
Influence of Participatory Decision Making On Pupils Management in Primary Schools of Kapseret Division.

Tanui Julius Kimeli¹, Jackson Too², Paul Sutter³

¹Masters Candidate, Kisii University School Of Business And Economics, Tuteihenry@Gmail.Com

²Lecturerdepartment Of Curriculum Instruction And Education Mediamoi University

³Lecturer, Paul Sutterlecturer Department Of Sociology And Psychologymoi University

Corresponding Author: Tanui Julius Kimeli

Abstract: The Main Aim Of The Study Was To Look Into The Influence Of Participatory Decision Making On Primary Schools Management At Kapseret Division, Wareng Sub-County, Uasingishu County Kenya. The Objective Of The Study Was To Find Out The Influence Of Participatory Decision Making On Management Of Pupils. The Study Research Design Used In This Study Is Descriptive Survey. The Study Will Be Carried Out In Kapseret Division, Wareng Sub-County, Uasingishu County Kenya. Therefore The Study Targeted 52 Head Teachers, 343 Respondents In The Selected Schools In Division. To Sample The Teachers The Researcher Used Simple Random Sampling Method and Used Table Of Determining Sample Size To Get A Sample Of 165. The Study Sampled 15 Head Teachers Using Purposive Sampling Method. The Study Utilized Questionnaires and Unstructured Interview Schedule For Data Collection. To Ensure Validity Of The Research Instrument, The Researcher Used Expert Raters And Research Supervisors In The University. The Data Was Analyzed Using Descriptive Statistics And Presented In Frequency Tables. Based On The Findings Of The Study It Was Concluded That The Role Of Participatory Decision Making In Primary Schools In Kapseret Division Wareng Sub-County Is The Fact That It Enhanced Regular Check On Pupil's Presence And Attendance By Effective Roll-Calling. It Has Also Made Pupils Take Keen Interest To Participate In School Activities Which Has Made Pupils Take Part In Fostering Time Management In School And Has Ensured Pupils Have Copies Of School Rules And Regulation.

Key Words: Participatory decision Making, Management Of Pupils, Roll-Calling, Time Management And Rules And Regulation.

Date of Submission: 23-02-2018

Date of acceptance: 10-03-2018

I. Introduction

The Idea Of Participative Management Is Generally Viewed As An Ideal Style Of Leadership And Management In Education Today (Johnson & Ledbetter 2003, Bush 2003). According To Mclagan And Nel (2005), Participatory Management Practices Emphasize Management Processes Rather Than Outcomes Only, And "High Involvement" Is Seen As The Ultimate Key To The Shift From Autocracy To Participation Hargreaves (2007) Shares The Sentiment And Argues That The Increasing Emergence Of Participatory Management In Schools Reflects The Widely Shared Belief That Flattened Management And Decentralized Authority Structures Carry The Potential For Achieving The Outcomes Unattainable By The Traditional Top-Down Bureaucratic Structures Of Schools.

Participative Decision Making (PDM) Is Still A Central Theme Of Research, Policy, And Practice In Schools (Pounder 2007; Leithwood And Duke 2008; Walker 2000; Somech 2002; San Antonio And Gamage 2007). This Theme Has Been The Subject Of Extensive Research For More Than 30 Years In Education, As Exemplified In The Seminal Work Of Conway (2004), Cloete Et Al. (2008), Bacharach Et Al. (2000), And Smylie (2002). These Scholars Embraced The Notion That Flatter Management And Decentralized Authority Structures Carry The Potential For Achieving Outcomes Unattainable Under Schools' Traditional Top-Down Bureaucratic Structure.

In The Past, Headteachers Throughout The World Have Been The Main Decision-Makers At School Level. This Situation Has Been Particularly Evident In A Number Of Countries Such As Australia, Canada, New Zealand, The United Kingdom, And Parts Of The United States Of America (Imber Et Al. 2000; Griffin 2005; Jonston 2007). During The Past 20 To 30 Years There Has Been A Major Shift Towards Participative Decision-Making (PDM) In Schools (Hart 2005; Mosoge And Vander Westhuizen 2008; Gultig And Butler 2009; Mabaso And Themane 2002; Bush And Heystek 2003). These Authors Have Called For Greater Participation In Decision-Making As A Progressive Way Of Making Schools More Democratic And More Efficient.

Anderson (2008) Contents That Deconstructing The Discourses Of Participatory Reforms In Education In USA Expounds On The Need For Authentic Participatory Reforms. He Cited On Participative Management And How It Was Being Promoted By Trade Books, Workshops, Motivational Speakers, Academic Scholarships And University Courses. These Voices Were For The Purpose Of Bringing Teachers, Parent And Pupils Into School Reforms. Anderson States That In An Attempt To Bring Conceptual Coherence To The Discourse Of Participatory Management, There Is Need To Create A Greater Institutional Legitimacy. Authentic Participation According To Anderson Entailed Who Is To Participate And In What Area And Under What Conditions. He Elaborated That Participation Is Authentic If It Includes Relevant Stake Holders And Creates Relatively Safe, Structured Spaces For Multiple Voices To Be Heard. This Would Lead To More Equal Levels Of Pupil Achievement And Improved Social Academic Outcomes For All Pupils.

A Study Conducted In Philippine Public Schools (2006) Indicated That Effective Participatory School Administration Would Lead To A More Democratic Approach In Which Planning And Decision Making Are Devolved To The Individual Schools Which Leads To High Academic Performance.

Cheng And Cheung (2003) Also Observe That Efforts To Enhance Organizational Effectiveness Since 2000s Have Featured Participative Management. As Caldwell And Spinks (2002) Point Out, Securing A "Synergy Of Communities" Is The Key To Attainment Of Educational Benefits. It Should Be Noted, However, That Attempts To Involve Stakeholders Should Be Geared Beyond Mere Participation But Towards Meaningful Involvement (Waters, Marzano & Mcnulty, (2003). Research Findings Show That Allowing Teachers And Stakeholders To Take Part In Decision Making Yields Salutary Results. Employee Satisfaction, Motivation, Morale And Self-Esteem Are Affected Positively By Involvement In Decision-Making And Implementation.

In South African Their New Education Policy Requires School Manager's Work In Democratic And Participative Ways To Build Relationships With Parents, Pupils, School Committees And Other Stakeholders To Ensure Efficient And Effective Delivery Of Services. (Task Team Report (Doe,2006), This View Was Supported Peters And Smith (2003) Who Advocates The Development Of Organization Systems, Structures And Processes That Are Conducive To, And Supportive Of Participation, Empowerment And Change.

Although It Is The Kenyan Government's Policy To Ensure The Delivery Of Quality Education In Primary Schools, Performance Has Remained Poor Despite The Various Interventions By Policy Makers And Implementers. Since Education Is A Highly Result-Oriented Discipline Notes That Examination Results Are Taken As A Valid Yardstick Of Pupil's Achievement (Mbae, 2004). In The Pursuit Of Improvements, Educators Introduce Various Innovations. Most Of These Innovations Were Towards Better School Outcomes Assign Utmost Importance To The Quality Of Leadership And Management In The Schools. According To Caldwell (2008) Headteachers Need The Involvement, Participation, And Support Of The Other Stakeholders Such As Teachers, Parents, Community Leaders And Pupils To Succeed.

An Analysis Of The Management Trend In Uasin- Gishu County, As Shown That Participatory Decision Making In Schools Is A Challenge, For Example, Service Delivery, And Pupil Discipline And Teacher Performance Has Been A Challenge To Many Schools Where Pupils Strike Because They Are Not Involved In Decision Making, Teachers Having Internal Conflicts With The Management Because They Feel Like The Headteachers Do Not Value Their Contributions (Deos Report On Education Day 2013). Pupil's Strikes That Have Recently Experience Is Due To Making Decisions without Involving the Pupils Such As Doing Exams in the Evening Preps (Standard Newspaper, 15th Jan 2012). This Disparity In School Performance Is Perceived To Be As A Result Of Management Liability That Is Good Participatory Management Practice Could Be Resulting To Good Performance While Poor Participatory Management Practice May Be Resulting To Poor School Performance. This Study Therefore Sought To Find Out The Influence Of Participatory Decision Making On School Performance In Primary Schools Of Kapsaret Division.

II. Statement of the Problem

Implementing Participatory Management Practices Enhances Trust In Schools As A Result Of Participatory Approaches, Enhancing The Levels Of Trust Within The School Community Which Makes It Attain Educational Benefits. Allowing Relational Trust To Grow In A School Community Triggers The Effective Interplay Of The Various Factors Towards School Performance. However, It Has Been Observed By Maranga That Kenya's Educational Machinery Is Highly Centralized Both At The National And School Level.. Teachers Are And Non-Teaching Staff Have Complained That Head-Teachers Do Not Involve Teachers In Running Their Schools. Yet, It Is Noted That Effective Schools Adopt Collegial And Professional Rather Than Hierarchical Stances In Making Decisions And Problem Solving Where The Input Of The Expert Is Sought .School Performance Indicators Such As Service Delivery, Discipline And Teacher Performance Are Affected By The Head Teachers Leadership Styles. Head Teachers Who Aspire To Succeed In Working For Continued School Improvement Need The Involvement, Participation And Support Of The Other Stakeholders Such As Teachers, Parents, Community Leaders And Pupils. Looking At Our Current Study Area The Situations Are Similar In That Most Of The Head Teachers Still Use Autocratic Leadership. At The School Level School

Heads Have Fallen Victim To The Sheep Syndrome In Which They See Teachers As A Faceless Herd To Be Led, Directed And Instructed Without Any Creativity And Knowledge To Contribute To The Success Of The School. This Study Therefore Sought To Establish The Influence Of Participatory Decision Making On Management Of Pupils In Primary Schools At Kapseret Division.

III. Literature

Christie, And Patterson,(2008) Note That Active Involvement Of Pupils In Discipline Process Is Viewed As Central To Having Long-Lasting Results. They Add That Co-Creating Discipline Solutions Contribute To Ownership For The Pupils- A Catalyst For Long-Term Responsible Behaviour. In Study Investigating Disciplinary Strategies Employed In Kenyan Primary Schools, Kiprop (2007) Also Found A Large Degree Of Agreement Among Her Subjects On Pupil Involvement In Discipline Task Forces On Their Fellow Pupils. Pupil Participation In Decision Making Refers To The Work Of Pupil Representative Bodies - Such As School Councils, Pupil Parliaments And The Prefectorial Body. It Is Also A Term Used To Encompass All Aspects Of School Life And Decision-Making Where Pupils May Make A Contribution, Informally Through Individual Negotiation As Well As Formally Through Purposely-Created Structures And Mechanisms. Pupil Participation Also Refers To Participation Of Pupils In Collective Decision-Making At School Or Class Level And To Dialogue Between Pupils And Other Decision-Makers, Not Only Consultation Or A Survey Among Pupils. Pupil Participation In Decision Making In Schools Is Often Viewed As Problematic To School Administrators, Parents And Society At Large. This Is Often Due To The Fact That Pupils Are Viewed As Minors, Immature And Lacking In The Expertise And Technical Knowledge That Is Needed In The Running Of A School. Thus Pupil Participation In Decision Making Is Often Confined To Issues Concerned With Pupil Welfare And Not In Core Governance Issues.

The Extent Of Pupil Involvement In Decision Making Is Debatable With Often Conflicting Viewpoints Propagated By Differing Stakeholders Depending On Their Background And World View. Basically There Are Three Viewpoints That Guide The Extent Of Pupil Involvement In Decision Making. The First Is That Pupils Must Remain Passive And Receive Instructions From Parents And Teachers (Sithole, 2008). This View Will Mean That Policies Must Be Designed By Adults And Pupils Are To Follow Them To The Letter. The Second Viewpoint Suggests That Pupils Can Participate But Only To A Certain Degree (Squelch, 2009; Magadla, 2007). In Support Of This View, Huddleston (2007) Suggests That There Is A Tendency Among Some Teachers And School Leaders To Define The Issues Which Affect Pupils Quite Narrowly. Pupil Consultation And Decision-Making Is Often Limited To Aspects Of School Life That Affect Pupils Only And Which Have No Immediate Relevance To Other Stakeholders, E.G., Playgrounds, Toilets And Lockers.

Aggrawal (2004) Adds That While Pupil Representatives May Not Participate In Matters Relating To The Conduct Of Examinations, Evaluation Of Pupil Performance, Appointment Of Teachers And Other Secret Matters, Their Participation Should Be Ensured In All Other Academic And Administrative Decisions Taken By These Bodies. Though This View Appears To Support Pupil Participation In Decision Making, It However Confines Pupil Involvement In Decision Making To Specific Areas Of School Life. Defining The Limits Of Pupil Participation In This Way Is However Not Only Likely To Give Pupils The Impression That The School's Commitment Is Tokenistic And Therefore Not To Be Taken Seriously, But It Also Severely Limits The Possibilities For Experiential Learning (About The Nature Of Schooling And The Education System As Well As In Different Forms Of Public Decision-Making) (Huddleston, 2007).

IV. Research Methodology

Orodho (2003) Defines Research Design As The Scheme, Outline Or Plan That Is Used To Generate Answers To Research Problems. In This Study The Researcher Adopted Descriptive Survey Design. The Research Design To Be Used In This Study Is Descriptive Survey, Which Is A Method Of Collecting Data By Interviewing Or Administering A Questionnaire To Sampled Individuals. The Study Targeted 52 Head Teachers 290 Teachers And 1 AEO. Sampling Means Selecting A Given Number Of Subjects From A Defined Population As Representative Of That Population. Any Statements Made About The Sample Should Also Be True Of The Population (Orodho 2005).To Sample The Teachers The Researcher Used Sampled Using Table For Determining The Size Of A Randomly Chosen Sample (Appendix V) To Get A Sample Of 165 Teachers. To Select The Individual Teachers, The Researcher Used Simple Random Sampling Method Using Lottery Method Where From 290 Teachers 165 Were Selected. This Was Done By Writing All The Names Of The 290 Teachers Obtained From The Records Of The Selected Schools Folding Them Into Same Shape And Picking 165 Names While Blind Folded.The Study Utilized Questionnaires And Unstructured Interview Schedule For Data Collection.Descriptive Statistics Provide Simple Summaries About The Sample And The Measures. Together With Simple Analysis, They Form The Basis Of Quantitative Analysis Of Data.

V. Results and Discussion

5.1 Influence Of Participatory Decision Making On Pupil's Management

The Study Sought To Find Out The Views Of Teachers On Participatory Decision Making And Management Of Pupils. The Findings Are Indicated In Table 1

Table 1 Influence Of Participatory Decision Making On Pupil's Management

Participatory Decision Making	SA	A	NS	D	SD
According To Me Participatory Decision Making Has Enhance Regular Check On Pupils Presence And Attendance By Effective Roll - Calling	40(24.2%)	72(43.6%)	53(32.1%)	0(0%)	40(24.2%)
Participatory Decision Has Ensured That Teachers Have Well Organized Records To Use For Monitoring Pupils.	69(41.8%)	47(28.5%)	49(29.7%)	0(0%)	69(41.8%)
According To Me Participatory Decision Making Has Made Pupils Take Keen Interest To Participate In School Activities	61(37.0%)	72(43.6%)	32(19.4)	0(0%)	61(37.0%)
Participatory Decision Making Has Made Pupils Take Part In Fostering Time Management In School	4(2.4%)	99(60.0%)	62(37.6%)	0(0%)	4(2.4%)
Participatory Decision Making Has Ensured Pupils Have Copies Of School Rules And Regulation.	27(16.4%)	105(63.6%)	33(20.0%)	0(0%)	27(16.4%)
Participatory Decision Has Prompt The Pupils Have Respect For People In Authority.	32(19.4%)	110(66.7%)	23(13.9%)	0(0%)	32(19.4%)
It Has Ensured That Pupils Promptly Do The Assignments	59(35.8%)	66(40.0%)	40(24.2%)	0(0%)	59(35.8%)
Believe Pupils Participate In School Activities Due To The Influence Of Participatory Decision	20(12.1%)	80(48.5%)	65(39.4%)	0(0%)	20(12.1%)
I Am Sure Pupils Promptly Do The Assignments Because Of The Influence Of Participatory Decision	15(9.1%)	108(65.5%)	42(25.5%)	0(0%)	15(9.1%)

As Revealed In Table 4.9, 40(24.2%) Strongly Agreed The Teachers Participatory Decision Making Has Enhance Regular Check On Pupils Presence And Attendance By Effective Roll - Calling, 0(30.3%) Agreed Whereas 53(32.1%) Are Not Sure 22(13.3%) Disagreed While 40(24.2%) Strongly Disagreed. Table 4.9 Also Showed That 69(41.8%) Of The Teachers Strongly Agreed That Participatory Decision Has Ensured That Teachers Have Well Organized Records To Use For Monitoring Pupils 30(18.2%) Agreed, Agreed 49(29.7%) Not Sure 17(10.3) Disagreed As Compared To 69(41.8%) Who Strongly Disagreed. Moreover 61(37.0%) Of Teachers Who Strongly Agreed That Participatory Decision Making Has Made Pupils Take Keen Interest To Participate In School Activities, 45(27.3%) Agreed While The Rest 32(19.4) Disagreed. Furthermore 4(2.4%) Strongly Agreed Participatory Decision Making Has Made Pupils Take Part In Fostering Time Management In School 99(60.0%) Agreed, While 62(37.6%) Disagreed. It Was Also Noted That 27(16.4%) Teachers Strongly Agreed That Participatory Decision Making Has Ensured Pupils Have Copies Of School Rules And Regulation., 105(63.6%), Agreed Whereas 33(20.0%) Disagreed

On The Hand 32(19.4%) Strongly Agreed Participatory Decision Has Prompt The Pupils Have Respect For People In Authority, 110(66.7%), Agreed While 23(13.9%) Disagreed. Moreover 59(35.8%) Strongly Agreed That It Has Ensured That Pupils Promptly Do The Assignments, 66(40.0%) Agreed While The Rest 40(24.2%) Disagreed. Table 4.12 Shows That 20(12.1%) Strongly Agreed That Pupils Participate In School Activities Due To The Influence Of Participatory Decision, 80(48.5%) Agreed While The Rest 65(39.4%). Of The 165 Teachers 15(9.1%) Strongly Agree That Pupils Promptly Do The Assignments Because Of The Influence Of Participatory Decision, 108(65.5%) Agreed Whereas 42(25.5%) Disagreed.

The Study Went Further And Interviewed The Headteachers And AEO On The Role Of Participatory Decision Making On Pupils Management, 10 Of 15 Them Including The AEO Said That Participative Decision Making Have Reduced The Number Of Pupils Suspended Or Expelled From School. These Findings Can Be Explained By Participative Decision Making Were The Pupils Are Allowed To Make Some Of The Decisions Concerning Their Management Under The Guidance Of Their Class Teachers. They Further Indicated That Pupils Can Be Given The Freedom On The Form Of Punishment They Would Want In Case Of Any Indiscipline Case.

At The Same Time, Being Spelled Causes Them To Fall Behind On Classroom Assignments And Instruction Lower Educational Attainment.

The Findings Above Shows That Most Of The Teachers Agreed That According To Them Participatory Decision Has Enhance Regular Check On Pupils Presence And Attendance By Effective Roll-Calling, It Has

Made Pupils Take Keen Interest To Participate In School Activities As Well As Taking Part In Fostering Time Management In School. A Majority Of Them Agreed That Participatory Decision Making Has Ensured Pupils Have Copies Of School Rules And Regulation And Has Prompt The Pupils To Have Respect For People In Authority And Do Their Assignments. This Borrows The Words Of Malen, Ogawa, And Kranz (2000), About School Based Management .In Their Own Words

School-Based Management Can Be Viewed Conceptually As A Formal Alteration Of Governance Structures, As A Form Of Decentralization That Identifies The Individual School As The Primary Unit Of Improvement And Relies On The Redistribution Of Decision-Making Authority As The Primary Means Through Which Improvement Might Be Stimulated And Sustained

VI. Conclusions

Based On The Findings Of The Study It Was Concluded That The Role Of Participatory Decision Making In Primary Schools In Kapseret Division Wareng Sub-County Is The Fact That It Enhanced Regular Check On Pupil's Presence And Attendance By Effective Roll-Calling. It Has Also Made Pupils Take Keen Interest To Participate In School Activities Which Has Made Pupils Take Pupils Take Part In Fostering Time Management In School And Has Ensured Pupils Have Copies Of School Rules And Regulation

Recommendations

The School Management Should Shift From The Centralized, Technocrat And Bureaucratic Managed System To A More Collaborative Decentralized And Inclusive Governance Ensured. They Should Do This By Embracing The School-Based Management (S.B.M) Phenomenon. The S.B.M Involved The Formal Change In The Structure Of The School Governance That Led To A More Democratic Administrative Approach In Which Planning And Decision Making Are Devolved To Individual Schools.

Suggestion For Further Research

Based On The Findings There Is Need To Investigate The Influence Of Participatory Decision Making On Primary Schools Management In Both Rural And Urban Schools. There Is Also The Need To Investigate The Influence Of Participatory Decision Making On Primary Schools Management In Schools In Uasingishu County.

References

- [1]. Aggrawal, G. (2004). *Student Voice: A Historical Perspective And New Directions*. Paper No 10. Department Of Education. Melbourne.
- [2]. Anderson, G. L. (2008). *Toward Authentic Participation: Deconstructing The Discourses Of Participatory Reforms In Education*. American Educational Researchjournal,35(4),571-603.
- [3]. Annual Meeting Of The American Education Research Association,Atlanta, GA: 12-16 April.
- [4]. Armstrong, M. (2009).*Term Reward*.London Chartered Institute Of Personnel And Development.
- [5]. Bacharach SB, Bamberger P, Conley SC, Bauer S 2000.The Dimensionality Of Decision Participation In Educational Organization: The Value Of A Multi-Domain Evaluative Approach. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26: 126-167.
- [6]. Bell, L. And Rhodes, C. (2006), *The Skills Of Primary School Management*, London: Routledge
- [7]. Brown DJ 2000. *Decentralization And School-Based Management*. London: Flamer
- [8]. Caldwell, B. J., &Spinks, J. M. (2002).*Leading The Self-Managing School*.London: The Falmer Press
- [9]. Chandan, J. S. (2007). *Management Theory And Practice*.New York; Vikas Publishing House.
- [10]. Cheng, Y. C., &Cheung, W. M. (2003).Profiles Of Multi-Level Self- Management In Schools. *The International Journal Of Educational Management*, 17(3), 100-115.
- [11]. Cheng, Y. C., &Cheung, W. M. (2003).*Profiles Of Multi-Level Self-Management In Schools*.The International Journal Of Educational Management, 17(3), 100-115.
- [12]. Christie, P. And Potterson, M. (2008). *Final Report: Schools Development In South Africa: A Research Project To Investigate Strategic Intervention For Quality Improvement In South African Schools*, Johannesburg: University Of Witwatersrand. *School Governance In European Schools*: London. Citizenship Foundation.
- [13]. Cloete, J.J.N. 2008.*South African Public Administration And Management*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- [14]. Conway J 2004.The Myth, Mystery, And Mastery Of Participative Decision Making In Education.*Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 20: 11-40.
- [15]. Cuttance, P. 2005. A Question Of Quality. Paper Presented At The ACEA International Conference, Sydney, 2-5 July
- [16]. Deos Report; Education Day 2013
- [17]. Duke KE 2005. *Principals' Practices Regarding Teacher Participation In School Decision-Making*.Deddisertation . Twin Cities: University Of Minnesota.
- [18]. Fox And Meyer Gilles Grapinet (2009) A Case Study Of Performance Contracting And The Management Of Local Services Of The Directorate General For Taxes France.
- [19]. Gashaija, J. (2007). *Effective Leadership Styles As Perceive By Academic Staff In Tertiary Institutions In Kampala District*.Unpublished Masters (Educ. Mgt) Dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda
- [20]. Ghobadian, A., Spellar, S. &Jones, M. 2003.Service Quality Concepts And Models.*International Journal Of Quality And Reliability Management*, 11(9): 43-66.
- [21]. Griffin GA 2005. Influences Of Shared Decision Making On School And Classroom Activity.*The Elementary School Journal*, 96: 29-45.
- [22]. Hallam, S. (2006), *Improving School Attendance*, Oxford Heinemann

- [23]. Hargreaves, A. (2007). Restructuring: Postmodernity And The Prospects For Educational Change. *Journal Of Education Policy* 9:47-65.
- [24]. Hargreaves, A. (2007). *Restructuring: Postmodernity And The Prospects For Educational Change*. *Journal Of Education Policy* 9:47-65.
- [25]. Hart AW (2005). Re-Conceiving School Leadership. *Elementary School Journal*, 96(1): 9-28
- [26]. House, R. J. & Terrence, R. M. (2004). *Path-Goal Theory Of Leadership*, *Journal Of Contemporary Business* Vol. 5, 2004, Pg. 81-97.
- [27]. Huddleston, T. (2007) *From Student Voice To Shared Responsibility: Effective Practice In Democratic Principals, Educators, Parents And Learners*. Unpublished Med Thesis: University Of Kwazulu- Natal
- [28]. Imber M, Neidt, WA, Reyes P 2000. Factors That Contributing To Teacher Satisfaction With Participative Decisionmaking. *Journal Of Research And Development In Education*, 23(4): 216-225.
- [29]. Johnson & Ledbetter, L. (2003). *The Role Of The Principal In A Shared Decision Making School: A Critical Perspective*. Paper Presented At The
- [30]. Jonston C 2007. *Leadership And The Learning Organisation In Self-Managing Schools*. Doctoral Thesis, Unpublished. Melbourne: University Of Melbourne
- [31]. Lahler, D. (2008). *Principles And Practices In Management*. London: Fountain Publishers.
- [32]. Leithwood K, Mascall B 2008. Linking Leadership To Student Learning: The Contributions Of Leader Efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44: 496-528.
- [33]. Lewis, S.G., Naidoo, J. And Weber, E. (2007). *The Problematic Notion Of Participation In Educational Decentralization: The Case Of South Africa: A Report On The Implementation Of The South African Schools Act*, University Of Witswatersrand, Johannesburg
- [34]. Love, J. (2003). *A Systematic Approach To Getting Results*. London Gower Publishers.
- [35]. Marzano, R.J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2003). *School Leadership That Works: From Research To Results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- [36]. Mclagan, P. And Nel, C. (2005). *The Age Of Participation*. Randburg, Knowledge Resources (Pty) Ltd.
- [37]. Moorhead, G. & Griffin, R. (2007). *Organisational Behaviour*, (2nded) Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company.
- [38]. Mosoge MJ, Van Der Westhuizen PC 2008. School-Based Management: Implications For The New Roles Of Principals And Teachers. *Koers*, 63(1): 73-87.
- [39]. Nalemo, S. P. (2002). *Factors Influencing The Choice Of Leadership Styles In Baringo Secondary Schools*.
- [40]. Okumbe, J.A. (2008). *Educational Management Theory, A Comparative Evolution To General Theory*. Nairobi: Nairobi University Printery.
- [41]. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, Valerie A., And Berry, Leonard L. (2008), "SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale For Measuring Consumer Perceptions Of Service Quality," *Journal Of Retailing*, Vol. 64, No. 1, Pp. 12-40.
- [42]. Pounder DG 2007. Teacher Teams: Promoting Teacher Involvement And Leadership In Secondary Schools. *High School Journal*, 80: 117-124.
- [43]. Riesgraf K.M (2002). *Effects Of School-Based Management Practices On Decision-Making For Special Education Doctoral Dissertation*, Unpublished. University Of Minnesota, Minneapolis
- [44]. Sallis, E. 2003. *Total Quality Management In Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- [45]. San Antonio DM, Gamage DT 2007. Building Trust Among Educational Stakeholders Through Participatory School Administration, Leadership And Management. *British Educational Leadership, Management And Administration Society*, 21: 15-22.
- [46]. Sithole, S. (2008) *The Participation Of Students In Democratic School Governance* In Magadla, M. (2007) *The Role Of The Learner In The School Governing Body: Perceptions And Experiences Of Student*
- [47]. Smylie MA 2002. Teacher Participation In School Decision Making: Assessing Willingness To Participate. *Educational Evaluation And Policy Analysis*, 14: 53-67.
- [48]. Somech A 2002. Explicating The Complexity Of Participative Management: An Investigation Of Multiple Dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 11(1): 341-371.
- [49]. Somech A, Drach-Zahavy A (2002). Influence Strategies Of Headteachers: Ordinary Times Compared With Times Of Change. *Journal Of School Leadership*, 11(1): 25-47
- [50]. Starstandardnews Paper 15th Jan 2012
- [51]. Stewart, A. (2000). *Social Stratification And Occupation*, London, Macmillan
- [52]. The World Book Encyclopedia (2004). T. Volume 19, London Scott Fetzer Company.
- [53]. Thornhill, C. 2008b. The Executive Mayor/Municipal Manager Interface. *Journal Of Public Administration*, 43(4.1):725-735.
- [54]. Walker EM 2000. Decentralization And Participatory Decision Making: Implementing School-Based Management In The Abbott Districts. *Research Brief*, 1: 3-23
- [55]. Webster (2002). *International Dictionary*. Massachusetts, Merriam Webster Inc.

IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) is UGC approved Journal with SI. No. 4481, Journal no. 46879.

Tanui Julius Kimeli "Influence Of Participatory Decision Making On Pupils Management In Primary Schools Of Kapseret Division." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)* 20.3 (2018): 32-37