

## **Students' Involvement in Decision Making and Discipline Management in Public Secondary Schools**

<sup>1</sup> Emmily A. Owuor\*,  
<sup>2</sup> Prof. Jeremiah M. Kalai  
<sup>3</sup> Prof. Ursula Okoth

<sup>1</sup> PhD Candidate, Department of Educational Management Policy and Curriculum Studies (Previously Educational Administration and Planning), University of Nairobi, Kenya

<sup>2</sup> Chairman: Department of Educational Management Policy and Curriculum Studies (Previously Educational Administration and Planning), University of Nairobi, Kenya

<sup>3</sup> Senior Lecturer, Department of Educational Management Policy and Curriculum Studies (Previously Educational Administration and Planning), University of Nairobi, Kenya

\*Corresponding Author: Emmily Achieng Owuor: +254-728336250; Email: emijones20@gmail.com

---

### **Abstract**

Involvement of stakeholders in decision-making process ensures acceptability of all proposed objectives in an organization. In the school organization, a realization emerged in the 20<sup>th</sup> century that involving students in decision-making provides a solution to many of the institution's objectives including realization of good behaviour and discipline. However, despite the participation of students in decision-making in a range of issues, public secondary schools in some parts of Kenya such Kisumu still experience student unrests and disruptive behaviour. The purpose of this paper was to investigate the influence of student involvement in decision making on discipline management in public secondary schools in Kisumu County, Kenya. Specific objectives were to analyse how involving students in decision making through their elected leaders influence discipline management, and to explore how involving students directly influence discipline management. The General Systems Theory by Ludwig von Bertalanffy, which argues that organizations including schools are systems which are positively or negatively influenced by their environment, was used to guide the study. This study used cross - sectional survey design on a target population of 225 public secondary schools comprising 225 principals, 225 discipline masters and 225 student council leaders. Yamane's formula was used to obtain of 144 schools: 144 school principals, 144 discipline masters, and 144 student council leaders, alongside 7 sub county education officers, thus forming 439 as the study sample. Questionnaire was used to collect data from discipline masters and student council leaders while interviews were done with school principals and sub county education officers. Findings showed that students' discipline incidents were moderate ( $M=4.14$ ;  $SD=0.95$ ), while involvement of students in decision-making ( $B=.236$ ;  $p=.000$ ) had a significant influence on students' discipline. It is concluded that well-implemented involvement of students in decision-making can lead to a significant improvement in students' discipline among public secondary schools.

**Key Words:** *Student Involvement; Decision-making; Students' discipline; Public Secondary Schools; Participation in decision-making*

---

Date of Submission: 10-07-2022

Date of Acceptance: 26-07-2022

---

### **I. Introduction**

It has been a genuine realization in the last two decades that students' involvement in key decisions of their educational systems produces motivation, and a sense of ownership to set objectives of the school (UNICEF, 2020). Student involvement in decision making has been argued as a gateway to shared governance including a higher inclination to abide by the set rules, personal drive to meet the individual and collective goals, and an overall higher academic performance (Asesa-Aluoch, Wanzare & Sika, 2016). Alternatively described as student participation, involvement in decision making basically refers to share in, take part, be or become actively involved (Kagendo, Onyango and Kyalo, 2019). The authors assert that the right to education ought to be understood in terms of universality, participation, respect and inclusion. Mithans, Grmek and Čagran (2017) report that the right to participation is among the four main principles set out in the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989. The aspect of participation involves children having greater influence on what happens to their lives (Pereira, Mouraz & Figueiredo, 2014). There is therefore need to gain deeper

understanding on how involvement of students in decision making influence their learning outcomes including discipline management.

According to Ilyasin (2019), students' discipline management is a process which is done in purpose and well-planned to create a conducive learning process in order to achieve learning objective. This kind of management should be arranged in terms of planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling by using human resources to gain organization goals (Daroni, Solihat, & Salim, 2018). The goal of students' discipline management is to build noble and positive characters for students through the application of students' discipline program and strengthening modern human resources (Daroni et al., 2018). One of the strategies for managing student discipline is a proactive move to involve them in decision making (Dundar, 2013; Kagendo et al, 2019). However, researchers of student involvement in decision making have tended to focus their attention in universities and colleges, overlooking secondary schools. For instance, Mithans, Grmek and Čagran (2017) analysed the opportunities and attitude of students with regards to participation in decision making in Austria and Slovenia and showed that students from Austrian schools had more decision-making opportunities than their peers in Slovenia, although participation was yet to become common practice. In Turkey, Erdol (2018) analyze the distribution of male and female students' participation in decision-making mechanisms in high schools and found that male students tended to prefer male candidates. In Israel, Perry-Hazan and Somech (2021) presented an integrative theoretical model on teacher and children's participative decision making and showed that student participative decision making is a complex and multidimensional concept whose manifestations are intertwined with its cultural context.

Regionally, Mbonyonga (2018) examined the role of student representative councils in curbing students' riots in secondary schools in Zambia and found that students' councils were forums through which students through representatives were involved in decision making about school route and activities. This helped to create a sense of ownership towards school routines and therefore had a positive effect on management of students' discipline. On their par, Lumanija and Mkulu (2020) investigated the contribution of students' council in management of students discipline in public secondary schools in Tanzania and showed the council was highly involved in enforcing school rules but less involved in decision making on disciplinary matters and punishing misbehaving students. Locally, Kyalo (2017) examined the influence of student councils' involvement in school governance on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Kathonzi Sub County and revealed that the councils played a significant role in enforcing the implementation of school rules and regulations. It is therefore emerging that student involvement in decision making in public secondary schools is debatable, with much attention by researchers being directed at student participation in Universities. This is irrespective of the fact that their involvement is critical in managing misbehavior among the adolescents in secondary schools

The importance of understanding student involvement in decision making at secondary level of education cannot be gainsaid. This is because most learners in secondary schools are undergoing adolescence, the period in which individuals' world views, values and political orientations are shaped (Amna, Ekström, Kerr, & Stattin, 2009). Adolescents are signs of change in future democracy that, if not nurtured well, may result into irresponsible citizenry (Syvertsen, Wray-Lake, Flanagan, Osgood & Briddell, 2011). According to Erdol (2018), the period under which a learner transit to adulthood is coupled with behavioural changes shaped more by the environment. Involving this category of the population in decision making over matters concerning their day to day expectations is therefore critical. This is important especially among secondary school among some counties in Kenya which have been witnessing rampant student indiscipline incidents in the recent past such as Kisumu County.

In Kenya, Kisumu County is one of the areas where rampant incidents of student misbehavior have been reported over the last decade. For instance, Luvega (2016) reports that act of sodomy against Form one students have been a tradition since the 90s in Maseno School, one of the oldest National schools in Kenya. The author also reports that examination dishonesty has been frequent, leading to cancellation of 2015 Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) examination results in several schools in the county. In addition, Kisumu County contributed an average of 32.9% of the reported cases of disobedience from all public secondary schools in the 47 counties in Kenya. This is an illustration of disobeying set rules and regulation, a process in which the very students were expected to have participated in decision making. Many researchers (see for example Kyalo, 2017; Lumanija & Mkulu, 2020; Mbonyonga, 2018) have illustrated diverse positive outcomes of student participation in decision making. There was therefore critical need to investigate how involving students in decision making influence management of student discipline among public secondary schools in Kisumu County, Kenya.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

Involving students in decision making processes has been documented by researchers as some of the practices with significant influence on student discipline. However, effectiveness of these student involvement practices has raised concern in some of the secondary schools among the 47 counties in Kenya. Reports indicate

that an average of 28.4% of sneaking; 27.6% of arson; 24.5% of use of mobile phones; 23.6% of exam cheating, and 19% of drug abuse in all public secondary schools in the 47 counties were from Kisumu during 2016 – 2019. These reports raise queries on the effectiveness of student involvement in decision making on student outcomes such as discipline. This study therefore investigated the influence of students' involvement in decision making on management of student discipline among public secondary schools in Kisumu County, Kenya.

### **1.3 Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of students' involvement in decision making on management of student discipline among public secondary schools in Kisumu County, Kenya.

### **1.4 Specific Objectives**

The specific objectives of the study were to:

- i. Analyse how involving students in decision making through their elected leaders influence discipline management in public secondary schools in Kisumu County, Kenya
- ii. Explore how involving students directly influence discipline management in public secondary schools in Kisumu County, Kenya

## **II. Literature and Theoretical Orientation**

### **2.1 Literature Review**

#### **2.1.1 Student Discipline Management**

Schools worldwide are faced with overwhelming incidences of student indiscipline which has posed tremendous challenges to educators, causing formidable concerns to school, parents and the society (Phuntsho, 2021). According to Amaewhule and Nukan-Adebayo (2019), discipline involves self-respect, control as well as self-restraint against immoral behavior guided by moral and social norms which force individuals to do what is good at all times. Similarly, Smith (2016) argues that discipline is the obedience to orders, respect for authority, self-reliance and teamwork within school organization. Many researchers (Amaewhule & Nukan-Adebayo, 2019; Ergün, 2014; Ilyasin, 2019; Zubaidia, 2009) have pointed out that indiscipline manifests in various ways such as disorderliness, examination malpractice, bullying, truancy, noise making, assault, loitering, wrong dressing, lateness to school, sexual immorality, forgery, fighting, riot, absenteeism, disobedience, dishonesty & many more anti-social behaviors. On the other hand, discipline management has been described as designed efforts for maintaining good behaviour and orderliness within a school compound (Phuntsho, 2021). Punishment (Nandeke, Chumba & Kiprop, 2017; Simatwa, 2012) as well as counseling and guidance (Etyang & Okoth, 2018) are some of the discipline management approaches widely documented by researchers. Whereas involvement of students in decision making has been adopted during the past decade as one of the approaches of participatory management practice, its effectiveness in managing student discipline remains debatable especially in secondary schools.

#### **2.1.2 Involvement of Students in Decision Making**

Participation of students in decision making processes is one of the components comprising the right to education of a child as set out in the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989 (Mithans et al, 2017). Involvement of students in decision making ensures that they have significant influence on what happens to their lives while on the school compound (Pereira et al, 2014). Involvement of students has been in the form of engaging learners through their elected leaders as well direct negotiation with the students (Moepya, 2020). However, existing studies on student involvement in decision making have tended to focus much on university institutions and have come up with contrasting results regarding its effectiveness in aiding discipline management. For instance, Erdol (2018) analyzed the distribution of male and female students' participation in decision-making mechanisms in high schools using a sequential explanatory design in Turkey. The participants were students in a high school offering mixed-gender education during 2016-2017. The results showed that students did not have enough motivation to participate in decision-making mechanisms, there were fewer female students in both being the candidate and being the president/assistant/representative, the proportion of female students decreased as the level of representation in decision-making mechanisms increased, and there were problems in adhering to democratic election principles when selecting representatives at schools. Perry-Hazan and Somech (2021), on their part, used an integrative theoretical model grounded in the organisational literature on participative decision making to explore views of students concerning participative decision making. Results suggested that promoting student participative decision making enhances pragmatic, moral, and developmental as well as pedagogical outcomes, which, in turn, affect student, teacher, and school outcomes.

Moepya (2020) investigated the extent to which student leaders participate in the governance of a transforming university in South Africa. The study adopted a qualitative approach which was modelled on a case study involving ten university student leaders from two different student structures in the Faculty of

Education were interviewed. The findings revealed that the student leaders at the ground level participated to some extent with the process allowing them to “hear and be heard” although they lacked power to influence final decision-making. The study further found that student leaders at the faculty/departmental level have access to experiences and information that may improve the quality and accountability of decision-making. Oni and Adetoro (2015) examined student involvement in university leadership and decision-making and its impacts on leadership effectiveness in universities in Nigeria. The study uses a descriptive survey conducted among students and staff in all 12 of the public and private universities in South-West Nigeria. The findings indicated that there is a significant relationship between student involvement in decision-making and leadership effectiveness. It also reveals that there are significant differences between decision-making with student involvement and decision-making without student involvement. Conversely, no significant difference was found in leadership effectiveness between decision-making in public and private universities.

Locally, Asesa-Aluoch et al (2016) investigated the extent of student participation management on institutional governance in public universities Kenya. Data was collected by means of a questionnaire distributed among 194 student leaders' public universities. The findings revealed that universities involved students in governance suggesting that there was shared governance in public Universities. However students' occasionally participated in decision making, thus, the study established a fairly low, significant positive correlations between the extent of student participation and institutional governance It was thus concluded that the frequently the students are involved in management, the higher the shared governance in public universities. Muthui, Muthaa, Barchok and Wamukuru (2018) sought to determine the influence of participation of students' councils in enhancing the management in boys' and girls' public boarding secondary schools in Nyeri County. The study adopted descriptive survey and correlation research designs. A sample of 384 respondents was used. Data was collected using questionnaires and interview schedules. The study established that participation of student councils influenced the management of public boarding secondary schools by 49 % in decision making. It is significant to note that, based on the aforementioned studies, research on student involvement in decision making have concentrated on university institutions and have not discussed how the same has aided discipline management discipline management in secondary schools.

## **2.2 Theoretical Framework**

This study was guided by the General System Theory (herein after referred to as GST) developed by a biologist, Karl Ludwig von Bertalanffy (Bertalanffy, 1972). Johnson (2019) observes that GST was an attempt by Bertalanffy to define a system as a complex of interacting components that together have the characteristics of an organized whole. The emphasis of a system as an “organized whole” incorporates the concept of holism which depicts an emergent characteristic of systems as a product of relationships between its components as they work together to collectively interact with their environment. According to Adams, Hester and Bradley (2013), a system is characterized by a group of parts that interact to form a coherent whole, with distinct boundary separating them from external elements and distinguishing between inputs, or factors that impact the system, and outputs, or effects and products of the system.

Social systems have three basic characteristics called the interdependence of the parts, their organization into some sort of whole, and the intrinsic presence of both individuals and institutions (Getzels, Lipham & Campbell, 1968, cited in Bozkus, 2014). As social systems, schools have three qualities: arbitrary and consequential boundaries, interrelated subsystems, and multiple causation- events happening as a consequence of more than one cause (Kowalski, 2010). Contextually, schools have different players with distinct boundaries: teachers, students, and the administration. As explained by Adams et al (2013), changes in one component of a system will affect other components as well as the overall entity: a dynamic which makes it possible to predict what might happen when a system experiences a known change. Therefore involving students in decision making in key programs in the school can affect the overall performance including good discipline and academic performance. The theory therefore offered a succinct explanation on how involvement of student in decision making might influence discipline management in secondary schools

## **III. Methodology**

### **3.1 Research Design**

#### **3.1 Research Design**

This study adopted a cross sectional survey design with mixed methods, whereby primary data were collected using both quantitative and qualitative approaches (Zegwaard and Hoskyn, 2015). This design allowed triangulation of qualitative and quantitative results gained respectively from interviews with the Principals and education officers on one hand, and discipline masters and student council leaders on the other hand (Creswell & Clark, 2018).

### 3.2 Study population and Sample

The study targeted 225 public secondary schools in Kisumu County which comprised of 225 principals, 225 discipline masters and 225 student council leaders. Seven Sub County education officers from the seven Sub Counties were also targeted. This made it 682 as the study population from which a sample size of 144 schools were obtained using Yamane (1967; cited in Israel, 2013). The sample size therefore comprised of 144 principals, 144 Discipline Masters (DMs), and 144 student council leaders (SLs). Stratified technique recommended by Nanjundeswaraswamy and Divakar (2021) was used to select the teachers based on school categorization or stratum, with six respondents being obtained from each school as shown in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1: Sampling frame for schools and Teachers**

School category (Stratum)	Sub-stratum	Calculation (w*n)	Sampled schools (n)	Sampled Respondents*
<b>National Schools</b>	Girls school	1	1	3
	Boys schools	1	1	3
<b>Extra County Schools</b>	Girls school	3	2	6
	Boys schools	5	3	9
<b>County Schools</b>	Girls school	7	4	12
	Boys schools	10	6	18
	Mixed schools	12	8	24
<b>Sub-County Schools</b>	Girls school	23	15	45
	Boys schools	51	33	99
	Mixed schools	112	72	216
<b>Sub Total for Schools</b>		225	144	432
Sub County Director of Education(SCDE)				7
<b>Grand Total</b>				439

Simple random sampling was used to select teachers while purposive sampling was used for the selection of sub county education officers.

### 3.4 Instrumentation

Questionnaire and interview schedule were used for data collection in this study. Questionnaire was administered on teachers while interview schedule was used gather information from the principals. Questionnaires were deemed fit to collect information from DMs and SLs owing to their large number (Creswell, 2015). On the other hand, interview process collection of information deeply held from lived experiences possessed by the principals and education officers. During the interviews, the authors observed saturation principles.

### 3.5 Instrument Validity and Reliability

The researchers used content validity index (CVI) to enhance validity of the study instruments. This involved ratings of four experts based on relevance of question items to constructs of study variables (Dawadi, Shrestha & Giri, 2021). The ratings adopted a 4-point ordinal scale of 1 – 4 for not relevant to highly relevant. The calculated rating of the four experts generated a CVI of 0.88. This was considered to be highly relevant by the researchers.

Reliability of the study instruments was calculated via split-half method from data collected during a pilot study involving randomly selected 22 schools (66 respondents) who were excluded from the final data collection exercise. Using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 tool, the reliability was calculated at 0.893 coefficients which surpassed the threshold of 0.70 espoused scholars (Akhtar, 2016; Creswell & Clark, 2018; Taherdoost, 2016) to be reliable.

### Data Analysis and Presentation

Quantitative data collected via questionnaire from DMs and SLs were analysed through descriptive and inferential statistics with the aid of SPSS version 21. This generated mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) as well as R<sup>2</sup> respectively for descriptive and inferential statistics. The researchers also used Thematic Analysis to

analyse qualitative data obtained through interview with school principals and education officers. This involved coding narrations or verbatim information from interviews and then grouping them to form themes relevant to study variables as articulated in Braun & Clarke (2019).

#### IV. RESULTS

##### 4.0 Results and Discussions

##### 4.1 Results

The objective of the study was to investigate how involvement of students in decision-making influence management of discipline. The objective was addressed by, first, using descriptive statistics to explore the views of student leaders and discipline masters on the extent of student involvement in decision-making and the level of students' discipline in public secondary schools in Kisumu County. Secondly, inferential statistics was used to establish the influence of student involvement in decision-making on students' discipline.

##### 4.1.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.1 presents descriptive statistics of student involvement in decision-making among the sampled public secondary schools.

Table 4.1: Involvement in Decision Making and Student Discipline

Indicator	Res.	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mean	SD
Participation through elected student leaders	DM	0.8	7.6	6.1	19.1	36.6	29.8	4.73	1.22
	SL	10.9	2.2	16.1	21.2	26.3	23.4	4.19	1.58
Participation through class representatives	DM	3.8	3.8	4.6	22.9	41.2	23.7	4.65	1.22
	SL	23.4	8.0	4.4	14.6	24.8	24.8	3.93	1.88
Participation through teams selected by student council leaders	DM	6.1	15.3	26.0	24.4	19.1	9.2	3.63	1.36
	SL	19.0	2.2	30.7	15.3	21.2	11.7	3.63	1.56
Participation by special teams picked directly by student population	DM	13.0	33.6	18.3	17.6	11.5	6.1	2.99	1.43
	SL	16.8	20.4	10.2	13.9	20.4	18.2	3.57	1.78
Participation through open suffrage, e.g referendum	DM	22.9	32.1	22.9	11.5	6.9	3.8	2.59	1.35
	SL	39.4	13.1	13.9	7.3	12.4	13.9	2.89	1.88
Participation through departments	DM	5.3	16.0	34.4	26.7	11.5	6.1	3.41	1.22
	SL	12.4	16.1	7.3	24.1	23.4	16.8	3.79	1.67
Participation in terms of class	DM	0.0	5.3	16.8	29.0	29.8	19.1	4.40	1.14
	SL	4.4	7.3	19.7	10.9	24.1	33.6	4.40	1.50
Participation through written expression of opinion	DM	3.8	11.5	21.4	29.8	25.2	8.4	3.86	1.26
	SL	22.6	13.9	12.4	24.1	12.4	14.6	3.30	1.76
Students participate in classroom management and resource allocation	DM	3.8	15.3	27.5	21.4	19.8	12.2	3.75	1.37
	SL	11.7	8.0	29.2	6.6	27.0	17.5	3.88	1.62
Positions are created for students to participate as full members of some school committees	DM	23.7	10.7	19.1	16.0	21.4	9.2	3.28	1.68
	SL	25.5	10.2	10.2	8.8	23.4	21.9	3.53	1.92
<b>Mean Rating on Student Involvement</b>								<b>3.72</b>	<b>0.88</b>

**Key:** 1.00-1.82 (Never); 1.83-2.65 (Very Rarely); 2.66-3.48 (Rarely); 3.49-4.31 (Occasionally); 4.32-5.16 (Frequently); 5.17-6.00 (Very Frequently).

**Source:** Survey data (2020)

Table 4.1 illustrates that there was generally moderate involvement of students in decision making in secondary schools in Kisumu County. This was revealed by an overall mean rating ( $M= 3.72$ ;  $SD=0.88$ ) by the respondents. Table 4.1 also illustrates that there was a marked difference in opinion between the discipline masters and student leaders who took part in the study on students participation through elected student leaders, with 66.4% of the discipline masters indicating that the students were frequently ( $mean=4.73$ ;  $SD=1.22$ ) given opportunity to participate in decision making through elected student leaders, while 21.2% of students leaders believed that they were only occasionally ( $mean=4.19$ ;  $SD=1.58$ ) given opportunity to participate in decision making through elected student leaders. Equally, whereas 64.9% the discipline masters believed that students at least frequently ( $M=4.65$ ;  $SD=1.22$ ) participate in decision making through class representatives, 38.0% of the students leaders said they were never or only occasionally ( $M=3.93$ ;  $SD=1.88$ ) given chance in decision making through class representatives.

Similarly, there was concurrence in opinion between discipline masters and student leaders that students participation through teams selected by student council leaders was generally low ( $M=3.63$ ). Likewise, the results of the survey show that a significant proportion ( $DM=21.4\%$ ;  $SL=21.2\%$ ) of the respondents were in agreement that participation by special teams picked directly by student population are not very common in their schools. This was reflected by a mean rating ( $M= 2.99$ ;  $SD=1.43$ ) and 3.57 ( $SD=1.78$ ) by the discipline masters and student leaders, respectively. Equally, the study established a low participation ( $mean_{DMs} =2.59$ ;  $mean_{SLs} =2.89$ ) in decision making through open suffrage, e.g referendum and participation through departments ( $mean_{DMs} =3.41$ ;  $mean_{SLs} =3.79$ ).

On the other hand, students' participation in decision making in terms of class was found to be fairly common, as was agreed by both the discipline masters and student leaders that participation in terms of class was either frequently or always used in their schools. For instance, both the discipline masters (48.9%) and student leaders (57.7%) who took part in the survey agreed that students participation in decision making through class was mostly ( $mean=4.40$ ) relied on by the school administration. However, participation through written expression of opinion was rated at 3.86 ( $SD=1.26$ ) and 3.30 ( $SD=1.76$ ) by the discipline masters and student leaders, respectively, with a respectable proportion ( $DM=15.3\%$ ;  $SL=36.5\%$ ) of the respondents agreeing that participation through written expression of opinion was either very rare or never used in their school. Likewise, the study show that involvement of students in decision making in classroom management and resource allocation was fairly low, as indicated by 19.1% of the discipline masters and 19.7% of the student leaders, reflecting composite mean rating of 3.82.

Findings also showed that 34.4% of the discipline masters and 35.7% of the student leaders accepted that positions are either rarely or never at all ( $M_{DMs} =3.28$ ;  $M_{SLs} =3.53$ ) created for students to participate as full members of some school committees which make decisions in school.

During interviews with the school principals (SPs), the researcher established that students were more often involved in making decisions regarding relationships with the community and social activities amongst them (students). An outstanding theme emerging from such interview sessions was captured in a statement:

*Decisions regarding social events like calendar of internal sports activities, selection of team captains, as well as making decisions with regards to school- community relations (SP 3).*

The statement attributed to SP 3 illustrates that students are largely involved in making decisions concerning matters affecting their relationships while in school. Similarly, the students are also involved in making decisions regarding their interactions with the external community. The Sub County Education Officers (SCEOs), on their part, suggested that student's council leaders are often involved during election of Board of Management albeit as ex-officio members. A statement reporting this was captured as:

*Elections of BoMs are often conducted under regulations from the Ministry of Education. One of the requirements articulated by such regulations include the requirement of participation of a democratically elected student council leader as an ex-officio member (SCEO 1)*

It is emerging from the statement from SCEO 1 that involvement of student in decision making is lukewarm: they are seldom involved in making key decisions such as amount of fee to be paid, type of meals, or curriculum implementation among others.

#### **4.1.2 Correlations for Students' Involvement in Decision-Making and discipline Management**

Pearson's correlation analysis was used to determine the degree of relationships between students' involvement in decision making and discipline management. The correlation analysis result is presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Correlation for Student Involvement in Decision-making and Discipline Management

		Involvement in Decision Making	Student Discipline
<b>Involvement in Decision Making</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>.454**</b>
	<b>Sig. (2-tailed)</b>		<b>.000</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>137</b>
<b>Student Discipline</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	<b>.454**</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>Sig. (2-tailed)</b>	<b>.000</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>137</b>

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlation analysis presented in Table 4.2 shows that there was a statistically significant positive correlation between students involvement in decision making and students' discipline ( $n=137, r=.454, p < .05$ ) among secondary school students.

#### 4.1.3 Regressions for Students' Involvement in Decision Making on Students' Discipline

Regression analysis was used to determine the degree of relationship and the level of significance between students' involvement in decision making and students' discipline. To estimate the level of influence of students' involvement in decision making on students' discipline, a coefficient of determination was computed. The results of model summary of regression are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Model Summary of Student Involvement in Decision-making on Discipline Management

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.454 <sup>a</sup>	.206	.200	.30797

a. Predictors: (Constant), Student Involvement in Decision Making

The model shows that Student Involvement in decision making accounted for 20% (Adjusted R Square = .200) of the variation in students' discipline among the secondary school students. This is a fairly high effect of a variable on the dependent variable. However, to determine whether Student Involvement in decision making was a significant predictor of students' discipline, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed as shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: ANOVA of Student Involvement in Decision Making and Students' Discipline

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.324	1	3.324	35.049	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	12.804	135	.095		
	Total	16.128	136			

a. Dependent Variable: Student Discipline

b. Predictors: (Constant), Involvement in Discipline Making

From Table 4.4, it is evident that student involvement in decision making was indeed a significant predictor of students' discipline among secondary school students [ $F(1, 131) = 35.049, p < .05$ ]. This means that the level of students' discipline in a school can be significantly predicted from the level of Student Involvement in decision making. Table 4.5 shows the values of the coefficient of the regression model.



Table 4.5: Regressions for Student Involvement in Decision-making on Discipline Management

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Communication	.236	.040	.454	5.920	.000	.157	.315

a. Dependent Variable: Student Discipline

$Y = \alpha + \beta X_2 + \epsilon$ , where Y= Students' Discipline;  $X_2$ = Student Involvement in Decision Making and  $\epsilon$  is the error term

$$Y = 2.844 + 0.236X_2 + \epsilon.$$

From the results, there is a positive unstandardized co-efficient of 0.236 as indicated by the co-efficient matrix with a p-value =.000 <.05. Hence, it is concluded that the model can provide the information needed to predict students' discipline from the level of student involvement in decision making; every one unit improvement in student involvement in decision making there is a resulting improvement by.236 units rise in students' discipline among the secondary school students. Similarly, an improvement in student involvement in decision making by one standard deviation, there is a subsequent rise in students' discipline among the secondary school students by .454 standard deviations.

#### 4.1.4 Hypothesis Testing

To determine the influence of student involvement in decision making on students' discipline in public secondary schools, the following null hypothesis was formulated;

**$H_0$ : Student involvement in decision making has no significant influence of on student's discipline in public secondary schools**

In Table 4.5, the regression ANOVA, indicates that the calculated *F* statistics was statistically significant [*F* (1, 135) = 35.049, *p* < .05)]. Further, Regression Coefficients confirm that there is a significant: *p*-value (*B*=.236, *t*= 5.920; *p*<.05) of the unstandardized co-efficient value. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis ( $\beta \neq 0$ ) was supported and it was concluded that Student Involvement in Decision Making has statistically significant influence on students' discipline in public secondary schools.

#### 4.2 Discussions

Findings in illustrates that there was generally moderate involvement of students in decision making in secondary schools in Kisumu County. This suggests that students were only occasionally involved in decision making on one hand, or whereas some schools would involve students in decision-making, others would not. This seems to water down the aspirations of the General Systems Theory (Bertalanffy, 1972) which considers interactions (including actively involving the student body) as the relationship enhancing sustained behaviour (as seen in student discipline) of a school. It is probably the lack of active interaction between student bodies and school administration that has led to poor student discipline in some schools. The school being a social system must actively interact with elements in its environment to achieve desired goals (Bozkus (2014). The student body in the system has a distinct role to play in the school in matters discipline (Adams et al, 2013).

The study findings also illustrate that students were rarely given opportunity to express their feelings by making their voice heard on issues that concerns them. Lack of regular open suffrage is an indication that the students are not given chance to take part in decision-making on issues of concern to them in school. These revelations seem to concur with findings obtained by early researchers such as Pereira et al (2014) which found in a study done in Porto that the role of a student representative is not yet sufficiently valued by the school and by educational actors. Similarly, study findings by Alesa-Aluoch et al (2016) also concurred with the current study that students occasionally participated in decision making, thus, the study established a fairly low. Perhaps it is due to low involvement of students in key decision-making processes which is the cause of disruptions seen in some schools such as being witnessed in the study area.

### V. Conclusions

The study concludes that secondary schools have adopted student involvement in decision-making approach of management. The study also concludes that student councils form one of the most common approaches through which school administrations involve students for purposes of decision making processes. It

is additionally concluded that while student involvement can significantly influence student discipline, the level of involvement is low in most of the secondary schools.

### Acknowledgement

The authors are thankful all the respondents for providing data for this study. Specifically, the authors are thankful to the Sub County Education Officers, Principals, Discipline Masters and Student Leaders for availing their time to provide information which eventually was used to produce this report. Without such information, this work could not have been a success.

### References

- [1]. Adams, K. M., Hester, P. T., & Bradley, J. M. (2013). A historical perspective of systems theory. *Industrial and Systems Engineering Research Conference*. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288782223\\_A\\_historical\\_perspective\\_of\\_systems\\_theory](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288782223_A_historical_perspective_of_systems_theory).
- [2]. Amaewhule, B. I. and Nukan-Adebayo, R. T. (2019). Perceived influence of students' indiscipline on academic performance in senior secondary schools in Rivers State. *International Journal of Innovative Psychology & Social Development*, 7(4), 43-52.
- [3]. Asesa-Aluoch, A. E., Wanzare, O. Z. and Sika, O. J. (2016). Influence of student leaders participation in management on institutional governance in public Universities, Kenya. *Greener Journal of Educational Research*, 6 (5), 202-212.
- [4]. Bertalanffy, L.V. (1972). *The history and status of general systems theory*. Retrieved from: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/b442/03ec8d6cb7acd4238c67651192b48bce862e.pdf>
- [5]. Bozkus, K. (2014). School as a social system. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 4(1), 49-61. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266082312>
- [6]. Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11 (4), 589-597, DOI: 10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806
- [7]. Creswell, J. W. (2015). *A concise Introduction to Mixed Methods Research*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- [8]. Dawadi, S., Shrestha, S., &Giri, R. A. (2021). Mixed-Methods Research: A Discussion on its Types, Challenges, and Criticisms. *Journal of Practical Studies in Education*, 2(2), 25-36
- [9]. Erdol, T. A. (2018). An analysis of high school students' participation in decision making mechanisms in terms of gender. *Education and Science*, 1 (20), 1 – 21: DOI: 10.15390/EB.2018.7645
- [10]. Johnson, O. (2019). General system theory and the use of process mining to improve care pathways. *Applied Interdisciplinary Theory in Health Informatics*, 11 – 22.
- [11]. Kagendo, D. A., Onyango, G. and Kyalo, D. (2019). Extent of student participation in decision making in secondary school management in Tharaka-Nithi and Nairobi Counties, Kenya. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 5 (10), 162 – 176.
- [12]. Kowalski, T. J. (2010). *The school principal: Visionary leadership and competent management*. New York: Routledge.
- [13]. Luescher-Mamashela, T.M. (2013). Student representation in university decision-making: Good reasons, a new lens? *Studies in Higher Education*, (38)10, 1442-1456. DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2011.625496.
- [14]. Lumanija, H. and Mkulu, D. G. (2020). Roles of students' council involvement in management of discipline in public secondary schools in Bariadi District Council, Tanzania. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 5(6), 2341 – 2355.
- [15]. Mboyonga, E. (2018). The role of student representative councils in curbing students' riots in selected secondary schools of Chipata District, Zambia. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education*, 5(3), 36- 43.
- [16]. Mithans, M., Grmek, M. I. and Čagran, B. (2017). Participation in decision-making in class: Opportunities and student attitudes in Austria and Slovenia. *CEPS Journal*, 7 (4), 167 – 186.
- [17]. Moepya, P. (2020). *Participation of student leaders in governance of a transforming university*. Unpublished dissertation submitted to the University of Pretoria
- [18]. Muthui, E. M., Muthaa, G. M., Barchok, K. H. and Wamukuru, K. D. (2018). Influence of student councils participation in decision making on management of public boys' and girls' boarding secondary schools, Nyeri County, Kenya. *Journal of Education & Social Policy*, 5 (3), 93 – 104. doi:10.30845/jesp.v5n3p12.
- [19]. Nandeke, E., Chumba, E. N. and Kiprop, C. (2017). Rethinking of public secondary schools discipline in Kenya. *European Scientific Journal*, 13(19). 156 – 168.
- [20]. Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S. and Divakar, S. (2021). Determination of sample size and sampling methods in applied research. *Proceedings on engineering sciences*, 3 (1) 25 – 32.

- [21]. Oni, A. A. and Adetoro, J. A. (2015). The effectiveness of student involvement in decision making and university leadership: A comparative analysis of 12 universities in South-west Nigeria. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, 3(1), 65–81
- [22]. Pereira, F., Mouraz, A., & Figueiredo, C. (2014). Student participation in school life: The “Student Voice” and mitigated democracy. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 16(4), 935–975. Retrieved from <http://hrcak.srce.hr/file/196318>.
- [23]. Perry-Hazan, L. and Somech, A. (2021). Conceptualising Student Participation in School Decision Making: An Integrative Model. *Educational Review*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2021.1976113>.
- [24]. Smith, K.P. (2016). *Bullying: Definition, Types, causes, Consequences & Intervention: Bullying*. Article in social & personality psychology compass. Accessed from
- [25]. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307872376\\_Bullying\\_Definition\\_Types\\_Causes\\_Consequences\\_&\\_Intervention\\_Bullying](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307872376_Bullying_Definition_Types_Causes_Consequences_&_Intervention_Bullying) on 27/3/2022
- [26]. Syvertsen, A. K., Wray-Lake, L., Flanagan, C. A., Osgood, D. W., & Briddell, L. (2011). Thirty-year trends in US adolescents' civic engagement: A story of changing participation and educational differences. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(3), 586-594.
- [27]. UNICEF (2010). *Progress Report for UNICEF Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transitional Program* Nairobi: UNICEF, Kenya.

Emmily A. Owuor, et. al. “Students’ Involvement in Decision Making and Discipline Management in Public Secondary Schools.” *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 27(07), 2022, pp. 38-48.