INFLUENCE OF STUDENT COUNCILS' INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNICATION ON MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KISII COUNTY

CHEPKAWAI R. LIMO
PhD student, School of Education,
Moi University.

Prof. KOSGEI ZACHARY K. PhD
Dept. Of Educational Management and Policy Studies,
Moi University.

Dr. JOSEPH K. LELAN, PhD
Dept. Of Educational Management and Policy Studies,
Moi University.

ABSTRACT

In the recent past, there has been a large number of secondary school unrests and other forms of indiscipline not forgetting that Kisii County in Kenya also got its share. This happens despite the inclusion of student councils in secondary school management. The specific objectives of the study were to; establish the influence of student councils' involvement in communication between students and the administration and management of public secondary schools in Kisii County. The study was anchored on functional leadership theory. The study adopted a mixed-method design. The target population was 140948 respondents comprising of 104 principals, 2080 teachers, 1040 student leaders, 137713 students, and 11 Sub County Directors of Education. The sample size was 1066 respondents comprising of 31 Principals, 336 teachers, 289 Student leaders, 399 students, and 11 Sub-County Directors of Education. Stratified, simple random sampling and purposive sampling techniques were used to select respondents. Data collection was done through the administration of questionnaires, interviews, and document analysis. Validity was established using expert judgment, while reliability was determined using Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient. Data analysis was done by using descriptive and inferential statistics such as Correlation analysis and multiple regression with the aid of SPSS V26. From the linear regression model, (R^2 = .525 shows that student councils' involvement in communication accounts for 52.5% variation in the management of public schools. The study findings depicted that there was a positive significant effect of student councils' involvement in communication on the management of public schools (β_1=0.780 and p-value <0.05). Therefore, an increase in student councils' involvement in communication led to an increase in the quality management of public secondary schools. It was concluded that creating networks and involving student councils in school administration reduces conflicts. School administration should put in place good communication systems in schools to ensure a smooth two-way flow of information to all students' council/(prefects,) students, teachers, and support staff. It is recommended that the sustainable communication link between the students' council and school administration be developed.

Keywords: Councils, Involvement, Communication, management.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Student Governing Council (SGC) is a representative body of students, through which they participate in the affairs of the school in partnership with teachers, parents and school management for the benefit of the wider student population (Kamuri, 2014). They are elected by students to voice their grievances to school management authorities (Wachira, 2010). Student councils are given very many roles like students' welfare, coordinating co-curricular activities, and supervising learning activities like early morning and late evening preps hence their role entails active involvement in school-based decision-making.

In Norway, all secondary schools are by law obligated to constitute students' councils with students' leaders democratically elected by the students. According to children in Scotland and University of Edinburgh (2010) such councils increase consultation between pupils and staff on important issues pertaining to the daily administration and general welfare of the student's body. Student councils are effective in enhancing a two-way communication system in school (Children in Scotland and university of Edinburgh 2010). Brasof (2011) observed that this system created "a double-loop learning organization". This refers to a situation with upward and downward communications between the school principals and learners which enhances both parties to uncover and critique assumptions and actions of decision-making processes. This is appropriate for a school since it reduces misunderstandings between teachers and students.

Mukiri (2014) also affirms that most of the secondary schools in Africa are very authoritarian due to the fact that the school administrations tend to be stricter with communications. In some cases, school administration tends to certify or doctor particular messages before they are passed to the students. Types of information passed to students through SGC can directly give indications on the extent of students' participation in communication process in their schools.

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

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

(Mabovula, 2009). The particular rationales underlying student participation in making decisions is the need to ensure their involvement in school affairs.

Student councils in Tanzania are charged with advisory and supervisory roles. The chairperson of the student council is supposed to advise Heads of schools on matters concerning students' affairs and maintenance of discipline. They control activities such as games, clubs and societies, supervise communal work within the compound, oversee the organization and life of students in dormitories and ensure that meals are served well and on time (Kambuga & Omollo, 2017).

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

Limited communication among students and the school management is the main course of indiscipline cases (Kiprop, 2012). The indiscipline cases reported in Kenya show evidence of a communication breakdown between the school's administration and the prefects. Most schools do not really use the Representative Council of Learners to promote democratic participation. The majorities of schools are still authoritarian and reinforces passive subordination amongst the learners (Duma, 2011). The policy maintains that the Representative Council of Learners acts as a link of communication between students and the school management (Hilda, 2004). Schools should build the necessary frameworks and communication avenues for developing student councils.

Indimuli (2012) says that transforming students' leadership from the prefect to more representative body was a voice in their leadership while changing the role of prefect from being master to being a bridge of communication between the students and school administration. Most of the times, decisions that teachers impose on students were the same that students themselves could gladly own if they were given an opportunity to participate in their deliberations. The true reward to student council members was to give chance to give service to the school. Kyungu (2009) emphasizes the need for clear duties for student councils.Thus, school administration should put in place good communication systems in schools to ensure a smooth two-way flow of information to all prefects, students, and teachers and support staff (Muli, 2012).

Muli (2012) in a study on the role of prefects in the governance of public secondary schools in Machakos Central found that majority of the Principals and teachers looked at different attributes in selection of prefects. The attributes which included good behaviour, discipline, academic performance and good communication skills were meant to create a positive image of the prefects towards other students. Hence, the right student leaders were meant to assist the administration in achieving the school objectives. Njue (2014) emphasized that the nature of response from students to any communication depends on who communicates. SGC create a good environment for further interaction, requisite for seeking more clarifications, thereby finding it easy to respond to information that they understand. Mutua (2014) notes that the

types of messages communicated by students through SGC are normally limited to issues related to the student's welfare within schools, and occasionally are conveyed orally.

A study involving 15 secondary schools in the former Rift valley province of Kenya showed that the level of student participation in decision-making was at best tokenistic (Tikoko & Kiprop, 2011). It is worth noting, however, that by the time the said study was conducted there was no law providing for the establishment of the Student Councils. The implementation of the Constitution of Kenya (2010) have just begun and the Basic Education Act of 2013 was enacted much later.

In the year 2008 more than 800 Secondary Schools went on strike in Eastern part of Kenya (Juma, 2008), (Ogol & Ruth, 2017). In July to August, 2016 over 120 Secondary Schools were burnt and several closed down indefinitely in the Republic of Kenya (Ogol & Ruth, 2017).

Student indiscipline in secondary schools in Kenya has continued to pose a great challenge to the education sector. It has been observed that student strikes in secondary schools seem to be on the rise (Malenya, 2014; Mulwa et al., 2015). This may point to lack of involvement of the students in decision-making in the secondary schools they attend.

A survey carried out by UNICEF, KSSHA and MOE in March 2013 revealed that sixty-seven percent (67%) of schools had established students' councils. There is scanty information on the effectiveness of student council involvement in communication in management of public secondary schools. There have been waves of student Unrests such as the 2016 where over 120 schools were burnt within three months. In Nyanza region in the same period, July 2016 many Secondary schools experienced burning of schools across the region. Kisii County alone experienced 23 Schools being burnt during the same period translating to 19.2% of the national total. This could be a large figure for one county compared to 47 others in Kenya. In view of the foregoing it was of interest to carry out a study to determine the effectiveness of student councils in involvement in communication the management of public secondary schools in Kisii County, Kenya.

2.0 METHODS

This study used pragmatist paradigm since it combines the qualitative and quantitative approaches within different phases of the research process (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Pragmatist researchers focuses on the 'what' and 'how' of the research problem (Creswell, 2009). This study used adopted an explanatory concurrent mixed methods design (Creswell, 2012).

All schools identified had similar characteristics and it is out of these schools that respondents were drawn. The target population (N) was 134,948 respondents distributed in 104 public secondary schools in Kisii County. It comprised of 104 principals, 2080 teachers, 131,713 students, 1040 student council leaders and 11 Sub County Directors of Education.

The stratified sampling technique was used to categorize schools into national, extra county and county schools. To arrive at the total number of respondents stratified random sampling and purposive sampling were applied to select 31 Principals, 336 Teachers, 289 student leaders

399 students and 11 Sub County Directors of Education, hence a total number of 1066 respondents.

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

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

Where;

n = the sample size,

N = the population size,

e = error tolerance

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

For teachers, the sample size was;

= 2080/1+ 2080(.05)2   =   2080/6.2   = 336 respondents

For student councils/leaders, the sample size was;

= 1040/1+ 1040(.05)2   =   1040/3.6   = 289 respondents

For students, the sample size was;

= 131713/1+ 131713(.05)2   = 131713/330.28   = 399 respondents

Primary data was collected from the respondents using questionnaires and interview schedules. The combination of these methods helped to complement the advantages of each method and yield more valid and reliable findings.

The questionnaire was designed to address specific objectives and that it had closed-ended questions. Unless otherwise stated, all variables were measured on a 5-point Likert scales ranging from 5 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree. The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with various statements. This ensured that answers are reliably aggregated and allow comparisons to be made.

The interview schedule was used to interview Principals and Sub-County Directors of Education (SCDE). All the groups of interviewees are involved in the management of education in school and sub county respectively. Verbal information was obtained and any other relevant observations made by the researcher was documented in writing.

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient was used to test the reliability of the measures in the questionnaires. Computation was done for each item to determine the reliability of the research instrument. The Cronbach's alpha (α) coefficient used for reliability test value should be above

0.7 to be adopted as a satisfactory level (Bryman, 2012). A reliability Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha of 0.7 or over was assumed to reflect the internal reliability of the instruments.

After all data have been collected, the researcher conducted data cleaning, the data was categorized, coded and entered in the computer for analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS V26). Qualitative data from the open-ended items interviews was organized into themes guided by research question and presented using descriptions and quotations. The data from the interviews was transcribed first and then combined with the data recorded manually. Data from open-ended questions was re-arranged into written statements out of which distinctive themes was generated.

Data was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive statistics was presented in contingency tables showing the frequencies and percentages of data obtained. To determine the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variable as captured by the null hypotheses H01 linear regression was undertaken. The regression model is given as:

Y= β0 + β1 X1 + Ɛ………………………..Equation 1

Where;

  Y = School Management

β0 = Slope Constant

β1 = Regression coefficients

X1 = Communication

Ɛ = error term

3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Students' views on Management of public secondary schools

A total of 9 indicators were used to assess students' views on management of public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point likert scale, shown in Table 1. Majority of the students 268 (75.5%) agreed that student leaders are involved in time management in schools, 23(6.5%) undecided and 64(18%) disagreed (M=3.81; SD=1.20). Most of the students 195(54.9%) agreed that student leaders are entrusted with full control of school time schedules even in absence of teachers and administration, with 125(35.2%) disagreed and 35(9.9%) undecided (M=3.25; SD=1.40). Majority of students 246(69.3%) agreed that student leaders ensure students observe time keeping, 79(22.2%) disagreed and 30(8.5%) were undecided (M=3.68; SD=1.34).

Most of the students 246(69.3%) agreed that student leaders are involved in time keeping to ensure seriousness in school timetable is taken, with 87(24.5%) disagreed and 24(6.8%) undecided (M=3.66; SD=1.34). Majority of students 244(68.8%) agreed that student leaders supervise other students to ensure duties such as cleaning the school compound, 38(10.7%)

disagreed and 9(2.5%) were undecided (M=4.19; SD=1.10). Most of students 258(72.7%) agreed that student leaders supervise other students in taking care of the environment, with 78(22%) disagreed and 19(5.4%) were undecided (M=3.72; SD=1.32). Majority of students 263(74.1%) agreed that student leaders supervise meals especially during breakfast, tea, lunches and supper with, 68(19.2%) disagreed and 24(6.8%) were undecided (M=3.89; SD=1.32).

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

Table 1 Students' views on Management of public secondary schools

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

Student leaders supervise meals especially during breakfast, tea, lunches and supper	155	43.7	108	30.4	24	6.8	34	9.6	34	9.6	3.89	1.32
Mean											**3.51**	**0.89**

3.2 Student Councils' Views on the Management of public secondary schools

A total of 11 indicators were used to assess student councils' views on the management of public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point likert scale are summarized in Table 2. Majority of the student leaders (or student council 239(91.9%) agreed that they are involved in time management in schools, 7(2.7%) undecided and 14(5.4%) disagreed (M=4.2; SD=0.84). Most of the student leaders 211(81.1%) agreed that they are entrusted with full control of school time schedules even in absence of teachers and administration, with 36(13.8%) disagreed and 13(5%) undecided (M=3.95; SD=1.07). Majority of student leaders 209(80.3%) agreed that they ensure students observe time keeping, 34(13.1%) disagreed and 17(6.5%) were undecided (M=3.94; SD=1.07).

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

At least 128(49.2%) of student leaders agreed that they supervise preps around the study areas like the library and the laboratories, 100(38.4%) disagreed and 32(12.3%) were undecided (M=3.10; SD=1.31). Most of student leaders 160(61.6%) agreed that they supervise games by making sure that students in the field, with 79(30.3%) disagreed and 21(8.1%) were undecided (M=3.41; SD=1.32). Majority of student leaders 226(87%) agreed that they supervise meals especially during breakfast, tea, lunches and supper, 23(8.8%) disagreed and 11(4.2%) were undecided (M=4.20; SD=1.02).

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

Table 2 Student councils' views on Management of public secondary schools

	SA		A		UD		D		SD		Mean	SD
	Freq	**%**	**Freq**	**%**	**Freq**	**%**	**Freq**	**%**	**Freq**	**%**		

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

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

3.3 Teachers' views on the Management of public secondary schools

A total of 11 indicators were used to assess teachers' views on management of public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point Likert scale are summarized in Table 3.

Majority of the teachers 235(82.5%) agreed that student councils are involved in time management in schools, with 44(15.5%) undecided and 6(2.1%) disagreed (M=3.81; SD=1.09). Most of the teachers 155(54.3%) agreed that student councils are entrusted in full control of school time schedules even in the absence of teachers and administration, with 97(34.1%) disagreed and 33(11.6%) undecided (M=3.21; SD=1.30).

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

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

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

Table 3 Teachers views on Management of public secondary schools

	SA		A		UD		D		SD		Mean	SD
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Student councils are involved in time management in schools	60	21.1	175	61.4	6	2.1	23	8.1	21	7.4	3.81	1.09
Student councils are entrusted in full control of school time schedules even in the absence of teachers and administration	42	14.7	113	39.6	33	11.6	58	20.4	39	13.7	3.21	1.30

Statement											Mean	SD
Student councils ensure students observe time keeping	62	21.8	141	49.5	16	5.6	50	17.5	16	5.6	3.64	1.17
Student councils are involved in controlling students not to skip classes	35	12.3	105	36.8	27	9.5	87	30.5	31	10.9	3.09	1.26
Ensure School's smooth running by ensuring order in school programs	55	19.3	159	55.8	22	7.7	34	11.9	15	5.3	3.72	1.07
Involvement in time keeping to ensure seriousness in school timetable is taken	68	23.9	155	54.4	17	6.0	34	11.9	11	3.9	3.82	1.05
Supervising other students to ensure duties such as cleaning the school compound	118	41.4	135	47.4	13	4.6	8	2.8	11	3.9	4.20	0.94
Supervise other students in taking care of the environment including watering young trees and flowers in the compound	60	21.1	148	51.9	23	8.1	34	11.9	20	7.0	3.68	1.14
Supervise preps around the study areas like the library and the laboratories,	36	12.6	100	35.1	33	11.6	77	27.0	39	13.7	3.06	1.29
Supervise games by making sure that students are in the field	53	18.6	132	46.3	20	7.0	57	20.0	23	8.1	3.47	1.23
Supervise meals especially during breakfast, tea, lunches and supper	95	33.3	147	51.6	6	2.1	21	7.4	16	5.6	4.00	1.08
Mean											**3.61**	**0.77**

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

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

from other students, incitement from the community against school principal and deployment of new principal.

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

3.4 Students' views on student councils' involvement in communication between students and administration

A total of 9 statements were used to establish the students' views on student councils' involvement in communication between students and administration in public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point Likert scale were summarized in Table 4. Majority of the students 243(68.4%) agreed that student leaders promote positive communication between students and school management, with 23(6.5%) undecided and 89(25.1%) disagreed (M=3.54; SD=1.34). Most of the students 225(63.3%) agreed that student leaders promote good discipline of learners through meetings and discussions, with 101(28.5%) disagreed and 29(8.2%) undecided (M=3.48; SD=1.39). Majority of the students 194(54.6%) agreed that student leaders use communication channels to discuss our fears and frustrations, with 30(8.5%) undecided and 131(36.9%) disagreed (M=3.20; SD=1.42).

Most of the students 219(61.7%) agreed that student leaders communicate to students' views regarding welfare programs, with 47(13.2%) disagreed and 49(13.8%) undecided (M=3.41; SD=1.30). Majority of the students 218(61.5%) agreed that student leaders pass students' views regarding school management, with 34(9.6%) undecided and 103(29%) disagreed (M=3.42; SD=1.39). Most of the students 216(60.8%) agreed that student leaders air students' grievances to administration, with 100(28.2%) disagreed and 39(11%) undecided (M=3.46; SD=1.38).

Table 4 Students views on student councils' involvement in communication between students and administration

	SA		A		UD		D		SD		Mean	SD
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Student leaders promote positive communication between students and school management	86	24.2	157	44.2	23	6.5	39	11.0	50	14.1	3.54	1.34
Student leaders promote good discipline of learners through	96	27.0	129	36.3	29	8.2	51	14.4	50	14.1	3.48	1.39

											Mean	SD
meetings and discussions												
Student leaders use communication channels to discuss our fears and frustrations	70	19.7	124	34.9	30	8.5	68	19.2	63	17.7	3.20	1.42
Student leaders participate freely in disciplinary meetings with school authority	72	20.3	100	28.2	48	13.5	66	18.6	69	19.4	3.11	1.43
Student leaders communicate to students views regarding Welfare programs	68	19.2	151	42.5	49	13.8			47	13.2	3.41	1.30
Student leaders pass students' views regarding school management	87	24.5	131	36.9	34	9.6	49	13.8	54	15.2	3.42	1.39
Student leaders evaluate student-teacher relationship	57	16.1	110	31.0	49	13.8	63	17.7	76	21.4	3.03	1.41
Student leaders air students' grievances to administration	96	27.0	120	33.8	39	11.0	51	14.4	49	13.8	3.46	1.38
Student leaders report student disciplinary cases to administration	144	40.6	134	37.7	21	5.9	26	7.3	30	8.5	3.95	1.23
Mean											**3.40**	**0.84**

Majority of the students 278(78.3%) agreed that student leaders report student disciplinary cases to administration, with 21(5.9%) undecided and 56(15.8%) disagreed (M=3.95; SD=1.23). At least 172(48.5%) of students agreed that student leaders participate freely in disciplinary meetings with school authority, with 135(38%) disagreed and 48(13.5%) undecided (M=3.11; SD=1.43). At least 167(47.1%) of students agreed that student leaders evaluate student-teacher relationship, with 139(39.1%) disagreed and 49(13.8%) undecided (M=3.03; SD=1.41).

From the findings of the study, responses to the indicators of student councils' involvement in communication between students and administration in Kisii County had an overall mean of 3.40 and a standard deviation of 0.84. This shows that students were not sure on the student councils' involvement in communication between students and administration in Kisii County. This infers that student councils were not involved by the administration in communication in the management of public secondary schools.

3.5 Student councils' views on their involvement in communication between students and administration

A total of 13 statements were used to establish the student councils' involvement in communication between students and administration in public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point Likert scale were summarized in Table 5. Majority of the student councils 206(78.7%) agreed that they promote positive communication with educators and school management, with 25(9.6%) undecided and 29(11.2%) disagreed (M=3.95; SD=1.06). Most of the student councils 205(78.8%) agreed that they promote good discipline of learners through meetings and discussions, with 36(13.9%) disagreed and 19(7.3%) undecided (M=3.93; SD=1.06).

Majority of the student councils 167(64%) agreed that they use communication channels to discuss our fears and frustrations, with 27(10.4%) undecided and 66(25.4%) disagreed (M=3.52; SD=1.37). Most of the student councils 152(58.4%) agreed that they participate freely in disciplinary meetings with school authority, with 82(31.5%) disagreed and 26(10%) undecided (M=3.39; SD=1.37). Majority of the student councils 204(78.5%) agreed that they present students' problems, to the management with 13(5%) undecided and 43(16.6%) disagreed (M=3.93; SD=1.18).

Most of the student councils 195(75%) agreed that they present students' views regarding welfare programs, with 41(15.8%) disagreed and 24(9.2%) undecided (M=3.83; SD=1.14. Majority of the student councils 188(62.3%) agreed that they pass students' views regarding school management, with 27(10.4%) undecided and 45(17.3%) disagreed (M=3.76; SD=1.21). Most of the student councils 177(68.1%) agreed that they evaluate student-teacher relationship, with 54(20.7%) disagreed and 29(11.2%) undecided (M=3.63; SD=1.30). Majority of the student councils 159(61.2%) agreed that they hold regular meetings with school administration, with 29(11.2%) undecided and 72(27.7%) disagreed (M=3.50; SD=1.28).

Most of the student councils 146(56.2%) agreed that they air students' grievances to administration and 32(12.3%) disagreed (M=3.88; SD=1.09). Majority of the student councils 182(70%) agreed that they address students' emotional and personal needs, with 23(8.8%) undecided and 55(21.1%) disagreed (M=3.73; SD=1.24). Most of the student councils 233(89.6%) agreed that they report disciplinary cases to administration, with 17(6.6%) disagreed and 10(3.8%) undecided (M=4.29; SD=0.93). Majority of the student councils 195(75%) agreed that they enhance positive students' behavior and positive relationship with SC, with 30(11.5%) undecided and 35(13.4%) disagreed (M=3.97; SD=1.12).

Table 5 Student councils' views on their involvement in communication between students and administration

	SA		A		UD		D		SD		Mean	SD
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
We promote positive communication with educators and school management	84	32.3	122	46.9	25	9.6	16	6.2	13	5.0	3.95	1.06
We promote good discipline by holding	83	31.9	122	46.9	19	7.3	27	10.4	9	3.5	3.93	1.06

Statement	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean	SD
regular learners' meetings and discussion												
We use communication channels to discuss learners' fears and frustrations	70	26.9	97	37.3	27	10.4	29	11.2	37	14.2	3.52	1.37
We participate freely in disciplinary meetings with school authority	64	24.6	88	33.8	26	10.0	49	18.8	33	12.7	3.39	1.37
We present students' problems to the management	97	37.3	107	41.2	13	5.0	27	10.4	16	6.2	3.93	1.18
We present students' views regarding welfare programmes	79	30.4	116	44.6	24	9.2	25	9.6	16	6.2	3.83	1.14
We pass students' views regarding school management	77	29.6	111	42.7	27	10.4	23	8.8	22	8.5	3.76	1.21
We evaluate student-teacher relationship	73	28.1	104	40.0	29	11.2	23	8.8	31	11.9	3.63	1.30
We hold regular meetings with school administration	65	25.0	94	36.2	29	11.2	51	19.6	21	8.1	3.50	1.28
We are airing students' grievances to administration	111	42.7	35	13.5			19	7.3	13	5.0	3.88	1.09
We address students' emotional and personal needs	81	31.2	101	38.8	23	8.8	37	14.2	18	6.9	3.73	1.24
We report disciplinary cases to administration	127	48.8	106	40.8	10	3.8	9	3.5	8	3.1	4.29	0.93
We enhance positive students' behavior and positive relationship with SC	103	39.6	92	35.4	30	11.5	25	9.6	10	3.8	3.97	1.12
Mean											**3.79**	**0.69**

From the findings of the study, responses to the indicators of student councils' involvement in communication between students and administration in Kisii County had an overall mean of 3.79 and a standard deviation of 0.69. This shows that student councils agreed on their involvement in communication between students and administration in Kisii County.

3.6 Teachers' views on the student councils' involvement in communication between students and administration

A total of 13 statements were used to establish the teachers' views on student councils' involvement in communication between students and administration in public secondary schools and their responses elicited on a 5-point Likert scale were summarized in Table 6.

Majority of the teachers 228(80.1%) agreed that student leaders promote positive communication with educators and school management, with 22(7.7%) undecided and 35(12.3%) disagreed (M=3.86; SD=1.01).

Most of the teachers 198(69.5%) agreed that student leaders promote good discipline of learners through meetings and discussions, with 58(20.3%) disagreed and 29(10.2%) undecided (M=3.60; SD=1.1). Majority of the teachers 201(70.5%) agreed that student leaders use communication channels to discuss our fears and frustrations, with 33(11.6%) undecided and 51(17.9%) disagreed (M=3.67; SD=1.10). Most of the teachers 166(58.2%) agreed that student leaders participate freely in disciplinary meetings with school authority, with 84(29.5%) disagreed and 35(12.3%) undecided (M=3.38; SD=1.23). Majority of the teachers 231(81%) agreed that student leaders present students' problems, with 22(7.7%) undecided and 32(11.2%) disagreed (M=3.95; SD=0.97).

Most of the teachers 228(80%) agreed that student leaders present students' views regarding welfare programs, with 31(10.93%) disagreed and 26(9.1%) undecided (M=3.91; SD=0.99). Majority of the teachers 206(72.3%) agreed that student leaders pass students' views regarding school management, with 32(11.2%) undecided and 47(16.5%) disagreed (M=3.71; SD=1.08). Most of the teachers 167(58.6%) agreed that student leaders evaluate student-teacher relationship, with 69(24.2%) disagreed and 49(17.2%) undecided (M=3.40; SD=1.09). Majority of the teachers 197(69.1%) agreed that student leaders hold regular meetings with school administration, with 29(10.2%) undecided and 59(20.7%) disagreed (M=3.63; SD-1.13).

Most of the teachers 212(74.4%) agreed that student leaders air students' grievances to the administration, with 38(13.3%) disagreed and 35(12.3%) undecided (M=3.85; SD=1.07). Majority of the teachers 190(66.7%) agreed that student leaders' addresses students' emotional and personal needs, with 35(12.3%) undecided and 60(21%) disagreed (M=3.56; SD=1.11). Most of the teachers 227(83.2%) agreed that student leaders report disciplinary cases to administration, with 26(9.2%) disagreed and 22(7.7%) undecided (M=4.00; SD=0.90). Majority of the teachers 214(75.1%) agreed that student leaders enhances positive students' behavior and positive relationship with SC, with 31(10.9%) undecided and 40(14%) disagreed (M=3.78; SD=1.04).

From the findings of the study, responses to the indicators of student councils' involvement in communication between students and administration in Kisii County had an overall mean of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 0.71. This shows that teachers agreed on student councils' involvement in communication between students and administration in Kisii County.

Table 6. Teachers views on their involvement in communication between students and administration

	SA		A		UD		D		SD		Mean	SD
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Student councils promote positive communication with educators and school management	65	22.9	163	57.2	22	7.7	21	7.4	14	4.9	3.86	1.01

Student councils promote good discipline by holding regular learners' meetings and discussion	47	16.5	151	53.0	29	10.2	42	14.7	16	5.6	3.60	1.10
Student councils use communication channels to discuss learners' fears and frustrations	56	19.6	145	50.9	33	11.6	35	12.3	16	5.6	3.67	1.10
Student councils participate freely in disciplinary meetings with school authority	50	17.5	116	40.7	35	12.3	61	21.4	23	8.1	3.38	1.23
Present students' problems	79	27.7	152	53.3	22	7.7	24	8.4	8	2.8	3.95	0.97
Present students' views regarding welfare programs	73	25.6	155	54.4	26	9.1	20	7.0	11	3.9	3.91	0.99
Passing students' views regarding school management	59	20.7	147	51.6	32	11.2	32	11.2	15	5.3	3.71	1.08
Evaluating student-teacher relationship	33	11.6	134	47.0	49	17.2	52	18.2	17	6.0	3.40	1.09
Holding regular meetings with school administration	57	20.0	140	49.1	29	10.2	43	15.1	16	5.6	3.63	1.13
Airing students' grievances to administration	80	28.1	132	46.3	35	12.3	26	9.1	12	4.2	3.85	1.06
Addresses students' emotional and personal needs	47	16.5	143	50.2	35	12.3	44	15.4	16	5.6	3.56	1.11
Reporting disciplinary cases to administration	80	28.1	157	55.1	22	7.7	21	7.4	5	1.8	4.00	0.90
Enhances positive students' behavior and positive relationship with SC	61	21.4	153	53.7	31	10.9	26	9.1	14	4.9	3.78	1.04
Mean											**3.72**	**0.71**

The interviews were conducted among the principals in public secondary schools in Kisii County to establish ways student council help link students to the school management. The findings were analyzed based on the themes emanating from their response. One of the principals stated that "they help inform on matters affecting students, they assist on disseminating information, they supervise programs on the absence of teachers, Convey the students' concerns to the administration, give feedback and explains the students' concerns in the school".

One of the principals stated that the "student council obtain student problems during class meetings, dorm meetings and communicate to administration. Other students communicate to administration through the council members". One of the principals stated that the student council "communicate student problems to school management, report cases of indiscipline to school management, ensure school policies and rules are observed by the students."

One of the principals stated that the student council "through meetings, they talk on behalf of others (Barazas, Assemblies), informing administration about student grievances, reporting welfare matters to the administration, providing feedback from parents, teachers, support staff to the students". Therefore, link with other students by disseminating information and giving feedback to the management. One of the principals stated that the student council "in their weekly meetings, they pass on issues raised by the students to the school administration which helps in timely interventions." It assists in disseminating the decisions made and is able to give the required feedback.

3.7 Correlation Analysis

Pearson's moment correlation was used to establish the influence of student councils' involvement in communication and management of public schools in Kisii County. There was a significant positive and strong relationship between student councils' involvement in communication ($r= 0.724$, $p =0.000$) and management of public secondary schools as shown in Table 7. Therefore, an increased student councils' involvement in communication led to improvement in management of public secondary schools.

Table 7 Correlation between student councils' involvement in communication and management of public schools

		Management	Communication
Management	Pearson Correlation	1	.724[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
Communication	Pearson Correlation	.724[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

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

b. Listwise N=285

3.8 Regression analysis

A linear regression model was used to explore the effect of student councils' involvement in communication and management of public secondary schools. From the model, ($R^2 = .525$) showed that student councils' involvement in communication account for 52.5% variation in management of public schools. The R^2 represented the measure of variability in management of public secondary schools that communication accounted for. The communication predictor used in the model captured the variation in the management of public secondary schools as shown in table 8.

Table 8 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.724[a]	.525	.523	.53001

a. Predictors: (Constant), Communication

The analysis of variance was used to test whether the model could significantly fit in predicting the outcome than using the mean as shown in (Table 9). The regression model with student councils' involvement in communication as a predictor was significant (F=312.27, p value =0.000) shows that there is a significant relationship between student councils' involvement in communication and management of public schools.

Table 9 Analysis of Variance

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	87.720	1	87.720	312.271	.000[b]
	Residual	79.497	283	.281		
	Total	167.217	284			

a. Dependent Variable: Management

b. Predictors: (Constant), Communication

In addition, the β coefficients for student councils' involvement in communication as independent variable were generated from the model, in order to test the hypotheses under study. Table 10 shows the estimates of β-value and gives contribution of the predictor to the model. The β-value for student councils' involvement in communication had a positive coefficient, depicting positive relationship with management of public schools as summarized in the model as:

Y = .713+0.780X1 + ε ………………………….………… Equation 1

Where: Y = Management of public schools, X1 = Communication, ε = error term

From the findings the t-test associated with β-values was significant and the student councils' involvement in communication predictor was making a significant contribution to the model. The coefficients result in table 11 showed that the predicted parameter in relation to the independent factor was significant ($\beta_1 = 0.780$; P<0.05).

Table 11 Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.713	.167		4.273	.000
	Communication	.780	.044	.724	17.671	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Management

The study hypothesized that there is no statistically significant effect of student councils' involvement in communication on management of public schools. The study findings depicted that there was a positive significant effect of student councils' involvement in communication on management of public schools ($\beta 1=0.780$ and p value <0.05).

Therefore, an increase in student councils' involvement in communication led to an increase in management of public schools. The null hypothesis (Ho1) was rejected. Therefore, student councils' involvement in communication had a significant influence on management of public schools. This implies that for each increase in student councils' involvement in communication, there was more management of public schools.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

It was concluded that involving student council to act as a link between students and school administration, representative council of student's acts as an important instrument for liaison and communication and must meet at fairly regular intervals, with educators and other school stakeholders to consider ideas, suggestions, comments and even complaints from the students. Schools should build the necessary frameworks and communication avenues for developing student councils.

REFERENCES

Indimuli, K. (2012). Effective student's council a tool kit for student's council leadership, Nairobi: Track academic solutions is BN 978996 – 615 5078.

Kambuga, Y. & Omollo, A. (2017). Understanding studnets' leadership role and challenges in secondary schools in Tanzania. Asian Research Journal of Arts and Social Sciences, 2 (3), 1 – 10.

Kamuri,P.K. (2014).The Students Council. A Handbook for Every Student Leader: Nairobi.

Kiprop, C., & Tikoko, J. (2011). The nature of students' participation in decision making in Secondary School. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1, p23.

Kiprop, C. J. (2012). Approaches to Management of Discipline in Secondary Schools in Kenya. International Journal of Research in Management, 2(2).

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

Malenya, F. L. (2014). The Phenomenon of Student Violence in the Context of Student Unrest in Kenyan Secondary Schools. Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, Kenyatta University

Mukiri, H. (2014). Prefects in enhancing students discipline in public secondary schools in Kenya. Nairobi University.

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

Muli, M. (2012). Role of Prefect in Governance of Public Secondary School in Machakos Central Division Machakos District. M.Ed. Unpublished Thesis. Kenyatta University.

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

Mutua, T. (2014). Role of students governing council in secondary school's management in Kenya. Kenyatta University: Nairobi

Ngwokabuenui, P. Y. (2015). Students" Indiscipline: Types, Causes and Possible Solutions: The Case of Secondary Schools in Cameroon. Journal of Education and Practice, Vol.6 (No.22).

Njue, N. (2014). Prefects as a link between students and administration in upholding of discipline in public secondary schools in Kenya. Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology: Kenya.

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

Pérez-Expósito, L. (2015). Scope and quality of student participation in school: towards an analytical framework for adolescents, 20:3, 346-374, International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 20(3), 346-374.

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