

# Influence of student councils' involvement in Student welfare activities on management of public secondary schools in Kisii County

Chepkawai R. Limo<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Joseph K.Lelan, PhD<sup>2</sup>, Prof. Kosgei Zachariah K., PhD<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PhD Student, School of Education, Moi University, Kenya

<sup>2,3</sup>Dept. of Educational Management and Policy Studies, Moi university, Kenya

**Abstract:** In the recent past there has been a large number of secondary schools' unrests and other forms of indiscipline in Kenyan secondary schools. This happens despite inclusion of student councils in secondary school management. The objective of the study was to establish the influence of student councils' involvement in welfare activities and management of public secondary schools in Kisii County, Kenya. The study was anchored on social systems theory and adopted mixed methods design. The target population was 140,948 respondents comprising of 104 principals, 2080 teachers, 1040 student leaders, 137,713 students and 11 Sub County Directors of Education. The sample size was 1066 respondents comprising of 31 Principals, 336 teachers, 289 Student leaders, 399 students and 11 Sub-County Directors of Education. Stratified, simple random sampling and purposive sampling technique was used to select respondents. Data collection was done through the administration of questionnaires, interviews and document analysis. Validity was determined using expert judgement, while reliability was determined using Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient. Data analysis was done by using descriptive and inferential statistics ie correlation analysis and linear regression with the aid of SPSS V26. From the linear regression model, ( $R^2 = .199$ ) shows that student councils' involvement in student welfare accounted for 19.9% variation in management of public schools. There was a positive significant effect of student councils' involvement in student welfare and management of public schools ( $\beta_2=0.539$  and p value  $<0.05$ ). Therefore, an increase in student councils' involvement in student welfare led to an increase in management of public schools. It was concluded that involving student council in students' welfare activities influences management public schools in Kisii. The study recommends that students be involved in welfare activities to avoid unnecessary conflicts between the school administration and students.

**Key Words:** Councils, Involvement, welfare, Management.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Student councils' involvement in school management entails active involvement in school-based decision-making processes. Within the newly emerging international focus on children's competence are calls for children to become active participants in the operations and management of schools. According to Davidsff and Lazarus (2007), administrative decentralization can be defined as a means of distributing authority to the different agencies, groups and stakeholders.

In Nigeria, it is reported that student unrests were attributed to lack of effective decision-making by school management. Students resorted to violence to vent their frustrations and disagreements (Arekenya, 2012). A study done in Nigeria by (Nwankwo, 2014) found that students' participation in decision-making in the areas human resources among other things was very low. This seems to be an area that is reserved for the adults as students are viewed as immature (Pérez-Expósito, 2015) to handle such cases. In Ghana, student councils ensure and safeguard the general welfare of students by acting as the voice of students, airing their grievances in order to create a conducive academic environment (Alexia, 2014).

A study done in Cameroon found that vandalizing of school properties and mass protest was common in secondary schools (Ngwokabuenui, 2015). In South Africa the ruling government came up with some policies intended to encourage student governance. In public secondary schools, students in the eighth grade or higher at the school must be represented on the Representative Council of Learners (RCL) (Mabovula, 2009). These schools must establish a Representative Council of Learners (RCL), elected by the students. This arrangement, however, presumes that the children of lower grades do not need to be heard or even be represented in the student governments. The student representatives in school governing bodies provide the students with a legitimate role to play in school governance (Mabovula, 2009). The particular rationales underlying student participation in making decisions is the need to ensure their involvement in school affairs.

Research further has it that in Uganda student councils play dynamic roles where students are allowed to participate in the administration of their own affairs. They control on the punishment of students by teachers and reduce congestion of students in staffroom by representing and communicating students' needs. They also empower students to instill morals amongst themselves by arbitrating cases, in the school court before being referred to the disciplinary committee (Mukiti, 2014).

In 2012 students of Rwathia girls secondary school in Kenya held a demonstration demanding to be allowed to wear shorter

skirts. The students said their uniform was too long and ugly (Karanja, 2012). It took the intervention of the then Minister for Education, to have the length of their skirt reduced to near knee length as opposed to earlier ones that almost touched their ankles. This incidence clearly points that students value their involvement in decisions relating to their uniform. It is, therefore, of interest for this study to determine the effectiveness of student councils in management of public secondary schools in Kisii County is concerned after the creation of the legal provisions.

Student council's participation in decision-making involves creating opportunities for children and young people to increase their influence over what happens to them and around them. For many years, student council is touted as one of the most important ways of minimizing or even eliminating student indiscipline and discontent in schools. Even with the creation of Student Councils in secondary schools, it is not clear the extent to which the student council members, and by extension the students' body, are involved in the decision-making process in the schools.

Tikoko & Kiprop (2011), found that students were not involved in the making decisions about their welfare issues like diet, school routine, but it is not clear whether this is still the case since this study was done before the promulgation of the Basic Education Act of 2013 that provided for the establishment of the Student Councils. In most secondary schools' principals and the teachers make all the decisions in relation to the co-curricular activities that the students need to participate in and at times students have no stake. Co-curricular activities include athletics, ball games, sports, clubs, movements and societies which impact directly on students.

There have been waves of student Unrests such as the 2016 where over 120 schools were burnt within three months. In Nyanza region in the same period, July 2016 many Secondary schools experienced burning of schools across the region. Kisii County alone experienced 23 Schools being burnt during the same period translating to 19.2% of the national total. This could be a large figure for one county compared to 47 others in Kenya. In view of the foregoing it was of interest to carry out a study to determine the effectiveness of student councils involvement in student welfare the management of public secondary schools in Kisii County, Kenya.

## II. METHODS

The study adopted the Social Systems Theory proposed by Talcott Parsons of 1975 as the theoretical underpinning for the study (Cohen & Romi, 2010). Social Systems Theory states that the social system is composed of persons or groups of persons who interact and mutually influence each other's behavior This study used pragmatist paradigm since it combines the qualitative and quantitative approaches within different phases of the research process (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Pragmatist researchers focuses on the 'what' and 'how' of the research problem (Creswell, 2009). Since this

research used quantitative and qualitative approaches, this paradigm is deemed appropriate for this study.

The study utilized the mixed method research design, and specifically triangulation method in which both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods was implemented simultaneously. Quantitative data was obtained by use of questionnaires while qualitative data was collected through face-to-face interviews. This study adopted an explanatory concurrent mixed methods design (Creswell, 2012). The explanatory concurrent mixed methods design was suitable for this study because exclusive use of either quantitative or qualitative method may not have been sufficient.

The locale of this study was Kisii County which is in the South Western part of Kenya about 400 kilometers from Nairobi. The target population of the study was: Principals, Teachers, Students, Student Councils from Public secondary schools in Kisii county and MoE officials (Sub county Directors of Education). All schools identified had similar characteristics and it is out of these schools that respondents were drawn. The target population of this study (N) was 134948 respondents distributed in 104 public secondary schools in Kisii County. The target population comprise 104 principals, 2080 teachers, 131,713 students, 1040 student council leaders and 11 Sub County Directors of Education respectively.

The stratified sampling technique was used to categorize schools into national, extra county and county schools, each forming a stratum. Also, Kisii County was stratified into eleven sub counties, with each forming a stratum. To arrive at the total number of respondents stratified, random sampling and purposive sampling was applied to select 31 Principals, 336 Teachers, 289 student leaders 399 students and 11 Sub County Directors of Education.

Purposive sampling was used to select 11 Sub County Directors of Education since their roles gave a wider view of the study. Similarly, 31 principals were purposively selected. The study used purposive sampling to select Sub County Directors of Education. All the sub county education officers were involved in the study because they are in charge of supervision of secondary schools. Sub county Directors of Education manage day to day programs of MoE. They receive, investigate and resolve issues during students' unrest or any form of disagreements in schools among various school stakeholders.

From each stratum the study employed simple random procedure to select 336 teachers 399 students and 289 student leaders. Simple random sampling was a major sampling technique because each respondent had an equal chance of inclusion in the sample. Simple random sampling technique was used to select student leaders based on sub-county and category of schools. In the second phase, purposive sampling technique was used to select principals, and Sub County Directors of Education who participated in interviews on the basis of quantitative data, based on the Sub county.

The sample size was established using Yamane’s (1967) formula, at 95% Confidence level, P = 0.05.

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where;

- n = the sample size,
- N = the population size,
- e = error tolerance

Given that the population was not homogeneous, the sample size determination for teachers, student councils and students was determined using (Yamane, 1967) as summarized below

- For teachers, the sample size was;  
 $= 2080 / 1 + 2080(.05)^2 = 2080 / 6.2 = 336$  respondents
- For student councils/leaders, the sample size was;  
 $= 1040 / 1 + 1040(.05)^2 = 1040 / 3.6 = 289$  respondents
- For students, the sample size was;  
 $= 131713 / 1 + 131713(.05)^2 = 131713 / 330.28 = 399$  respondents

The sample size comprised of 31 principals, 289 students’ leaders, 336 teachers, 399 students and 11 Sub County Directors of Education respectively giving a total of 1066 respondents.

Primary data was collected from the respondents using questionnaires and interview schedules. The combination of these methods helped to complement the advantages of each method and yield more valid and reliable findings. Questionnaires are set of questions which give answers of the research participants in a set of ways. The questionnaire is a suitable tool for collecting quantitative data because it consists of a set of questions with fixed wording, sequence of presentation, and precise indications on how to answer the questions (Orodho, 2010; 2009).

The questionnaire was designed to address specific objectives and that it has closed-ended questions. Unless otherwise stated, all variables were measured on a 5-point Likert scales ranging from 5 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree. The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with various statements. The study used questionnaires which the researcher constructed on the basis of the research questions of the study. Two data collection instruments were constructed by the researcher to be used namely the Teacher, Student and Student Council questionnaire respectively. This ensured that answers were reliably aggregated and allowed comparisons to be made. The interview schedule was used to interview Principals and Sub-County Directors of Education (SCDE). All the groups of interviewees were involved in the management of education in school and sub county respectively. The interview schedule constituted open-ended questions which required principals and Sub-County Directors of Education to provide information on specific aspects of effectiveness of student councils in the management of public secondary schools in Kisii County as per the four research objectives of this study.

Verbal information was obtained from both principals and Sub-County Directors of Education and other relevant observations made by the researcher was documented in writing.

The content validity of the instruments used in this study established through expert judgment (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012; Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009). To determine content validity of the instrument, the researcher sought suggestions from experts. After obtaining the information it was coded into the statistical package for social scientist (V26) and the reliability analysis done using Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient. Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient was used to test the reliability of the measures in the questionnaires. Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha was computed for each item to determine the reliability of the research instrument. The Cronbach’s alpha (α) coefficient used for reliability test value should be above 0.7 to be adopted as a satisfactory level (Bryman, 2012). From the results it was established that all the variables considered had Cronbach’s alpha (α) coefficient of above 0.7. A reliability Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha of 0.7 or over was assumed to reflect the internal reliability of the instruments.

Qualitative data from the open-ended items interviews was organized into themes guided by research question and presented using descriptions and quotations. The data from the interviews was transcribed first and then combined with the data recorded manually. Data from open-ended questions was re-arranged into written statements out of which distinctive themes was generated. The quantitative data from the questionnaire was first subjected to preliminary processing through validation, coding and tabulation in readiness for analysis with respect to objectives. Data was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive statistics was presented in contingency tables showing the frequencies and percentages of data obtained. Descriptive statistics consisted of mean, standard deviation frequencies, percentages, and means. To establish the strength of relationships between variables, inferential statistics such as Pearson’s correlation coefficient and linear regression analysis was used. To determine the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variable as captured by the null hypotheses H<sub>01</sub> linear regression was undertaken. The regression model is given as:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \epsilon \dots \dots \dots \text{Equation 1}$$

Where;

- Y = School Management
- β<sub>0</sub> = Slope Constant
- β<sub>1</sub> = Regression coefficients
- X<sub>1</sub> = Welfare
- ε = error term

### III. RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS

#### *Students' views on student councils' involvement in student welfare activities*

A total of 6 statements were used to establish the students' views on student councils' involvement in student welfare activities in public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point Likert scale were summarized in Table 1. Majority of the students 228(64.2%) agreed that student leaders discuss issues with the staff concerning school hygiene and sanitation, with 23(6.5%) undecided and 104(29.3%) disagreed ( $M=3.40$ ;  $SD=1.44$ ).

Most of the students 247(69.6%) agreed that student leaders are important in maintaining the school hygiene and sanitation, with 88(24.7%) disagreed and 20(5.6%) undecided ( $M=3.61$ ;  $SD=1.39$ ). Majority of the students 259(72.9%) agreed that student leaders are given opportunity to help keep the school clean and safe without teachers' supervision, with 17(4.8%) undecided and 131(36.9%) disagreed ( $M=3.75$ ;  $SD=1.39$ ).

Most of the students 236(66.5%) disagreed that student leaders felt that the maintenance of hygiene and sanitation was a total punishment to them, with 95(26.8%) agreed and 24(6.8%) undecided ( $M=2.32$ ;  $SD=1.47$ ). Majority of the students 183(51.6%) agreed that student leaders ensure the indiscipline students do cleaning activities in the school, with 35(9.9%) undecided and 137(38.6%) disagreed ( $M=3.16$ ;  $SD=1.46$ ). Most of the students 236(66.5%) agreed that student leaders are in-charge and serve as role models in maintaining cleanliness, with 91(25.6%) disagreed and 28(7.9%) undecided ( $M=3.57$ ;  $SD=1.47$ ).

From the findings of the study, responses to the indicators of student councils' involvement in student welfare in Kisii County had an overall mean of 3.30 and a standard deviation of 0.81. This shows that students were not sure on student council involvement in student welfare in Kisii County. This implies that student councils' were sometimes involved in student welfare activities.

Table 1 Students' views on student councils' involvement in student welfare activities

	SA		A		UD		D		SD		Mean	SD
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Student leaders discuss issues with the staff concerning school hygiene and sanitation	85	23.9	143	40.3	23	6.5	37	10.4	67	18.9	3.40	1.44
Student leaders are important in maintaining our hygiene and sanitation	108	30.4	139	39.2	20	5.6	36	10.1	52	14.6	3.61	1.39
Student leaders are given opportunity to help keep the school clean and safe without teachers' supervision.	135	38.0	124	34.9	17	4.8	32	9.0	47	13.2	3.75	1.39
Student leaders feel the maintenance of hygiene and sanitation was a total punishment to them.	49	13.8	46	13.0	24	6.8	86	24.2	150	42.3	2.32	1.47
Student leaders ensure the indiscipline students do cleaning activities in the school.	79	22.3	104	29.3	35	9.9	69	19.4	68	19.2	3.16	1.46
Student leaders are in-charge and serve as role models in maintaining cleanliness.	122	34.4	114	32.1	28	7.9	28	7.9	63	17.7	3.57	1.47
Mean											<b>3.30</b>	<b>0.81</b>

#### *Student councils' views on their involvement in student welfare activities*

A total of 9 statements were used to establish the student councils' views on the student councils' involvement in student welfare activities in public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point Likert scale were summarized in Table 2. Majority of the student councils 170(65.4%) agreed that they discuss issues with the staff concerning school hygiene and sanitation, with 14(5.4%) undecided and 14(5.4%) disagreed ( $M=3.49$ ;  $SD=1.44$ ).

Most of the student councils 229(88.1%) agreed that they were important in maintaining their school hygiene and sanitation, with 22(8.5%) disagreed and 9(3.5%) undecided ( $M=4.19$ ;  $SD=0.96$ ). Most of the student councils 232 (89.2%) agreed that the kitchen, latrines, classrooms and play grounds must have specific student in charge, with 19(7.3%) disagreed and 9(3.5%) undecided ( $M=4.37$ ;  $SD=0.95$ ). Majority of the student councils 236(90.8%) agreed that student leaders are given opportunity to help keep the school clean and safe without teachers' supervision, with 16(6.1%) undecided and 8(3.1%) disagreed ( $M=4.37$ ;  $SD=0.88$ ).

Most of the student councils 153(58.8%) disagreed that students always felt that the maintenance of hygiene and sanitation was a total punishment to them, with 95(36.5%) agreed and 12(4.6%) undecided ( $M=2.58$ ;  $SD=1.60$ ). Majority of the student councils 197(75.8%) agreed that they ensured that indiscipline students took part in cleaning activities in the school, with 22(8.5%) undecided and 41(15.8%) disagreed ( $M=3.87$ ;  $SD=1.14$ ). Most of the student councils 242(93.1%) agreed that they were in-charge and must serve as role models in maintaining cleanliness, with 13(5%) disagreed and 5(1.9%) undecided ( $M=4.43$ ;  $SD=0.88$ ).

Majority of the student councils 208(80%) agreed that principals and teachers must appoint students to be in charge

of hygiene and sanitation, with 11(4.2%) undecided and 41(15.8%) disagreed ( $M=4.07$ ;  $SD=1.18$ ). Most of the student councils 172(66.1%) agreed that academic performance should be considered when electing or appointing a student to be in charge of hygiene and sanitation, with 74(28.5%) disagreed and 14(5.4%) undecided ( $M=3.61$ ;  $SD=1.44$ ). From the findings of the study, responses to the indicators of student councils' involvement in student welfare in Kisii County had an overall mean of 3.89 and a standard deviation of 0.58. This shows that students council agreed on their involvement in student welfare activities in Kisii County.

Table 2 Student councils' views on their involvement in student welfare activities

	SA		A		UD		D		SD		Mean	SD
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
We discuss issues with the staff concerning school hygiene, catering and sanitation	70	26.9	100	38.5	14	5.4	39	15.0	37	14.2	3.49	1.40
We are very important in maintaining hygiene and sanitation	111	42.7	118	45.4	9	3.5	14	5.4	8	3.1	4.19	0.96
Our kitchen, latrines, classrooms and play grounds have specific students in charge	150	57.7	82	31.5	9	3.5	12	4.6	7	2.7	4.37	0.95
We are given opportunity to help keep the school clean and safe without teachers' supervision.	142	54.6	94	36.2	8	3.1	11	4.2	5	1.9	4.37	0.88
Students always feel that maintenance of hygiene and sanitation is total punishment to them.	51	19.6	44	16.9	12	4.6	51	19.6	102	39.2	2.58	1.60
We ensure that indisciplined students take part in cleaning activities in the school.	84	32.3	113	43.5	22	8.5	27	10.4	14	5.4	3.87	1.14
Students in-charge must serve as role models in maintaining cleanliness.	151	58.1	91	35.0	5	1.9	5	1.9	8	3.1	4.43	0.88
Principals and teachers must appoint student to be in charge of hygiene and sanitation	123	47.3	85	32.7	11	4.2	28	10.8	13	5.0	4.07	1.18
Academic performance should be considered when electing or appointing student to be in charge of hygiene and sanitation.	95	36.5	77	29.6	14	5.4	40	15.4	34	13.1	3.61	1.44
Mean											<b>3.89</b>	<b>0.58</b>

*Teachers' views on the student councils' involvement in student welfare activities*

A total of 9 statements were used to establish the teachers views on student councils' involvement in student welfare activities in public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point Likert scale were summarized in Table 3. Majority of the teachers 213(74.7%) agreed that student leaders discussed issues with the staff concerning school

hygiene and sanitation, with 17(6%) undecided and 55(19.3%) disagreed ( $M=3.67$ ;  $SD=1.44$ ). Most of the teachers 251(88.1%) agreed that student leaders were important in maintaining their school hygiene and sanitation, with 20(7.1%) disagreed and 14(4.9%) undecided ( $M=4.16$ ;  $SD=0.90$ ).

Most of the teachers 245(86%) agreed that in some areas like kitchen, latrines, classrooms and play grounds must have

specific student in charge, with 26(9.2%) disagreed and 14(4.9%) undecided ( $M=4.16$ ;  $SD=1.05$ ). Majority of the teachers 218(76.5%) agreed that student leaders were given opportunity to help keep the school clean and safe without teachers’ supervision, with 22(7.7%) undecided and 45(15.8%) disagreed ( $M=3.86$ ;  $SD=1.20$ ).

Most of the teachers 160(56.1%) disagreed that student leaders felt that the maintenance of hygiene and sanitation was a total punishment for them, with 102(35.8%) agreed and 23(8.1%) undecided ( $M=2.66$ ;  $SD=1.37$ ). Majority of the teachers 202(70.9%) disagreed that they ensure that only indiscipline students take part in cleaning activities in the school, with 13(4.6%) undecided and 70(24.5%) agreed ( $M=2.24$ ;  $SD=1.30$ ).

Most of the teachers 245(86%) agreed that student leaders were in-charge and must serve as role models in maintaining

cleanliness, with 29(10.2%) disagreed and 11(3.9%) undecided ( $M=4.16$ ;  $SD=1.01$ ). Majority of the teachers 186(65.3%) agreed that principals and teachers appoint student to be in charge of hygiene and sanitation, with 18(6.3%) undecided and 81(28.4%) disagreed ( $M=3.50$ ;  $SD=1.34$ ). Most of the teachers 184(64.6%) agreed that academic performance should be considered when electing or appointing a student to be in charge of hygiene and sanitation, with 84(29.5%) disagreed and 17(6%) undecided ( $M=3.52$ ;  $SD=1.34$ ).

From the findings of the study, teachers’ views responses to the indicators on student council involvement in student welfare in Kisii County had an overall mean of 3.55 and a standard deviation of 0.64. This shows that teachers agreed on student councils’ involvement in student welfare activities in Kisii County.

Table 3 Teachers’ views on their involvement in student welfare activities

	SA		A		UD		D		SD		Mean	SD
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Student councils and staff discuss issues concerning school hygiene and sanitation	56	19.6	157	55.1	17	6.0	31	10.9	24	8.4	3.67	1.16
Student councils are very important in maintaining hygiene and sanitation	108	37.9	143	50.2	14	4.9	13	4.6	7	2.5	4.16	0.90
Some areas like kitchen, latrines, classrooms and play grounds must have specific student in charge	128	44.9	117	41.1	14	4.9	11	3.9	15	5.3	4.16	1.05
Given opportunity student councils can help keep the school clean and safe without teachers’ supervision.	95	33.3	123	43.2	22	7.7	22	7.7	23	8.1	3.86	1.20
Students feel that maintenance of hygiene and sanitation is total punishment to them.	31	10.9	71	24.9	23	8.1	91	31.9	69	24.2	2.66	1.37
Teachers ensure that only indiscipline students take part in cleaning activities in the school	20	7.0	50	17.5	13	4.6	98	34.4	104	36.5	2.24	1.30
Students in-charge must serve as role models in maintaining cleanliness.	124	43.5	121	42.5	11	3.9	20	7.0	9	3.2	4.16	1.01
Principals and teachers appoint student to be in charge of hygiene and sanitation	71	24.9	115	40.4	18	6.3	48	16.8	33	11.6	3.50	1.34
Academic performance should be considered when electing or appointing a student to be in charge of hygiene and sanitation.	76	26.7	108	37.9	17	6.0	55	19.3	29	10.2	3.52	1.34
Mean											<b>3.55</b>	<b>0.64</b>

The interview was conducted among the principals in public secondary schools in Kisii County to establish the involvement of students’ when it comes to their welfare programs. The findings were analyzed based on the themes emanating from their response. One of the principals stated that student council-

*“were involved in making school rules and routines, through formation of students’ welfare group, they are involved in*

*“barazas” where they air their views positively, cleaning the school compound, participating in chapel program for their spiritual welfare. They discuss in “Barazas” their discipline issue, sanitation, academics, sports, spiritual nourishment etc. They come with suggestions but moderated by teachers”*

Another of the principal stated that student council

*“help in coming up with extra-curricular activities such as debates, clean-ups, pastoral programs and have their own*

leaders run.” One of the principals stated that student council “involve students in school cleanliness, in the event of bereavement student contributions are done, creation of a kitty for the disadvantaged students, discussions and flexibility on weekly menu.”

*Students’ views on Management of public secondary schools*

A total of 9 indicators were used to assess students’ views on management of public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point likert scale, shown in Table 4. Majority of the students 268 (75.5%) agreed that student leaders are involved in time management in schools, 23(6.5%) undecided and 64(18%) disagreed ( $M=3.81$ ;  $SD=1.20$ ). Most of the students 195(54.9%) agreed that student leaders are entrusted with full control of school time schedules even in absence of teachers and administration, with 125(35.2%) disagreed and 35(9.9%) undecided ( $M=3.25$ ;  $SD=1.40$ ). Majority of students 246(69.3%) agreed that student leaders ensure

students observe time keeping, 79(22.2%) disagreed and 30(8.5%) were undecided ( $M=3.68$ ;  $SD=1.34$ ).

Most of the students 246(69.3%) agreed that student leaders are involved in time keeping to ensure seriousness in school timetable is taken, with 87(24.5%) disagreed and 24(6.8%) undecided ( $M=3.66$ ;  $SD=1.34$ ). Majority of students 244(68.8%) agreed that student leaders supervise other students to ensure duties such as cleaning the school compound, 38(10.7%) disagreed and 9(2.5%) were undecided ( $M=4.19$ ;  $SD=1.10$ ). Most of students 258(72.7%) agreed that student leaders supervise other students in taking care of the environment, with 78(22%) disagreed and 19(5.4%) were undecided ( $M=3.72$ ;  $SD=1.32$ ). Majority of students 263(74.1%) agreed that student leaders supervise meals especially during breakfast, tea, lunches and supper with, 68(19.2%) disagreed and 24(6.8%) were undecided ( $M=3.89$ ;  $SD=1.32$ ).

Table 4 Students’ views on Management of public secondary schools

	SA		A		UD		D		SD		Mean	SD
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Student leaders are involved in time management in schools	111	31.3	157	44.2	23	6.5	37	10.4	27	7.6	3.81	1.20
Student leaders are entrusted with full control of school time schedules even in absence of teachers and administration	75	21.1	120	33.8	35	9.9	67	18.9	58	16.3	3.25	1.40
Student leaders ensure students observe time keeping	115	32.4	131	36.9	30	8.5	37	10.4	42	11.8	3.68	1.34
Student leaders are involved in time keeping to ensure seriousness in school timetable is taken	117	33.0	127	35.8	24	6.8	49	13.8	38	10.7	3.66	1.34
Student leaders supervise other students to ensure duties such as cleaning the school compound	173	48.7	135	38.0	9	2.5	16	4.5	22	6.2	4.19	1.10
Student leaders supervise other students in taking care of the environment	115	32.4	143	40.3	19	5.4	39	11.0	39	11.0	3.72	1.32
Student leaders supervise preps around the study areas like the library and the laboratories	47	13.2	59	16.6	35	9.9	98	27.6	116	32.7	2.50	1.43
Student leaders supervise games by making sure that students are in the field	50	14.1	117	33.0	26	7.3	72	20.3	90	25.4	2.90	1.45
Student leaders supervise meals especially during breakfast, tea, lunches and supper	155	43.7	108	30.4	24	6.8	34	9.6	34	9.6	3.89	1.32
Mean											<b>3.51</b>	<b>0.89</b>

Majority of the students 214 (60.3%) disagreed that student leaders supervise preps around the study areas like the library and the laboratories, 35(9.9%) undecided and 106(29.8%) agreed ( $M=2.5$ ;  $SD=1.43$ ). At least 167(47.1%) of the students agreed that student leaders supervise games by making sure that students are in the field, with 162(45.7%) disagreed and 26(7.3%) undecided ( $M=2.9$ ;  $SD=1.45$ ). From the findings of the study, responses to the indicators of management of public secondary schools in Kisii County had an overall mean of 3.51 and a standard deviation of 0.89. This shows that students agreed on the management of public

secondary schools in Kisii County by involving student leaders.

*Student Councils’ views on Management of public secondary schools*

A total of 11 indicators were used to assess student councils’ views on management of public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point likert scale are summarized in Table 5. Majority of the student leaders (or student council 239(91.9%) agreed that they were involved in time management in schools, 7(2.7%) undecided and 14(5.4%)

disagreed ( $M=4.2$ ;  $SD=0.84$ ). Most of the student leaders 211(81.1%) agreed that they are entrusted with full control of school time schedules even in absence of teachers and administration, with 36(13.8%) disagreed and 13(5%) undecided ( $M=3.95$ ;  $SD=1.07$ ). Majority of student leaders 209(80.3%) agreed that they ensured students observed time keeping, 34(13.1%) disagreed and 17(6.5%) were undecided ( $M=3.94$ ;  $SD=1.07$ ).

Most of student leaders 258(72.7%) agreed that they were controlling students not to skip classes, with 78(22%) disagreed and 19(5.4%) were undecided ( $M=3.72$ ;  $SD=1.32$ ). Majority of student leaders 263(74.1%) agreed that student leaders supervise meals especially during breakfast, tea, lunches and supper with, 68(19.2%) disagreed and 24(6.8%) were undecided ( $M=3.89$ ;  $SD=1.32$ ). Most of the student leaders 153(58.8%) agreed that they supervised other students in taking care of the environment including watering young trees and flowers in the compound, with 72(27.7%) disagreed and 35(13.5%) undecided ( $M=3.41$ ;  $SD=1.31$ ).

At least 128(49.2%) of student leaders agreed that they supervised preps around the study areas like the library and the laboratories, 100(38.4%) disagreed and 32(12.3%) were

undecided ( $M=3.10$ ;  $SD=1.31$ ). Most of student leaders 160(61.6%) agreed that they supervised games by making sure that students in the field, with 79(30.3%) disagreed and 21(8.1%) were undecided ( $M=3.41$ ;  $SD=1.32$ ). Majority of student leaders 226(87%) agreed that they supervised meals especially during breakfast, tea, lunches and supper, 23(8.8%) disagreed and 11(4.2%) were undecided ( $M=4.20$ ;  $SD=1.02$ ).

Most of the student leaders 199(76.5%) agreed that they were involved in time keeping to ensure seriousness in school timetable is taken, with 43(16.6%) disagreed and 18(6.9%) undecided ( $M=3.93$ ;  $SD=1.20$ ). Majority of student leaders 217(83.4%) agreed that the school's smooth running by ensuring order in school programs, 26(10%) disagreed and 17(6.5%) were undecided ( $M=4.15$ ;  $SD=0.99$ ). Most of student leaders 216(83%) agreed that they were involved in time keeping to ensure seriousness in school timetable was taken, with 30(11.5%) disagreed and 14(5.4%) were undecided ( $M=4.13$ ;  $SD=1.04$ ). Majority of student leaders 241(92.7%) agreed that they supervised other students to ensure duties such as cleaning the school compound, 9(3.4%) disagreed and 10(3.8%) were undecided ( $M=4.43$ ;  $SD=0.80$ ).

Table 5 Student councils' views on management of public secondary schools

	SA		A		UD		D		SD		Mean	SD
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
We are involved in time management in schools	95	36.5	144	55.4	7	2.7	7	2.7	7	2.7	4.20	0.84
We are entrusted in full control of school time schedules even in absence of teachers and administration	83	31.9	128	49.2	13	5.0	25	9.6	11	4.2	3.95	1.07
I ensure increase students' time keeping	82	31.5	127	48.8	17	6.5	22	8.5	12	4.6	3.94	1.07
We are controlling students not to skip classes	103	39.6	96	36.9	18	6.9	27	10.4	16	6.2	3.93	1.20
School's smooth running by ensuring order in school programs	114	43.8	103	39.6	17	6.5	21	8.1	5	1.9	4.15	0.99
I am Involved in time keeping to ensure seriousness in school timetable is taken	114	43.8	102	39.2	14	5.4	23	8.8	7	2.7	4.13	1.04
We supervise other students to ensure duties such as cleaning the school compound	144	55.4	97	37.3	10	3.8	4	1.5	5	1.9	4.43	0.80
We supervise other students in taking care of the environment including watering young trees and flowers in the compound	56	21.5	97	37.3	35	13.5	41	15.8	31	11.9	3.41	1.31
We supervise preps around the study areas like the library and the laboratories	36	13.8	92	35.4	32	12.3	63	24.2	37	14.2	3.10	1.31
We supervise games by making sure that students in the field	55	21.2	105	40.4	21	8.1	49	18.8	30	11.5	3.41	1.32
We supervise meals especially during breakfast, tea, lunches and supper	119	45.8	107	41.2	11	4.2	12	4.6	11	4.2	4.20	1.02
Mean											<b>3.90</b>	<b>0.59</b>



From the findings of the study, responses to the indicators of management of public secondary schools in Kisii County had an overall mean of 3.90 and a standard deviation of 0.59. This shows that students councils agreed on the management of public secondary schools in Kisii County.

*Teachers' views on Management of public secondary schools*

A total of 11 indicators were used to assess teachers' views on management of public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point Likert scale are summarized in Table 6. Majority of the teachers 235(82.5%) agreed that student councils were involved in time management in schools, with 44(15.5%) undecided and 6(2.1%) disagreed ( $M=3.81$ ;  $SD=1.09$ ). Most of the teachers 155(54.3%) agreed that student councils were entrusted in full control of school time schedules even in the absence of teachers and administration, with 97(34.1%) disagreed and 33(11.6%) undecided ( $M=3.21$ ;  $SD=1.30$ ).

Majority of teachers 203(71.3%) agreed that student councils ensured students observed time keeping, with 66(23.1%) disagreed and 16 (5.6%) were undecided ( $M=3.64$ ;  $SD=1.17$ ). Majority teachers 214(75.1%) agreed that student leaders ensured School's smooth running by ensuring order in school programs, with 49(17.2%) disagreed and 22(7.7%) were undecided ( $M=3.72$ ;  $SD=1.07$ ). Most of the teachers 223(78.3%) agreed that student council involvement in time keeping to ensure seriousness in school timetable is taken, with 45(15.8%) disagreed and 17(6%) undecided ( $M=3.82$ ;  $SD=1.05$ ).

Majority of teachers 253(88.8%) agreed that student council supervising other students to ensure duties such as cleaning the school compound, with 19(6.7%) disagreed and 13(4.6%) were undecided ( $M=4.20$ ;  $SD=0.94$ ). Most of teachers 208(73%) agreed that student council supervise other students in taking care of the environment including watering young trees and flowers in the compound, with 54(18.9%) disagreed and 23(8.1%) were undecided ( $M=3.68$ ;  $SD=0.07$ ). Majority of teachers 185(64.9%) agreed that student council supervise games by making sure that students are in the field, with 80(28.1%) disagreed and 20(7%) were undecided ( $M=3.47$ ;  $SD=0.07$ ). Most of teachers 242(84.9%) agreed that student leaders supervise meals especially during breakfast, tea, lunches and supper, with 37(13%) disagreed and 6(2.1%) were undecided ( $M=4.00$ ;  $SD=0.06$ ).

At least 136(47.7%) of teachers agreed that student councils supervised preps around the study areas like the library and the laboratories, 116(40.7%) disagreed and 33(11.6%) were undecided ( $M=3.06$ ;  $SD=1.29$ ). At least 140(49.1%) of the teachers agreed that student councils are involved in controlling students not to skip classes, with 118(41.4%) disagreed and 27(9.5%) were undecided ( $M=3.09$ ;  $SD=1.26$ ). From the findings of the study, responses to the indicators of management of public secondary schools in Kisii County had an overall mean of 3.61 and a standard deviation of 0.77. This shows that teachers agreed on the management of public secondary schools in Kisii County.

Table 6 Teachers views on Management of public secondary schools

	SA		A		UD		D		SD		Mean	SD
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Student councils are involved in time management in schools	60	21.1	175	61.4	6	2.1	23	8.1	21	7.4	3.81	1.09
Student councils are entrusted in full control of school time schedules even in the absence of teachers and administration	42	14.7	113	39.6	33	11.6	58	20.4	39	13.7	3.21	1.30
Student councils ensure students observe time keeping	62	21.8	141	49.5	16	5.6	50	17.5	16	5.6	3.64	1.17
Student councils are involved in controlling students not to skip classes	35	12.3	105	36.8	27	9.5	87	30.5	31	10.9	3.09	1.26
Ensure School's smooth running by ensuring order in school programs	55	19.3	159	55.8	22	7.7	34	11.9	15	5.3	3.72	1.07
Involvement in time keeping to ensure seriousness in school timetable is taken	68	23.9	155	54.4	17	6.0	34	11.9	11	3.9	3.82	1.05
Supervising other students to ensure duties such as cleaning the school compound	118	41.4	135	47.4	13	4.6	8	2.8	11	3.9	4.20	0.94
Supervise other students in taking care of the environment including watering young trees and flowers in the compound	60	21.1	148	51.9	23	8.1	34	11.9	20	7.0	3.68	1.14
Supervise preps around the study areas like the library and the laboratories.	36	12.6	100	35.1	33	11.6	77	27.0	39	13.7	3.06	1.29
Supervise games by making sure that students are in the field	53	18.6	132	46.3	20	7.0	57	20.0	23	8.1	3.47	1.23

Supervise meals especially during breakfast, tea, lunches and supper	95	33.3	147	51.6	6	2.1	21	7.4	16	5.6	4.00	1.08
Mean											<b>3.61</b>	<b>0.77</b>

From the interview’s all the Sub County Director of Education rated the state of discipline in the schools under their jurisdiction to be fair with traces of indiscipline cases. The situation at the moment is calm though in some schools’ students demanded for half term. From the interview’s schedule with the Sub County Director of Education the most common types of indiscipline experienced in secondary schools comprise of truancy, absenteeism and drug and substance abuse. Other identified were students sneaking, bullying, stealing, failure to do homework, cheating in exams and boy-girl relationships

From the interview’s schedule with the Sub County Director of Education majority of them (seven out of eleven) had experienced student unrests/strikes in the last three years. The incidences of student unrests/strikes were either once, thrice and four times in the last three years. The causes of student unrest in schools that had experience incidences of student unrests/strikes once comprised of student’s grievances were not handled in good time, incitement from other students, incitement from the community against school principal and deployment of new principal.

The causes of student unrest in schools that had experienced incidences of student unrests/strikes thrice were insufficient food, refusal to sit for exams, lack of power supply to the school and change of administration. The causes of student unrest in schools that had experienced incidences of student unrests/strikes four times were overstaying of principal/transfer in one station, protesting transfer of the deputy principal, Strict enforcement of school rules, community interference and punishing of student council members. From the interviews with Sub County Director of Education, all of them rated the level of students’ participation in making decisions in those schools that had unrests/strikes to be very minimal and principal then had never involved learners in decision making.

*Correlation analysis*

Pearson’s moment correlation was used to establish the influence of student councils’ involvement in student welfare activities and management of public schools in Kisii County. There was a significant positive and strong relationship between student councils’ involvement in student welfare activities ( $r = 0.446$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) and management of public secondary schools as shown in Table 7. Therefore, an increased student councils’ involvement in student welfare activities led to improvement in management of public secondary schools.

Table 7 Correlation between student welfare activities and management of public schools

		Management	Welfare
Management	Pearson Correlation	1	.446**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
Welfare	Pearson Correlation	.446**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
b. Listwise N=285

IV. REGRESSION ANALYSIS

A linear regression model was used to explore the effect of student councils’ involvement in student welfare and management of public schools. From the model, ( $R^2 = .199$ ) showed that student councils’ involvement in student welfare account for 19.9% variation in management of public schools. The  $R^2$  represented the measure of variability in management of public schools that student welfare accounted for. The student welfare predictor used in the model captured the variation in the management of public schools as shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.446 <sup>a</sup>	.199	.196	.68803

a. Predictors: (Constant), Welfare

The analysis of variance was used to test whether the model could significantly fit in predicting the outcome than using the mean as shown in (Table 9). The regression model with student councils’ involvement in student welfare as a predictor was significant ( $F=70.24$ ,  $p \text{ value} = 0.000$ ) shows that there is a significant relationship between student councils’ involvement in student welfare and management of public schools.

Table 9 Analysis of Variance on student welfare and management of public schools

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	33.250	1	33.250	70.240	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	133.967	283	.473		
	Total	167.217	284			

a. Dependent Variable: Management  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Welfare

In addition, the  $\beta$  coefficients for student councils’ involvement in student welfare as independent variable were generated from the model, in order to test the hypotheses under study. Table 10 shows the estimates of  $\beta$ -value and gives contribution of the predictor to the model. The  $\beta$ -value for student councils’ involvement in student welfare had a

positive coefficient, depicting positive relationship with management of public schools as summarized in the model as:

$$Y = 1.697 + 0.539X_1 + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots \text{Equation 4.2}$$

**Where:** Y = Management of public schools, X<sub>1</sub> = student welfare, ε = error term

From the findings the t-test associated with β-values was significant and student welfare predictor was making a significant contribution to the model. The coefficients result in table 10 showed that the predicted parameter in relation to the independent factor was significant (β<sub>1</sub> = 0.539; P<0.05).

Table 10 Student welfare and management of public schools' coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.697	.232		7.323	.000
	Welfare	.539	.064	.446	8.381	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Management

The study hypothesized that there was no significant effect of student councils' involvement in student welfare and management of public schools. There was a positive significant effect of student councils' involvement in student welfare and management of public schools (β<sub>2</sub>=0.539 and P-value <0.05). Therefore, an increase in student councils' involvement in student welfare led to an increase in management of public schools. The null hypothesis (H<sub>02</sub>) was rejected. Therefore, student councils' involvement in student welfare had a significant influence on management of public schools. This implies that for each increase in student councils' involvement in student welfare, there was an improvement in management of public schools.

V. CONCLUSIONS

It was concluded that involving student council in students' welfare activities influences management public schools in Kisii. Students councils play an important role in school management because they were given very many roles like students' welfare, coordinating co-curricular activities, supervising learning activities like early morning and late evening preps. They also check students' attendance to such activities and monitor indiscipline cases.

REFERENCES

[1] Ali, A. A., Dada, I. T., Isiaka, G. A., & Salmon, S. A. (2014). Types, Causes and Management of Indiscipline Acts Among

Secondary School Students in Shomolu Local Government Area of Lagos State. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, 8, 254-287.

[2] Baginsky, M., & Hannam, D. (1999). *School Councils: The views of parents and teachers*. NSPCC Policy and Research Series. London: NSPCC.

[3] Bakhda, S. (2004). *Management and Evaluation of Schools*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press, East Africa Ltd. Borden, R. (2004). *Taking School design to students*. Washington D. C: National institute of building science.

[4] Chemutai, L. & Chumba, S.K.(2014). Student council's participation in decision making in public secondary schools in Kericho West Sub- County, Kenya. *International journal of advanced research*. Vol. 2(6):850-858.

[5] Cohen, E. H., & Romi, S. (2010). Classroom management and discipline: a multi- method analysis of the way teachers, students, and pre-service teachers view disruptive behaviour, *Educational Practice and Theory*, 32 (1), 47- 69.

[6] Davidsff, S. and lazarus, S. (2007). *The Learning School; Organization Development Approach*, Kenwyn: Juta

[7] Gikungu, J. M., & Karanja, B. W. (2014). An epistemic understanding of Strikes in selected secondary schools, Kenya. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(5).

[8] Karanja, S. (2012, July 9th). School girls boycott classes, demand shorter skirts, *Daily Nation*.

[9] Katz, L. G., & Chard, S. (2000). *Engaging the Children Minds; The Project Approach* (2nd ed.). Stamford, CT: Ablex. National School Health Policy, Ministry of Public Health and Sanitation and Ministry of Education.

[10] Mabovula, N. (2009). Giving voice to the voiceless through deliberative democratic school governance. *South African Journal of Education*, 29, 219-233.

[11] Mati, A., Gatumu, J. C., & Chandi, J. R. (2016). Students' Involvement in Decision Making and their Academic Performance in Embu West Sub-County of Kenya. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 4(10), 2294-2298.

[12] Mukiti, M. T. (2014). Role of student council in secondary school's management in Mwingi Central District, Kitui County, Kenya. M.Ed. Research Project, Kenyatta University, Nairobi.

[13] Mulwa, D. M., Kimosop, M. K., & Kasivu, G. M. (2015). Participatory Governance in Secondary Schools: The Students' Viewpoint in Eastern Region of Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(30).

[14] Ndaita, J. S. (2016). The Nature and Causes of Indiscipline Cases among Public Secondary School Students in Thika Sub-County, Kiambu County, Kenya. *British Journal of Education*, 4(7), 55-66.

[15] Ngwokabuenui, P. Y. (2015). Students' Indiscipline: Types, Causes and Possible Solutions: The Case of Secondary Schools in Cameroon. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(22), 64-72.

[16] Njue, N. K. (2011). Influence of prefects on maintenance of students' discipline in public secondary schools in Gatundu North District, Kenya. M. Ed Thesis, University of Nairobi.

[17] Nwankwo, I. N. (2014). Students' Participation in Decision Making and its Implications for Educational Leadership. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS)* 5(3): 362-367

[18] Simatwa, E. M. W., Odhong, S. O., Juma, S. L. A., & Choka, G. M. (2014). Substance Abuse among Public Secondary School Students: Prevalence, Strategies and Challenges for Public Secondary School Managers in Kenya: A Case Study of Kisumu East Sub County *International Research Journals* 5(8), 315-330.

[19] Tikoko, B. J., & Kiprop, C. J. (2011). Extent of Student Participation in Decision-making in Secondary Schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(21).