frequencies, percentages, weighted mean. Meanwhile, inferential statistics included independent sample t-test was used to determine the relationship between teacher participation in decision-making and their job motivation levels. Qualitative data was analyzed using content analysis. Finding of the study revealed that public secondary schools in the study Counties practiced participatory decision-making moderately. The dominant common decision-making area that teachers were involved was student’s affair. The study recommended that teachers should be actively involved in decision-making in their schools and principals should establish collaborative relationship with teachers.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter comprises the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions and significance of the study. It also presents assumptions, limitations and delimitations of the study, theoretical framework, conceptual frameworks and operational definitions of terms.

1.1 Background to the Study

According to Owens (2008), making decisions in a participatory fashion necessitates the interaction of influence and power from the teacher on one-hand and the administrator, community members and/or students on the other hand. Owens (2008) further expounds that making decisions in a participatory manner is believed to bear notable desirable effects in the school. Collective decision making process motivates the entire staff members to do all that it takes to achieve the resolutions. Teachers’ participation in decision making augments their ambition, attitude and positive involvement in all their undertakings in the development and growth of the school hence cultivating cooperation, hard-work and commitment towards achieving the set goals.

Owing to the mounting recognition of valid, well-informed inputs of teachers in administrative decision-making at the school level, teachers would be highly motivated to make such decisions be of significance (Wekesa, 2013). The thought of being involved directly in the decisions made in schools, as specialists and professionals in different thematic areas, they are in a better position to take into
account what is obligatory of them as teachers to bring to reality. There is overwhelming agreement among scholars and practitioners to the effect that in the overall school success, teachers play a greater part when devoted to participate in the decision-making process more actively. In turn, teachers improve their opportunities in acquiring insights and new knowledge, thereby enhancing their instructional implementation and consequently student outcomes (Smylie, 2010).

If there is involvement in school decision-making among teachers especially in the areas of curriculum and instructions, finance, management of physical resources, human resource management, student affairs and community relations, teachers would be committed to such decisions hence, the overall school performance will likely improve. A motivated teacher would always display love for work, dedication to duty, create time to accomplish resolutions, operate beyond limits, possessed with a feeling of being part and parcel of success or failure and be exemplary in all his/her undertakings. These are considered crucial for motivated teacher who participate in decision-making process. It is also importance for it enhances a sense of democratic involvement (Smylie, 2010). To this end, this study paid attention to the involvement of teachers in decision-making for their job motivation in the areas of; curriculum and instructions, finance, management of physical resources, human resource management, student affairs and community relations.

Teachers will be attached and committed to curriculum and instructional success if only he/she was involved in resolutions pertaining to that. It is more of an oath to be a party to a resolution and fail to honor it to the end. Teachers are aware that every individual is judged by his/her own failures or successes especially after
agreement on the way forward by all parties involved. The researcher’s conviction is that once teachers are involved in such decision making exercises, they will deliver to the letter.

Participation in a democratic manner motivate and mirrors the confidence that allowing teachers to participate in the school governance as an ethical necessity in the sense that individual teachers possess the right to impart some control over their lives and work (Dachler & Wilpert, 2008). Greater participation in school is in tune with democratic society and enhances commitment; better productivity and improved school performance. Among the motives for improving teacher participation in decision-making is a way to augment the efficiency and productivity of the school (Hayes, 2012). School policies can be more responsive to the needs of the school when there is efficient teacher participation in the decision-making process. Teachers play a greater part when devoted to participate in the decision-making process more actively (Mokoena, 2011). This implies that teacher participation in decision-making improves the schools’ effectiveness as well as the quality of the decision.

Secondary school principals are expected to enhance learning and teaching. They need to be curriculum and instructional leaders; educational visionaries; assessment experts; community builders; budget analysts; public relations experts; disciplinarians; facility managers; expert overseers of policy, contractual, and legal mandates and initiatives as well as special programme administrators (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2012). They are as well expected to broker lasting understanding and harmony among the often-conflicting interests of teachers, parents, students, unions, county officials and national agencies, and they also need
to be alive to the broadening array of student needs. These responsibilities are overwhelming and thus call for people who have an expert and deep knowledge of decision-making. This is due to the fact that they are a significant driving force for school reforms when they are adequately supposed to involve teachers in widely shared and responsible decision-making as well as rational problem-solving.

Leithwood and Steinbach (2013) accordingly argue that head teachers ought to cultivate a school climate that is positive; joint planning and guarantee teachers’ collaboration opportunity through better participation in decision-making at the school level. School head teachers have a responsibility for making school a better teachers’ work place where they are autonomous enough to make decisions affecting their work life. They have the power to reassure or dishearten teacher initiative; as well as to put in place or hamper occasions for growing leadership skills among teachers. In this case, the current study sought to find out if principals share these enormous duties with teachers by allowing them to participate in making decisions (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2012).

A participatory approach in the management of schools has been recognized as an indispensable component in the effort towards having better schools (Blase, 2011). In schools, effective teacher participation in decision-making can be very motivating to the teacher and an approach of practicing participatory management where everybody is involved in decision making process. According to Mueller and Gokturk (2010), teachers can play a greater role in the overall success of the school when they are committed to being active participants in decision-making process. Teachers play a key role in implementing curriculum decisions at the school level and therefore, their motivation is important in making this to happen.
The entire system will benefit when teachers play an active role in controlling their work environment (Pashiardis, 2014). It is therefore, imperative that setbacks to teachers’ inclusion in decision-making must be addressed if school goals and objectives are to be attained. It is against this background the current study sought to find out the extent at which teachers are involved in decision making creates job motivation for curriculum and instruction achievement.

Teacher participation in secondary school decision-making has been embraced worldwide. In Hong Kong, school administrators are required to not only invite teachers in decision-making, but also to encourage them to participate in curriculum and managerial decision domains, as the intent of the School-based Model policy which has been adopted in Hong Kong is to increase job satisfaction and to enhance greater commitment to the school policies (Smylie, Conley, & Marks, 2012).

In South Africa, shared decision-making in schools is no longer an option. The framework of shared decision-making is embedded in South African Act (Act 84 of 2010). According to the Act, parents, teachers and learners should be given the opportunity of participating in decision-making on educational matters. In Kenya, effective decision-making in schools is being emphasized by the government. According to the Basic Education Act 2013, the school management board, which is mandated to make key decisions in school, should include one representative of the teaching staff in the school elected by the teachers. This is to ensure that the teachers participate in school decision-making.
There is overwhelming agreement among scholars and practitioners to the effect that in the overall school success, teachers play a greater part when devoted to participate in the decision-making process more actively. A myriad of studies have been conducted on the effect which augmented teacher’s decision-making participation may have on a variety of significant school variables. It was established that one imperative aspect for teacher’s participation in decision-making is individual development and growth. Smylie (2010) posits that involving teachers more in decision making enhances their opportunity in acquiring insights and new knowledge, which respectively enhance student outcomes and instructional implementation. Thus, there would be improved students’ achievement if better decisions would be made. Teacher participation in school decision-making is also important in inculcating a sense of their democratic involvement in pertinent decisions taken at the school level (Mueller & Gokturk, 2010). With regard to this, Dachler and Wilpert (2008) state that participation in a democratic manner mirrors the confidence that allowing teachers to participate in the school governance is an ethical necessity in the sense that individual teachers possess the right to impart some control over their lives and work.

Among the motives for improving teacher participation in decision-making is a way to augment the efficiency and productivity of the school. Growing the level of teacher participation in decision making and spreading their participation in the overall process of decision-making makes school management and policy more receptive to communal needs (Pashiards, 2014). Teachers play a greater part when devoted to participate in the decision-making process more actively. This implies
that teacher participation in decision-making improves the schools’ effectiveness as well as the quality of the decision (Pashiards, 2014).

It can be contended that school principals need to have expert and deep decision-making knowledge. It is also true that the decision-making style adopted by school leaders greatly influence the level of teacher participation in decision-making (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2012). This is due to the fact that they are a significant driving force for school reforms when they are adequately supposed to involve teachers in widely shared and responsible decision-making as well as rational problem-solving. Commonly used decision-making styles include; rational, dependent, spontaneous, intuitive and avoidant style. Leithwood and Steinbach (2013) accordingly argue that head teachers ought to cultivate a school climate that is positive; joint planning and guarantee teachers’ collaboration opportunity through better participation in decision–making at the school level. School head teachers have a responsibility for making school a better teachers’ work place where they are autonomous enough to make decisions affecting their work life. They have the power to reassure or dishearten teacher initiative; as well as to put in place or hamper occasions for growing leadership skills among teachers (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2012).

Public secondary schools in developing countries are characterized by presence of low teacher motivation levels attributed to a lack of such intrinsic factors as lack of professional support, development and training as well as teachers’ voice in decision-making. In Kenya, coupled with comparatively low pay and poor working conditions relative to other professions, teacher motivation levels are considerably low. In addition, across a majority of public secondary schools in the country,
teachers are not allowed to take part in making decisions since meetings among staff are simply used as forums on which directions are given that they are expected to comply with unconditionally (Nyantika, 2010).

Motivation is necessary if school objectives and overall school efficiency is to be achieved. It makes the teachers put utmost effort in their work and leads to school efficiency and better academic performance. Motivation of teachers is very important as it affects the students directly (Alarm & Farid, 2011). This fact is supported by Marques (2010) in her conclusion that motivation, teacher efficacy and performance are interdependent. Teacher effectiveness has a direct impact on students since there exists a strong and positive correlation between student performance and teacher efficacy and therefore a preferred performance by the students can transpire with the teachers’ aid (Dornyei, 2011). This is of the implication that low teacher motivation has an effect on his or her performance which in turn affect the performance of the students.

Motivation in the school should not only be through monetary rewards but should also involve the proper use of verbal praise and other non-monetary rewards such as letters of appreciation and presentation of gifts (Ocham, 2010). Headteachers should also recommend promotion of teachers who have shown excellent performance to boost their morale and productivity. As Hackman and Oldham (2011) opine, lower turnover and absenteeism as well as higher performance are signs of teacher motivation. The greater involvement of teachers in school decision-making improves teacher motivation and commitment hence improves school performance. As managers, headteachers should work to maintain an
environment that supports teachers’ efforts in the classroom and minimize outside factors that can disrupt the learning process (Ocham, 2010).

It is a major challenge to raise the dwindling motivation and morale of teachers across a majority of Sub-Saharan African countries since most teachers thereof are deficient of commitment and self-esteem in the teaching profession. Maranga (2013) attributes this absence of commitment and self-esteem partly on the lack of management styles that are participatory in nature which he asserts are neither applied nor adequately understood in Africa. The foregoing is with no exception to Kenyan teachers who are at the educational pipeline’ receiving end as they are for the most part receivers of instructions and decisions to be executed at the school level of decisions taken at the national, county or sub-county levels (Maranga, 2013).

The head teacher is at the school positioned at a place of authority and responsibility at which all the most important decisions pertaining instruction and curriculum, student discipline management, staff personnel matters, school organization, financial matters as well as community and school relations among others are taken (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2012). Headteachers are assisted by the Board of Management to deliberate on various issues including budgeting for the school, contracting of support staff, student affairs, instructions and curriculum as well as community relations (Education Act. Cap. 211). The foregoing decision making structure pays no consideration of the contributions in decision making, of most of the school policy implementers, the teachers.
In an effort to address the foregoing, the Ministry of Education (MoE) has given special attention and action priority to the change of educational organization and management of the country (MoE, 2010). The Ministry of Education has put in place mechanisms to ensure that the secondary schools administration and management are decentralized, efficient and professionally coordinated where all the stakeholders participate. Accordingly, as per the Basic Education Act of 2013, the educational management of the school has been set to a democratic leadership by secondary school heads, Board of Management (BoM), MoE headquarters staff, Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) staff and Board of Management committees consisting of members from the community, teachers and students (MoE, 2013).

The government’s effort on participatory decision-making has created a mechanism by which teachers participate in preparation, implementation, evaluation and decision of the curriculum (MoE, 2010). It can be asserted that the efforts by the Ministry are in line with many scholars’ argument (Owens 2008; Pashiard, 2014) for the need to employ participative decision-making at school level. Participative decision-making which is a decision-making style that allows teachers to take part in making decisions has progressively developed into the consented upon model across the globe for school operation, predominantly those that belong to the public education systems (Mokoena, 2011). The idea of effective participation in decision-making in schools is also supported by Okumbe (2008) who affirms that group or participatory decision-making process is recommended given that a broader perspective of knowledge and facts can be gathered very
easily from a group and individuals who participate are usually more satisfied with the decisions made hence enthusiastically support them.

It has been observed that the motivation of secondary school teachers in public secondary schools has affected their teaching performance. When teachers motivation is high, teachers are happy even with a low compensation and when contented, they are inspired to teach, thereby making them efficient and effective (Mueller & Gokturk, 2010). Decision-making is not only imperative owing to the fact that information circulates around the system; it is also important that teachers also feel more satisfied and empowered, with the knowledge that they have a hand at decision-making on matters that affect their professional life. Similarly, Anderson (2012) stresses that in the educational institutions context, teachers work further towards a school’s success when they feel that they are involved in decision-making as they find a sense of purpose in the school.

The foregoing background points to the crucial role teachers can play in decision-making at the school level, with implications on their mandate as educators. It is also apparent from the foregoing that in this realization, the Kenya government has moved to include teachers in the making of pertinent decisions affecting them at the school level. It however remains scanty in the Kenyan published empirical literature, how participation in decision-making influences teachers’ job motivation in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties, thus warranting the present study. The study particularly focused on the three counties owing to their diversity with respect to the socio-economic settings and therefore, teaching environments.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

The Basic Education Act of 2013 tasks the school leadership, particularly the headteacher with a central role in setting the tone of the school in a democratic leadership style. The democratic leadership style should embrace teacher participation in decision making to augment their job motivation by being part and parcel to that decision hence doing what it takes to enable the achievement of the very decisions. This should be done in collaboration and regular consultation with the Board of Management (BoM) and school management committees consisting of members from the community, teachers and students (MoE, 2013). Teachers are the custodians of instruction and curriculum implementers and therefore, their participation in decision making ability is necessary to motivate their endless efforts to achieve them.

From the foregoing background, it is evident that lack of teachers’ involvement in decision-making at the school level could be dangerous to the implementation and execution of curriculum and policies of the school. The Kenyan published empirical literature however, in view of the enhanced teacher participation as per the provision by the Basic Education Act of 2013, remains scanty on how participation in decision-making influences teachers’ job motivation in public secondary schools. Against this backdrop, the present study set out to assess both the extent of teacher involvement in school level decision-making and the influence thereof on their job motivation with reference to Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties in Kenya.
1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to assess the influence of secondary schools teachers participation in decision-making on their job motivation in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado Counties in Kenya.

1.4 Study Objectives

The following were the objectives of this study:

i. To find out the decision-making styles used by principals in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties.

ii. To examine the extent to which public secondary school teachers are involved in decision-making among public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties.

iii. To determine the level of job motivation among public secondary school teachers in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties.


1.5 Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following research questions:

i. What are the decision-making styles used by public secondary school principals in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties?

ii. To what extent are secondary school teachers involved in making decisions among public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado Counties?

iii. What is the current level of secondary school teachers’ job motivation among public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties?
iv. What is the joint effect of public secondary school teachers’ participation in decision-making on job motivation among public secondary school teachers in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties?

1.6 Significance of the Study

i. The study findings give insights into the main decision-making styles used by principals across public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado Counties. This may also give an indication on the most effective decision-making styles relative to teacher motivation levels thereof. School-heads will thus be informed on what decision-making style(s) to adopt.

ii. The study findings also reveal the extent to which public secondary school teachers should be involved in decision-making among public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties and the implications thereof on teacher motivation. In this regard, school leaderships may be informed on how best to involve teachers in their decision-making endeavors for effective outcomes.

iii. The study findings may also indicate the level of job motivation among public secondary school teachers in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties. This may inform the Ministry of Education types of school leadership in various schools being practiced and the need for adoption.

iv. The study findings may be informant in nature to Teachers Service Commission on the importance of involvement of teacher population in a school on joint decision making in public secondary school. The importance of teachers participation in decision-making for job motivation in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties.
1.7  **Limitations of the Study**

The following were the limitations of this study:

Having focused on 3 counties, the geographical expanse of the study area was considerably wide, but the study managed to recruit research assistants to aid with the data collection.

1.8  **Delimitations of the Study**

The following were the delimitations of this study:

i. This study only examined teachers’ interactive decision-making regarding areas of human resource management, student affairs, community relations, curriculum and instructions, finance and management of physical resources.

ii. The study was unable to generalize findings to the whole country, since the study only focused on 3 counties out of the 47. Inferences were however adequately made with reference to the 3 counties.

iii. Participants of the study were limited to teachers and principals of public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties.

1.9  **Assumptions of the Study**

This study was based on the following assumptions:

i. That different schools employ different decision-making styles including participatory decision-making

ii. That the schools had fully embraced greater teacher participation in decision-making and the school management is committed to its implementation in their schools.
1.10 Theoretical Framework

This study is based on shared decision-making theory by Charles, Gafni and Whelan (1997) who posits that to reach a quality decision, one based on the best available evidence about the risks and benefits of each option, there ought to be an exchange of information between recipient of the decision and the decision-maker in a professional setting. Although the decision-making process focuses primarily on the individual decision-maker, groups make many of the decisions in schools (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2014). These groups may be called committees, teams, task forces or site-based councils. Very often, decisions are reached through consensus process rather than by majority vote (Straus, 2012). Making the move to shared decision-making is not an easy process, but has positive results in terms of faculty commitment, cooperation amongst group members, complete attachment to the decision made hence creating motivation for the common good of all stakeholders involved. Ownership of and commitment to such decision are essential if we are to restructure schools and revamp curriculum to meet the needs of students in the 21st century (Lunenburg, 2012, 2013).

Teachers would feel motivated, appreciated, valued, honored, respected and devote their energy, talents, skills and time to ensure such decisions are achieved. In essence, teachers would be highly compelled to the achievement of decision they participate in making and create substantive change in the organization once they are part and parcel of the decision. Without commitment of teachers, reform efforts will be unsuccessful.

Herzberg (1966), in Motivation-Hygiene theory posits that there exist distinct factors which cause satisfaction (motivators) and dissatisfaction (hygiene). It can
be argued that in a school setup, collective decision making process are factors that give teachers satisfaction with their work and subjecting them to already made decisions as factors that prevent them from becoming satisfied. According to the theory, Herzberg argued that motivators and hygiene factors play a part in an employee’s behavior at work.

Participation of teachers in decision making alongside principal and other stakeholders would be a real motivator for job satisfaction. Work becomes dissatisfying upon the reduction of hygiene factors. They are deemed as upkeep factors that are essential in an effort to avoid discontent but themselves do not contribute to the motivation and/or job satisfaction of the personnel. In the context of this study, and in accordance with Herzberg’s view, hygiene factors only maintain the teachers in the job. A noisy work environment or unsafe working conditions will lead to dissatisfaction among teachers with their job but absence of the same will not

Teacher participation in decision-making process could ease the head teachers’ increasing difficulties in handling individual teachers’ problems. Many school principals would be involved single handedly address teachers conducts, problems and end up causing enmity with those individual teachers.

A principal and the entire staff members would be informed on when to encourage or discourage wanted and unwanted behavior or conduct through understanding of the shared decisions hence pulling together as a unit. Problems and benefits associated with teacher participation in decision making would be shared by all stakeholders and not apportioning blames to some individuals hence better
equipped institution with well-defined structures. Principals should be determined when to involve their teachers in decision-making as well as how to enhance group decisions quality (Yalesky, 2012).

Because it takes time to develop a comfort level for the principal concerning involving their teachers in decision-making, Huddleston, Claspell, and Killion (1991) brought forward the shared decision-making theory which proposed a four-phase process to involve teachers in the school’s decisions and developed some strategies principals can use to help teachers participate more fully in school decision-making.

**Phase One: Readiness**

Principals in this primary phase begin to move and plan towards shared decision-making. While upholding autonomy over all of the process’ phases, they establish the school culture and climate in which the process can start developing. They have control of who will be involved in the process, the kind of decisions that will be shared, as well as how participants will be involved (Huddleston et al., 1991).

**Phase Two: Experimentation**

Familiarity and comfort are built in this phase with faculty involvement in decisions. At this phase, since the principal and teachers are experimenting with shared decision-making, the importance is on the developing process as opposed to the decisions themselves. The degree of participation is the prerogative of the teachers. Some teachers in most cases commit to the shared decision-making concept and work with the head teacher to start articulating the process for the school (Huddleston et al., 1991).
**Phase Three: Refinement**

The principals in the third phase start sharing with the teachers both the decisions themselves and the process for decision-making. In this phase, teachers help in a shared manner in deciding who will participate and what will be decided. Teachers also participate in defining the decision making process (Huddleston et al., 1991).

**Phase Four: Institutionalization**

At the fourth phase, the school has adopted shared decision-making as the norm. The shared decision-making process based on the school’s history, may be informal or formal. The faculty and principal jointly determine both the decision making process and decisions to be shared. The faculty monitors their decision-making process and assumes the accountability for their decisions (Huddleston et al., 1991).

The theory is of relevance to the present study in that in a school-based decision-making setting, on decisions that have implications on teaching and learning as well as human resource, teachers ought to be involved by the school leadership, including the school heads, BoM, and the school management committees. This ought to occur across the four phases that is readiness, experimentation, refinement and institutionalization.
1.11 Conceptual Framework

From the conceptual model presented in Figure 1.1, in order to involve teachers in the school’s decisions, the schools need to develop some strategies.

The strategies illustrated in figure 1.1 should be crafted in such a way that they enable the teachers to feel more comfortable and free to participate more fully in school decision-making. Those strategies can be seen in four phases; Phase One: Readiness, Phase Two: Experimentation Phase Three: Refinement and Phase Four: Institutionalization as explained in the shared decision-making theory.

Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework showing Interrelationships among Variables

Source: Author 2016
As evident from the literature reviewed, there are other dynamics that can moderate and mediate in the relationship between participation and job motivation level. The individual teachers’ characteristics and personality can have a significant mediating effect on teachers’ participation in decision-making and their job motivation level. Fundamentally, a gap between some anticipated states and an individual teacher’s actual state always exists and therefore schools should continuously endeavor to learn about the individualities of their teachers and work towards bridging this gap to sustain a motivated and performing teaching staff. People are basically different; they differentiate themselves from each other concerning their needs, upbringings, potentials, and individual characteristics.

Conversely, at least in terms of job motivation levels, what may motivate one may not be the same to another or cause discomfort to other teachers. A group of teachers with the same personal characteristics may have the same desires and prospects toward work and may be motivated and perform in a way that is more likely to be the same. The identification of those factors may be of great importance to the schools in their pursuit to increase the teacher job motivation and performance in school. Teacher features in this case comprising the age, gender, highest level of education, number of years worked in the school and work experience.

The moderating variable in this case is the setting in which the situation of decision-making in the particular school happens. This includes the school policies which summaries the schools’ hierarchy as well as the decision-making process. Human rights laws, the national constitution, legal structures of the country are also intervening variables in this setting. The conceptual model shown in figure 1.1
shows that there is a relationship between a teacher participation in decision-making and their job motivation level however, this relationship is moderated by the teacher characteristics and school characteristics. The intervening variables also have an influence on the level of teacher participation and hence their job motivation level.
1.12 Operational Definition of Terms

Decision Issues: In a school there are four aspects of a decision issue, these are; the work and task design, work conditions, strategies and then there is the capital distribution aspect.

Decision-making Process: In a decision-making there are several processes involved. These are; identifying of the problems, generating a solution to the problem, high work efficiency, productivity, profits, etc.

Level of Participation: This is the extent to which a teacher is involved in decision-making.

Structure: The format has been decided previously. Informal: no fixed format, content, few rules.

Motivation of Teachers: Morale to continue working and perform to expectation of teaching standards.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, literatures were reviewed under the following sub-topics: decision making and teacher involvement, teacher job motivation levels and teacher participation in decision-making and job motivation. All these are related to issues of participatory decision-making in public secondary schools and teachers job motivation.

2.2 Decision Making and Teacher Involvement

Najike, McRobbie and Lucas (2012) carried out a study to determine science teachers motivation and attitudes towards their profession in a high school learning environment in Papua New Guinea. Among the major findings was that lack of teachers’ voice in decision-making affected teachers’ motivation and that major determinants of improved education experience and outcomes was the quality of teaching as a result of improved motivation. The study concluded that understanding of teachers’ own attitudes to their profession was poor. Terms and conditions of service such as salaries, system of allowances and other benefits such as housing, in-school and regional education centres management professional support and development and training were poor. The study however, only narrowly focused on science teachers and overlooked public secondary school teachers in general. The present study endeavored to fill this gap by exploring the influence of secondary school teachers participation in decision-making on their job motivation with reference to Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties in Kenya.
In a study to determine the level of participatory decision-making among teachers in Makueni District, Kenya, Mualuko, Mukasa and Achoka (2009) revealed that teachers desired greater involvement than they are currently involved in. They concluded that among others, very important groups to involve in making decisions in schools are teachers who are the custodians of instruction, implementers of school policies and co-organizers for school activities along with headteachers. They recommend that due to the growing appreciation of the need for valid, knowledgeable inputs in administrative decision-making from various organization levels, the need for involving stakeholders in decision-making is paramount. The study focused on Makueni District alone. This may not be representative of the state of affairs in all public secondary schools in Kenya. To address this, the present study widened the scope to three counties in Kenya, Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado. Despite the fact that the study looked at the levels of participation in decision-making, it failed to establish its influence on motivation which the current study sought to find out.

Chen and Silverthrone (2008) conducted a study on the impact of locus of control on job stress, job performance and job satisfaction in Taiwanese public secondary schools. Findings provided insights into the reasons why teachers do not participate in decision-making. The reasons listed by the respondents were varied and included lack of trust, divisions among staff members, victimization, and double standards by headteachers, fear, and principal’s perception. They mentioned ways that could enable them to fully participate in decision-making which included: delegation, team building, empowerment, motivation, collective setting of standards, avoiding witch-hunting, open administration and inclusion
throughout the decision-making process. The study was however conducted in Taiwan which may not be reflective of the Kenyan scenario hence the present study. The study also assumed that teachers do not participate in decision-making. The current study focused on the extent of involvement since Kenya educational sector has policies that guarantee the same.

Dewettinck and Ameijde (2011) conducted a study on the effect of leadership empowerment behavior on staff attitudes and behavioral intentions among primary school teachers in India. In a quest to understand whether teachers were involved in decision-making process, teachers were asked to indicate their involvement in different areas. Teachers are not effectively involved in decisions dealing with finances. Findings indicate that most teachers felt that they were not involved in financial decisions because headteachers, as a teacher observed, in the interview feel that teachers are not trained to handle financial issues in the school. Interviews with the head teachers revealed that they were not very comfortable involving teachers in financial decisions. The context of the study was however in India and the target population was primary schools. The present study focused on the Kenyan context and public secondary schools as the target population. The study also paid attention to involvement on financial matters but the current study focused on other additional areas, namely’ human resource management, student’s affairs, community relation, curriculum and instructions and management of physical resources.

Ejaz, Khalid and Riaz (2011) studied employees’ participation in decision-making (actual vs perceived) with reference to the Telecom sector of Pakistan. Results from the study revealed that the factors with very high significance are
organizational climate, management style, implementation of past decisions and teacher expertise. Factors with high significance are organizational structure, nature of task and communication. The study also indicates that the respondents felt that physical facilities did not hinder participation in decision-making though some indicated that it had very high significance. The study focused on the Telecom sector which is significantly different from the school setting, hence the present study.

Wall and Rinchart (2009) studied school-based decision-making and the empowerment of secondary school teachers in Brooklyn, New York. Teachers were found to have different levels of participation in different decision-making areas. They were moderately involved in curriculum and instruction, co-curriculum and their welfare decisions. Most teachers were involved in the implementation level. Teachers desire to participate throughout the entire process up to the implementation level. Some headteachers and other stakeholders like the BoM and PA formulate policies that are passed on to teachers who implement them involuntarily. The study was conducted in New York, a developed economy in the United States of America which has fundamental socio-economic differences with Kenya hence the present study. The study failed to focus on the influence of participation on decision-making on job motivation which the current study addresses.

Khandwalla (2009) argues in his study on organizational designs four excellence in New Delhi, India that the stress in the participatory mode is on a given amount of equalization power, in such a way that even subordinates have a contribution to
make in decision making. Khandwalla furthermore listed some imperative characteristics of the participatory management mode as follows: frank and free deliberations between all involved parties; information and ideas sharing among the group; everyone’s right in participating and speaking up in the school; the custom of everyone speaking up; stress on attaining agreement in decisions that factor in the genuine disquiets of all the decision process participants; coordination and control vest in the entire group as opposed to the boss; and major sources of motivation are fitting into a group and aiding in deciding its destiny. The study was not particular to public secondary schools hence findings may not be applicable to the same, warranting the present study.

Huang, Iun, Liu and Gong (2010) evaluate the effect of participative leadership on work performance among manufacturing firms in China. Findings included a summary of some imperative characteristics of the participative approach to management including: manager harmonizes their own group's work in line with that in which they are a subordinate; work (charge) is delegated; manager dissipates problems out of path of subservient; work can be a basis for satisfaction or chastisement reliant on manageable conditions (management and manager); decision-making participation at all levels. All persons participate in the decision-making process; people learn to seek greater responsibility over and above accepting it, but; and recompenses are employed in motivating the staff. The study focused on the manufacturing industry which is different from the education sector and particularly public secondary schools, hence the present study.

Mualuko, Mukasa and Judy (2009) assessed the degree to which teachers participated in decision-making in compared to their preferred degree of
participation in Kenya and found that teachers’ participation in educational and curriculum planning is the essential key to the improvement of programmes, and that teachers participation in the process of the improvement of, and change in school programmes is of great importance. Teachers can recognize problems and find solutions very well. Thus, they argue, it is suitable to allow them to participate in the council meetings to discuss the issues. They concluded that to organize regularly teachers meetings at school for textbook content analysis, exchange of ideas, appropriate decisions, educational issues and development of annual plans will result in the increase of teachers’ awareness about the use of the new technological methods in teaching, and eventually in the students’ progress. The study used ex-post factor research design while the present study took a descriptive research design approach. Despite the fact that the study looked at teachers’ involvement on decisions making, it failed to link it with job motivation which is the focus of the current study.

Robertson (2013) studied the politics of self-management, devolution and post-Fordism in Canadian secondary schools and established that teachers reported lower actual involvement levels and higher desired involvement levels in managerial issues, especially in those relating to determining the organization and administrative structure of the school, deliberating on the teacher evaluation procedures, assessing teams or subject departments, choosing team leaders or departmental chairpersons, hiring new faculty members, instituting wide-ranging school policies as well as revising and setting school goals. The study was based in Canada which may have considerable differences in the day-to-day operations and management of the schools relative to the Kenyan context, hence the present study.
Steyn (2010) assessed teacher empowerment and its effect on the leadership role of principals in South Africa. The study established that teachers were least willing to be involved in general administrative decisions and most willing to be involved in instructional and curricular decisions. Steyn asserted that teachers' desires and expectations varied considerably across decision domains and amongst teachers. Teacher participation was considered as increasing motivation to making decisions and promoting commitment to them. The study was based on a different context, South Africa while the Kenyan literature on the same is rather scanty hence the present study. The current study was more specific on areas that teachers ought to be involved like human resource management, student affairs and others and therefore filled that gap.

Parnell and Crandall (2011) examined teachers’ desired participation vis a vis their actual participation in Latin America in the decision fields of objectives and goals, mission, curriculum, student progress assessment as well as communication. It was found in the study that actual decision-making participation was lower for a majority of teachers as compared to the desired participation though actual involvement fluctuated by education, rank of teacher and issue. The study was based on a different context, Latin America while the Kenyan literature on the same is rather scanty hence the present study. The current study didn’t focus on teachers rank but on the influence of involvement on job motivation which the researcher finds it more critical.

Parnell (2010) further explored the propensity for participative decision-making in Latin America with reference to Peru and Mexico based on over 45 decision
issues. The results indicated that the desired teacher participation was significantly more than actual participation in decision-making. Parnell (2010) used the deprivation-decision concept to articulate the condition in which the involvement of teachers’ in decision-making was more in practice compared to the desired. In the domain of individual managerial level, teachers’ decision making participation was much more disadvantaged as compared to that of the technical domains. Involvement in decision-making across all three levels including group, individual and school was in the deficiency state. The highest teacher participation level was in the technical domain of the individual. The study was based on a different context, Latin America. The present study sought to determine teacher participation levels in decision-making among public secondary in three socio-economic settings.

Rotenberry and Moberg (2007) assessed the effect of job involvement on college teachers’ performance in USA and found that compared to managerial (strategic) school administration, teachers seemed to wish more power on technical (operational) decisions relating to direct student instruction. Teachers however compared to the personal domain, also affirmed to being more deprived of decision in the organization domain, in which case they felt they ought to have more control over decisions that delimited the boundary between the organization and classroom, for instance, decisions involving grading policies, reporting procedures and students rights. The present study is concerned with examining whether this situation is different in Kenya, given that the reviewed study focused on colleges rather than high schools.
Scott-Ladd and Chan (2014) explored the relationship between emotional intelligence and participation in decision-making among secondary level teachers in New Zealand and found that the success of teachers in influencing decisions and the substance of these decisions may be crucial for having teachers actually become leaders in schools by influencing the decision-making process, encouraging the shifting of their active participation in the direction of teacher leadership. The study further argued that teachers experiencing a truly meaningful shared decision-making process that encourages teachers, not just in participation but to lead, can enhance teacher leadership opportunities and its benefits. Considering the two differing contexts, the present study sought to find out how the same applies in Kenya. The current study has established that shared leadership can be established through participative decision-making.

Too (2009) assessed teachers participation in decision-making in Hong Kong with reference to a local secondary private school. The study found that personal goals, capacity, context belief, and emotional arousal work to promote a greater commitment to making decisions and synthesis of individual and organizational goals. The study concluded that teachers must do more than just participate in decision-making but also to provide effective leadership. Therefore, they need to be empowered to do so. The context of the study is however not similar to the Kenyan context, since this study focused on private schools and didn’t look at various areas that teachers are supposed to be involved in hence motivating the present study.

Selart (2005) studied the role of locus of control in consultative decision-making among secondary schools in the Philippines and argued in the discussion that the
involvement of teachers in this process should occur when the teachers have a personal stake in the outcome, have expertise to contribute to the solution, and can be trusted to decide what is in the best interest of the organization. Participation in decision-making in the workplace is, therefore, important because the effectiveness of the decision is determined by both the quality of the decision being made and the acceptance and commitment of subordinates to implement the decision. The study took a case study design which is narrow in scope compared to the survey employed in the present study.

A study done by Selmer and Lauring (2011) on job factors and work outcomes in Colombian private primary schools found that a majority of teachers still on the payroll felt that they were not involved in decision-making and had very little interaction with administrators. The teachers in the study felt that effectiveness of student instruction was adversely affected by their lack of decision-making and that if they were given greater participation and autonomy, especially in the classrooms, teacher retention would be enhanced. They also felt greater involvement in decision-making would assist them in helping students reach their potential, as they felt teacher participation in the organization would help them shape both short- and long-term goals. Consequently, teachers would stay longer in the organization, and would be less likely to leave for other schools or leave the teaching altogether. Taylor further suggested that as teachers remained longer in the teaching profession, students would become recipients of a better quality education. The study was based in Colombia private primary schools while the present study focused on Kenyan public secondary schools. The current study also
established that teachers play other roles beyond curriculum instruction when they are involved in decision-making.

In an empirical study on job satisfaction of academic staff in Turkey, Toker (2011) developed two instruments that were considered to accurately measure teacher involvement in shared decision-making: they measured teacher expectations of what was occurring with what was not occurring; they also determined whether it was necessary to describe shared decision-making involvement in terms of the extent of occurrence, extent of decision-making, and the way in which decision-making was occurring. From these issues, a Teacher Decision-Making Instrument was developed with eight categories (planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, staff development, school/community, and budget/management). Based on the success of this instrument, they developed a Shared Education Decision Survey for use by those on decision-making councils at the schools, which included administrators, teachers, support staff, parents, community members, and board members. The study was based in Turkey which may not reflect the scenario in the Kenyan context. Also, the current study went further and established the influence participative decision-making had on motivation which the study had failed to address.

Ahsan, Abdullah, Fie, David and Alam (2009) conducted a study on the effect of job stress on job satisfaction among university staff in Malaysia and found four factors that tend to influence a teacher’s willingness to participate in decision-making: principal-teacher working relationship; norms influencing working relationships among teachers; teachers’ perceived capacity to contribute to or make decisions, and teachers’ sense of responsibility and accountability in their work.
with students. These four significant factors associated with participation in decision-making need further investigation to understand how they relate to student outcome and teacher commitment to the organization. The study was conducted in a different context other than Kenya, hence motivating the present study. The target population was university staff while the current study looked at secondary school teachers.

Bijlsma and Bunt (2013) studied the antecedents of trust in private school principals in Indonesia and found that the association between the principal and teachers influenced the readiness to contribute in decision-making, and those collaborative, open and supportive relationships between teachers and the principal were more enthusiastic to participate in decision-making. Beikzad, Ranjbarian, Esgandari and Khalilinaghadeh (2012), on the other hand, studied the association between the academic staff performance and departmental head members’ duties in Atlanta, Georgia and found that teacher participation in decision-making carries an expectation that school performance and productivity will increase. The studies were conducted outside the Kenyan context presenting a motivation for the present study.

Akiri and Ugborugbo (2009) reviewed literature on teachers effectiveness and students academic performance in public secondary schools in Delta State, Nigeria and found that the data regarding the effect of teacher participation in decision-making and student achievement are inconclusive due to lack of definitive agreement on the full meaning and definition of participative decision-making, who participates in making decisions, categories of decisions, measures of effectiveness, motivation, and control. In this regard, the literature suggests further
study is needed on the relationship between teacher decision-making and other factors, such as the extent to which they would be committed to the organization they serve. The study brought out the gap of the kind of influence participative decision-making may have on other job issues warranting the present study. It was also a desktop review, but the present study takes a descriptive design.

Bogler and Somech (2014) studied the influence of teacher empowerment on teachers’ organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools in the United Kingdom and found three organizational levels associated with school-based management: participation at the individual level-decision area close to the teaching task within a classroom; and participation at the group level-decision area of topics related to the functioning of groups (departments, subject-areas, and grade-level); Participation at the school level-decision issues at the whole school level including goals, budget, personnel. The study suggested further study on the relationship between teacher decision-making and other factors as a key component to student achievement. The study focused on teacher decision-making against student achievement and in a developed economy context yet the present study focused on teacher decision-making and job motivation in Kenya.

Abdulkadir, Isiaka and Adedoyin (2012) reviewed literature on the effects of strategic performance appraisal, career planning and staff participation on organizational commitment identified strategies linked to effective implementation of participative management implementation in schools where stakeholder participation, and in general, school improvement would optimally occur, namely; stakeholders’ professional development as an on-going effort; the power
distribution among stakeholders through decision-making processes that are shared; effective information dissemination between stakeholders; accomplished leaders that control stakeholder participation; group and individual rewards for stakeholders with a view to goal attainment; and clearly pronounced participation goals in management decision-making at the school level. The study was a desktop review yet the present took a descriptive design.

Adham (2011) studied the effect of employee involvement on organizational commitment and job satisfaction in Turkish schools and found that four basic elements were responsible for empowering teachers, including reward, power, information and knowledge. To participate in decision-making regarding school management, it was essential that a teacher possessed all of the four essential elements. There was no assurance, by offering a school head teacher with just authority as well as opportunity for teachers to be involved in the meeting that teachers were in a position to obtain enough information and knowledge on how to work together. The study was based in Turkey, a different context from Kenya. The current study established that participative decision-making is a continuous process and has a lot of influence on the quality of decisions made.

Akuoko, Dwumah and Ansong (2012) explored teacher participation in decision-making and their performance in selected public secondary schools in Ashanti region of Ghana and found that teachers had to alter their attitudes and beliefs with regard to their outside classroom roles and learnt how to think in new ways in respect to what was possible. The study further found that it was not easy for teachers themselves to adapt to the new odd condition they were not acquainted with while some were not prepared to take on the new roles in making decisions.
The foregoing cases point to the lack of the suitable attitude and belief toward participation in teachers’ psyche, which necessitated the in-service and retooling activities for them to construct new roles and attitudes essential to the new decision-making style. The study was however skewed to a particular region, Ashanti of Nigeria. This was narrow as the present study covered three different counties with different socio-economic contexts. The current study also focused on the extent teachers should be involved in decision-making and to what extent.

Appelbaum (2013) studied participation in decision-making and its influence on job satisfaction and commitment among teachers in Amsterdam and found that shared decision-making obligates each school to make a site-based management that draw its membership from the teachers, parents and the principals. The work of this committee is to get involved in shared decision-making to improve students attainment. The study concluded that when principals share decision-making with the teachers, they are able to avoid conflicts that could otherwise occur due to individual differences. Furthermore, by sharing decision-making responsibility with teachers, the principals are able to share the authority and responsibility bestowed upon them by the structures. The study was based in Germany, a developed economy different from Kenya.

Bhatti (2011) studied the effect of direct teacher participation on organizational commitment among private schools in New Delhi and found that through working together, the teachers and the principals are able to know what is expected of them and are able to measure their performance. If well implemented, this participatory decision-making can be a major factor that contributes to the stability of the school. The study added that the school objectives will be attained proportionally.
and effectively to the extent that the school can achieve an environment where members can level with one another in open and trusting interpersonal relationship. The study focused on private schools in India, yet the present study focused on public secondary schools in Kenya. The current study sought to establish the levels of motivation that teachers attain through participative decision-making which consequently enhances teacher performance.

Burnes (2014) assessed the decision-making styles by school principals in Manchester and found that shared authority requires the school principals to share their governing responsibilities with the teachers. Shared governance is identical to participative decision-making, whereby the teachers are invited to take part in different ways and variable extents, in making decision in schools. The study added that despite the fact that most of the school principals single-handedly make decisions, others actually do consult with their subordinates before making most of their decisions, yet some others involve teachers and they both take decisions together. This latter phenomenon has been appropriately labelled as participatory decision-making. The study was based in the United Kingdom, a developed economy different from Kenya. Despite the fact that the study paid attention to shared governing responsibilities, it failed to be specific on those roles which the current study is addressing.

Botha (2013) studied the role of leadership in school-based management with reference to selected schools in Southern Africa and found that leaders are perceived to be at the helm of decision-making, are held accountable for the decisions they make either individually or as a group and legally so, as acumen in their field has led them to take leadership positions. It is against this background
that the current study focused on how the school principal involves teachers on decision-making and its influence on job motivation. This is out of recognition that collective decision-making is likely to be well-informed than the one made by the leader alone.

This notion was validated by Chalchissa and Emnet (2013) who found that women involvement is an effective management tool in decision-making in Oromia regional public organizations. Principals to agree that all stakeholders to be invited to take part in decision-making if the school was to be effective and that teachers to have the expertise required to make critical decisions about the school. The study also found that performance improvement in public secondary schools requires highly motivated teachers through taking part in decision-making. A lot of teachers feel they have a place in the school for the reason that their ideas or proposals are considered when decisions are made in the school. The study recommended that education administrators even out of school structures allow teachers the opportunity to take ownership for school decision-making. Teachers’ empowerment may be a good strategy to improve their performance. The study was, however, based in Ethiopia, which may not be indicative of the Kenyan scenario, hence the present study. The study also used women as the respondents while the current study got views from all teachers irrespective of their gender.

Jones (2007) assessed teacher participation in decision-making and its relationship to staff job motivation and student achievement among schools in Queensland University, Australia and found that principals are now being advised to give teachers an opportunity to own for school decision-making. The study also found that giving teachers the opportunity to take part in decision-making yields higher
outcomes. Teachers’ satisfaction, job motivation, performance and self-esteem were further positively impacted by participation on decision-making and implementation. Similarly, teachers commitment and reliability are nurtured by collective school management practices. The study was based in Australia which is a different context from Kenya. The study was also not specific to public secondary schools, but the present study focused on Kenya context.

Kok, Lebusa and Joubert (2014) assessed teacher involvement in decision-making with reference to the University of Technology in South Africa and found that the decision-making of school staffing, curriculum, or resource allocation had been conventionally made by school principals or members of administrative managerial teams. Teachers were usually excluded by school administrators in the process of decision-making and not endowed with the obligation to implement school policies. Merely informed of the results of decisions made, teachers might not clearly understand why or how those decisions were made. As they seldom had opportunities to be involved in these crucial matters, their isolation within classroom might bring about the alienation or misunderstanding between them and school. With the advent of teacher empowerment, teachers were expected to be given authority to be the ones having access to decision-making about school significant matters. Schools would encourage teachers to participate in school activities outside the classroom, such as textbook selection, curriculum development, learning assessment, student placement, personnel staffing, or professional development. The study however focused on a university setting in South Africa, which is a different study area compared to secondary schools, hence the present study.
Wilson and Coolican (2010) studied how high and low teachers work self-empowered with colleagues and school principals in Yemen and found that teacher empowerment could include extrinsic power and intrinsic power. The extrinsic power concerned with the phenomenon that teachers had the status of affirmation, the knowledge they need, and the process of participatory decision-making. The intrinsic power was involved with teachers’ attitude and confidence in displaying their capacity of mastering their own work, and the representation of intrinsic power counts on teachers’ own self-determination and sense of self-efficacy a lot. In this regard, the role of a teacher had been transformed into an active participant from a passive practitioner by the practice of teacher empowerment. The study was however based in Yemen, a different context compared to Kenya. The current study established decision-making areas that teachers are often involved in.

2.3 Teacher Job Motivation Levels

Ukeje, Akabogu and Ndu (2013) studied “the role of educational administration in teacher motivation in Enugu, Nigeria” and found that teacher involvement in decision-making continuously by the school head teachers will enhance teachers’ development and job motivation levels. Ukeje et al., stated further that teacher participation in decision-making process could ease the head teachers’ increasing difficulties in handling individual teachers’ problems. Many school principals would be involved single handedly address teaches conducts, problems and end up causing enmity with those individual teachers. Differences between individual teachers and the principals would otherwise remain unaddressed by the head teacher alone. The study concluded that head teachers ought to not completely ignore the less knowledgeable members of the teaching staff in making decisions.
since they need to also be advanced on the job. School head teachers ought to also take part in more seminars and workshops to know how to administer over the younger teachers with a view to grow them up as they will ultimately succeed them. The study was however based in Nigeria, yet Kenyan literature on teacher motivation levels remains scanty, hence the present study.

Kanabe (2013) studied the relationship between teacher motivation and retention of teachers in California and found that to make a teachers committed, the school management must motivate them by showing that they are cared for by listening to them and assisting them in their personal problems. Kanabe found that frequent acknowledgement of teachers and students whose performances are outstanding will make them consistent and spur others to work hard to the lime light. Teachers must be handled with care and encouraged to do their work. Their feelings and problems must be understood by extending love and friendship towards them as this will add value to their welfare, and repudiate the notion of treating them as mere working tools for achieving school goals.

Oyewale and Alonge (2013) assessed teachers’ motivation in relation to the performance of instructional supervisory role of principals in Nigeria’s Ekiti State, Ekiti Central Senatorial District and found that one of the challenges schools face today is motivating teachers with a view to perform allocated tasks to meet prearranged goals. Accordingly, principals have to motivate their teachers to put them in the right frame of mind in order to deliver quality teaching to the students. The authors reiterated that when teachers are adequately motivated, they will be delighted to put in more efforts in their profession and consequently there will be achievement of better results. The study posited that in motivating teachers,
principals should employ democratic leadership skills, involve teachers fully in programme development, provision of adequate teaching materials and improved condition of service by liaising with the school boards. The study was based in Nigeria, while the present focused on the Kenyan context. The study also focused on one senatorial jurisdiction yet the present focused on three.

Mgbodile (2007) studied educational administration and supervision in Ibadan Nigeria and argued that since the planned objectives of an organization must be achieved using people, it is important that administrators try to create conditions that encourage workers to do good job. Administrators can make excellent plans and organize work operations efficiently, but if they lack the ability to motivate the workers, their efforts at planning and organizing will be rendered useless. Thus, the key success in any organization lies on the effective use of the human resources. The study was however not particular to public secondary schools and was based in the Nigerian context, yet the present focused on public secondary schools in Kenya.

Chukwuemeka (2008) studied motivation as the substance of public administration in Nigeria and argued that while skills and knowledge that employees possess are imperative in influencing their job performance, these features are not alone sufficient. Knowing what keeps an individual motivated is required to reveal how skills and abilities are triggered and their personal potentials realized. Similarly, Marnane and Olson (2010) investigated Job Satisfaction of the Mathematics and Science Teachers in Secondary Schools in North Carolina and Michigan and found that the salary of a teacher is a significant indicator of the period of time that members of the teaching staff spend in teaching. The findings reveal that higher
opportunity cost teachers as indicated by degree subject or test scores stay in teaching less as compared to others; and that to stay longer in teaching, teachers ought to be paid more. Whereas the former study was based in Nigeria, a different context from Kenya, the latter narrowed down to only mathematics teachers in Michigan and North Carolina. The present study focused on the Kenyan context and at a wider scope as it explored all teachers and not those of a particular subject. The current study didn’t look at motivation from the monetary view but emphasized on intrinsic motivation.

Mutie (2013) studied overall and facet satisfaction of teachers and secondary school administrators in Kitui District Kenya and found that a variety of individual factors determine teachers’ desires and that this is particularly so since teachers as human beings possess different own tastes. The study concluded that better methods must be devised for educational administrators of determining means and ways in which teachers will be rewarded if they anticipate their performance to be impacted upon by reward. Similarly, Akyeampong and Bennell, 2007) assessed teacher motivation in Sub-Saharan and African and South-Asia and found that living and working conditions affect teacher motivation and morale and thus their performance. Among the key factors that affect teachers’ motivation and morale include classroom conditions, workload, distance at work, management support and travel and housing. The high travel cost contributed to teacher lateness and absenteeism in schools while the norm for most teachers are very large class sizes. The studies however failed to show how participation in decision-making or lack thereof influenced teacher motivation, hence the present study.
Mungunyu (2008) studied selected factors of free primary education that influence job satisfaction among primary school teachers in Embakasi Division and found that job demotivation/dissatisfaction lead to aggressive behavior to learners and colleagues, absenteeism from schools, psychological withdrawal from work as well as early teaching profession exits. Additionally, other outcomes may include among many, poor school performance in extracurricular activities, examinations, demoralized workforce, financial mismanagement as well as student unrest. Job motivation/satisfaction will alternatively result in commitment, low absenteeism from schools; friendly behavior with students and colleagues, desirable examination performance, low exists from the profession, better performances in extracurricular activities as well as a motivated workforce (Mungunyu, 2008). The study was however narrowed to a single division within Nairobi yet the present study widens the scope to three different counties in the country.

A study by Ubom and Joshua (2014) explored “needs Satisfaction Variables as Predictors of Job Satisfaction of teachers in the UK” and revealed that teachers motivation and job satisfaction were low due to work overload, poor pay and low perception of teachers by the society. He went further to support conclusions by Herzberg’s two-factor model. Findings also confirmed presence of low teachers motivation and job satisfaction which were attributed to intrinsic factors such as pay incentives were ineffective in increasing motivation. The reviewed study was based in the UK, a different context from Kenya, hence the present study.

Kivaze (2000) explored the evaluation of incentives used for teachers in secondary schools in Marakwet District and their influence on performance in KCSE and some schools experienced high teachers’ abrasion by way of quitting the
profession owing to low motivation. This was according to Kivaze (2000) influenced by education attainment, intellectual capacity and, age which were correspondingly positively and negatively associated with the abrasion. In a similar study, Locke and Luthan (2009) studied the causes and nature of job satisfaction in South-Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, a myriad of primary schools faced “a teacher motivation crisis” owing to ineffective management and policy environment, low accountability, low pay, occupational and vocational status, as well as poor living and working conditions. The studies however failed to show the role of teacher involvement in decision-making on teacher motivation levels.

In a study carried out by Alarm and Farid (2011) on factors affecting teachers’ motivation in India, it was revealed that teachers were not satisfied with socio-economic status, choice of profession, students’ behaviour and examination stress. It also revealed that personal and social status, classroom environment, socio-economic status, students’ behaviour, examination stress, rewards and incentives and self-confidence of the teacher affected teachers’ motivation. Glaser (2011) explored the effect of improving the quality work life and in the process on improving productivity among high school teachers in selected Sub-Saharan African countries and observed that raising the wearying morale and motivation of teachers in most Sub-Saharan African countries is a major challenge because many teachers lack self-esteem and commitment to their profession. He attributed this lack of self-esteem and commitment partly to lack of participatory management styles, which he claims are poorly understood or applied in Africa. Both studies were conducted outside Kenya and thus findings are not reflective of the Kenyan context hence the present study.
Mncube (2008) studied democratization of education in South Africa and found that teachers are being pushed to the limit leading to high levels of demotivation. The expectations placed on them appear to be increasing exponentially. Progressively, their role includes not only teaching specific subjects and acting as mentors to the students in the love of learning, but should be at the forefront when it comes to social work. Moreover, teachers are also expected to deal with smorgasbord of broader problems in their classrooms. The study was based on South African schools while the present study focused on Kenyan public secondary schools.

Mbambo (2009) studied the role of teachers’ resource centres from the perspective of school managers and teachers in South Africa and found that motivation can be viewed in terms of what it is, where it lives, who it has an impact on and what its impacts are. Accordingly, to use the this definition, motivation comprises: What it is – an attitude of mind, a spirit, a state of wellbeing and an emotional state, where it resides – in the minds, attitudes, and emotions of people as members of a group, who it affects – directly, teachers and principals in their interactions; ultimately the students and the parents, What it affects – directly, readiness to work and combine forces in the best interests of the school; ultimately, output, quality of output, and cost of operations. The study did not show how teacher involvement in decision-making led to the observed aspects of motivation.

Aipinge (2007) studied cluster center principals’ perceptions of the implementation of the school cluster system in Namibia and found that a highly motivated teacher may also be viewed as a happy teacher and that job motivation has been
understood variously as an emotion, a mind state, attitude and a feeling. It is the feeling teachers have about their work founded on how the teachers see themselves in the school and the degree to which the school is perceived to be meeting the teacher’s personal needs and expectations. The study fails to show the place of teacher involvement in decision-making on motivation.

Bennell and Mukyanuzi (2005) studied teacher motivation in Tanzania and viewed teacher job motivation as the professional attention and eagerness that a teacher shows towards the attainment of their personal and group objectives in a school setup. The study found that when a healthy school environment is provided and the teacher is highly motivated, teachers develop a good feeling towards each other and at the same time, tend to have sense of achievement from their work. The study failed to link teacher motivation to involvement in decision-making.

According to Ifinedo (2013), in a study on employee motivation and job satisfaction in Finnish organizations, found that healthy social school environment and high levels of employee motivation is a complex and difficult term to define; therefore a precise definition of this concept is elusive as the notion comprises the characteristics of individual and situation as well as the perception of that situation by the individual. The study did not focus on the public secondary school context, but the commercial sector in a different context other than Kenya.

Ladebo (2005) studied the effects of Work-related Attitudes on the Intention to leave the profession with reference to School Teachers in Nigeria and asserted that organization’s liveliness comes from the motivation of its employees, although their abilities play just as crucial a role in determining their work performance as
their motivation. It was also found that motivated and committed staff can be a determining factor in the success of a school. At any rate, the study failed to link teacher motivation to involvement in decision-making.

Ololube (2005) benchmarked “the Motivational Competencies of Academically Qualified Teachers and Professionally Qualified Teachers in Nigerian Secondary Schools” and found a myriad of factors that determine a person’s job satisfaction level. These include social relationships, income, leadership, perceived promotion system fairness, working condition quality as well as the job itself. Medical practitioners’ job dissatisfaction or satisfaction determine their association with the administration, co-workers and patients. Motivation and job satisfaction are very critical to the longstanding development of any educational system across the globe. The study however failed to link teacher motivation to involvement in decision-making.

Firestone and Pennel (2013) studied “teacher commitment, working conditions and differential incentive policies in New York” and found a strong correlation between performance and job satisfaction owing to the narrow procedures often employed to articulate job performance. Firestone and Pennel (2013) opined that when performance is articulated to comprise imperative behaviours not largely reproduced in performance appraisals, there is improvement in its association with job satisfaction. The study however also failed to link teacher motivation to involvement in decision-making.

Judge, Thoresen, Bono and Patton (2011) reviewed literature of the job satisfaction-job performance relationship and found that when the correlations are
appropriately made (for sampling and measurement errors), the average correlation between job motivation and job performance is higher. In addition, the relationship between job motivation and performance was found to be even higher for complex (e.g., professional) jobs than for less complex jobs. Thus, contrary to earlier reviews, it does appear that job satisfaction is, in fact, predictive of performance, and the relationship is even stronger for professional jobs. The study also failed to link teacher motivation to involvement in decision-making.

Kovach (1995) studied “employee motivation as a factor in organization’s performance in Pakistan” and found that “job motivation has been the most frequently investigated variable in organizational behaviour.” Greater job motivation was associated with higher job prestige. A majority of workers are however satisfied in even the minimum admired jobs. Job motivation is in any case as discrete as one’s state of mind or feelings. A variety of factors can influence job satisfaction, including one’s quality of relationship with their supervisor, the physical work environment quality, as well as the extent of contentment in their work. Improved job motivation on the other hand can in some instances lead to a reduction of their job performance. The study was based in Pakistan which is a different context compared to Kenya.

Mwangi (2012) studied “factors related to the motivation of Agriculture Teachers in Machakos District” and reported that teacher motivation is affected by among other issues: constant shortage and low turnover, displeasure with school authorities, poor career structure, insufficient pay, poor school facilities, lack of promotion opportunities, inadequate school disciplinary policy, lack of interest in the school, pupils’ poor work as well as behaviour and attitudes of the school
principal and of other teachers. The study however narrowed down the scope to study only Agriculture teachers and in Machakos District whereas the present study focused on all teachers across three different counties.

Andrew (2014) studied the “impact of perceived leadership behaviours on satisfaction, commitment, and motivation” and concluded that employee motivation is based on recognition and rewards in desktop review intrinsic rewards are inherent rewards inside the occupation itself including gratification from successfully completing a task, autonomy, and gratitude from the head teacher, while extrinsic rewards are palpable rewards including fringe benefits, bonuses, pay and promotions. The study was a desktop review yet the present study adopted a descriptive study design.

Glewwe et al., (2013) studied teacher incentives in Kenya and found that in the sample, 20% of the period allocated for teaching, teachers are absent. In Uganda, nonattendance rates was found as great as 26% of the times. The same problems have been recorded in Madagascar. Often, teachers have been found to hold a second job. Typically, compensation is applied to direct, energize or control staff behaviour. An organization exists to achieve specific objectives and goals. Different persons in an institution have their own different needs. The scheme that an institution uses to recompense staff can play an imperative role in the institution’s effort to advance competitive advantage and to accomplish its key objectives. The study however failed to link teacher motivation to involvement in decision-making.
Kazeem (2009) studied the “correlation of job motivation of workers in selected public and private secondary schools in Ife-Ijesa Zone, Osun State, Nigeria” and found that compensation system should attract and retain the talent of organizational needs, encourage employees to develop the skills and abilities they need, motivate employees and create the type of team culture in which employees care about the organization’s success. Through motivation, individuals willingly engage in some behaviour. In retaining, linking performance to pay is probable to help enhance staff composition. Staff that perform higher than their peers seem to achieve a greater share of payment resources and are therefore inspired to continue working in the organization. On the other hand, employees that perform below to average become disheartened and express intent to exit the institution. As such, the impact of incentive on employee retention and performance should be measured and attended to in public organizations. The study however failed to link teacher motivation to involvement in decision-making.

Michaelowa (2012) studied “teacher Job Satisfaction, Student Achievement and the Cost of Primary Education in Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa” and established that if staff deem their efforts as outweighing the productions, they become discouraged in relation to the employer and the job. Staff react to this reality in dissimilar ways, as the degree of discouragement is relative to the apparent difference between expected outputs and inputs. Some staffs decrease application and effort and become interiorly discontented, or externally problematic or even troublesome. Other staffs pursue an improvement of the productions by making demands or claims for more rewards, looking for a
substitute job. The study however focused on primary schools yet the present study focused on secondary schools.

Sirima and Poipoi (2010) studied the “perceived factors influencing public secondary school teachers’ job satisfaction in Busia District, Kenya” and advocated that there ought to be an operational return system to keep the high performers in the institution and compensation should be associated with their productivity. To maximize employee the performance, organizations ought to make such procedures and policies and articulate such compensation system under those procedures and policies which raises employee motivation and satisfaction. The reviewed study failed to link teacher motivation to involvement in decision-making.

Reio and Callahon (2014) conducted a path analysis of job performance precursors in India and argued that both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards led to higher productivity as a result of motivating employees. In some instances, management concentrates resources in extrinsic rewards, but similarly significant in employee motivation are intrinsic rewards. Psychological or intangible rewards like recognition and appreciation play a vibrant role in increasing employee performance and motivating employees. The study was however not specific to the public secondary school context and was based in India, hence the present study.

Omenge, Cleve and Agoki (2012) conducted an analysis of motivation in teacher performance with reference to primary schools in Ekerenyo division, Nyamira district and found that intrinsic rewards are inherent rewards inside the occupation itself including gratification from successfully completing a task, autonomy, and
gratitude from the head teacher, while extrinsic rewards are palpable rewards including fringe benefits, bonuses, pay and promotions. The study focused on primary school teachers while the present study focused on secondary school teachers.

Tosti and Herbst (2009) studied organizational performance and customer value focusing on private primary school parents in Punjab Pakistan and found that teacher motivation is essential for it can impact positively on the teacher’s performance and also on students’ attitudes and learning. They argue that increasing the level of teacher job motivation is not only making teaching more enjoyable for teachers, but also making learning more enjoyable for students. This builds an atmosphere that is more favourable to learning. Teacher’s job motivation levels and performance are also correlated. Even though teachers can individually make initiatives to preserve their job motivation, they need also to feel valued by the school principal to remain inspired and enthusiastic in the classroom. When the teachers’ performance is high, the students are also likely to improve on their performance too. The study did not link teacher motivation to involvement in decision-making.

Gorham and Millete (1997) in a comparative analysis of teacher and student perceptions of sources of motivation and demotivation in college classes in Chile found that schools and their communities have always pursued the best teachers they could get in the hope that their students’ achievement is determined by the teachers. High teacher job motivation has some very important results for the school. The principal finds that teachers are prepared to follow their requests and instructions with enthusiasm and respect. Undeniably, teaching and learning are
done with minimal supervision. This is a very good environment for the principals who find that teachers will work hard in the face of technical hitches. When called for overtime or holiday work, teachers’ response will quicken. Above all, teachers openly demonstrate an attitude of respect for and confidence in their principals. The study however was based in Chile and did not link teacher motivation to involvement in decision-making hence the present study.

Kreisman (2012) sought to find out the identification of the drivers of employee dissatisfaction and turnover with a focus on the University of Texas and found that schools profit from the supposed motivational influences of teachers in participative decision-making. When teachers take part in the decision-making process, they increase their understanding and attitude among colleagues and principals and improve their value in the school. While demonstrating the role of principals in the entire setting of participative decision-making, the study argues that participative decision-making by the principal safeguards the totality of decision-making and grows teachers commitment to final decisions made. The study was based on the university setting which is considerably different from the secondary school setting hence the present study.

Ofoegbu (2014) studied teacher motivation as a factor for classroom effectiveness and school improvement in Nigeria and showed that participative decision-making has a positive impact on teacher job motivation, teacher commitment, teacher performance and school effectiveness. Furthermore, when all the teachers in the school take part in the decision-making process, communication within the school is much more effective and all the teachers produces more efficient results. The
study was however based in Nigeria while the present explored the Kenyan scenario.

Mungunda (2013) conducted an investigation into School Principals’ Experiences and Perceptions of Participative Management in South Africa and points out that participative decision-making in schools has different results. In the aspect of teachers, PDM raises to motivation, satisfaction, and performance, which are generally acknowledged as commitment and productivity. In the aspect of principal, participative decision-making is evolved into decision quality and efficiency that is subjective to various and differential mixed layers in terms of information access, level of involvement, procedures and dimensions. The study was however based in South Africa while the present study explored the Kenyan scenario.

2.4 Teacher Participation in Decision-making and Job Motivation

Uba-Mbibi and Oluchi (2013) explored “decision-making and Job Satisfaction as Correlates of Teachers job performance in Junior Secondary Schools in Abia State, Nigeria” and recognized the following benefits: a greater amount of information are provide by groups than would hitherto be accessible to separable members, thus resulting in knowledgeable decisions; involvement in decision-making leads to the acceptance of decisions, which advances the incentive to execute the decision; and groups are ready to take larger risks than persons, which results in vibrant resolutions to difficulties. The study was however based in Nigeria while the present explored on the Kenyan context. The present study paid more attention to the aspect of motivation influenced by participation in decision-making.
Kim (2012) studied “participative management and job satisfaction among teachers in Manila, the Philippines” and found that collective decision-making has the possibility to advance the decision quality, surge a decision's implementation and acceptance, reinforce staff morale, teamwork and commitment, build trust, increase school effectiveness and help administrators and staff obtain new skills. The study was based in Manila which presents a different socio-economic context from the Kenyan scenario hence the present study.

Wadesango and Bayaga (2012) studied teachers’ involvement in decision-making processes in South Africa and found “a strong relationship between teachers empowerment and self-efficacy, where reducing teachers empowerment may lead to low self-efficacy”, and “low self-efficacy in people can destroy motivation, lower their aspirations, interfere with cognitive abilities and adversely affect physical health” Additionally “people who are extremely low in self-efficacy will not even attempt to cope because they are convinced that nothing they do can make a difference”. The study was however based in South Africa while the present study was conducted in Kenya.

In a study on teachers' participation in educational affairs in Iran performed by Hava and Miskel (2013), the results showed that providing teachers with opportunities to participate in educational decisions has an important effect on the development of teachers' professional skills. It also showed that there was a positive correlation between the teachers’ participation in educational decisions and their occupational motivation. The study was done in Iran while the present study was done in Kenya. The present study established that involving teachers in decision-making enhances their job motivation.
An extensive structural equation modelling research by Keung (2008) on “the effect of shared decision-making on the improvement in teachers’ job development in Hong Kong” revealed that though teachers possessed more pronounced wish to participate in instructional decisions than in managerial and curricular domains, they deemed themselves to be in a state of deprivation – decision in all the decision domains. In addition, results revealed that job motivation was linked to participation in curricular and managerial decisions, and commitment was linked to participation in curricular decisions. Participation in instructional decisions was not linked with commitment and job satisfaction. It was also found that involvement in curriculum decision domains was the only job commitment forecaster, while involvement in instructional domain was the only workload determinant. The study was based in China and not in Kenya hence prompting this study.

Kazempur (2010) conducted a comparison between the existing and desired conditions of less experienced and experienced teachers in curriculum planning process focusing on Islamic Azad University and found that there was a significant correlation between teachers’ participation in educational affairs and their professional skills as well as their subsequent performance. The study failed to link the teachers’ participation in educational affairs to motivation, hence the present study.

Fathi (2014) studied the feasibility of teacher participation in curriculum planning processes of education system in Persian, Iran and showed that teacher participation in curriculum – related decision-making is effective on the enhancement of their professional skills. On the other hand, others discussed that the problem is not on formulation but in the implementation of decisions. The
study however failed to link the teachers participation to motivation, hence the present study.

Taylor and Bogotch (1994) studied the school-level effects of teachers’ participation in decision-making in Texas and found that participation did not improve outcomes for teachers or students and that teachers did not feel sufficiently involved in decision-making as was sufficient despite working in a reform district. These findings contrast previous studies hereby reviewed, hence a motivation for the present study.

Grant, Kajee, Gardner, Somaro and Moodley (2010) conducted a survey analysis of Kwa Zulu Natal teachers’ perceptions and found that “although the teachers were involved in decision-making, some decisions reached were not implemented by the school principals.” Consequently, there was low job performance and lack of job satisfaction among junior secondary school teachers. The study was based in South Africa while the present explored the Kenyan context.

Kiprop and Kandie (2012) conducted “an investigation into teacher participation in decision-making in public secondary schools in Kenya with reference to Baringo District” and reported that teachers’ participation in making decisions at the school level was realized to enable arrival at better decisions since those nearest to students are best equipped to carry out and make decisions and are best suited to know how best to advance their schools. It was considered as inspirational to the involved members and it released their responsibility, energy and initiative, leading to augmented teacher job satisfaction and superior job commitment. The study was however narrow in its scope as it focused on only one district. The present study
surveyed three counties and also established other areas that teachers get involved in decision-making.

Wagner (2014) studied “teachers’ participation’s effects on performance and satisfaction” in desktop review and it was found to inspire members of the teaching profession to take on bigger accountability for what transpired in a school thereby increasing teachers’ change ownership, offering teachers an input in putting to better use their expertise and in school policy. The involvement of teachers in decision-making was deemed as forging relations between teachers and administrators. The involvement of teachers in making decisions was viewed as an initiative for change focusing on a substitute school management strategy. The study employed a desktop design while the present study employed a descriptive design. The study was based more on how the teachers would use participative decision-making to create school ownership whereas the current study focused more on the extent teachers are involved in various areas since the Kenya policy framework has provided for the same.

Williams (2000) studied “teachers’ perceptions of principals’ effectiveness in selected secondary schools in Tennessee Education” and found that the involvement of teachers in decision-making also empowers them while the abandonment of them in making decisions was considered as a supposition that they were unexploited resources with experience, knowledge and interest in participating. Staffs need to offer structures and opportunities for their participation. Wilkinson also expected that making decisions in a participative manner is probable to better quality decisions as well as job motivation and that improvements are obtainable both to workers job satisfaction and increased
efficiency to the principal. In short, a win-win scenario is maintained. The study was based in Tennessee while the present explored the Kenyan context. However, the study was concerned with teachers’ perception on how the principals involve them but the current study also focused on the styles principals use to involve teachers since they affect the extent of participation.

Knoop (1995) studied the “influence of participative decision-making on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of school principals in Turkey” and found that “when teachers participate under a decentralized setup, they tend to be more committed to the issues they care about and hence to the organization they serve.” Similarly, Imber (2010) studied “factors that contribute to teacher satisfaction with participative decision-making in Cameroon” and found that teachers who feel that they were deprived of decision-making ability, reported lower levels of satisfaction, but flooded and at symmetry expressed greater senses of satisfaction but were not certainly enthusiastic to upsurge their participation. As such, to basically surge involvement in making decisions in total terms may be ineffective. However, in general terms, they concluded that “allowing teacher participation in decision-making purports to result in a more satisfied teacher with greater commitment to organizational goals”, but exceptions were noted. The two studies were based in contexts different from Kenya, hence the present study. Also, the current study sought to find out the level of motivation that results from participation in decision-making which this study had not looked at.

Mark (1992) studied “teachers’ participation in decision-making with focusing on assessing willingness to participate in Chicago.” In an attempt to comprehend better a teacher’s wish to take part in making decisions, the study employed four
groupings of teacher participation in decision-making: disenfranchised (desired but not involved), empowered (desired and involved), disengaged (neither desired nor involved), and involved (involved but no desire). The study endeavored to determine what was considered a lack of comprehension of the qualities of teacher involvement dimensions. They also established that the best distinction between low and high participation groups was the principal and evidence of job satisfaction, and that teacher effectiveness was the most likely to discriminant variable among teachers with regard to their longing to take part in making decisions. This study failed to emphasize the role of principal in engaging teachers in decision-making which the current study is focusing on since the style the principal uses determines the extent of teachers’ involvement.

Mustafa and Othman (2010) studied “the effect of work motivation on teacher’s work performance in Pekanbaru senior high schools, Riau Province, Indonesia” and found that teachers have a greater motivation acting as leaders and therefore more committed to change. The study further found that shared decision-making was a means for teachers to lead beyond the school and the classroom. Such stretched involvement and influence enhanced their obligation to methodical change and enabled them to become more efficacious and empowered teachers. Over time, focus on participation in decision-making has shifted its focus from merely coopting teachers, to empowering them to lead. The study was based in Indonesia, a different context from Kenya, hence the present study. To ensure teachers participation is effective, there is need to ascertain that the style the principal is using is acceptable by the teachers which this current study is addressing.
Latham (2010) studied “site-based management in educational leadership in Indonesia” and found that a major reason for the popularity of this reform is that it tends toward decentralization of school decision-making, and consequently improves student performance. Involving teachers in decision-making changes the manner that schools are governed by removing the power from the hands of the central office or administration and sharing it among teachers, principals, and sometimes parents. There was no clear linkage in the study between participation and teacher motivation hence the present study. Teacher’s motivation is instrumental in enhancing job satisfaction and it is a great concern to the researcher in the current study.

Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach (2010) studied “leadership and other conditions which foster organizational learning in schools in the Netherlands” and found that teachers can be empowered by decentralization accompanied by site-based decision-making to varying degrees, ranging from minimal enablement to full teacher control or partnership. Similarly, Anderson (2012) sought to find out “why teachers participate in decision-making and the third continuum in Canada” and found that high teacher participation results in teacher leadership and that teachers’ actual participation was dependent upon individual desire and teacher characteristics. The study was based in the Netherlands, a different context from Kenya, hence the present study. The study also failed to link participation with motivation which the current study is addressing.

Sidner (1994) studied “site-based management/shared decision-making in New York” and found that the shared decision-making process could increase
communication and accelerate change in an organizational culture, and that shared decision-making could redistribute authority and foster collaborative work ways among professionals. Positive variations could span from the schools using a shared decision-making approach. Sidner (1994) found that “shared decision-making increased communication”, which was the prime medium to transmit cultural change. As such, communication was seen to be a prerequisite to any systematic problem-solving. The study was based in New York, a different context from Kenya, hence the present study.

Tarara, (2005) performed “a content analysis of how participatory decision-making and teamwork affect employee satisfaction and employee commitment in Menomonie” and found that large desirable companies to work for, implement participatory decision-making and teamwork in their everyday environment. The execution of these features increases the organization’s level of employee satisfaction and commitment. Although the study was not on teachers, the results are relevant since teachers are also employees and the study contains relevant variables of investigation. The study was not specific to secondary schools, hence the present study. Teamwork which this study looked at may not necessarily guarantee involvement in decision-making hence the current study is more specific.

Beem (2007) studied “the relation between direct participation, organizational commitment, and turnover: A test of the mediating role of organizational justice and leader-member exchange in the University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands” in which a survey was carried out among 991 employees of Twente University in the Netherlands. The results revealed no significant differences in gender in scores
between the groups, but the variables’ mean scores showed moderate scores. “Satisfaction, with employee influence as a measure of satisfaction with direct participation practices, did not correlate to all forms of commitment.” The study was based in Netherlands, a different context from Kenya, hence prompting the present study.

Algoush (2010) assessed the relationship between teacher involvement in decision-making process and teachers’ job satisfaction in Malaysia among 60 teachers in a private school located in Bahrain (100% response rate with a theoretical framework that there are benefits that impact increased decision-making authority on teacher work life). The research was conducted using a survey method (two questionnaires: TJSQ-teachers’ job satisfaction questionnaire, and DIAQ—decision involvement analysis questionnaire). The Pearson correlation was used to find the correlation between the variables of TJSQ and DIA variables. Involvement of teachers in decisions of managerial topics was a mean 2.5. The average rate of teacher involvement in decisions of teaching kind was 4.5 (on a scale of 1-5). There was a significant negative correlation (r>-0.3) between levels of participating in managerial decisions and the following TJSQ variables. The study was however based in Malaysia, a different context from Kenya, hence the present study. The study was conducted in private school teachers while the present one was done at public secondary school.

Smylie, Lazarus and Brownlee-Conyers (2010) explored the instructional outcomes of school-based participative decision-making in Spain. Using social psychology and organizational theory to draw upon, three intermediate variables were identified as mechanisms that influenced the construct of teacher
participation in decision-making: (a) teacher autonomy (motivation mechanism), (b) accountability (control mechanism), and (c) professional learning opportunities (learning mechanism). The researchers argued that the three variables were control mechanisms through which participation in decision-making was processed and through which instruction may be influenced. The 4-year study conducted in a Midwest district in the United States by Smylie et al., included six decision-making measures: (a) participative decision-making, (b) individual autonomy, (c) individual accountability, (d) organizational learning, (e) instructional improvement, and (f) student outcomes. The study found large correlations between teacher participation in decision-making and instructional improvement \((r = 0.84)\), changes in reading achievement \((r = 0.80)\), and changes in mathematics achievement \((r = 0.52)\). There was no clear linkage in the study between participation and teacher motivation hence the present study.

Khandwalla (2009), in a study on “organizational designs four excellence in New Delhi” summarized the rewards participatory management as including: compared to an individual, a group can arrive at considerably better decisions since the group contains many persons with diverse information, skills and brains; people naturally work hard to execute something that they have jointly decided or designed; it induces the participants’ commitment in the decision-making process due to their sense of involvement; this leads to better solutions, information and options. However, there was no clear linkage in the study between participation and teacher motivation hence the present study.

Khoza (2014) studied teacher participation in site-based management in schools in South Africa and listed the following benefits of the participative mode of
management: it increases employee productivity, it enhances job satisfaction, it leads to high performance work practices; and it increases employee sense of belonging and commitment. On the disadvantages, Khandwalla (2009) recommended numerous major points to demonstrate the drawbacks of participative management as follows: it is a sluggish style of reaching decisions; in situations that necessitate prompt reactions in real time, such as emergencies and crises, it is not favored; it is not preferred when hard-hitting resolutions have to be made as this is a ‘soft’ mode; and it is not suitable when the capability discrepancy between the led and the leader is very large. The study was based in South Africa, a different context from Kenya, hence the present study.

Chapman (2010) studied *school-based decision-making and management* in Hampshire and warns of the possibility that the participation of the teachers may affect their teaching quality in the classrooms, for participation to be attractive for such a group, organizational arrangements must ensure that participation in decision-making does not detract from teaching. Meanwhile, Chapman suggested that the time factor has negative impact on the teachers, teaching and the quality of decisions as follows: Participation in decision-making process may detract from teaching; teachers spend more time in committee work, that increases their tiredness and stress which in turn affect classroom practice and attendance; and the teachers’ limited time affects the decision-making process itself and the quality of the decisions made. The study presents a contrast to the foregoing studies reviewed hence the present study.

Newcombe, McCormick and Sharpe (1997) studied “financial decision-making, teacher involvement and the need for trust in Queensland Australia” and found
that teachers participating in the corporate and managerial life of the school expressed an understanding of their obligation to the classroom. Curriculum development occasions were said to be decreased, little time was accessible to deliberate with coworkers, involvement with students was limited outside the classroom and preparation of lessons was affected. Teachers found that there was "little time for personal and professional reflection for developing a sense of pedagogic purpose". This study was conducted in Queensland Australia, a different context from Kenya, hence the present study. The present study is wide in scope since it focuses on more areas in which teachers may be involved like human resource management, student affairs and others which consequently influence job motivation hence filling the gap.

Tshomela (2008) examined “teacher participation in decision-making in secondary schools in South Africa” and indicated that participative decision-making outcomes have a number of advantages including: increased decision creativity and quality, acceptance, judgment, understanding and accuracy. Mullins (2005) states that staff participation in decision-making leads to higher performance and which is necessary for survival in an increasingly competitive world. There was no clear linkage in the study between participation and teacher motivation hence the present study.

Chan, Ching and Cheng (1997) studied “teacher participation in decision-making with reference to Hong Kong” and found that teachers’ reaction to quality management (QM) and their involvement in decision-making (PDM) are regarded as the major issues affecting teacher’s job motivation. The enhancement effort issues are anticipated to impact teacher’s job motivation. The findings disclosed
that the impact of PDM on development efforts is significantly greater than that of QM. This finding advises that PDM is the most essential element of the QM process that impacts on improvement efforts and individual performance. The study was however based in Hong Kong, a different context from Kenya, hence the present study.

Vengrasalaman (2000) conducted “a survey of teachers’ participation in decision-making process in Batu Pahat district schools of Malaysia” and found that providing the teachers with the opportunity to contribute, enabling them, and involving them in the process of decision-making offers a new chance for constant improvement of the process. There was no clear linkage in the study between participation and teacher motivation hence the present study. Nakpodia (2010) studied “the influence of principals’ leadership styles for effective administration of secondary schools in Delta State, Nigeria” and found that the superior participation of teachers in making decisions was an imperative feature of the school-based management devolution policy and a substitute to the bureaucratic top-down system of schooling in many diverse settings. The study was however based in Nigeria and not in Kenya, hence the present study.

Ndayelechi (2011) assessed “the financial management practices in special science schools in Niger State, Nigeria (2005-2010).” The results of the analysis showed that shared management style results in employee satisfaction of higher order needs including self-actualization and self-esteem needs. Affective model supporters argue that fulfilled employees will be more productive as they are motivated more. Criticizers have argued that much participatory management is “involvement for the sake of involvement’ and that ‘as long as subordinates feel
they are participating and are being consulted, their ego needs will be satisfied and
they will be more cooperative”. Although the study was done in Nigeria, the past is
now superimposed on present Kenya in a different context. The finding of this
study is only for selected teachers from science special school but the current study
used teachers from public secondary schools hence it is more representative.

Nkado (2012) assessed “the capacity building needs of principals in human
resources development in secondary schools in Bornu State, Nigeria” and found
that participatory decision-making was associated with augmented commitment
and job satisfaction and that renunciation of participation in decision making issues
of prominence led to lower satisfaction levels. Nwaeze (2013) explored “the
relationship between leadership styles of principals on organizational climate of
secondary schools in Anambra State” and “found a significant relationship existed
between levels of teacher involvement and job satisfaction”. Further, other studies
have espoused on job satisfaction in relation to administrative influence. The two
studies were based in Nigeria, a different context from Kenya, hence the present
study.

Obasi (2009) studied “factors influencing the administrative effectiveness of
Secondary School Principals in Port Harcourt Metropolis” and found that
“teachers’ perceived autonomy within the classroom was positively related to
satisfaction in the work setting”. Njoku (2014) assessed “the relationship between
organizational factors and administrative effectiveness of University Academic
Managers in Imo and Rivers State of Nigeria” and found that administrators and
teachers practiced comparable job satisfaction levels, autonomy and commitment
in decision-making. The two studies were however based in Nigeria, a different context from Kenya, hence the present study.

Yadegari and O’Connell (1997) studied “selected school variables and the achievement related activities of shared decision-making teams in New England” and found that job satisfaction is positively correlated with professionals’ participation and job commitment. Involvement has been deemed as a key cause of organizational and individual school outcomes, such as the job satisfaction of teachers. These studies in general have indicated that decision-making involvement affects and is related to teacher job satisfaction. A positive extrapolative effect thus exists in relation to teachers’ participation in decision-making and job satisfaction as hypothesized in the present study.

Wiener and Vardi (1980) studied “the relation between Job Organization and Career Commitment and work outcomes among teachers in Malaysia” and found that if teachers participated in the decision-making process and the setting of school goals, they appear to be committed staff members. The study also found that job commitment was occasioned by teacher participation in decision-making. Involving teachers in decision-making improved their commitment. The study was however based in Malaysia, a different context from Kenya, hence the present study.

Gamage (2000) studied “international Developments and Current trends in School-Based Management in Hong Kong” and showed that school leaders and teachers with 10 years of experience in participatory decision-making are happier in executing local school management. School heads contented that it leads to a
higher degree of commitment to and ownership of the execution process. Participation in making decisions also creates commitment, ownership and a sense of enablement, as teamwork leads to relationships and new roles.

Goodin (1995) performed an “Exploratory Study on school Based Management and Teacher Satisfaction in India” and found that “teachers’ participation in decision-making was positively correlated with their commitment and satisfaction”. They add that teachers’ decision-making involvement could lead to an improvement in commitment and their job satisfaction, which were affirmative pointers for effective school management. Therefore, a positive extrapolative impact of teachers’ participation in decision-making on job commitment is hypothesized in this study. The study was exploratory in design yet the present is descriptive.

2.5 Summary of Gaps

The foregoing studies attempted to link teacher participation in decision-making with various notable learning outcomes including teachers’ job motivation and academic performance. The literature reviewed has however brought out pertinent knowledge gaps that formed the basis of the present study. It was particularly notable that majority of the studies have narrowly focused on subject specific teachers including science and mathematics and overlooked public secondary school teachers in general; narrowly focused on particularly administrative regions for instance single districts which may not be representative of the state of affairs in all public secondary schools in Kenya; and conducted in other developed economies including Europe, the United States if America and Asia which may not be reflective of the Kenyan scenario hence the present study.
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Some studies further focused on primary school levels or other sectors of the economy other than education and public secondary schools in Kenya and failed to link the three concepts underpinning the study including teacher participation in decision-making and teacher motivation. The present study endeavors to fill this gap by exploring the influence of secondary school teachers’ participation in decision-making on their job motivation with reference to Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado Counties in Kenya.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section presents a description of research design that was adopted in the process of carrying out this study. It gives a description of the target and study population, sample size, research instruments, pilot testing, data analysis procedures, validity of the instruments, reliability of the instruments and logistical and ethical considerations in research.

3.2 Research Design

To achieve its objectives, this study used descriptive design, employing both qualitative-quantitative approaches. According to Creswell (2009) integration of qualitative and quantitative strategies will help to complement each other. This assisted in offsetting the weaknesses of both qualitative and quantitative data analysis techniques as well as for triangulation for data validity. The descriptive design is justified in the present study as it uses the description, recording, analyzing and interpreting of conditions that exist. It also involves some types of comparison or contrast to discover relationships. Thus, the study made use of a questionnaire for the quantitative aspect and the interview guide for the qualitative aspect of a descriptive survey research. The researcher collected in-depth empirical data from public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties to explain the existing status of teacher participation in decision-making and its influence on job motivation. Orodho (2009) asserts that by descriptive design the researcher can collect data from a wide spectrum of respondent interested for further clarification of issues. By employing descriptive study design, the
researcher was to collect data from the secondary school teachers as well as the principals.

3.2.1 Study Variables

Independent Variable

The independent variable was teacher participation in decision making (decision making styles)

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables were teachers motivation levels (absenteeism level, turnover levels and job performance).

3.3 Study Locale

This study was conducted in Nairobi, Kajiado and Nyeri counties. Nyeri County represented a rural socio-economic setting, while Nairobi County represented an urban setting and Kajiado represented Arid and Semi- Arid Lands (ASAL) setup.

Nairobi City County has an area of 684sq km. It has an estimated population of about 3 million (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2009). Nairobi City County offers good education facilities which attract students from around the country. It has 60 public secondary schools with enrollment of 42,826 students and 3,060 teachers (TSC, 2013). The researcher chose Nairobi County due to its socio-economic setup to represent an urban population. Because of its status, the researcher felt it was best to establish how teachers participate in decision-making and find out how it influences their motivational level in regards to their performance in educational out-put in the County.
Kajiado County is located in the southern section of the Eastern Great Rift Valley in Kenya, it encompasses the Athi-Kaputei ecosystem (2,200 km²) within its northern half, the greater Amboseli Ecosystem (7730.32 km²) to the east and the western Kajiado ecosystem (11388.54 km²) to the west. The county borders Nairobi city to the north and extends to the Kenya-Tanzania border further south (RoK, 2009). Kajiado has only 42 public secondary schools and a small (798) number of teachers compared to Nairobi and Nyeri counties. Being an ASAL region, also the richest county in Kenya as per the Commission for Revenue Allocation (CRA, 2015), education sector in the county is somehow incapacitated as many of the schools in this region have very limited basic schooling resources like teachers, supplies of books and materials. The researcher has chosen Kajiado to represent an ASAL region to establish how teachers participate in decision-making and how it influences their motivational level in public secondary schools in this county.

Nyeri County is located in Central Kenya, it borders the following counties; Laikipia to the North, Meru to the North East, Kirinyaga to the East, Murang’a to the South, and Nyandarua to the West. The County is situated about 150 km (a two-hour drive) north of Kenya's capital Nairobi, in the country's densely populated and fertile Central Highlands, lying between the eastern base of the Aberdare (Nyandarua) Range, which forms part of the eastern end of the Great Rift Valley, and the western slopes of Mount Kenya. Nyeri County has a total of 175 public secondary schools with 175 principals and 5250 teachers. The researcher developed interest in distinguishing teachers’ in sparsely/ densely populated and teachers in the city’s participation in decision making for their job motivation
3.4 Target Population

3.4.1 Schools

This study targeted all public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado Counties. The target population was 9335 which included principals and teachers of the selected schools in the three counties. There are a total of 277 public schools in the three counties. In this study, the schools were classified based on gender as mixed schools (185), girls’ schools (52) and boys’ schools (40). Table 3.1 shows the distribution of these schools in the three counties.

3.4.2 Respondents

The study targeted two categories of respondents, namely; all the principals and teachers, in the 277 public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties. The principals and teachers are expected to involve themselves in participatory decision-making in their schools. Details regarding the population distribution of the two categories of respondents in the three counties are presented in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1: The target population of respondents in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyeri</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajiado</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>277</strong></td>
<td><strong>277</strong></td>
<td><strong>9108</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

3.5.1 Sample Size

Mugenda and Mugenda (2013) argue that depending on time and resources available, the researcher should take the biggest sample size in order to increase precision. This proposal shows that a sample of 10% of the total population should be used when the population sampled from a relatively large population (above 1000) and 30% for relatively smaller target population (below 1000). The researcher used 111 schools which were randomly selected for this study. This constituted 40% of the total study population, which ensured that schools per all categories were represented in the study. Stratified random sampling with proportional allocation was employed in sampling the respondents from the different categories of schools (Table 3.2). All the principal respondents in the study schools were purposively sampled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School County / School type</th>
<th>Nyeri (pop)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Nairobi (pop)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Kajiado (pop)</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys Schools</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Schools</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed schools</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% of 175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40% of 60</td>
<td></td>
<td>40% of 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample size per county</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample size n=111 schools
3.5.2 Sampling of the Principals and Teachers

Principals were purposively sampled based on the sampled schools. To determine the number of teachers to be included in the study, the Fisher’s formula was used to determine the sample size (Fisher, 1984).

**Equation 3.1: Fisher’s formula**

\[ n = \frac{Z^2 \cdot pqN}{e^2 (N - 1) + Z^2 \cdot pq} \]

But since our population size \( N \) is large i.e. 9108, we reduce the formula to;

\[ n = \frac{(Z^2 \cdot p \cdot q)}{E^2} \]

Which normal approximation to binomial

Sample size \((n) = (1.96^2 \cdot 0.5 \cdot 0.5)/0.05^2 = 384.16 \) teachers

\( P=0.5, q=0.5, Z=1.96, e=0.05 \)

Where \( n = \) sample size, \( N= \) entire population, \( Z= \) the z score corresponding to \( \alpha =0.05 \) level of significance, \( E= \) Expected Error, \( p = \) Probability of interest, \( q = \) Probability of non-interest. The number of sampled teachers was taken to be the nearest whole number i.e. 385.

Stratified sampling technique was used in this study. The sample drawn in the strata depended on the size of that stratum in relation to the population. Cooper and Schindler (2011) argued that it is upon the researcher to make decisions concerning how a sample was allocated among the different strata. In this study, there are greater differences between the counties (strata) in terms of number of
teachers located in each county (stratum), the proportional stratified random sampling method becomes very appropriate.

As stated by Babbie and Mouton (2011), stratified random sampling is a technique used to obtain a high degree of representativeness by decreasing the likelihood of committing a sampling error. In this study, stratified random sampling allowed the researcher to obtain a general view of teachers’ participation in Kenya through the different opinions of those three counties. After dividing the population into the appropriate strata, respondents were randomly selected through a simple random sampling. Equal number of teachers was selected from each selected school. Information on sampling procedure is presented in Table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of teachers</th>
<th>Proportion of teachers</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Teachers per school</th>
<th>Gender distribution per school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyeri</td>
<td>5250</td>
<td>5250/9108</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 M 2 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>3060</td>
<td>3060/9108</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 M 3 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajiado</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>798/9108</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 M 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9108</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 Research Instruments

The research instruments that aided in conducting this study were;

i. A semi-structured decision-making questionnaire for the teachers and

ii. Unstructured decision-making interview guide for the principals.
3.6.1 Decision-Making Questionnaire for the Teachers

The decision-making questionnaire for the teachers was self-administered. The questionnaire had closed-ended questions adopting Likert scales as the chosen measurement. However, the questionnaire also contained open-ended questions which aimed at giving the respondents an opportunity to express their views on various issues related to teacher participation in decision-making process. According to Bonharme (2012), closed questions provide structured responses where respondents are asked to choose the answers from the given alternatives and thus they do not take much effort to complete and thus save a lot of time. The research objectives of the study formed the basis from which the research instruments were constructed. Questionnaires were used because they could collect a large amount of information in a reasonably quick space of time (Orodho, 2003). Questionnaires ensure confidentiality and information needed were easily narrated (Kombo & Tromp, 2009).

The questionnaire was structured into 4 sections: Section A contained questions geared towards addressing respondents’ biodata while section B contained questions designed to address the first objective that is decision-making styles used by principals in public secondary schools. Section C contained questions designed to address the extent to which public secondary school teachers are involved in decision-making; while section D contained questions designed to determine the level of job motivation among public secondary school teachers.

3.6.2 Decision-Making Interview Guide for the Principals

The principals formed key informants for the study and mainly gave information on how they ensured that teachers participated in decision-making and the areas,
and extent to which they allow them. The interview questions were also structured as per the study objectives. The researcher probed the principals to give more detailed information based on their responses to the questions. Interview created an opportunity to develop relationships with the participants so that the researcher could get the full range and in-depth of information from them.

### 3.7 Validity of the Instruments

Validity refers to the extent to which the measures used in the questionnaire are truthfully measuring the intended concept and not something else (Sekaran & Bougie, 2009). To ensure content validity, the questionnaires were subjected to a panel of 2 supervisors who were experts in that area to assess whether each measurement question in the questionnaires was essential, useful or necessary. Essential responses on each item from each panellist were evaluated by a content validity ratio, and those meeting statistical significance values were retained.

### 3.8 Reliability of the Instruments

Reliability refers to the consistency of the measure of concept (Bryman, 2012). It is the extent to which a measure is stable or consistent and produces similar result when administered repeatedly (Sushil & Verma, 2010). Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient (α) was employed in determining the reliability of the instruments. The coefficient is suitable since it has internal consistency, it is administered only once. Furthermore, Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient does not require the splitting of items into halves. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24 was used to test for reliability.
Smith (2013) advises that an alpha (α) of 0.8 or higher is normally deemed to be satisfactory and therefore, the instrument is deemed reliable. Therefore, the instrument was accepted as reliable at an alpha level of 0.8 or more based on the outcome generated from SPSS.

3.9 Piloting of the Instruments

Prior to the main study, a pilot study was conducted to assist in determining if there were flaws, limitations, or other weaknesses within the interview design and questionnaires which allowed for necessary corrections prior to the implementation of the study (Kvale, 2008). The desirability of piloting research instruments is not solely to ensure that survey questions operate well but also ensures that the research instruments as a whole function well (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In this study, a pilot study was carried out in two schools from each of the three counties under study. This exercise determined the time needed to carry out the study in one school and the time one respondent required to completely fill the questionnaires.

3.10 Data Collection Procedures

During data collection, the researcher made a visit to the selected schools. During the visit, the researcher asked for permission to conduct the study from the principal. At this stage, the researcher presented ethical clearance letter, clearance letter to conduct the study from the Ministry of Higher Education and an introduction letter from Kenyatta University. After being allowed to carry on with the study, the researcher gave the principals consent forms to sign and interviewed them. After explaining the purpose of the study, teachers who agreed to participate in the study signed a consent form. The teacher was then left to fill the questionnaire; the researcher picked the questionnaires from the teachers after five
days, to allow them ample time to respond to the questionnaires based on their busy schedule.

3.11 Data Analysis

This study aimed at establishing the influence of secondary school teachers’ participation in school decision-making on their job motivation in Nairobi, Nyeri and Kajiado counties. To find out the decision-making styles used by principals in secondary schools in the three counties; frequency and percentage were computed. Information gathered using the principals’ interview helped to validate the quantitative data. The qualitative data from the principals interviews were analyzed thematically. To determine the extent of participatory decision-making practices in public secondary schools in the three counties, the weighted arithmetic mean was computed.

To determine the level of teachers’ job motivation in public secondary schools in the three counties compared with the level of participation, the weighted arithmetic mean was computed. For the study to determine the relationship between participatory decision-making and teachers’ job motivation levels, T-test was used to determine whether there was any significant difference between them or not. Qualitative data were analyzed by content analysis.
Table 3.4: Data analysis Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To find out the decision-making styles used by principals in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties</td>
<td>What are the decision-making styles used by public secondary school principals in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties?</td>
<td>Quantitative (Scale)</td>
<td>Descriptive: Frequency and percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To examine the extent to which public secondary school teachers are involved in decision-making among public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties</td>
<td>To what extent are secondary school teachers involved in making decisions among public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties?</td>
<td>Quantitative (Ordinal)</td>
<td>Descriptive: Weighted arithmetic mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine the level of job motivation among public secondary school teachers in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties</td>
<td>What is the current level of secondary school teachers’ job motivation among public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties?</td>
<td>Quantitative (Ordinal)</td>
<td>Descriptive: Weighted arithmetic mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.12 Logistical and Ethical Considerations in Research

The researcher sought a Research Permit from the National Council for Research and Technology (NACOSTI). The necessary pre-fieldwork logistics such as pre-testing the instruments and making the sampling frame to identify the subjects before fieldwork. The researcher then visited schools to inform the subjects the purpose of the intended study, their role and then sought their informed consent to participate. The researcher then administered the tools with the help of research assistants who had been trained beforehand.
The researcher ensured that there was confidentiality and anonymity throughout the research process. No question required the respondents to give their names because such a question was outside the framework or the purposes of this study.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess the influence of secondary school teachers’ participation in decision-making on the job motivation. This chapter presents the findings from the results of the data analysis in relation to the study objectives and the interpretation and discussion of these findings in relation to the reviewed literature. The findings of the study are presented along the following thematic areas;

i. Decision-making styles used by principals.

ii. Extent to which secondary school teachers are used in decision-making.

iii. Levels of secondary school teachers’ motivation.

iv. Influence of teachers’ participation in decision-making on their job motivation.

4.2 Response Rate

As illustrated in Table 4.1, the samples for the study consisted of 111 principals and 385 teachers. A total of 340 self-administered questionnaires issued to the teachers were completely filled and returned yielding a response rate of 88.31% as depicted in Table 4.1. Out of the 111 principals, 99 responded to the interview yielding a response rate of 89.19%. The findings are presented in Figure 4.1.
Table 4.1: Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>88.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>89.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, 2016

According to Rogers, Miller and Judge (2009), a response rate of 50% is acceptable in descriptive social sciences. Mugenda and Mugenda, (2013) assert that 50% response rate is adequate, 60% good, while over 70% is rated very good. Bryman and Bell (2011) assert that a return of 50% is adequate, although Kvale (2008) set the adequacy bar at 75%. This implies that based on these assertions, the response rate of 88.31% for the teachers and 89.19% for the principals are therefore very good.

4.3 Demographic Information

This section presents respondent principals and teachers’ demographic information which includes gender, highest education level, age, length of years in service, school category and geographical location.

4.3.1 Principals Demographic Information

i. Principals Gender

The gender of the principal is assumed to have an impact on the leadership styles which in turn have an influence on the level of teacher participation in decision-making. The gender of the principals was sought to establish the representation of men and women among the principals in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties.
Table 4.2: Principals’ gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated in Table 4.2 show that 74.7% of the principals were male with 25.3% of the sampled principals being female. The principals gender distribution is in contravention of the Constitution of Kenya’s (2010) stipulation of the two thirds gender rule in which both gender is entitled at least a 30% representation in public office a position. It is expected that principals regardless of gender will encourage teacher participation in decision-making with a view to enhancing teacher participation.

ii. Level of Education

The principals’ level of education was sought. According to UNESCO (2012), principal’s level of education influences the teacher participation in decision-making which in turn determines their success and participation in education. The results are indicated in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Principals’ highest education level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education Level</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree level</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters level</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate level</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was noted that most principals had postgraduate qualifications with 44.4% having a Masters degree followed by 35.4% with a Bachelors degree while only
20.2% had a Doctorate degree. The higher education levels recorded among a majority of respondent principals was expected as school heads are usually sampled from teachers with higher qualifications. To effectively execute decision-making as well as teaching and administration, secondary schools need sufficient administrative staff with rich academic backgrounds to work effectively. The finding also indicates that the academic qualification level is high for this group of respondents, thus they were able to comprehend the research questions and answer appropriately.

iii. Principal’s Age

Age is considered a relative indicator of length of service. Individuals of different age categories exhibit different aspirations and various levels of motivation in their career and the performance of their duties (Obasi, 2009). The findings as indicated in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years and above</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of this study indicate that the majority 84 (84.9%) were above 45 years of age with 45 (45.5%) of the principals in the age bracket of 45-54, while 39 (39.4%) being from the age bracket of above 54 years. On the other hand, 15 (15.1%) of respondents were between 35-44 years. This can be attributed to the fact that most teachers are promoted to the level of principalship after serving for about 10 years, ordinarily above 45 years of age. Age is, therefore, a relative indicator of
principals’ experience on matters pertaining to decision-making and teacher motivation. Age of the principal also influences the command and respect that may encourage the willingness of teachers to participate in decision-making.

iv. Work Experience

Work experience is very important in any job. Many employees consider experience as their main source of competence. Principal’s management experience influences their decision-making styles which in turn determine the level of teacher participation in decision-making (Ogbeide and Harrington 2011). Table 4.5 indicates the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As presented in Table 4.5, majority 60 (60.6%) of the principals had worked between 6-10 years. This can be attributed to the fact that there has been an extension of retirement age from 55 to 60 years leading to extension of service of the already appointed principals. It is also shown that the ministry rarely appoints principals with minimal experience as indicated by those with 6.1% (3-5yrs). It can be deduced from the finding that the long period of service by the principals implies that a majority have a wealth of experience on various decision-making styles which in turn determine the level of teacher participation in decision-making.
v. Socio-Economic Background

Socio-economic background refers to a combination of individual’s income, occupation and social background. The study also sought to establish a representation of the various socio-economic settings within which respondents operated as shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Principals’ geographical location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Location</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-urban</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study established that a majority of respondents worked in schools in the rural setting (66.7%) followed by the urban setting (19.2%) then semi-urban (14.1%). This was also proportionate to the sampled schools with respect to the socio-economic settings. As such, the study can be deemed representative of the diverse experiences by school principals in regard to their respective schools socio-economic setting. It is expected that to enhance teacher motivation, teacher participation in decision-making is mainstreamed more in urban and semi-urban school settings as compared to the rural setting owing to the more demanding urban and semi-urban socio-economy in which teachers live that may require their input especially on decisions affecting their work environment and overall wellbeing.
4.3.2 Teachers Demographic Information

i. Gender

The gender of the teachers was assumed to have had an impact on participation in decision-making process in the study schools. This was sought to establish the representation of men and women among the teachers in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado Counties as shown in Table 4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that 190 (55.9%) of the teachers were male while the remaining 150 (44.1%) were female. This was consistent with the Constitution of Kenya 2010 which advocates for at least 30% of any gender (Constitution of Kenya, 2010). It is expected that teacher motivation may be influenced by their participation in decision-making on matters affecting their work environment and welfare regardless of gender.

ii. Level of Education

The study sought to find out teachers’ level of education. Table 4.8 presents responses on teachers’ level of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education Level</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was noted that most teachers (70.3%) had undergraduate degree followed by 14.7% of teachers with a Diploma level qualification while 13.8% had a Masters level. Doctorate degree was the least attained (1.2%). This indicates that the academic qualification level is also high among majority of teachers, thus they were able to comprehend the research questions and answer appropriately. It is expected that the higher the level of education a teacher possesses, the more value they would add towards decision-making and therefore the more motivated they would be by participation thereof.

iii. Teachers Age

The age of the teacher is considered a relative indicator of length of service. It can influence their level of participation in decision-making. The ages of the teachers were sought as indicated in Table 4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34 years</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years Above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate that the majority (43%) of the teachers were between age 25-34 years followed by 112 (33%) who were aged between 35 and 44 years and 75 (22%) of the teachers in the age bracket of 45-54. This can be partly attributed to the fact that most of the teachers had served between 6-10 years as established by the study. It was also worth noting that 2% of the teachers were from the age
bracket of above 54 years. This indicates that most teachers change their career before retirement age. Among the factors contributing to the high turnover rate may be low motivation. It is expected that the more teachers are allowed to participate on key decisions, the more they would find their jobs more interesting and the more they would be motivated to remain in the teaching career.

iv. Work Experience

Work experience refers to any experience that a person gains while working in a specific field or occupation. The number of years worked is used as an indicator of maturity and experience in decision making ability for sustainability of job motivation. The longer the length of service, the longer the teachers experience on matters pertaining to job motivation as they participate in decision-making for the fate of the organization. Table 4.10 represents the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from descriptive analysis indicate that the majority of the teachers 227 (67%) had worked as teachers between 6-10 years with 85 (25%) of the teachers having worked between 3-5 years. It was encouraging that majority of teachers had a teaching experience of more than 5 years which indicate they are familiar with decision-making process in their schools. It can be deduced from the finding that the long period of service by the teachers reflects their wealth of experience on
participation or lack thereof in school decision-making and the influence on their motivation.

v. Socio-Economic Background

Socio-economic background refers to a combination of individual’s income, occupation and social background. The study finally sought to establish a representation of the various socio-economic settings within which teachers operated. The responses are as indicated in Table 4.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Location</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-urban</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was established that a majority of respondents worked within the rural setting (58.8%) followed by the semi-urban (33.3%) then urban setting (7.9%). As such, the study can be deemed representative of the diverse experiences by teachers in regard to their respective schools socio-economic setting. It is expected that teachers living in both urban and semi-urban environments would be more demanding for participation in decision-making as compared to those living in rural environments owing to the pressing demands of the socio-economic environment in the two settings. This is with particular regard to decisions pertaining to teacher welfare and work environment.
4.4 Decision-making Styles Used by Principals in Public Secondary Schools

Decision-making is a human act. Within the decision-making process information is structurally managed by an organization through the human manipulation of information (Streufertn & Streufertn, 2008). The human actors are decision makers who ultimately determine the choice among the alternatives in the decision-making process. Significant research has demonstrated variations among individual decision processing. Individuals within the decision-making process can act very differently. For example, some individuals may be able to think quickly and methodically. Other decision makers may prefer to analyze and reflect, while others may like to act upon their thoughts rather than contemplating their actions.

In this study, the variable decision-making style was used to refer to the way principal uses information to formulate a decision. The decision-making style used by the principal is likely to influence the level of teacher participation in decision-making thus it was important for this study to identify the decision-making styles that were used by the principals (Smylie, 2012).

The first objective of this study was to find out the decision-making styles used by principals in secondary schools in making decisions as perceived by the teachers. Table 4.12 presents the main decision-making styles used by principals in public secondary schools.
The teachers were given various decision-making styles so as to make their choices and these were: rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous. As shown in Table 4.12, most of the teachers 122 (36%) reported that their principals use rational decision-making style, followed dependent decision-making style which was reported by 78 (23%) of the teachers, spontaneous decision-making style was reported by 54 (16%) of the teachers, intuitive decision-making style was reported by 48 (14%) of the teachers and avoidant decision-making style was reported by 38 (11%) of the teachers.

The use of rational and dependent decision-making styles by the majority of the principals can be attributed to the fact that the principals make decision based on the available facts and the circumstance. For the principals to ensure there is effective decision-making, according to Rausch (2005), they must ensure that the decision-making process encompasses the following stages: articulating concerns to be resolved, pinpointing other courses of action, searching for pertinent facts, assessing the other courses of action, picking the most appropriate alternative, executing the course of action, and checking how the implementation process
progresses towards the anticipated outcome. Simon (2007) is in support of the view that, the head teacher as the school manager should, after making decisions, communicate the decisions to teachers, and note how the choices taken are being carried out.

4.4.1 Methods Used by Principals to Ensure Teachers Participate in Decision-Making

Teachers were asked questions on participatory decision-making practices of school principals and teachers in public secondary schools in the three counties. This was in order to establish how the teachers participated in decision-making process. All the items specified in the questionnaire pertaining to participatory decision-making practices of school administrators and teachers were analyzed. Table 4.13 presents the results.

Table 4.13: Methods used by principals to ensure teachers participate in decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asking teachers’ opinion on various issues</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory management meetings arranged for teachers</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good communication between teachers and principal/administration</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers-to-principal feedback/teachers give back feedback</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special sessions/retreats to discuss school matters</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming sessions</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual reviews of the school’s strategy for making future plans</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular reviews of job description by teachers and administration</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As presented in Table 4.13, 56% of the teachers reported that the principals involve teachers in decision-making by asking teachers’ opinion on various issues; 44% reported that the principals involves teachers in decision-making by holding participatory management meetings arranged for teachers; while 33% reported that the principals involve teachers in decision-making by having a good communication between teachers and principal/administration and that there is a feedback process between the teachers and the principals. On the other hand, only 11% of the respondents reported that the principals use regular reviews of job description by teachers and administration as a way of ensuring that the teachers are participating in decision-making. Brainstorming sessions and annual reviews of the school’s strategy for making future plans were also not commonly used.

Principals play a critical role in establishing and maintaining school participative decision–making. Leithewood and Steinbach (2013) stated that “principals who developed a positive school climate, should come up with a method that will ensure opportunity for teachers’ collaboration and joint planning through a greater involvement in decision–making”. This part now considers the particular approaches that the school head can use in sustaining and developing shared tactic to making decisions at the school level. According to Lawler (2012), in nurturing high participation school, head teachers ought to deliver knowledge, information, rewards and power to teachers. A decision group’s leader enables the dissemination of information between persons and assimilates the feedback with a view to reach a united response. Organ and Batema (2011) add that the principal ought to share information about the work and school, power and understanding of
the field with teachers to surge their involvement by permitting them the occasion
to partake in decision making that touches on their work.

It was further confirmed in interviews with the school principals that different schools use various methods in ensuring teacher participation. A school principal for instance noted that he convenes regular meetings with his teachers in which he seeks their opinions on various areas of the school operation including student discipline, adequacy of teaching materials, budgeting among others. A school principal in the rural setting concurred that they regularly hold staff meetings where they review a range of issues affecting their day-to-day running of the school.

The researcher probed to find out when school principals allow their teachers to help them in decision-making. It was found that teachers are normally involved on various occasions, mostly at the beginning and the closing of every term in development of the content and form of lesson plan, developing teaching methodologies, setting the learning objectives, evaluating how well department is operating in developing procedures for assessing student achievement.

4.4.2 Areas of Decision-Making Where Teachers Are Involved

Moharman et al. (2012) observe that teachers’ involvement in different concerns of decision-making at the school level is thought to advance instruction and therefore the quality of education decision. Further, the authors asserted that teachers’ involvement in diverse decision-making issues, is likely to produce services and products of higher quality, less turnover, less absenteeism, less management
overhead and better problem solving. Involving teachers in decision-making can result in greater administrative efficiency.

Against this backdrop, the present study sought to observe the degree to which teachers on an individual level or collectively partake in school decision-making. For this purpose, six decision-making areas classified as: human resource management, student affairs, community relations, curriculum and instructions, finance and management of physical resources were taken by considering the current Kenyan secondary school practices. The summaries of respondents in each area of decision-making were shown in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14: Areas of decision-making where teachers participate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Decision-making</th>
<th>Teacher Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and instructions</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource management</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of physical resources</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparison with curriculum and instructions, community relations, human resource management, management of physical resources and finance, the involvement of teachers regarding student affairs is relatively higher. More than half of the teachers (60%) respondents affirmed that the involvement frequently practised (30%) occasionally and with only (10%) reporting that participation was never practised in making decision on student affair. On the other hand, for
curriculum and instructions, the responses of teachers participation in making decisions on curriculum and instructions have been relatively practised with 38% reporting that it is frequently practised and 52% reporting that this is occasionally practised.

For community relations, respondents reported a very low extent of participation with 53% reporting that they are never involved. This was followed by human resource management with 48%.

Finance recorded the lowest level of teachers participation with 75% of no participation. This indicates that principals are reluctant to delegate or allow teachers to participate in making financial decisions.

i. **Management of students Affairs**

To establish the decision making activities in student affairs where teachers participate, the teachers were given six decision activities to indicate their level of participation in making such decisions. The findings were presented in Table 4.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision activities in student affairs</th>
<th>Teacher Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting of students targets and rewards</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of student leaders</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students discipline</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting school rules and regulations</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of continuing students</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing disciplinary policies of the school</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As presented in Table 4.15, teachers mainly participate in making decisions that involve setting of students targets and rewards with 218 (64%) of the teachers reporting that they are frequently involved and another 99 (29%) reporting that they are occasionally involved with only 23 (7%) of the teachers reporting that they never participate in making decisions on setting of students targets and rewards. From Table 4.15, it is also clear that most teachers (63%) frequently participate in making decisions on election of student leaders while 122 (36%) occasionally participate in making such decisions with only 4 (1%) of the teachers reporting that they are never involved in such decisions.

On matters of students discipline and setting school rules and regulations the teachers are moderately involved with 146 (43%) and 116 (34%) of the teachers reporting that they are frequently involved. On the flip side, majority of the teachers 194 (57%) reported that they are never involved in making decisions on developing disciplinary policies of the school while another 143 (42%) reported that they are never involved in making decisions on admission of continuing students. The implication of these findings on teacher motivation is that the extent of teacher involvement on decision-making on matters that affect their effective teaching in the school determine their level of motivation. The more teachers are involved on such decision-making areas as discipline policies, the more they would be motivated compared to their involvement on such matters as student admission as this falls squarely in the principals’ docket.

The overall teachers participation in management of student affairs under the sample study was found to be relatively high. This is because over 50% of teachers affirmed to frequent extent of participation in two activities of decision-making.
On the other hand, above 30% of the total respondents affirmed that the frequent extent of participation in two items with the remaining two items scoring above 20%.

During the interviews, the principals were asked to identify the activities of decision-making with regard to student affairs that their teachers actively participated in, concerning the school policy, rule and regulation, they agreed that teachers participate occasionally. They also confirmed the finding obtained in Table 4.15 by stating that primarily, disciplinary policy was made at the national level and forwarded to the school for discussion. At the school level, some rules and regulations were derived from the general policy guidelines by the school Board of Management.

It was also found that teachers are invited for discussion to strengthen those rules and regulations already established by school board of management. In contrary to this view, the teachers feel that their participation in making such decisions is crucial.

**ii. Management of curriculum and Instruction**

To establish the decision activities in curriculum and instructions supervision where the teachers participate, the teachers were given six decision activities to indicate their level of participation in making such decisions. The findings are presented in Table 4.16.
Table 4.16: Teacher participation in curriculum and instructions supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision activities in curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Teacher participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing procedures for assessing student achievement</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on the content and form of lesson plan</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating how well department is operating</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing teaching methodologies</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting the learning objectives</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining when and how instructional supervision can be delivered.</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4.16 shows all of the teachers reported relatively high extent of participation on each item, majority of the teachers (73%) reported that they are frequently involved in developing procedures for assessing student achievement, 22% reported that they are occasionally involved with only 5% reporting that they are never involved in developing procedures for assessing student achievement. On deciding on the content and form of lesson plan, 68% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved, 26% reported that they are occasionally involved while only 6% reporting that they are never involved in deciding on the content and form of lesson plan. Sixty-five per cent reported that they are involved in evaluating how well department is operating.

On developing teaching methodologies, 63% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved in setting teaching strategy, 23% reported that they are occasionally involved while 14% reported that they are never involved in developing teaching methodologies. On setting the learning objectives, 62% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved in setting teaching strategy,
26% reported that they are occasionally involved while only 12% reported that they are never involved in setting the learning objectives. On determining when and how instructional supervision can be delivered, 60% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved in setting teaching strategy, 22% reported that they are occasionally involved while 18% reported that they are never involved in determining when and how instructional supervision can be delivered as displayed in Table 4.16. Teachers’ participation in all the activities was considerably high ranging with over 60% of the teachers reporting frequent participation.

The finding of this study is also in agreement with that of Achilles and High (2009) where teachers preferred to be perceived to be more involved in curriculum and instruction efforts. Similarly, Aggarwal (2013) points out that, “individual and cooperative efforts by teachers to decide when, how and what to teach, to revise courses, select content, plan units and produce teaching aids has become a common practice”. Moreover, Krug and Aggarwal, (2013) state that, “teachers participation in curriculum planning today is to be regarded not as a pleasant gesture to the teachers, but rather as an indispensable part of the process”.

Mualuko et al., (2009) similarly found that teachers participation in educational and curriculum planning is the essential key to the improvement of programmes, and that teacher participation in the process of the improvement and change in school programmes is of great importance. Teachers can recognize problems and find solutions very well. Thus, they argue, it is suitable to allow them to participate in the council meetings to discuss the issues. They concluded that to organize regularly teachers meetings at school for textbook content analysis, exchange of ideas, appropriate decisions, educational issues and development of annual plans
will result in the increase of teachers awareness about the use of the new technological methods in teaching, and eventually in the students progress.

iii. Managements of Finances

To establish the decision activities in finance where the teachers participate, teachers were given four decision activities to indicate their level of participation in making such decisions. The findings are presented in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17: Teacher participation in decisions on finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision activities in finance</th>
<th>Teacher participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining school expenditure priorities</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting for the department</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining means of income generating</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding budget allocation for instructional material</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 4.17, for the extent of teachers’ current participation in school budgeting and income generating, four factors were generated. As a whole, teachers rate of involvement of regarding school budgeting and income-generating was relatively low. Only 37% of the teachers are involved in budgeting for the department while 17% the teachers are involved in determining school expenditure priorities. The overall participation of teachers in determining school budget and means of income-generation was low.

As presented in Table 4.17, only 17% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved in determining school expenditure priorities, 10% reported that
they are occasionally involved while the remaining 73% reported that they are never involved in determining school expenditure priorities. On budgeting for the department, 37% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved, 11% reported that they are occasionally involved while the remaining 52% reported that they are never involved in budgeting for the department.

On determining means of income generating activity, only 22% of the teachers reported that they were frequently involved, 17% reported that they were occasionally involved while the remaining 61% reported that they were never involved in determining means of income generating activity. On deciding budget allocation for instructional material, 26% of the teachers reported that they were frequently involved, 18% reported that they were occasionally involved while the remaining 56% reported that they were never involved in deciding budget allocation for instructional material.

The interview conducted with principals also confirmed that there was a low extent of teachers’ participation in this particular decision category. In some cases, the principals reported that decision concerning school budget was not a mandate of teachers; rather the mandate was given to school management. The teachers participated through their one representative as provided in the Board of Management composition.

Accordingly, Newcombe and McCormick (2011) argues that teachers can participate in financial management by being involved in activities such as; budgeting and finance planning group committees. They can also be encouraged to be involved in a wide variety of financial issues. To determine if teachers were
fully involved on financial matters, teachers were required to state their level of participation in determining school expenditure priorities which was core in financial management, budgeting for department, determining means of income-generation and deciding budget allocation for instructional material. Obviously, involving teachers in these areas required creating conducive atmosphere by school principals.

iv. Management of Physical Resources

To establish the decision activities in physical resource management where the teachers participate, the teachers were given the various activities to indicate their level of participation in making such decisions. School physical resource management is the performance of those management actions connected with physical resources, with the main aim of achieving effective education. For the purposes of this study, a school’s physical resource management involves planning use of the budget, organizing through structures and processes, coordinating and monitoring, and control by the school management team and governing body to ensure that physical resources are acquired, deployed and controlled effectively, economically and efficiently to achieve the goals of education (Naidu et al., 2008). Teachers involved in physical resources management were required to indicate their extent of participation on deciding maintenance of school buildings, assigning the same for administrative and teaching room service, expansion of buildings and construction of new one. The findings are presented in Table 4.18.
Table 4.18: Teacher participation in decisions on physical resource management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision activities in physical resource management</th>
<th>Teacher participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on maintenance of school buildings</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning school building for administrative, department and teaching room purpose</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on the expansion of school buildings</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on the construction of new buildings</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As presented in Table 4.18, on deciding maintenance of school buildings, only 25% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved, 11% reported that they are occasionally involved while the remaining 64% reported that they are never involved in deciding on maintenance of school buildings.

On assigning school building for administrative, department and teaching room purpose, only 18% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved, 12% reported that they are occasionally involved while the remaining 70% reported that they are never involved in assigning school building for administrative, department and teaching room purpose. For deciding on the expansion of school buildings, only 15% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved, 14% reported that they are occasionally involved while the remaining 71% reported that they are never involved in deciding on the expansion of school buildings. On deciding on the construction of new buildings, only 13% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved, 16% reported that they are occasionally involved while the
remaining 71% reported that they are never involved in deciding on the construction of new buildings.

v. Human Resource Management

The department of human resource in any organization or institution is charged with the responsibility of recruiting qualified and competent staff for the organization. For this to happen, decision-making styles used by principals or the in-charge of the organization should be involving. This is usually done in a pre-determined and procedural manner and calls for the involvement of the staff. In public secondary schools, the principals handle all the human resource management roles they have not trained on. This makes it necessary for them to involve teachers in making such decisions. To establish the decision activities in human resource management where the teachers participate, the teachers were required to indicate their level of participation on setting targets and rewards for staff, recruitment of teaching and non-teaching staff, deciding on their remuneration and their process of hiring and promotions. The findings are presented in Table 4.19.
Table 4.19: Teacher participation in decisions on human resource management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision activities in human resource management</th>
<th>Teacher participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting of targets and rewards for staff</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of teaching and non-teaching staff</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration of teaching and non-teaching staff</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firing of teaching and non-teaching staff</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions of teaching and non-teaching staff</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19 provides a summary of teachers’ response on their participation on decision pertaining to human resource management. The finding of this study indicates that teachers’ involvement regarding school human resource is quite low. It ranges from 17% decision on the promotions of teaching and non-teaching staff to 28% setting of targets and rewards for staff.

As presented in Table 4.19, setting of targets and rewards for staff, only 28% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved, 27% reported that they are occasionally involved while the remaining 45% reported that they were never involved in setting of targets and rewards for staff. Recruitment of teaching and non-teaching staff, only 25% of the teachers reported that they were frequently involved, 13% reported that they were occasionally involved while the remaining 62% reported that they were never involved in recruitment of teaching and non-teaching staff. With respect to remuneration of teaching and non-teaching staff,
only 23% of the teachers reported that they were frequently involved, 19%
reported that they were occasionally involved while the remaining 58% reported
that they were never involved in remuneration of teaching and non-teaching staff.

Regarding firing of teaching and non-teaching staff, only 18% of the teachers
reported that they were frequently involved, 20% reported that they were
occasionally involved while the remaining 62% reported that they are never
involved in firing of teaching and non-teaching staff. For promotions of teaching
and non-teaching staff, only 17% of the teachers reported that they were frequently
involved, 21% reported that they were occasionally involved while the remaining
62% reported that they were never involved in promotions of teaching and non-
teaching staff.

From these results, it can be deduced that the overall teachers’ participation in
deciding about the human resource management in public secondary schools under
the sample study is low. More than half of the teachers reported that they are never
involved in making decisions on the human resource management. These findings
are consistent with prior studies on teacher participation in decisions on human
resource. Tambe and Krishnan (2010) found that teachers were rarely involved in
making decisions on human resource.

vi. Management of Community Relations

To establish the decision activities in community relations where the teachers
participate, the teachers were given the decision activities to indicate their level of
participation in making such decisions. The findings are presented in Table 4.20.
Table 4.20: Teacher participation in decisions on community relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision activities in community relations</th>
<th>Teacher participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate social responsibility</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications with the community</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20 provides a summary of teachers’ response on their participation on decision pertaining to community relations. The finding from Table 4.20 indicates that teachers involvement regarding community relations is quite low. It ranges from 20% corporate social responsibility to 33% communications with the community.

As presented in Table 4.20, only 22% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved in corporate social responsibility, while 20% reported that they are occasionally involved while the remaining 58% reported that they are never involved. On communications with the community, 33% of the teachers reported that they are frequently involved, 23% reported that they are occasionally involved while the remaining 44% reported that they are never involved in communications with the community.

Teachers typically have more complete knowledge of their work management; so if teachers participate in decision-making, decision will be made with a better pool of information. Teacher participation is thought to give school administrators access to critical information closest to the source of many problems of schooling, namely; the classroom. Increased access to and use of this information are thought to improve the quality of curricular and instructional decision (Smylie et al., 2012). Each principal in any school must make decision, and be responsible for the
outcomes of that decision. Ivancevich and Kono (2012) suggest a guideline for a leader to improve the quality of decision in groups. These are creating an environment in which the group members feel free to participate and express their opinions, include all the concerned bodies and people who can provide the needed additional information relevant to the problem and involve those individuals whose acceptance and commitment are important.

4.5 Extent of Teachers Participating in Decision-Making Areas

Teachers participate in various decision-making areas in different extent. It was necessary in this study to find out how the principals involve them on those key areas. Teachers were required to indicate the strength at which they participate on the six areas which had been highlighted. As per the second objective of this study which was to examine the extent secondary school teachers are involved in decision-making in areas of; human resource management, student affairs, community relations, curriculum and instructions, finance and management of physical resources. The findings are presented in Table 4.21.

Table 4.21: The extent of teachers participating in decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making Area</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>moderately practised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>moderately practised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>moderately practised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and instructions</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>moderately practised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>moderately practised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of physical resources</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>moderately practised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 4.5 – 5.0 - very much practised, 3.5 – 4.49 - much practised, 2.5 – 3.49 - moderately practised 1.5 – 2.49 - minimally practised and 1.0 – 1.49 - not practised
The mean on the extent of participatory decision-making as practised by the principals in the areas of human resource management, student affairs, community relations, curriculum and instructions, finance and management of physical resources was within the range which has verbal description of moderately involved since it ranged from 2.5 to 3.49 as presented in Table 4.21. Human resource management had the highest mean (3.41) indicating that teachers are more involved in managing students’ personnel and other school staff. This was followed by curriculum and instruction (2.99) which is the core business of the teachers. Finance, community relation and student affairs had the least mean (2.67) implying that this is mostly done by the principal and other senior administrators.

From principal interview guide, they also confirmed teachers are highly involved on human resource management and curriculum instruction, they are least involved on finance and community relations.

The next section sought to establish the degree and characteristics of teachers participation in public secondary schools decision-making. Teachers were required to indicate their degree of agreement on various participation attributes. The findings are presented in Table 4.22.
Table 4.22: Degree of public secondary school teacher participation in decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I effectively participate in guiding students in their academic progress</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I effectively participate in guiding students in their future career choice</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunity to share with other teachers my innovative ideas</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have strong knowledge in my area to help me participate in decisions</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that I have the opportunity to influence others</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I am involved in important programmes for students</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in staff development</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advice is solicited by others</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been involved in developing school goals</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have freedom to make my own decisions on how to carry out my job</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the freedom to plan my own schedule</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been involved in planning school/community activities</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to information I need to make informed school decisions</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in making implementation decisions on new programmes</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the freedom to make decisions on how to implement curriculum</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal(s) solicit my ideas in matters of school governance</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School personnel solicit my ideas</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a decision maker in the school I teach</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in the development/operation of the school budget</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** 4.5 – 5.0 - very much practised, 3.5 – 4.49 - much practised, 2.5 – 3.49 - moderately practised 1.5 – 2.49 - minimally practised and 1.0 – 1.49 - not practised

Table 4.22 provides the table on extent of participation in decision-making. For the purposes of this study, the following criteria were applied in order to determine levels of teacher participation in decision-making: the level of participation was taken to be high if the mean was greater than or equal to 4 ($x \geq 4.00$), the level of
participation was taken to be moderate if the mean was between 3 and 3.99 (3.00-3.99) and the level of participation was taken to be low if the mean was below 3 (x< 3.00).

Table 4.22 presents the ranking in order of highest to lowest mean: 4.33 on effective participation in guiding students in their academic progress, to a low mean of 2.33 for involvement in the development/operation of the school budgeting process. The results indicate that levels of participation in teacher decision-making among public secondary school teachers are high in the areas of guiding students in their academic progress (M=4.33) and future career choices (M=4.06). The low standard deviation in these higher means suggests strong cohesiveness in these areas among teachers. Moderate levels of participation in decision-making are in areas such as sharing innovative ideas (M=3.99), programmes for students (M=3.65), staff development (M=3.54), and developing school goals (M=3.37). Low levels of participation are in areas such as implementation of new school programmes (M=2.98), school governance (M=2.92), and development of school budget (M=2.33). Higher standard deviations in these lower means, suggest high variations in teachers responses.

The lowest standard deviation was on participation in guiding students in their academic progress (SD=0.87) and soliciting advice from others (SD=0.88). However, the highest standard deviation was on being a decision-maker on what to teach (SD=1.44) and Freedom to make decisions on how to implement curriculum (SD=1.28).
The interview conducted with principals also confirmed that there is a low extent of teachers’ participation in this particular decision category. This was an indication that extent of teachers participating in decision-making degree is low in academic progress. In some cases, the principals reported that decision concerning school budget is not a mandate of teachers; rather the mandate is given to school management. The teachers may participate through their one representative as provided in the Board of Management composition.

A principal in a semi-urban school setting added that teachers are mainly involved in curriculum and supervision, human resource management, student affairs and maintenance of school infrastructure. Finance and budgeting lie squarely under the mandate of the school administration. The foregoing responses were concurred with, by a school principal in a semi-urban school setting other than finance, which is the school administration’s mandate, teachers are largely involved in all other areas pertaining to the school management including curriculum and supervision, human resource management, student affairs and maintenance of school infrastructure.

The study probed to find out the extent of teacher involvement in the foregoing areas. It emerged across different school settings as appertain to student affairs, teachers are only involved in appointment of student leaders, students discipline, setting of students’ targets and rewards, and developing disciplinary policies of the school. Teachers were found to be left out on the admission of continuing students and setting school rules and regulations.
A respondent for instance observed that on student affairs, teachers are only involved in appointment of student leaders, students discipline, setting of students’ targets and rewards, and developing disciplinary policies of the school. Admission of continuing students and setting school rules and regulations are the preserve of the school management. The study further probed to establish the extent of teacher involvement with regard to matters of human resource management. It was unanimously affirmed by respondents across the different school settings that teachers are only involved in the recruitment of teaching and non-teaching staff especially through participating in conducting interviews and setting of targets. Only the school management is however involved in the remuneration of teaching and non-teaching staff, firing of teaching and non-teaching staff, promotions of teachers and non-teaching staff and rewards for staff.

Asked what constitutes the challenges or effects of participation of teachers in decision-making at the school, it emerged in interviews with the school principals that among the main challenges include lack of expertise on various areas among the teachers, delays in decision-making when a large number of teachers are involved as well as requirement by the Ministry of Education on the extent of teacher involvement. To improve on participative management/decision-making in schools, majority of school principals recommended that the Ministry of Education empowers teachers to participate in crucial areas of the school management beyond student affairs and curriculum development. A respondent offered that teachers ought to be empowered more to participate in other areas of the school administration including budgeting for school infrastructure such as libraries,
laboratories and other learning resources since they are the ones directly affected by the inadequacies of these resources.

The overall teachers’ participation in management of student affairs under the sample study was found to be relatively high. This can be attributed to the fact that the teachers are always in contact with the students and thus are better placed in making decisions that regards them. From the study done by Kanjwang (2012), it was observed that schools were created for the purpose of ensuring the education of students. The effectiveness with which this particular process is going on, the standard by which we judge the quality of discipline and the relationship among the parties concerned (Kamat, 2008). This shows good discipline should be established and be maintained in the school besides the availabilities of the necessary input for the achievement of school objectives.

Thus teacher can use several mechanisms to establish and maintain good discipline in the school. On the first place, teachers can establish good student’s behaviour in the schools by incorporating and providing support through guidance and counselling services and involving students in various co-curricular activities. The other strategy that teachers use to establish good discipline is by effective classroom management. In relation to this, Charles (2009) argues that with good class room management, the curriculum flows smoothly with few problems, students enjoy the class, the teacher feels successful and rewarded. Therefore, developing and maintaining good discipline in the school should be one of the primary functions of teachers. School principals and other non-teaching staff should involve teachers in any decision of school student affairs.
Curriculum and instruction-related activities refer to the process of bringing about improvement in institutional performance and productivity under the control and guidance of school administrators (Dawo, 2011). In this study, curriculum and instruction-related activities were identified as an activity and a mechanism for continuous school improvement which can enhance teaching practices in ways that empower teachers and facilitates students learning. Dawo (2011) further highlights that school-based instructional supervision embraces an environment whereby individuals rely on team performance. In Kenyan public secondary schools, the school administrators include headteachers, heads of departments and class teachers.

The findings are in agreement with Wall and Rinchart (2009) who studied school-based decision-making and the empowerment of secondary school teachers in Brooklyn, New York. Teachers were found to have different levels of participation in different decision-making areas. They were moderately involved in curriculum and instruction, co-curriculum and their welfare decisions. Most teachers were involved in the implementation level. Teachers desire to participate throughout the entire process up to the implementation level. Some headteachers and other stakeholders like the BoM and PA formulate policies that are passed on to teachers who implement them involuntarily.

The researcher observes that teachers should be able to know the school budget and the school leaders should clearly show and involve them in each and every issue related with budget decisions. In some schools, interviews with the principals revealed that only one or two teachers’ representatives normally attended the decision-making on finance matters in order to express their opinions on behalf of
their colleagues; often the decisions were not announced to teachers. This finding is supported by the findings of other researches. Financial management deals with how the schools’ revenues and expenditures are run. It is crucial for teachers to participate in all areas of school finance because they are well placed in identifying what is lost or fulfilled regarding school resources.

Findings further agree with Dewettinck and Ameijde (2011) who conducted a study on the effect of leadership empowerment behavior on staff attitudes and behavioral intentions among primary school teachers in India. In a quest to understand whether teachers were involved in decision-making process, teachers were asked to indicate their involvement in different areas. Teachers are not effectively involved in decisions dealing with finances. Findings indicate that most teachers felt that they were not involved in financial decisions because headteachers, as a teacher observed, in the interview feel that teachers are not trained to handle financial issues in the school. Interviews with the headteachers revealed that they were not very comfortable with involving teachers in financial decisions.

The study sought to find out the level of teacher participation in decisions on community relations. Findings indicate that teachers’ involvement regarding community relations is quite low. It ranges from 20% corporate social responsibility to 33% communications with the community. This means that only those in management participate on community organized responsibilities while the rest of the teachers are left out. These findings are consistent with prior findings, for example, Tambe and Krishnan (2010); Kao and Kao (2007), and
Griffith (2014) who found that teachers’ involvement regarding community relations is quite low.

The findings are in line with a study by Mualuko, Mukasa and Achoka (2009) which determined the level of participatory decision-making among teachers in Makueni district, Kenya. The study found that teachers desired greater involvement than they are currently involved. They concluded that among others, very important groups to involve in making decisions in schools are teachers who are the custodians of instruction, implementers of school policies and co-organizers for school activities along with headteachers. They recommend that due to the growing appreciation of the need for valid and knowledgeable inputs in administrative decision-making from various organization levels, the need for involving stakeholders in decision-making is paramount.

Similarly, Chen and Silverthrone (2008) conducted a study on the impact of locus of control on job stress, job performance and job satisfaction in Taiwanese public secondary schools. Findings provided insights into the reasons why teachers do not participate in decision-making. The reasons listed by the respondents were varied and included lack of trust, divisions among staff members, victimization, and double standards by headteachers, fear, and principal’s perception. They mentioned ways that could enable them to fully participate in decision-making which included: delegation, team building, empowerment, motivation, collective setting of standards, avoiding witch-hunting, opens administration and inclusion throughout the decision-making process.
The foregoing findings are further in tandem with Robertson (2013) who studied the “politics of devolution, self-management and post-Fordism in Canadian secondary schools” and found that teachers reported lower actual involvement levels and higher desired involvement levels in managerial issues, especially in those relating to determining the organization and administrative structure of the school, deliberating on the teacher evaluation procedures, assessing teams or subject departments, choosing team leaders or departmental chairpersons, hiring new faculty members, instituting wide-ranging school policies as well as revising and setting school goals.

Findings also agree with Parnell and Crandall (2011) who examined teachers’ desired participation vis a vis their actual participation in Latin America in the decision fields of objectives and goals, mission, curriculum, student progress assessment as well as communication. It was found in the study that actual decision-making participation was lower for a majority of teachers as compared to the desired participation though actual involvement fluctuated by education, rank of teacher and issue.

4.6 **Level of Secondary School Teachers’ Job Motivation**

Teacher’s job motivation is the teacher’s state of mind and spirit, influencing their readiness to work, consequently affecting the schools and teachers individual goals (Mbambo, 2009). It may vary from very high to very low depending upon the schools plan and practices. The third objective of this study was to determine the level of secondary school teachers’ job motivation in public secondary schools. The dependent variable for this study was job motivation; therefore, the researcher was interested to know how motivation varies from various teachers. Teachers
were required to rate their motivation levels based on various attributes. The findings are presented in Table 4.23.

Table 4.23: Level of secondary school teachers’ job motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of Teacher Job Motivation</th>
<th>Urban schools</th>
<th>Rural schools</th>
<th>Semi-Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Description</td>
<td>Mean Description</td>
<td>Mean Description</td>
<td>Mean Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regard my work with pleasure and not misery I am highly motivated to teach</td>
<td>2.20 Low</td>
<td>2.80 Moderate</td>
<td>2.44 Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not satisfied with the management practices of my school principal</td>
<td>2.80 Moderate</td>
<td>3.0 Moderate</td>
<td>2.73 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do my work without supervision</td>
<td>3.0 Moderate</td>
<td>3.82 High</td>
<td>3.25 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work hard even in the face of difficulties</td>
<td>3.82 High</td>
<td>2.84 Moderate</td>
<td>2.97 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my interests are not being served fairly by my school principal</td>
<td>2.84 Moderate</td>
<td>2.78 Moderate</td>
<td>2.70 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I am safe and secure in my workplace</td>
<td>3.28 Moderate</td>
<td>2.88 Moderate</td>
<td>3.16 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of the work I do</td>
<td>3.10 Moderate</td>
<td>3.01 Moderate</td>
<td>2.98 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value my academic professional development</td>
<td>3.01 Moderate</td>
<td>3.14 Moderate</td>
<td>3.12 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the share I get is fair in relation to what I contribute to the school</td>
<td>3.14 Moderate</td>
<td>3.33 Moderate</td>
<td>3.11 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to follow directives with enthusiasm and respect</td>
<td>3.30 Moderate</td>
<td>3.40 Moderate</td>
<td>3.28 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to serve the school even beyond my official time</td>
<td>3.47 Moderate</td>
<td>3.14 Moderate</td>
<td>3.05 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively participate in school activities</td>
<td>3.04 Moderate</td>
<td>3.31 Moderate</td>
<td>3.42 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t do my work because there is no other work for me except teaching</td>
<td>3.31 Moderate</td>
<td>3.13 Moderate</td>
<td>3.24 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am contented with the salary and other fringe benefits I receive</td>
<td>3.03 Moderate</td>
<td>3.21 Moderate</td>
<td>3.15 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the sense of accomplishment for the work I do</td>
<td>3.21 Moderate</td>
<td>3.28 Moderate</td>
<td>3.19 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never feel like getting out of the school where I am presently employed</td>
<td>3.08 Moderate</td>
<td>3.21 Moderate</td>
<td>3.04 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel empowered in my teaching</td>
<td>3.20 Moderate</td>
<td>3.29 Moderate</td>
<td>3.13 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel burnout and unproductive</td>
<td>3.09 Moderate</td>
<td>3.32 Moderate</td>
<td>3.17 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel I am overly stressed</td>
<td>3.50 High</td>
<td>3.23 Moderate</td>
<td>3.26 Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND MEAN</td>
<td>Moderate motivation</td>
<td>3.10 Moderate motivation</td>
<td>2.97 Moderate motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** 1.0 - 1.49 - Never (very low motivation), Rarely (low motivation) 1.50 - 2.49 Sometimes (Moderate motivation) 2.5 - 3.49, Often (high motivation) 3.50 – 4.49, Always (very high motivation) 4.5 - 5

From Table 4.23, all the items on teachers job motivation across the three socio-economic settings that is urban, rural and semi-urban except one in the urban
setting had a mean score that showed the level of teachers job motivation to be moderate. The grand mean score for the items on teachers job motivation as assessed by the teachers is 3.10 for urban schools, 2.97 for rural schools, 3.07 for semi-urban schools as presented in Table 4.23. This means that teachers in public secondary schools whether urban, rural or semi-urban have a moderate job motivation. It could also mean that there is a positive school climate in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties.

4.7 Participation in Decision-Making and their Job Motivation

The fourth objective of this study was to determine how teachers participation in school decision-making in areas of; human resource management, student affairs, community relations, curriculum and instructions, finance and management of physical resources influence their job motivation. A T-test was carried out on the results as displayed in Table 4.24.

Table 4.24: T-test on teachers’ participation in decision-making and their job motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Teacher participation in decision-making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ job motivation</td>
<td>0.264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

α = 0.05, n= 340

Table 4.24 presents the results of the correlation between teachers’ participation in decision-making and the teachers’ level of job motivation as assessed by the teachers in the public secondary schools. From the results displayed in Table 4.24, teacher participation in decision-making is significantly correlated with the level of job motivation as shown by the R – value of 0.264 that has a probability value of
0.027 which is lower than $\alpha = 0.05$. This implies that there is a significant positive relationship between the practice of participatory decision-making and public secondary teachers’ job motivation. This means that as teachers are given more opportunities to participate in decision-making, teachers’ job motivation increases. This is inconsonance and inconformity with the ideas of Adams (2012) who claimed that a significant positive correlation exists between Site – Based Management (SBM) decision-making and teachers’ level of job motivation.

The finding is in tandem with Ukeje, Akabogu and Ndu (2013) who studied “the role of educational administration in teacher motivation in Enugu, Nigeria” and found teacher involvement in decision-making continuously by the school head teachers will enhance teachers’ development and job motivation levels. Ukeje et al., stated further that teacher participation in decision-making process could ease the head teachers’ increasing difficulties as many school principals would be involved to knowledgeably address problems that would otherwise remain unaddressed by the head teacher alone. The study concluded that head teachers ought to not completely ignore the less knowledgeable members of the teaching staff in making decisions since they need to also be advanced on the job. School head teachers ought to also take part in more seminars and workshops to know how to administer over the younger teachers with a view to grow them up as they will ultimately succeed them.

Similarly, Kanabe (2013) explored the relationship between teacher motivation and retention of teachers in California and found that to make a teacher committed, the school management must motivate them by showing that they are cared for by listening to them and assisting them in their personal problems. The finding is also
in line with Oyewale and Alonge (2013) assessed teachers’ motivation in relation to the performance of instructional supervisory role of principals in Nigeria’s Ekiti State, Ekiti Central Senatorial District and found that one of the challenges schools face today is motivating teachers with a view to perform allocated tasks to meet prearranged goals. Accordingly, principals have to motivate their teachers to put them in the right frame of mind in order to deliver quality teaching to the students. The authors reiterated that when teachers are adequately motivated, they will be delighted to put in more efforts in their profession and consequently there will be achievement of better results. The study posited that in motivating teachers, principals should employ democratic leadership skills, involve teachers fully in programme development, provision of adequate teaching materials and improved condition of service by liaising with the Schools Board.

Mgbodile (2007) studied educational administration and supervision in Ibadan Nigeria and argued that administrators can make excellent plans and organize work operations efficiently, but if they lack the ability to motivate the workers, their efforts at planning and organizing will be useless. Thus, the key success in any organization lies on the effective use of the human resources. Chukwuemeka (2008) studied motivation as the substance of public administration in Nigeria and argued that while skills and knowledge that employees possess are imperative in influencing their job performance, these features are not alone sufficient. Knowing what keeps an individual motivated is required to reveal how skills and abilities are triggered and their personal potentials realized.

Marnane and Olson (2010) investigated Job Satisfaction of the Mathematics and Science Teachers in Secondary Schools in North Carolina and Michigan and found
that the salary of a teacher is a significant indicator of the period of time that members of the teaching staff spend in teaching. The findings reveal that higher opportunity cost teachers as indicated by degree subject or test scores stay in teaching less as compared to others; and that to stay longer in teaching, teachers ought to be paid more. Akyeampong and Bennell (2007) assessed teacher motivation in Sub-Saharan and African and South-Asia and found that living and working conditions affect teacher motivation and morale and thus their performance. Among the key factors that affect teachers’ motivation and morale include classroom conditions, workload, distance at work, management support and travel and housing. The high travel cost contributed to teacher lateness and absenteeism in schools while the norm for most teachers are very large class sizes.

The finding is also in line with Mungunyu (2008) who studied selected factors of free primary education that influence job satisfaction among primary school teachers in Embakasi Division and found that job demotivation/dissatisfaction lead to aggressive behavior to learners and colleagues, absenteeism from schools, psychological withdrawal from work as well as early teaching profession exits. Additionally, other outcomes may include among many, poor school performance in extracurricular activities, examinations, demoralized workforce, financial mismanagement as well as student unrest. Job motivation/satisfaction will alternatively result in commitment, low absenteeism from schools, friendly behavior with students and colleagues, desirable examination performance, low exists from the profession, better performances in extracurricular activities as well as a motivated workforce. Accordingly, a study by Ubom and Joshua (2014) explored “needs Satisfaction Variables as Predictors of Job Satisfaction of teachers
in the UK” and revealed that teachers motivation and job satisfaction were low due to work overload, poor pay and low perception of teachers by the society. Findings also confirmed presence of low teachers motivation and job satisfaction which were attributed to intrinsic factors such as pay incentives were ineffective in increasing motivation.

The finding also agrees with Alarm and Farid (2011) who studied “factors affecting teachers’ motivation in India” and found that teachers were not satisfied with socio-economic status, choice of profession, students’ behaviour and examination stress. It also revealed that personal and social status, classroom environment, socio-economic status, students’ behaviour, examination stress, rewards and incentives and self-confidence of the teacher affected teachers’ motivation. Glaser (2011) explored the effect of improving the quality work life and in the process on improving productivity among high school teachers in selected Sub-saharan African countries and observed that it is a major challenge to raise the dwindling motivation and morale of teachers across a majority of Sub-Saharan African countries since most teachers thereof are deficient of commitment and self-esteem in the teaching profession.

Accordingly, Kapapero (2007) found that “principals control many of the eventualities in the work environment and are the sources of much strengthening for teaching behavior”, hence are the keys in improving job motivation and self-esteem of teachers. This only shows that teachers’ feelings are good and that the schools where they are assigned value their development and job motivation as high. Thus, if they have high job motivation, they are happy as teachers. Adams (2012), says that when a healthy school environment exists and the teacher’s job
motivation is high, Adams (2012) further points out that in a healthy school environment, teachers feel good about each other and at the same time, feel a sense of accomplishment from their jobs.

The study finally sought to establish the joint effect of public secondary school teachers' participation in decision-making on job motivation among public secondary school teachers in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties. It was found that teacher participation in decision-making is significantly correlated with the level of job motivation as shown by the R – value of 0.264 that has a probability value of 0.027 which is lower than \( \alpha = 0.05 \). This implies that there is a significant positive relationship between the practice of participatory decision-making and public secondary teachers’ job motivation.

The finding is in line with a study on teachers' participation in educational affairs in Iran performed by Hava and Miskel (2013) which showed that providing teachers with opportunities to participate in educational decisions has an important effect on the development of teachers' professional skills. It also showed that there was a positive correlation between the teachers' participation in educational decisions and their occupational motivation. The finding is also in tandem with Keung (2008) who studied “the effect of shared decision-making on the improvement in teachers’ job development in Hong Kong” revealed that though teachers possessed more pronounced wish to participate in instructional decisions than in managerial and curricular domains, they deemed themselves to be in a state of deprivation – decision in all the decision domains. In addition, results revealed that job motivation was linked to participation in curricular and managerial decisions, and commitment was linked to participation in curricular decisions.
The finding also agrees with Kiprop and Kandie (2012) who “an investigation into teacher participation in decision-making in public secondary schools in Kenya with reference to Baringo District” and reported that teachers’ participation in making decisions at the school level was realized to enable arrival at better decisions since those nearest to students are best equipped to carry out and make decisions and are best suited to know how best to advance their schools. It is also in line with Wagner (2014) who studied “teachers’ participation’s effects on performance and satisfaction” in desktop review and it was found to inspire members of the teaching profession to take on bigger accountability for what transpired in a school thereby increasing teachers’ change ownership, offering teachers an input in putting to better use their expertise and in school policy.

The finding is further in agreement with Williams (2010) who studied “teachers’ perceptions of principals’ effectiveness in selected secondary schools in Tennessee Education” and found that the involvement of teachers in decision-making also empowers them while the abandonment of them in making decisions was considered as a supposition that they were unexploited resources with experience, knowledge and interest in participating. Staffs need to offer structures and opportunities for their participation. Wilkinson also expected that making decisions in a participative manner is probable to better quality decisions as well as job motivation and that improvements are obtainable both to workers job satisfaction and increased efficiency to the principal.

The finding also agrees with Knoop (2007) who studied the influence of participative decision-making on job satisfaction and organizational commitment
of school principals in Turkey and found that when teachers participate under a
decentralized setup, they tend to be more committed to the issues they care about
and hence to the organization they serve. Similarly, Imber (2010) studied factors
contributing to teacher satisfaction with participative decision-making in
Cameroon and found that teachers, feeling that they were deprived of decision-
making ability, reported lower levels of satisfaction, but saturated and at
equilibrium were more satisfied but not necessarily willing to increase their
participation.

Khoza (2014) studied teacher participation in site-based management in schools in
South Africa and listed the following benefits of the participative mode of
management: it increases employee productivity, it enhances job satisfaction, it
leads to high performance work practices; and it increases employee commitment
and sense of belonging. Accordingly, Algoush (2010) argues that growing the level
of teacher participation in decision making and spreading their participation in the
overall process of decision-making makes school management and policy more
receptive to communal needs. Pashiards (2014) adds that teachers play a greater
part when devoted to participate in the decision-making process more actively.
This implies that teacher participation in decision-making improves the schools’
effectiveness as well as the quality of the decision. Kim (2012) also supports that
collective decision-making has the possibility to advance the decision quality,
surge a decision's implementation and acceptance, reinforce staff morale,
teamwork and commitment, build trust, increase school effectiveness and help
administrators and staff obtain new skills.
The participation of teachers in decision-making was perceived as forging links between administrators and teachers (Sergiovani, 2012). The important decision-making in educational organizations has been recognized as a key function required by administrators. In schools where commitment in students learning is apparent, teacher participatory decision-making is crucial for effective operation of the school (Pashiardis, 2014). Mangunda (2013) also stated that participative management ensures that members in an organization take ownership of their decision, and are willing to defend decision they made through collaborative means. This means that participative management results in a great commitment and ownership. In most cases, the responsibility to obtain school objectives depends on teachers’ full time involvement in that decision. In this regard Moharman et al. (2012) observes that teachers’ involvement in different concerns of decision-making at school level is thought of to advance instruction hence quality education standards. Further, the authors asserted that teachers’ involvement in diverse decision-making issues is likely to produce services of higher quality. Teachers’ involvement equally produces fewer turnovers, less absenteeism, less management overhead and better problem solving skills. Involving teachers in decision-making can result in greater administrative efficiency.

It has been noted that the association between the principal and teachers influenced the readiness to contribute in decision-making, and that collaborative, open and supportive relationships between teachers and the principal were more enthusiastic to participate in decision-making. Hoy and Miskel (2010) found that, “participation of teacher in decision–making is positively related to individual teachers’
satisfaction with the profession of teaching”. Ivancevich et al., (2010) also noted that “teacher’s participation in decision–making process may lead to higher level outcomes satisfaction and efficiency while decisions made unilaterally do not contribute to the development or change of the school performance”. White (cited in Algoush, 2010) found five major benefits of impact of increased decision-making authority on teacher work life; (a) improve teacher moral, (b) better informed teachers, (c) improve teacher communication within and across school, (d) improve student motivation (e) and increased incentives that serve to attract and retain quality teachers.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the summary of the major findings of the study, relevant discussions, conclusions and the necessary recommendations. The chapter gives the summaries of the major findings based on the output of the descriptive and inferential statistical and recommendations and suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary
This study examined the extent at which teachers’ participation in decision-making is practised in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties and its relationship to teachers’ job motivation. This study was conducted from January 2016 to March 2016, the study employed field survey and personal interviews as the data gathering techniques. The data were gathered from 99 public secondary schools from Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties between January and February 2016 where 99 principals and 340 teachers were involved. Total enumeration was employed in the selection of the principals and stratified random sampling for the teacher respondents. The researcher utilized the quantitative approach through the descriptive survey questionnaire and at the same time the qualitative approach through personal interviews. The following are the key findings of the study.

5.2.1 Decision-Making Styles Used by Secondary School Principals
It was found that principals mainly preferred using rational decision-making style (36%) and dependent decision-making style (23%). Spontaneous decision-making style was reported to be used by 16% principals while intuitive decision-making
style was used by 14% of the principals. Avoidant decision-making style was used by 11% of the principals.

5.2.2 Extent of Secondary School Teachers Involvement in Decision-making

It was found that the extent of participatory decision-making in the areas of human resource management, student affairs, community relations, curriculum and instructions, finance and management of physical resources was within the range which has verbal description of moderately practised since it ranged from 2.5 to 3.49. From the findings, human resource management had the highest mean (3.41) indicating that teachers were more involved in managing students’ personnel and other school staff. This was followed by curriculum and instruction (2.99) which is the core business of the teachers. Finance, community relation and student affairs had the least mean (2.67) implying that this is mostly done by the principal. From principals interview guide, they also confirmed that teachers are highly involved on human resource management and curriculum instruction, they are least involved on finance and community relations.

5.2.3 Level of Secondary School Teachers’ Job Motivation

The Grand Mean Score for the items on teachers job motivation as assessed by the teachers is 3.10. This means that teachers in public secondary schools had a moderate job motivation. It could also mean that there is a positive school climate in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties.

5.2.4 Teachers’ Participation in Decision-Making and their Job Motivation

From the findings of the study, teacher participation in decision-making is significantly correlated with the level of job motivation as shown by the R – value
of 0.264 that has a probability value of 0.027 which is lower than $\alpha = 0.05$. This implies that there is a significant positive relationship between the practice of participatory decision-making and public secondary teachers’ job motivation. This means that as teachers are given more opportunities to participate in decision-making, their job motivation increases.

5.3 Conclusions

The study sought to find out the decision-making styles used by principals in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties. From the findings of the study, it can be concluded that principals mainly prefer using rational and dependent decision-making styles. This implies that principals make decisions based on available facts and depending on the circumstance in which the decision is being made.

The study also sought to examine the extent to which public secondary school teachers are involved in decision-making among public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties. From the findings, human resource management had the highest mean. However, teachers’ involvement in making decisions on finance, community relation and student affairs had the least mean. This implies that, less attention was given to teacher’s contribution to efficient and effective decisions on finance, community relation and student affairs. This can affect the overall activities of school in general and teaching-learning process in particular. Teachers have dual role to play. One is their role in instruction and the other is their participation in school management and decision-making. However, from the obtained findings, obtained, it can be concluded that, there might be misperception in identifying teachers’ roles and responsibilities by the principals,
that is, they might consider the role and responsibility of teachers as teaching and learning activities only, and other activities of the school as the role and responsibilities of the management of the school.

The study further sought to determine the level of job motivation among public secondary school teachers in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties. From the findings of the study, teachers in public secondary schools were found to have a moderate job motivation. It can therefore, be concluded that there is a positive school climate in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties.

The study finally sought to establish the joint effect of public secondary school teachers' participation in decision-making on job motivation among public secondary school teachers in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties. From the findings of the study, there was a significant positive relationship between the practice of participatory decision-making and public secondary teachers’ job motivation. It can be concluded that when teachers are given more opportunities to participate in decision-making, teachers’ job motivation is likely to increase. Increased job motivation can lead to high performance.

5.4 Recommendations

As a result of the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are hereby presented:

i. There is need to train principals on decision-making styles. This will enable them to choose a decision-making style that will enable them to accommodate the teachers in making decision. By choosing a decision-making style that accommodates the teachers, they will be actively involved
in decision-making in their schools which is likely to encourage, motivate and utilize their wide range of experience and personal characteristics.

ii. There is need to sensitize the school principal to allow the teachers participate in making decision that pertains to; finance, community relation and student affairs. This can be done alongside providing proper orientation on the right duties and responsibilities of individual teachers in each area of decision-making and involve them to bring a change in teaching learning process and other related issues of school activities.

iii. Having established that participation in decision-making increases teacher motivation, there is need to provide training for teachers in the form of workshop, seminar and so on, so as teachers become competent, and skillful to participate in the areas that concern them and make the school efficient and effective in achieving the objectives of the schools. This is likely to increase their participation in decision-making which will in turn increase their motivation.

iv. Teachers’ involvement in school decision-making depends largely on school leaders’ ability and interest to divide and delegate tasks to teachers, train and involve them in all areas of decisions that affect them. To carry out these tasks effectively and efficiently, there is need to equip school principals with the appropriate knowledge, skills and attitude.

v. As shown in the findings of the study, absence of participative and democratic leadership style was mentioned as one of the constraints in involving teachers in school decision-making. To alleviate this problem, the school leaders have to:
a) Treat all teachers equally regardless of their sex, experience, academic qualification, religion and ethnicity.

b) Practise various leadership styles depending upon teachers’ needs, experiences, maturity level along with the organizational objectives.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

The present study has explored the influence of secondary school teachers’ participation in decision-making on their job motivation in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado counties in Kenya. Based on the study findings and conceptual limitations thereof, the study recommends that future studies should explore other factors that may influence teacher motivation, particularly professional development programmes.
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APPENDICE

APPENDIX I: INTRODUCTION LETTER

Dear Respondent

I am a postgraduate student at Kenyatta University currently undertaking research on the topic:

INFLUENCE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING ON TEACHERS’ JOB MOTIVATION IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN NYERI, NAIROBI AND KAJIADO COUNTIES

You have been identified as one of the respondents for this study and therefore kindly requested to provide the much needed information to enable the researcher write the report. Please feel free and honest to provide the required information to the best of your knowledge and will not only be kept confidential and anonymous but also will be strictly used for the purpose of the study.

Yours Faithfully,

CM
Christopher Migwi
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE TEACHERS

Please be free and honest to provide the information required which will not only be kept confidential and anonymous but also will be used strictly for the purpose of the study.

PART 1: DEMOGRAPHIC AND GENERAL DATA

Please put a tick (✓) in the responses given after each question or fill in as directed.

1. Gender
   - Male [  ]
   - Female [  ]

2. What is your highest academic qualification? (Please tick one box only)
   - Diploma [  ]
   - Bachelor Degree [  ]
   - Masters Degree [  ]
   - Doctorate Degree [  ]

3. Age:
   - Below 25 years [  ]
   - 25-34 years [  ]
   - 35-44 years [  ]
   - 45-54 years [  ]
   - Above 54 years [  ]

4. For how long have you been a teacher in the current school/station?
   - 3-5 years [  ]
   - 6-10 years [  ]
   - 11-20 years [  ]
   - Over 20 years [  ]

5. What is your school category?
   - Boys school [  ]
   - Girls school [  ]
   - Mixed school [  ]

6. Geographical Location of your school
   - Rural [  ]
   - Semi-urban [  ]
   - Urban [  ]
PART 2: DECISION-MAKING STYLES

1. What are the decision-making styles used by your principals to make decision in this school?

   Rational [ ]  Dependent [ ]
   Spontaneous [ ]  Intuitive [ ]
   Avoidant [ ]

2. How do you ensure that teachers participate in your decision-making? Please tick as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asking teachers’ opinion on various issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory management meetings arranged for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good communication between teachers and principal/administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers-to-principal feedback/teachers give back feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special sessions/retreats to discuss school matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual reviews of the school’s strategy for making future plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular reviews of job description by teachers and administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How frequently are you involved in the following decision-making areas?

**A. Human resource management**

To what extent are teachers involved in making decisions in the following area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of targets and rewards for staffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of teaching and non-teaching staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration of teaching and non-teaching staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firing of teaching and non-teaching staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions of teaching and non-teaching staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting of targets and rewards for staffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Management of physical resources**

To what extent are teachers involved in making decisions in the following area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on maintenance of school buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning school building for administrative, department and teaching room purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on the expansion of school buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on the construction of new buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Finance

To what extent are teachers involved in making decisions in the following area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining school expenditure priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting for the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining means of income generating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding budget allocation for instructional material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Curriculum and instructions

To what extent are teachers involved in making decisions in the following area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing procedures for assessing student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on the content and form of lesson plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating how well department is operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing teaching methodologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting the learning objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining when and how instructional supervision can be delivered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Student affairs

To what extent are teachers involved in making decisions in the following area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of students targets and rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election of student leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting school rule and regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of continuing students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing disciplinary policies of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Community relations

To what extent are teachers involved in making decisions in the following area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate social responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications with the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 3: EXTENT OF TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION-MAKING

1. To what extent are teachers involved in making decisions in the following area?

   Use; 1. Not practised; 2 minimally practised; 3 moderately practised; 4 much practised; and 5 very much practised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making Area</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of physical resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. This section, requires you to report your **Participation in School Decision-Making**. Please indicate your degree of agreement with each statement by circling one number of each item.

**1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly Agree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I participate in staff development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I feel that I am involved in important programs for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I have the freedom to make decisions on how to implement curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I am involved in the development/operation of the school budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I am a decision maker in the school I teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I have strong knowledge in my area to help me participate in decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I believe that I have the opportunity to influence others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. I effectively participate in guiding students in their future careers choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I effectively participate in guiding students in their academic progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. My advice is solicited by others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. I have opportunity to share with other teachers my innovative ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Principal(s) solicit my ideas in matters of school governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. School personnel solicit my ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. I am involved in making implementation decisions on new programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. I have the freedom to plan my own schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. I have freedom to make my own decisions on how to carry out my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. I have been involved in developing school goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. I have been involved in planning school/community activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. I have access to information I need to make informed school decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 4: LEVELS OF TEACHER JOB MOTIVATION

1. Please read statements on your left about your motivation as a teacher in this school and on the right tick the column that corresponds to the given item.

1=Never, 2= Sometimes, 3=Often and 4= Always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on Teacher Motivation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I regard my work with pleasure not a misery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have high job motivation to teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am not satisfied with the management practices of my school principal/head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do my work without supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I work hard even in the face of difficulties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I believe that my interests are not being served fairly by my school principal/head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel that I am safe and secure in my workplace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am proud of the works I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I value my academic professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I believe that the share I get is fair in relation to what I contribute to the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am willing to follow directives with enthusiasm and respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am willing to serve the school even beyond my official time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I actively participate in school activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am contented with the salary and other fringe benefits I receive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I feel a sense of accomplishment for the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel like getting out of the school where I am presently employed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel empowered in my teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I don’t feel burnout and unproductive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I don’t feel I am overly stressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank You
APPENDIX III: DECISION-MAKING INTERVIEW GUIDE
FOR THE PRINCIPALS

Dear Respondent

I am a postgraduate student at Kenyatta University currently undertaking research on the topic:

INFLUENCE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING ON TEACHERS’ JOB MOTIVATION IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN NYERI, NAIROBI AND KAJIADO COUNTIES

You have been identified as one of the respondents for this study and therefore kindly requested to provide the much needed information to enable the researcher write the report. Please feel free and honest to provide the required information to the best of your knowledge and will not only be kept confidential and anonymous but also will be strictly used for the purpose of the study.

Yours Faithfully,

CM
Christopher M. Migwi
DECISION-MAKING INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR THE PRINCIPALS

1. Gender  
   - Male [ ]  
   - Female [ ]

2. What is your highest academic qualification? (Please tick one box only)
   - Diploma [ ]  
   - Bachelor Degree [ ]  
   - Masters Degree [ ]  
   - Doctorate Degree [ ]

3. Age:
   - Below 25 years [ ]  
   - 25-34 years [ ]  
   - 35-44 years [ ]  
   - 45-54 years [ ]  
   - 55 and above [ ]

4. For how long have you been a secondary school principal in the current school?
   - 3-5 years [ ]  
   - 6-10 years [ ]  
   - 11-20 years [ ]  
   - Over 20 years [ ]

5. What is your school category?
   - Boys school [ ]  
   - Girls school [ ]  
   - Mixed school [ ]

6. Geographical Location of your school
   - Rural [ ]  
   - Semi-urban [ ]  
   - Urban [ ]

7. How is decision-making being practised in your school? Please explain ...............
   .................................................................................................................................
   .................................................................................................................................
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8. When do you allow your teachers to help you in decision-making? Please explain... 

9. To what extent do you consult teachers’ with regard to matters of management of the following physical resources? 
   Library 
   Stores 
   Buses 
   Tendering process 

10. Please explain the extent to which you consult teachers’ with regard to matters of curriculum and instructions? ... 

11. How often do you consult teachers’ with regard to matters of finance? Please explain 
   Setting of school fees 
   School Budget 
   School Expenditure 
   Income Expenditure
12. To what extent do you consult teachers’ with regard to matters of human resource management? Please explain
i) Recruitment of teaching and non-teaching staff
ii) Remuneration of teaching and non-teaching staff
iii) Firing of teaching and non-teaching staff
iv) Promotions of teaching and non-teaching staff
v) Setting of targets and rewards for staff

13. Please explain the extent to which you consult teachers’ with regard to matters of students?
   i) Election of student leaders
   ii) Admission of continuing students
   iii) Students discipline
   iv) Setting of students targets and rewards
   v) Developing disciplinary policies of the school
   vi) Setting school rule and regulation
14. To what extent do you consult teachers’ with regard to matters of community relations? Please explain.

15. What are the challenges/effects of participation of teachers’ in decision-making at the school? Please explain.

16. What do you think the Ministry of Education can do to improve participative management/decision-making in schools? Please explain.

Thank You
APPENDIX IV: CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

Researcher: Mr. Christopher Migwi

I have been given information about “INFLUENCE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING ON TEACHERS’ JOB MOTIVATION IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN NYERI, NAIROBI AND KAJIADO COUNTIES” and discussed the research project with Christopher Migwi, who is conducting this research as part of a PhD degree at Kenyatta University.

I have been advised of the potential risks and burdens associated with this research, and have had an opportunity to ask Mr. Migwi any questions I may have about the research and my participation. I consent to participate in an interview to be conducted by Christopher Migwi. I understand that anonymous data from the interview will be reported in Christopher Migwi’s PhD thesis and may also be used in publications based on this research. I understand that my contribution will be confidential. I also understand that apart from the 45 minutes to one-hour interview session, there are no potential risks or burdens associated with this study. I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary, I am free to refuse to participate and I am free to withdraw from the research at any time, and that I do not have to give any reasons for withdrawing. My refusal to participate or withdrawal of consent will not affect my treatment in any way, my relationship with Kenyatta University or my relationship with Christopher Migwi.

If I have any enquiries about the research, I can contact Christopher Migwi (+254722423890) or if I have any concerns or complaints regarding the way the research is or has been conducted, I can contact the Ethics Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, Office of Research, Kenyatta University.

Sign............................................................................................................ Date...........................................

Name..................................................................................................................
APPENDIX V: APPROVAL OF RESEARCH FROM KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

E-mail: dean-graduate@ku.ac.ke
Website: www.ku.ac.ke

FROM: Dean, Graduate School

TO: Christopher Mugiambi Mwangi
C/o Educational Management Policy and Curriculum Studies Dept.
Kenya University

REF: E85/CE/13386/2009

DATE: 1st March, 2016

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL

This is to inform you that Graduate School Board at its meeting of 24th February, 2016 approved your Research Proposal for the Ph.D. Degree Entitled, “Influence of Participation in Decision Making on Teachers’ Job Motivation in Public Secondary Schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado Counties, Kenya”.

You may now proceed with your Data Collection, subject to clearance with Director Ethic Office, Kenyatta University and Director General, National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation.

As you embark on your data collection, please note that you will be required to submit to Graduate School completed Supervision Tracking Forms per semester. The form has been developed to replace the Progress Report Forms. The Supervision Tracking Forms are available at the University’s Website under Graduate School webpage downloads.

By copy of this letter, the registrar (Academic) is hereby requested to grant you Substantive registration for your Ph.D. studies.

EDWIN MUGAMI 2016
DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

C/o Educational Management Policy and Curriculum Studies Department.
Registrar Academic – Att: J. Likam

Supervisors:

1. Dr. George A. Omyango
   Department of Educational Management Policy and Curriculum Studies
   Kenyatta University

2. Dr. Nduru John
   Department of Educational Management Policy and Curriculum Studies
   Kenyatta University
APPENDIX VI: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Telephone: +254-20-2211341
Fax: +254-20-2219420
Email: dg@nacost.go.ke
Website: www.nacost.go.ke

Ref. No NACOSTI/P/16/90332/11487

Christopher Mugambi Migwi
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Influence of participation in decision making on teachers’ job motivation in public secondary schools in Nyeri, Nairobi and Kajiado Counties,” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Kajiado, Nairobi and Nyeri Counties for the period ending 25th May, 2017.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioners and the County Directors of Education, Kajiado, Nairobi and Nyeri Counties before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

BONIFACE WANYAMA
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
Kajiado County.

The County Director of Education
Kajiado County.

The County Commissioner
Nairobi County.
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THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:
MR. CHRISTOPHER MUGAMBI MIGWI
of KENYATTA UNIVERSITY, 469-10100
karanina, has been permitted to conduct
research in Kajiado, Nairobi, Nyeri
Counties.

on the topic: INFLUENCE OF
PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING ON
TEACHERS’ JOB MOTIVATION IN PUBLIC
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25th May, 2017
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Signature

Permit No: NACOSTI/P/16/90332/11487
Date Of Issue: 25th May, 2016
Fee Received: Ksh 2000