PARTICIPATORY DECISION MAKING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: CASE OF STUDENTS' INVOLVEMENT IN MWALA DIVISION, KENYA

Mulwa David, Julius Maiyo
Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya
E-mail: maiyojulius@yahoo.com, davimulwa@yahoo.com

Abstract

The study was an investigation of the participation in decision making by secondary schools students in Mwala division, Mwala district. The purpose was to identify the key decision makers in Secondary schools and the extent to which students were involved in decision making as far as curriculum and instruction, students' management and welfare, and school-community relations were concerned. The study was based on the Normative Model of Group Decision making. The study hypothesized that schools would largely involve students in decision making in order to avert major crises like school strikes.

The study used data collected from three secondary schools randomly selected from 10 public secondary schools in Mwala division. A sample of 80 students was selected randomly to represent the schools. A descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study. Data were sourced from the students by use of a questionnaire. Data was analyzed by use of descriptive analysis techniques which involves frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations.

It was established that students participated least in decision making concerning curriculum and instruction, and students' management and welfare but largely participated in making decisions concerning school community relations. More than 95% of the students indicated that they would like to participate more in decision making.

Key words: *decision, decision making, decision making process, involvement.*

Introduction

Background to the Problem

Since Kenya's independence in 1963, the government has continually reviewed the education system so as to ensure that the education meets the needs of the country as outlined in the national goals and objectives of education which include: to foster national unity, instill in the learners a feeling of mutual, social responsibility, promote social values and international consciousness, create positive attitudes towards work and incentives, especially manual work.

Several commissions have been set-up since independence to address issues in education and look into ways and means of achieving the national educational objectives. One of the commissions, the Presidential Working Party on Second University (Mackay Report) of 1981 recommended among other things, the major change of education system from 7:4:2:3 to 8:4:4.

As far as primary education is concerned, 1983 was the final year that the Certificate of Primary Education (CPE) examination was taken by standard seven pupils. Pupils were promoted to standard eight in 1985 to mark the beginning of a new educational system in Kenya, the 8:4:4 system. The system comprises eight years of primary education followed by four years of secondary education and another four years of university education.

The 8:4:4 system therefore introduced a new dimension in our educational trend which called for rethinking when formulating and structuring educational policies from 1985 onwards. The 8:4:4 system initially laid more emphasis on practical and technical subjects in each cycle of the system and stressed training of pupils for self-reliance and attitudinal change towards appreciation of the dignity of manual labour. This was a significant change because in the past, emphasis was laid on theoretical subjects, which made the pupils to expect white-collar jobs when they left school. However, this noble objective has already been overtaken by events and the emphasis now is on the integrated.

Another change brought by the 8:4:4 system is that education takes a longer time than before, eight instead of seven years. Each pupil had new subjects to learn such as music, art and craft, home science and so on. At secondary school level, Forms V and VI were gradually phased out as the 8:4:4 system progressed and each pupil was supposed to study the sciences as well as technical education. In the past, pupils opted for science or arts after form two, but with the 8:4:4, a combination of the two was made compulsory.

Together with these changes, the introduction of the 8:4:4 system meant that secondary schools were admitting older pupils with more varied and sophisticated standards of education than before. To meet the needs of these pupils, schools had been forced to adjust their physical structures, equipment, teaching personnel, curriculum and instructional programmes and the general school organization.

The 8:4:4 system came with its own challenges which have been faced by educational administrators in particular in their work. One of the goals of education in Kenya is to create positive attitudes towards work. As it was indicated by the then Government:

"The concept of 8:4:4 system is aimed at responding to the challenge of national development and the youth participation in the task of nation building" (Republic of Kenya, 1984; p.4).

For educational administrators, these challenges call for greater skill, an innovative, open mind to encourage the staff and students to make decisions and implement them without unnecessary delays and supervision. Creativity is necessary for both the administrator and the staff, and the students in order to make best use of available resources for maximum productivity and quality.

The major task of the administrator is to facilitate development of the organization. This task has been emphasized by Greg (1980) when he said that "managers are required to make decisions by virtue of their positions, but how they make those decisions is a matter of choice" (p. 21).

When the administrator chooses to make all decisions by himself and excludes his subordinates and students completely from the process of decision-making, crisis might result, disrupting the smooth running of the organization. In most cases, wherever there is a crisis in any particular institution, administrators have been blamed on failure to encourage

all members of the institution to fully participate in the policy formulation, goal setting and decision making for themselves at work and the institution as a whole.

In Kenya since the beginning of the 1990s, there have been strikes in secondary schools, which have led to loss of lives. The most outstanding cases are the St. Kizito tragedy of July 13th 1991 where 19 girls died, Nyeri High School strike of May 24th 1999 where four prefects were burnt to death and Kyanguli Mixed Secondary School fire of March 25th 2001 where 67 students were burnt to death.

But exactly who is to blame for these strikes? Kamuyu (East African Standard, July 28 2001) points out that:

In some cases, the school administration has failed to address some genuine grievances that the students may have. The students and parents are exposed and knowledgeable. The parents discuss various issues with their children, which makes them know their rights. The rights movements have penetrated into schools today and talk of freedom and right hence the students are aware of human rights abuses, child abuses and so on. Indiscipline, peer pressure, excessive academic premium and drugs have played a part in many strikes (p.14).

Statement of the Problem

As indicated in the background to the problem, failure of school administrators to involve students in decision making in matters that concern them is suspected to be one of the causes of schools' unrest. Ndambuki (1995) comments that:

Due to lack of personnel, facilities and funds, in-service training and seminars for school administrators are minimal. Again, there is hardly any research on administration locally little has been written, especially on the area of decision making in educational institutions in Kenya (p. 15).

In view of these problems, it was found necessary to conduct a study in the various areas of administration and in the area of decision making and students' participation in particular since these are very important components of administration.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the involvement of students' in decision making in matters that concern them in various task areas in Mwala division.

Objective of the study

The objectives of the study were as follows:-
1. To identify the key decision makers in secondary schools in the following task areas
    a) Curriculum and Instruction
    b) Students' management and Welfare
    c) School-Community relations
2. To find out the extent of student involvement in decision making in secondary schools.

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study
1. Who are the key decision makers in:
    a) Curriculum and instruction?
    b) Students' management and student welfare?
    c) School-community relations?
2. To what extent are students actually involved in decision making?

Significance of the Study

As indicated earlier, there is very little research done locally in Kenya on this topic, and little has been written on the decision making process and the involvement of students in the process in secondary schools. Therefore, the study is meant to address this problem. The study is also expected to contribute significantly to educational administration by providing insights into the strategies for involvement of students in decision making in secondary schools.

The study also provides a background for examining other related issues in educational administration, such as the establishment of more professional training for administrators to help them become better decision managers, teachers' involvement in decision making, the effects of communication channels on decision making patterns, involvement of parents and the community in decision making and administrators' participation in broad national policy making.

Limitations of the study

This study like many other studies in the social sciences is faced by a number of limitations in terms of scope and area of coverage among other variables. The study limits itself to public secondary schools in Mwala division in Mwala district, Eastern province, Kenya. The major limitations are

1. Due to time and financial constraints, it was not be possible to cover a larger area. Thus only a reasonable sample, which could be dealt with effectively under the prevailing circumstances was selected. Specifically random sampling and stratified techniques were utilized when selecting respondents from all the public secondary schools in Mwala division. Ideally, the respondents of this study should have been drawn from secondary schools in all districts in Kenya in order to make its findings more conclusive and also generalized to all students' country wide, however this was not possible hence the findings cannot be applied countrywide.

Theoretical Framework

The Theoretical Framework is based on the Normative Model of Group Decision Making. This was developed by Vroom and Yetton in Caldwell (1978) and it shows how leaders should approach group related decisions. According to the model, there is no leadership style which is appropriate for all situations therefore it's imperative that leaders develop a series of responses which range from autocratic to consultative style and thus apply the leadership style which is most favourable to the decision situation.

The Normative model uses decision effectiveness to evaluate the effectiveness of an administrator. According to Okumbe (1998:157), this is done on the basis of three factors namely:

Decision quality: how important the decisions are for facilitating group performance.

Decision acceptance: how group members accept and implement decisions.

Timeliness: all decisions must be made in a timely fashion depending on whether they are urgent or not.

The model suggests that administrators should have the skills to apply five decision making styles in a continuum from highly autocratic to highly participative. The first decision making style called the highly autocratic; the administrator can make the decision alone. In the second which is less autocratic, the administrator asks for information from his or her subordinates but he or she makes the decision alone. The third is the consultative style where the administrator shares the problem with the subordinates and asks for their information and evaluation. However, he or she makes the decision alone. In the fourth decision making style, called the more consultative style, the administrator and the subordinates meet as a group to discuss the problem but he or she makes the decision.

The fifth style called the highly consultative style, the administrator and subordinates meet as a group to discuss the problem and the group makes the decision.

Thus as stated by Okumbe (1998:157), the model requires administrators to posses' two very important qualities namely: the ability to make effective decisions and the ability to apply the continuum of the five decision styles depending on the favourableness of the decision situation.

Methodology of Research

Research Design

This study used the descriptive survey design. This is because it was possible to collect data from a large sample and was relatively cheap.

Population and Sample

The population composed of the 10 public secondary schools in Mwala division of Mwala district. These schools had a total of 732 form four students. The study sample comprised of three secondary schools selected from the ten public schools in Mwala division. This sample comprised 30% of the population of the total number of schools which is higher than the 10% recommended by social science researchers (Mugenda, 1999).

From this sample of schools, a student sample of 80 students was randomly selected. In two schools, 27 students were selected from each school, while 26 were selected from the third school.

Research Instrument

The study employed questionnaires to collect data from the teachers and students. Also interviews were to get views of schools principals. Prior to visiting the schools for data collection, the research instrument was thoroughly examined by the researchers for appropriateness of items so as to minimize irrelevances and redundancy, and then revisions done accordingly. The instrument was also piloted in a secondary school in Mwala division for the purposes of pre-testing it for validity and reliability.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the students was coded and entered in the computer for analysis using the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS). Data was analysed using both preliminary and statistical analysis procedures. The preliminary analysis procedures employed included frequencies, means, range and standard deviations.

Results of Research

Key Decision Makers in Curriculum and Instruction

The Students' who participated in the study (n=76) were asked to indicate, on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from never (1) to always (5), the extent to which they felt the ministry officials, B.O.G members, principals, teachers and students in their schools were involved in decision- making as far as curriculum and instruction issues were concerned.

There were four items in the questionnaire for this, meaning that a student could get a highest of 4x 5=20 and a lowest of 4x1=4. The midpoint for this scale was set at 12, with scores below 12, (4-11) indicating that the people concerned were viewed to be less involved in decision- making while scores of 12 and above (12-20) indicated that the people involved were mostly involved in decision making. The table below presents a summary of the statistics for the responses given by the students.

Table 1.   Major participants in Curriculum and Instruction.

Statistics	Involvement in Curriculum and Instruction				
	Ministry officials	B.O.G members	Principals	Teachers	Students
N	76	76	76	76	76
Mean	7.9219	8.9375	14.8923	15.5538	8.3281
Range	14.00	14.00	15.00	16.00	14.00
Minimum	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum	18.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	18.00

From the table above, it emerges that the teachers scored the highest mean (15.5) followed by the principals with a mean of 14.9. The means for teachers and Principals is above the scale's midpoint of 12 meaning that the students viewed them as the most frequent decision makers in the schools. Ministry officials were given a mean of 7.9 while that for students stood at 8.3. The mean for B.O. G members was given as 8.9. The means were below the midpoint of 12 and hence the students viewed them as least involved in decision making.

An overall computation was conducted to see the extent to which each group of participants-Ministry officials, Boards of governors members, principals, teachers and students were involved in decision making for curriculum and instruction issues. The table below shows the extent of involvement ranging from never to always.

Table 2.   **Extent of various Participants in Decision Making.**

Extent of Involvement	Ministry officials		B.O.G Members		Principals		Teachers		Students	
Extent	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	22	34.4	18	28.1	2	3.1	3	4.6	23	35.9
Rarely	23	35.9	18	28.1	6	9.2	2	3.1	20	31.3
Sometimes	11	17.2	20	31.3	16	24.6	9	13.8	13	20.3
Frequently	7	10.9	7	10.9	18	27.7	27	41.5	7	10.9
Always	1	1.6	1	1.6	23	35.4	24	36.9	1	1.6
Total	64	100.0	64	100.0	65	100.0	65	100.0	64	100.0

Majority of the students (n=23, 35.9%) reported that students were never involved in decision-making. Another 20 students (31.3%) reported that students were rarely involved. Only one student felt that students were always involved in this. A total of 24 students (36.9%) observed that teachers were always involved in decision making, while 27 students (41.5%) felt that their teachers were frequently involved. For the Principals, 23 students (35.4%) felt they were always involved while 18 students (27.7%) felt that they were frequently in-volved.

Key Decision- Makers for Students' Management and Welfare

The students were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt the ministry officials, BOG members, principals, teachers and students in their schools were involved in decision making as far as student management and welfare was concerned. For this there were seven items. The highest that one could get on the scale was 35 and the lowest was 7. A score of 7 indicated that the student felt that the group was always involved in decision making. A midpoint value for the scale was set at 21. Scores below 21(7-20) indicate that the student perceived the involvement of a given group in decision making to be low while scores of 21 and above (21-35) indicated that the student perceived the involvement of a group in decision making to be high. Table 3 below presents a summary of the statistics that indicate the major participants in decision making for student management and welfare.

Table 3.   **Major Participants in students' management and Students' Welfare.**

Statistics	Involvement in student-Management and Welfare				
	Ministry Officials	B.O. G members	Principals	Teachers	Students
N	62	63	63	63	63
Mean	16.7419	21.1905	30.4444	27.1587	15.9841
Standard Deviation	5.46805	5.6393	4.62035	5.5276	5.25938
Range	24.00	28.00	18.00	22.00	20.00
Minimum	7.00	7.00	17.00	13.00	7.00
maximum	31.00	35.00	35.00	35.00	27.00

It is evident that the least utilised group in decision making as far as student management and welfare is concerned was the students, with a mean score of 15.9. This was followed by Ministry officials (Mean=16.7) and then BOG members (Mean=21.1). The most popular group in decision-making for this respect was the Principals (Mean=30.4) followed by teachers (Mean=27.1).The Principals and teachers had a mean score above the mid-point (21) meaning that the students viewed them as being highly involved in decision making. The mean scores for the students and Ministry officials was below the mid-point (21) and hence they were viewed as being the least involved in decision making, BOG members scored a mean of 21.1 which is just above mid-point indicating that they were viewed to be on the 50-50 position as far as decision making was concerned.

Table 4 below shows how each group of stakeholders was viewed to participate in decision making, in scale ranging from Always to Never, for student-management welfare issues**.**

Table 4.   Extent of Involvement in Decision-Making: Student Welfare and Management.

Extent of Involvement	Involvement in student welfare and Management									
	Ministry Officials		B.O. G Members		Principals		Teachers		Students	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	9	14.5	3	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	12.7
Rarely	23	37.1	9	14.3	1	1.6	4	6.3	31	49.2
Sometimes	27	43.5	36	57.1	6	9.5	18	28.6	19	30.2
Frequently	3	4.8	14	22.2	24	38.1	24	38.1	5	7.9
Always	0	0.0	1	1.6	32	50.8	17	27.0	0	0.0
Total	62	100.0	63	100.0	63	100.0	63	100.0	63	100.0

It is clear from the table above that majority of the students rated never and rarely(n= 39,61.9%) meaning that students were the least favored in decision making while the principals were the most favored with 32 of them (50.8%) being rated always.

Key Decision makers in School Community Relations

The students were further asked to indicate the extent to which they felt ministry officials, BOG members, Principals, teachers and students in their schools were involved in decision making as far as school community relations was concerned. The table below presents a summary of the responses given by the students concerning this issue.

Table 5. **Extent of involvement in Decision Making: School Community Relations.**

Extent of Involvement	Ministry Officials		B.O.G		Principals		Teachers		Students	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	17	27.4	4	6.5	1	1.6	1	1.6	15	24.2
Rarely	12	19.4	7	11.3	0	0.0	1	1.6	9	14.5
Sometimes	15	24.1	25	40.3	10	16.1	13	21.0	12	19.4
Frequently	12	19.4	11	17.7	19	14.5	18	29.0	7	11.3
Always	6	9.7	15	24.2	42	67.7	29	46.8	19	30.6
Total	62	100.0	62	100.0	62	100.0	62	100.0	62	100.0

From table 4.5 above it can be deduced that the Principals were the most favored decision makers in this area, with 42 students (67.7%) observing that the Principals were always involved in decision making. This was followed by teachers, with 29 students (46.8%) observing that they were always involved in making decisions. The least favored were the Ministry of education officials, whereby 17 Students (27.4%) observed that they were never involved in decision making. This was followed by students with 15 students (24.1%) observing that they were never involved in decision making.

Extent of Involvement of students in Decision making

The second research question of the Study was concerned with identifying the extent to which secondary school students were involved in decision making process. In order to answer research question, the following issues were considered:

a) Whether students found it important for them to be involved in decision making.

b) The extent to which students were involved in decision making.

c) The perception of students about the significance of the level of their involvement in decision making.

d) Students' rating of their involvement in decision making.

The analytical procedures for each of these issues are presented below.

Importance of involving Students in Decision Making: The student Views

The students were asked to state whether they thought secondary school students should be involved in decision making. Their responses are as tabulated below.

Table 6. **Importance of Involving students In Decision-Making.**

Gender of student	Should Students be Involved in decision making?				Total	
	Yes		No			
	N	%	N	%	F	%
Male	44	60.3	1	1.4	45	61.6
Female	26	35.6	2	2.7	28	38.4
Total	70	95.9	3	4.1	73	100

Out of 73 students who respondent to the item, 70(95.9%) of them felt that students should be involved in decision making. The major reasons the students gave for the need to involve them in decision making were:

- So that students do not feel undermined
- So that students can feel respected and valued
- Because students are part and parcel of the school
- Since most decisions directly affect them
- To allow students to express their views
- So that decisions may not be made against the interest of the students

Involvement of students in Decision Making: Students View

The actual involvement of students in decision making was determined from each of the three aspects: Curriculum and Instruction, student management and welfare, and school-community relations. The results are as tabulated below.

Table 7.   Summary of Involvement of students in Decision making: Students View.

Extent of involve-ment	Curriculum and Instruction		Student- management and Welfare		School- community Relations	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	23	35.9	8	12.7	15	24.2
Rarely	20	31.3	31	49.2	9	14.5
Sometimes	13	20.3	19	30.2	12	19.4
Frequently	7	10.9	5	7.9	7	11.3
Always	1	1.6	0	0.0	19	30.6
Total	64	100.0	63	100.0	62	100.0

As can be seen in table 7, 23 students (35.9%) reported that students were never involved in making decision for curriculum and instruction issues. Eight students (12.7%) reported that they were never involved in student management and welfare issues, while 15 students (24.2%) reported that they were never involved in decision making for school community relation issues. For school-community relations, 19 students (30.6%) reported that they were always involved. Majority of the students reported that they were 'rarely' involved in decision making across the three issues.

Significance of students' Involvement in Decision making: Students' Perception

The students were asked to indicate the extent to which they perceived their involvement in decision making in their schools. Table 8 below presents the findings for this, indicating the perception across gender.

Table 8.   **Significance of students Involvement in Decision making.**

Significance of Involvement	Gender of the Student				Total	
	Male		Female			
	N	%	N	%	F	%
Very significant	10	14.5	8	11.6	18	26.1
Significant	25	36.2	12	17.4	37	53.6
Not significant	4	5.8	6	8.7	10	14.5
Very Insignificant	2	2.9	2	2.9	4.0	5.8
Total	41	59.4	28	40.6	69	100.0

The table shows that 18 out of 69 students (26.1%) felt that involvement of students in decision making was very significant while 37(53.6%) felt that this was significant. Ten (10) students (14.5%) reported that the level to which they were involved in decision making was not significant while 4 (5.8%) felt that this was very insignificant.

Students' Rating of their involvement in Decision making

The students were asked to indicate how they would rate their involvement in decision making in their schools. Below is a presentation of a summary of their responses.

As can be seen in table 9 below, 10 students (14.5%) felt that their involvement in decision making was very adequate while 32 (46.4%) found it adequate. another 22 students (31.9%) reported that their involvement was inadequate while 5 students (7.2%) found it to be very inadequate. It emerges therefore majority of the students were of the opinion the level at which they were involved in making decisions was adequate.

Table 9.   **Students rating of their Involvement in Decision Making.**

Adequacy of involvement of Students	Gender of the student				Total	
	Male		Female			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very adequate	5	7.2	5	7.2	10	14.5
Adequate	23	33.3	9	13.0	32	46.4
Inadequate	10	14.5	12	17.4	22	31.9
Very Inadequate	3	4.3	2	2.9	5	7.2
Total	41	59.4	28	40.6	69	100.0

Discussion

Major Participants in Decision making in schools

It was found out that the major decision makers in the task area of curriculum and instruction supervision are the teachers in the perception of the students. Probably this is because the teachers in schools are the one who teach, set examinations, mark the examinations, grade, set practical's and demonstrations. This is why they are selected as the major decision makers in curriculum and instructional supervision. This agrees with Ndambuki (1995) from where she concludes that heads of departments, deans of curriculum and tutors are the major decision makers in curriculum and instructional supervision; this is because heads of depart-

ments, deans of curriculum and tutors are basically teachers. In both cases, the principals are the most important decision makers in curriculum and instructional matters.

In students' management and students' welfare, the findings indicate that the Principals are the major decision makers followed by the teachers. The students in this case perceive themselves as the least involved. Ndambuki (1995) has similar results where she indicates that Principals are the major decision makers in this area. In her case she also indicates that students are the least involved. Students may come up with this conclusion because they see the Principal as the major decision maker in tasks like determining the size of the classes, determining entertainment and recreational activities for the students, determining school rules and regulations for the students, determining how responsibilities should be delegated to students, just but to mention a few. This could also explain why students go on strike over issues that are non-academic like boarding, poor diet and recreational activities since in their perception, they have indicated that among all stakeholders they are least involved (never-12.7%) and rarely (49.2%).

In school community relations, the students perceived the head teachers as the major decision makers (67.7%) followed by teachers (46.8%), then students (30.6%), BOG (24.2%) and ministry officials (9.5%). This could be because the head teacher deals with the community in getting supplies for the schools, in appointment of BOG and PTA members. The teachers also get their individual supplies from the community where they work like in housing and food. Students and BOG members come from the community. Since ministry officials rarely interact with the community, this may be the reason why they are voted as the least involved. This agrees with Njoka (1995).

Extent of Involvement of Students in Decision Making

About 95.9% of the students indicated that they would like to be involved in decision making. This is an indication that students would want to be involved in decision making and if the school administrators fails to involve the students, it may result to school disturbances since the students overwhelmingly feel they should be involved. The reasons they give seem to be convincing enough because they do not want to feel to be undermined, they want respect and be valued, most decisions directly affect them and that decisions may not be made against their interests.

Majority of the students reported that they were rarely involved in decision making across the three issues. This creates a source of conflict since the students have indicated that they would want to be involved, but practically rarely involved a clear sign of school strikes. The students also indicated that their involvement in decision making is very significant (26.1%) and significant (53.6%), implying that their contribution in decision making is very significant (26.1%) and significant (53.6%), implying that their contribution in decision making cannot be overlooked.

Conclusion

In the students' opinion, the major decision makers in the task area of curriculum and instruction programs were teachers and principals. Students viewed themselves as among the least involved, just slightly better than ministry of education officials. In the task area of students' management and welfare, the least involved group was the students. They viewed principals, teachers, boards of governors (BOG) members and ministry of education officials as more involved in making decisions in the task area of students' management and welfare. Students were also among the groups that were least involved in making decisions in school-community relations while principals and teachers were the most involved. Most of the students were of the opinion that students should be involved in decision making. From the study findings, it can be concluded that the involvement of students in decision making in secondary schools is low and the students would want to be involved more.

Recommendations

1) Principals and school authorities should make deliberate efforts to involve their students in making decisions more especially on matters that involve them.
2) School managers should establish channels of communication through which students can provide feedback and their views and suggestions anonymously without being identified with the information. Perhaps the idea of suggestion boxes should be encouraged and students always reminded to use them, then the school authorities should ensure that they respond immediately and appropriately.
3) The Ministry of Education should encourage head teachers to adopt democratic leadership style which allows for involvement of students in decision making in many task areas.
4) The ministry of education should hold regular in-service courses for Principals and other stakeholders to show them the importance of involvement of other stakeholders in decision making and especially the students because they are the consumers of the services.

References

Caldwell, B. (1978). *Participatory Management: A promising Model for Administration.* A Working Paper, Department of Educational Administration; University of Alberta.

Greg, H. L. (1980). *The School as an Organization.* London: Nefferton Driffield.

Kamuyu C. (July 28, 2001). *'The era of strikes'.* The East African Standard.

Mugenda, O. M. (1999). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches.* Nairobi: Acts Press.

Ndambuki, J. K. (1995*). Involvement of Tutors in Decision Making in Primary Teacher Education Institutions In Kenya.* Unpublished M.Ed Thesis, Kenyatta University.

Njoka, Z. G. (1985*). Decision Making Patterns In Selected Secondary Schools in Kirinyaga District.* Unpublished M.Ed Thesis, Kenyatta University.

Okumbe, J. A. (1998). *Educational Management: Theory and Practice*. Nairobi, Nairobi University Press.

Republic of Kenya. (1964). *Educational Commission, Part one.* Nairobi: Government Printer.

Republic of Kenya. (1984). *Development Plan 1984-1989.* Nairobi: Government Printer.

Republic of Kenya. (1981*). Report of the Presidential Working Party on the Second University in Kenya.* Nairobi: Government Printer.

Adviced by Naglis Švickus, SMC "Scientia Educologica", Lithuania

Mulwa David	Lecturer, Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Department of Education Planning and Management, P.O. Box 190 - 50100, Kakamega, Kenya. E-mail: davimulwa@yahoo.com Website: http://www.mmust.ac.ke
Julius Maiyo	M.ED, Lecturer, Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Department of Education Planning and Management, P.O. Box 190 - 50100, Kakamega, Kenya. Phone: +254 0721 223 154 E-mail: maiyojulius@yahoo.com Website: http://www.mmust.ac.ke