
**AN INFLUENCE OF STUDENT LEADERS 'ELECTION
CRITERIA ON MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING
OUTCOMES IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN
MANDERA WEST SUB COUNTY**

***¹Mohamed Abdi Hukay & ²Dr. Ruth Thinguri**

¹Student, Mount Kenya University

²Lecturer, Mount Kenya University

***Email of corresponding author: mabidi337@gmail.com**

Publication Date: October 2023

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study: The purpose of the study was to examine the influence of student leaders 'election criteria on management decision making outcomes in public secondary schools in Mandera West Sub County in Kenya.

Methodology: The study adopted a comprehensive approach, combining both quantitative and qualitative methods simultaneously, following a triangulation plan. The researcher sampled 195 student leaders, 55 department heads, and 10 heads of various public secondary schools in the study site where data was collected using questionnaires and interview schedule.

Findings of the study: The research findings conclude that there were varied opinions on direct appointment by management and by students' selection criteria.

Conclusion: The study concludes that there is no single best way to select student leaders. The best approach will vary depending on the specific context and needs of the school community.

Recommendations: The study recommends that school management further explore and assess the views and preferences of stakeholders, including students, teachers, and parents, regarding the selection criteria for student leaders.

Keywords: *Student Leaders, Election Criteria, Management Decision Making, Outcomes in Public Secondary Schools, Mandera West Sub County*

INTRODUCTION

Student leadership programs provide continuous learning opportunities for students to understand their leadership roles better. They focus on enhancing students' adherence to school rules, promoting respect, punctuality, and improving academic performance. These programs aim to create a mutually reinforcing network among diverse types of student leaders to maintain discipline within their schools. This paper examined the influence of student leaders' election criteria on management decision making outcomes in public secondary schools in Mandera West Sub County in Kenya.

Worldwide, arrangement of sharing authority has grown to account for more representing in the process of formulating of decisions. In keeping with these assertions, David (2011) posits that student participation in management is the procedure of involving students as associates in each area of institutional changes for solidification their obligation to schooling and democratization. David (2011) posits that students' participation in management and management ought to be focused in chosen student representation or council. This means, the body is a representation figure of learners chosen by their colleagues to voice the sentiments and requirements of the students in management issues like formulation of policy, time table, teachers' supervising, subject selecting, infrastructure arrangement and mentorship of peers. To substantiate these statements, Hoy and Miskel (2008) indicated that, presently, in many governments and private institution organizations in the US, Canada, Australia and Philippines, the councils are otherwise called Student Council Association, Associated Student Body, council of students, government of students and Student Activity Council. In numerous Commonwealth institutions, councils of students are frequently learners in senior class who have significant authority and efficiently control the institutions outdoor (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). According to Hoy and Miskel (2008), councils of students in these institutions have their roles, tasks and distinct rights permitted to discipline colleagues who misbehave opposing the guidelines and rules.

According to David (2011), school preparedness in terms of students' selection criteria, students' participation forums, students' support, policy adherence and attitudinal preparedness are critical dynamics which determine students' participation in school management. Nevertheless, like other associations, the schools need to run efficiently. This is to say there are primarily human resourcing, monetary resources, legal and technological nature. Institutional leaders are faced with immense challenges in knowing the various instruments of administration and likewise in keeping the obligatory professionalism and follow the pertinent

Acts of Education to efficiently manage the institution events (World Bank, 2008). Cognizant of these developments, Weindling and Dimmock (2006) posit that, in the present worldwide education atmosphere, where numerous challenges and external pressure to achieve better have been identified, there is growing recognizing of the need of participatory institutional management in backing up changes and providing quality education. As an outcome, the numerous participants have augmented their prospects of institutional managers, requiring higher results in academics and performing standards.

In this background, it is vital to orientate again the responsibility of the institutional administration and categorise the methods of management activities, manners and practices that effect the chief drive of an institution's undertaking, that of propelling students' learning. From such a re-orientating, particular areas of institution managing need adjusting like those that identify students as significant persons in decision-making procedure (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011). In UK, David (2011) established that meaningful learner participation is the procedure of making engagement with learners as associates in each angle of school changes for solidification of their obligation to schooling and democratization. Participation of students in managing ought to be focused within voted for councils of students (David, 2011). This means, the council of students is a representing figure of learners voted by their colleagues to air the sentiments and wishes of the scholars in management issues like formulating policy, time table making, teacher supervising, selecting subjects, infrastructure scheduling and peer mentorship.

To validate these proclamations, Hoy and Miskel (2008) indicated that, currently, in many communities and private school arrangements in Canada, Australia, USA and Philippines, the establishments are otherwise permitted as council of students, student government and also Associated Student Body. In numerous institutions in commonwealth, the establishments are regularly learners in the higher grades who have substantial authority and successfully control the institutions in outdoor activities (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). The student councils in those institutions have their obligations, tasks, distinct rights in which they are permitted to discipline students who misbehave and fail to obey the instructions and guidelines (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In line with those statements, in an investigate done in Austria, Kythreotis, Pashiardis & Kyriakides (2010) showed that participation of learners in institution managing advances efficiency in schools and student attainment.

Kythreotis et al (2010) additionally say that participation of student leadership in school administration supports them in being vigorous partakers of the entire schooling procedure,

from plans, mobilization of resources, implementation, assessment and evaluation of the learning programmes, amenities and strategies. Nevertheless, they are occasionally controlled whereby cases is beyond their framework. The responsibilities of the councils comprise role modeling for others, to encourage the philosophy of institution, keep the levels of disciplining, attend activities and council of student forums as needed and to guarantee every student adheres to complete institutional instructions and rules. Macky as well as Johnson (2003) whereas investigating on learners' opinions on kids' rights in New Zealand, stated that where councils were invited in administration of the school, learners were more expected to be entangled in a variety of administration matters, given a larger sense of institution possessing and catapulting problem resolution skills and refining conduct.

In reality, every institution is special with its own guidelines and rules, which students' councils support as they impact their colleagues to observe them. Many nations in Africa's Sub-Sahara are not an exceptional and schools have frequently seen fierce disturbances from learners (World Bank, 2008). Harber and Dadey (2014) utilized facts from Nigerian schools to maintain that institutions where learners were never consulted in making decisions or were never involved when vital pronouncements were made, resulted to fierceness to exhaust their woes and differences. Harber and Dadey (2014) established that that the councils permitted the issues to be deliberated beforehand to avert more problems. South African Republic announced decentralized management in schools and democracy sharing making of decisions using South African Schools Act, No. 84 of 1996 (RSA, 1996). In referring to the Act, teachers, heads, non-teaching workers and students, in institutions were allowed to be selected in the School Governing Bodies.

Referring to Kenya Secondary Schools Heads Association, the two thousand and eight meeting began with a throughst to begin learners' management at the class and institution level all over Kenya. The managements were anticipated could produce collaborating discussions amongst the learners and managers where matters touching them would be deliberated before they deteriorated into complete disturbances. In this meeting secondary, the learners voiced their desires and complaints so plainly amazing education ministry top leaders plus the education minister. Nonetheless, the necessity to set up student managements at schools did not kick off as fast as anticipated in counties across the country (KSSSC, 2010). Referring to these declarations, Muthamia (2001) held that, so as to enhance inter-student discussions and progress a sense of community, a component of strategy and organization was compulsory within the body of students. Nevertheless, the students' councils are supposed to keep in touch

with matters and activities that learners are interested in, and communicating info and consider sentiments of leaners. Consequently, evocative and focused student involvement is a tactical aim. Therefore, it is necessary to include learners in administration.

In the sub county of Nakuru, the participation of students' councils in the managing and administration of the institutions hasn't been plainly given a definition (Obondo, 2013). This infers that learners haven't been sufficiently collaborated in organizing, sourcing, planning or guiding, and directing the school events. So far, it is an obligation that partaking of students in the school management be improved (RoK, 2012). In Mandera West Sub- County, gradually the part played by management is known to be significant for giving and bringing real services at every level of education. Institutional policy making is far more probable to be fruitful where it is evidently comprehended and acknowledged by every partner inside the institution population (Republic of Kenya, 2012). Nevertheless, a lot is yet to be completed to establish how student leaders 'election criteria influence management decision making outcomes in public secondary schools in Mandera West Sub County in Kenya.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The election and decision-making roles of student leaders play a crucial part in achieving school objectives. There has been a pressing need to increase students' involvement in decision-making processes within educational institutions in Mandera Central Sub-County. This call for greater student participation arises from frequent disruptions caused by students in these institutions (Kindiki, 2019). Advocates of student involvement in decision-making argue that decisions made without their input can negatively impact students, both in obvious and subtle ways. By involving students in decision-making, the hope is that they will not only accept but also take ownership of decisions that affect them. Nevertheless, despite the compelling arguments in favor of student involvement in decision-making, recent observations, as highlighted by the Government of Kenya (GoK, 2021), indicate that many educators have shifted away from the concept of students being active partners in school administration. Consequently, schools continue to grapple with managerial inefficiencies, low student performance, and an increase in disciplinary problems in most secondary schools. To tackle this concerning situation, it becomes imperative to examine the readiness of schools, encompassing factors such as the criteria used for selecting student leaders and the overall decision-making processes within secondary school management. This study aims to provide insights into these crucial aspects, with the goal of addressing the existing challenges in secondary education.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- i. To examine the influence of direct appointment by teachers on management decision making outcomes in public secondary schools in Mandera West Sub County
- ii. To establish the influence of students voting for their leaders on management decision making outcomes in public secondary schools in in Mandera West Sub County
- iii. To establish the influence of adherence to selection criteria of open competitive selection on management decision making outcomes in public secondary schools in in mandera west sub county

LITERATURE REVIEW

The school administration frequently creates the selection criteria for student leaders. Menon (2005) claims that secondary school administration typically appoints student leaders or occasionally gives general students the chance to participate in voting the leaders. According to Menon (2005), the process by which student leaders are chosen or elected is crucial in ensuring that judgments are as accurate as the actual variances in educational life that councils contribute to. Menon (2005) makes the further observation that student bodies are most likely to show successful in school decision-making when the selection criteria are perceived as just. These results indicate that student councils operate effectively provided the board is seen to be accurate by other students and if it was established through a democratic process.

The concepts of election, mentoring, and peer election are properly stated in counseling. A person's way of exchange, according to Pritchard (2007), depending on an idea which many people choose to ask the peers to assist while dealing with obstacles, nervousness, and a wide range of other problems. He is aware that junior undergrads occasionally experience emotional distress when switching from top to optional schools, necessitating the creation of a coordinated support system. To put it another way, when students enroll in school for initial times, some experiences emotional unease due to variations in the culture and behavior and the development of gaps (Steinhardt and Dolbeire, 2008).

In a study conducted in Philadelphia, Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) found that individuals under study inside the student chamber give their less experienced partners a chance for self-skill and personal growth through character or group mediation. Through guidance and coaching, one can gain knowledge of oneself and the surroundings, which results to the personal growth and excellent making decision. To support these claims, Smylie, Conley, and Imprints (2002) found in the research carried out in the Chicago that understudy chamber serves as the mentors that

provide the young colleagues with a wealth of knowledgeable to aid in enhancing the behavior, disciplines, and a few particular fundamental skills that are deemed appropriate in the job market.

According to Smylie et al. (2002), committee members are picked to assist their younger cohorts in being ensnared in the process of seeking for persons who performed better and asks them to train them to particular job. This relates to facts any lower-level student seeking the mentor, or an expert from the the research committee, is expected to be looking for helpful and appealing behavior styles and character, rather than a simple successful musical record. Undergraduate voting pioneer gives under examination a risk to artistic works on their problems and nerves free from stress and psychological oppression. Smylie et al. (2002) claim that friend regulating was pushed into the companions 'advisors' reverence, compassions, reality, etc.

With the skills, the students peer counselors are able to establish a relationship with a person they are guiding, make it simple to forge a connection and a patient to reaches thorough outcomes. This supports the claims made by Ringer (2002) described political races as a fantastic tool that provides students advisors with advisory tactics and processes that makes it easier for them direct the friends and additionally assist researchers. Ringer (2002) also observed that understands peer minds provides an acceptable way for achieving the expanding goals of understudies who require individual assistance. As the friends 'advisors assist the undergrads in obtaining further develops results, anticipating appropriately behavior, taking delivery of them, and taking delivery best approach for lifestyles tying it to their cycle benefits and enjoyment, Chime (2002) acknowledges the process of adjusting to something which immerse under analysis ins a chamber. This implies that a study can identify the positions' interests and the decisions on professions and other things through tutoring and peer political decision-making.

According to research, supplemental schools in Sub-Saharan Africa have accepted the concept of buddy political campaigns and student tutors as an efficient master the advising technique (World bank, 2008). For instance, in Botswana, the institution began a companion coaching and advising program in the year 1000 under the direction of a researcher chamber after this mindfulness. This program produced remarkable results, which became apparent when the under study revealed their analysis. Careers and Guidance the College of Botswana's friend determination program focuses on giving students training and equipping them with the skills they need to aid their partners (Imprints & Printy, 2003). It enables the subject of the

investigation to work around test-related troubles with the understanding assistance of their friends.

Peer counselors differ from professionals in that they offer patients access to them whenever they need it and hold unofficial counseling sessions. They talk frankly without threatening each other. Some academics have long understood how peer selection works in universities. Peer selection enabled pupils to acknowledge one another and recognize the importance of education, according to research (Marks & Printy, 2003).

Peer choices believes that because partners have a better understanding of one another, they can influence and replace one another. Sithole (1998), aware of these viewpoints, established that the surrender under analysis is expected to create its owns data set of probable study boards guide and arrange activities planning for the associations. This research was conducted in a KwaZulu Natal Region of Southern Africa. Before approaching the potential coaches, they must first guarantee what they need to get from them. These findings also corroborate the idea that student mentoring has evolved into a reliable path to determining the status of those under investigation. The students 'mentors help the younger members adjust to the new schedule and way of life of voluntary school attendance.

Understudy chamber plays a crucial role in guiding new undergrads in Kenya (RoK, 2012). An investigation conducted in Machakos by Muli (2011) discovered that researchers 'committees coach the supportive relationships in their collaboration in programs for mentorship and regularly take pleasure in helping a less-experienced understudy, potentially influencing his or her way of life positive ways. Manderu West sub county cannot be an exception, with the understudy committee be one of important optional resources. Member of the understudy board act as friend mentor new examination, the companion mentees, in a certain issue, method of acting, or lifestyle (Muli, 2011). For instance, Kindiki (2009) reported that an experimental study conducted in the Manderu West Sub-Province revealed that the formation of student committees was influenced by the necessity of advancing employable training, learning about, and the fundamental need to manage unrest among the schools in this nation.

According to Kindiki (2009), researcher principals play a significant and amazing role in mentoring junior freshmen. They organize extracurricular activities, handle minor acts of disobedience, and oversee funding from the government for particular researchers. They also oversee learning opportunities for additional young partners after school and monitor engagement. These findings support the idea that the distribution of student executives

constitutes an important component of a student's male or female growth, outlining their sense of responsibility and positive contribution higher than ever. However, Kindiki (2009) omitted to include the special political race criteria that were made by using extra resources in order to educate the executives. In many ways, Kindiki (2009) fails to demonstrate the impact that researcher chamber political race norms have had on the management of the optional school.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Group Decision-Making Theory

The groups decisions-making methodology developed by Vroom and Yetton (see Caldwell, 2002) guided the investigation. It claims that managers must consider a range of responses—from authoritarian to consultative—and then employ the management approach that best suits decisions states. The model demonstrates how managers should approach choices involving groups. According to the paradigm, there isn't a management strategy that works in every circumstance. The normative model measures a manager's effectiveness through decision efficiency. This is based on three criteria: the decision's quality, acceptability, and timeliness. It advises managers to be able to use five different decision-making processes, ranging from highly authoritarian to extremely participatory.

The manager makes the decision on their own in the first technique, also referred to as the excessively autocratic method. The manager in the following, which is less autocratic, requests for information from juniors but takes the decision alone. The third strategy is consulting, where supervisors discuss problems with junior staff members and request their knowledge and opinions. However, managers make the choice on their own. The managers and juniors meets as a teams to discuss the issue fourth in making decision, knowing greater consultation approach, but the managers make the final decision. The fifth decision-making process, referred to the "extreme consulting," entails the manager and juniors holding a conference to discuss the matters before coming to a decision as a team. An explanation of how the group decision theory's normative theory can be used to planned study on council of students' involvement in school administration.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this study, a comprehensive approach was employed, combining both quantitative and qualitative methods simultaneously, following a triangulation plan. The research targeted a diverse group of participants, including 735 students, 35 administrators, 175 departmental heads, and 525 student leaders. Out of these, 260 respondents from ten public schools

participated in the research. To account for the diversity within Mandera West Sub County, the study divided the examination into five distinct levels. Each level was represented by two directors and 11 division heads, selected through a purposeful sampling approach. Additionally, 39 student leaders from each region were randomly chosen for the study. In total, the researcher successfully recruited 195 student leaders, 55 department heads, and 10 heads of various institutions. The data analysis process began with identifying common themes within the participants' records of their contributions. Descriptive statistics, such as mean and standard deviation, were used for data summarization, while inferential statistics, particularly ANOVA, were applied using Statistical Packages for Social Science (SPSS 24) for deeper analysis.

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This research examined the influence of student leaders 'election criteria on management decision making outcomes in Mandera West Sub county. Three levels of analysis were employed namely: descriptive, inferential and thematic; and then there was mixing and interpreting of the data. In this study, the researcher analyzed data collected in descriptive statistics and presented it in frequencies, tables and percentages. The data was analyzed and presented according to the study objective as it is seen underneath in the case of the first objective regarding students 'leaders' mode of selection.

Table 1: Extent of Head of Departments Agreement on Selection Criteria

	N	Mean	Std. D
Direct appointment of student leaders by teachers has enhanced their participation in school policy formulation.	49	2.4490	.61445
Infrastructural management has been made easy by direct appointment of student leaders in my school	49	2.5918	.57440
Students select their leaders by voting to be involved in formulation of school rules and regulations	49	2.8367	.58974
The number of trips students in my school participate depends on the student council	49	3.1224	.56394
Students councils organize co-curricular and encourages participation in the same	49	3.3469	.52245
Student council plans tournaments among students in my school and other schools	49	3.4694	.50423
Student vote in their colleagues to sit in a panel which decides on the number of co-curricular activities the students should take part in	49	3.9796	.14286

On average, the participants moderately disagreed with the notion that direct appointment of student leaders by teachers enhanced their participation in school policy formulation. This suggests that the participants may feel that other methods or factors contribute more significantly to student involvement in policy formulation. The relatively high standard deviation indicates a considerable variation in opinions among the participants. The participants, on average, moderately disagreed that the direct appointment of student leaders in

their school has made infrastructural management easy. This implies that they do not perceive student leaders' appointment as a significant factor in facilitating infrastructural management. The standard deviation suggests diverse opinions among the participants regarding this criterion. The participants, on average, slightly disagreed that student involvement in the formulation of school rules and regulations occurs through voting for their leaders. This indicates a perception that voting alone may not be an effective means of ensuring meaningful student participation in rule-making. The standard deviation suggests some variation in responses but is relatively lower compared to the previous criteria. On average, the participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the student council determines the number of trips students participate in. This suggests a lack of consensus regarding the influence of the student council on organizing school trips. The standard deviation indicates moderate variation in responses.

The participants, on average, slightly agreed that student councils in their school organize co-curricular activities and encourage participation. This indicates a perception that student councils play a role in promoting and coordinating co-curricular involvement. The standard deviation suggests relatively low variation in responses. The participants, on average, slightly agreed that the student council plans tournaments among students in their school and other schools. This suggests a recognition of the student council's involvement in organizing inter-school tournaments. The standard deviation indicates relatively low variation in responses. On average, the participants agreed that students vote for their colleagues to sit on a panel responsible for determining the number of co-curricular activities they should participate in. This indicates a perception that student voting is an effective method of determining student involvement in co-curricular activities. The low standard deviation suggests a high level of agreement among the participants regarding this criterion.

Table 2: Extent of Student Leaders Agreement on Selection Criteria

	N	Mean	Std. D
Direct appointment of student leaders by teachers has enhanced their participation in school policy formulation	171	2.0994	.59066
Infrastructural management has been made easy by direct appointment of student leaders in my school	171	2.4152	.51746
Students select their leaders by voting to be involved in formulation of school rules and regulations	171	2.6199	.53298
The number of trips students in my school participate depends on the student council	171	3.0585	1.50961
Students councils organize co-curricular and encourages participation in the same	171	3.1287	.41423
Student council plans tournaments among students in my school and other schools	171	3.4620	.58663
Student vote in their colleagues to sit in a panel which decides on the number of co-curricular activities the students should take part in	171	3.7544	.65836

On whether direct appointment of student leaders by teachers has enhanced their participation in school policy formulation, the majority of respondents disagreed (mean = 2.0994, SD = 0.59066). The average response indicates moderate agreement (closer to disagreement) among student leaders regarding the enhancement of their participation in school policy formulation through direct appointment by teachers. The standard deviation suggests some variability in the responses. On whether infrastructural management has been made easy by direct appointment of student leaders in my school, the majority of respondents disagreed (mean = 2.4152, SD = 0.51746). The average response suggests moderate agreement (closer to disagreement) among student leaders regarding the ease of infrastructural management through direct appointment of student leaders. The standard deviation indicates some variability in the responses.

Respondents were neutral that students select their leaders by voting to be involved in the formulation of school rules and regulations a shown by (*Mean: 2.6199, Std. Deviation:*

0.53298). The average response indicates a moderate agreement (closer to disagreement) among student leaders regarding the involvement of students in the formulation of school rules and regulations through voting. The standard deviation suggests some variability in the responses. Respondents were neutral that the number of trips students in my school participate depends on the student council as shown by (Mean: 3.0585, Std. Deviation: 1.50961). The average response indicates a moderate agreement (closer to agreement) among student leaders regarding the influence of the student council on the number of trips students participate in. The high standard deviation suggests significant variability in the responses.

On whether student councils organize co-curricular activities and encourage participation in the same, respondents were neutral, as indicated by a mean of 3.1287 and a standard deviation of 0.41423. The average response indicates moderate agreement (closer to agreement) among student leaders regarding the organization of co-curricular activities by student councils and their encouragement of participation. The low standard deviation suggests relatively less variability in the responses. Respondents were neutral that student councils plan tournaments among students in their school and other schools, as shown by a mean of 3.4620 and a standard deviation of 0.58663. The average response indicates moderate agreement (closer to agreement) among student leaders regarding the planning of tournaments by student councils among students in their school and other schools. The standard deviation suggests some variability in the responses. There was agreement that students vote for their colleagues to sit on a panel that decides the number of co-curricular activities they should take part in, as indicated by a mean of 3.7544 and a standard deviation of 0.65836. The average response indicates a relatively strong agreement among student leaders regarding students' involvement in decision-making about the number of co-curricular activities through voting. The standard deviation suggests some variability in the responses.

INFERENCE ANALYSIS

The researcher conducted ANOVA test to examine the association between the variables and checked if the expected proportions met the reality of the experiments. This means the investigator compared the observed data to what was expected to be seen under normal circumstances. The judgement was based on either due to chance or due to significant association. The tests were done in all the four objectives of the study using information from heads of departments and student leaders from their questionnaires. The results were displayed from table.

Table 3: ANOVA for Head of Departments

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.381	4	.095	2.5	.052 ^b
	Residual	1.635	44	.037	60	
	Total	2.015	48			

In Table 3, the ANOVA (analysis of variance) results for the Head of Departments' regression model are presented. The ANOVA helps assess the overall significance of the regression model and the predictor variables. The p-value (0.052) is greater than the commonly used significance level of 0.05. Therefore, we do not have sufficient evidence to conclude that the regression model, as a whole, is statistically significant in predicting the "Management Decision Making Outcomes." The p-value is marginally higher than the significance level, suggesting that the relationship between the predictor variables (Policy Adherence, Students Participation Forums, School Support, and Selection Criteria) and the outcome variable may be close to being statistically significant but does not reach the conventional threshold.

In summary, the ANOVA results indicate that the overall significance of the regression model is not statistically significant at a conventional level ($p > 0.05$). However, it's important to consider other factors, such as effect sizes, domain knowledge, and the specific context of the study, to draw meaningful conclusions from the regression analysis.

Table 4: ANOVA for Student Leaders

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.128	4	.032	.553	.697 ^b
	Residual	9.592	166	.058		
	Total	9.720	170			

The table provides information about the analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the regression model that includes the predictors: Policy Adherence, School Support, Students Participation Forums, and Selection Criteria. The regression sum of squares is 0.128. It represents the variation in the dependent variable, Management Decision Making Outcomes, that is explained

by the predictors in the model. The residual sum of squares is 9.592. It represents the unexplained variation or the variability that remains after accounting for the predictors in the model. The total sum of squares is 9.720. It represents the total variation in the dependent variable, Management Decision Making Outcomes. For the regression model, there are 4 degrees of freedom associated with the predictors, representing the number of predictors minus one. For the residual, there are 166 degrees of freedom, representing the number of observations minus the number of predictors. The total degrees of freedom is 170, which is the sum of the degrees of freedom for the regression and the residual.

The mean square for the regression is 0.032, which is calculated by dividing the regression sum of squares by the degrees of freedom for the regression. The mean square for the residual is 0.058, which is calculated by dividing the residual sum of squares by the degrees of freedom for the residual. The F-statistic is 0.553, calculated by dividing the mean square for the regression by the mean square for the residual. It measures the ratio of the explained variance to the unexplained variance in the dependent variable. The corresponding p-value (Significance) is 0.697. It represents the probability of obtaining an F-statistic as extreme as the one observed, assuming that there is no significant relationship between the predictors and the dependent variable.

Based on the results, the F-statistic is not statistically significant ($p = 0.697$). This suggests that the predictors (Policy Adherence, School Support, Students Participation Forums, and Selection Criteria) do not have a significant combined effect on the dependent variable, Management Decision Making Outcomes. The regression model with the given predictors does not provide strong evidence to support a significant relationship between the predictors and the dependent variable. The majority of the variation in the dependent variable remains unexplained by the predictors included in the model. It may be necessary to explore alternative predictors or consider different modeling techniques to better understand and explain the factors influencing Management Decision Making Outcomes.

Table 5: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.435a	.189	.115	.19275

The provided Model Summary (Table 30) presents the statistics for a regression model used to predict the Head of Departments' outcome variable based on four predictor variables: Policy Adherence, Students Participation Forums, Schools, and Support and Selection Criteria. The correlation coefficient (multiple correlation coefficient) represents the strength and direction

of the linear relationship between the predictor variables and the outcome variable. In this case, the value of R is 0.435. The coefficient of determination indicates the proportion of the variance in the outcome variable that can be explained by the predictor variables. In this model, R-squared is 0.189, meaning that approximately 18.9% of the variance in the Head of Departments' outcome variable can be explained by the predictor variables. This is a modified version of R-squared that takes into account the number of predictor variables and the sample size. The adjusted R-squared is 0.115, suggesting that around 11.5% of the variance in the outcome variable can be explained by the predictor variables after accounting for these factors. This value represents the standard deviation of the residuals (the differences between the observed and predicted values of the outcome variable). In this model, the standard error of the estimate is 0.19275. Regarding the p-values, they are not directly provided in the Model Summary table. However, it is common practice to analyze the statistical significance of individual predictor variables using the p-values in regression analysis. By assessing the p-values for each predictor variable, we can determine their significance in the model. Based on the provided Model Summary, we can conclude that the predictor variables as a whole (taken together) have a modest relationship with the Head of Departments' outcome variable, as indicated by the R and R-squared values. However, without the p-values for the predictor variables, we cannot make conclusions about their individual significance in the model.

Table 6: Model Summary for Student Leaders

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.115 ^a	.013	-.011	.24038

The summary table provides information about the regression model that includes the following predictors: Policy Adherence, School Support, Students Participation Forums, and Selection Criteria. The multiple correlation coefficient, denoted as R, is 0.115. It measures the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the predictors and the dependent variable, Management Decision Making Outcomes. In this case, the value of R indicates a weak positive correlation. The coefficient of determination, R-squared, is 0.013. It represents the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that can be explained by the predictors in the model. In this case, the low R-squared value suggests that only a small portion (1.3%) of the variability in Management Decision Making Outcomes is explained by the predictors included in the model. The adjusted R-squared is -0.011. It is a modified version of R-squared that takes into account the number of predictors and sample size. The negative adjusted R-squared value suggests that the predictors in the model do not contribute significantly to explaining the variability in Management Decision Making Outcomes. The standard error of the estimate is 0.24038. It represents the average distance between the observed values of the dependent variable and the predicted values from the regression model. In this case, the relatively high

value of the standard error suggests that the model's predictions may have a considerable amount of error. Overall, the regression model with the predictors Policy Adherence, School Support, Students Participation Forums, and Selection Criteria does not appear to be a good fit for explaining the variability in Management Decision Making Outcomes. The low R-squared and negative adjusted R-squared values suggest that the predictors included in the model do not have a substantial impact on the dependent variable. Additionally, the relatively high standard error of the estimate indicates that the model's predictions may not be very accurate.

QUALITATIVE

The thematic analysis took two dimensions: first the researcher looked at the findings from the interview schedules for principals and county directors of education. Both dimensions were addressing student leaders 'election criteria on management decision making outcomes for objective one as indicated below: On the modes they would advise the heads of institution in their sub county to adopt in selecting student leaders, the county directors of education interviewees were of the view they should be varied depending on the sensitivity of the position while the principals 'feelings seem to vary with five principals feeling the students 'selection criteria mode should be direct appointment while three of them felt the selection criteria modes should be varied to allow for democracy. it was evident that the views of the principals and county directors of education varied.

. According to EO1,

—the selection mode of the students' leaders should be varied depending on the sensitivity of the position” (A Male Education Officer aged 44 years).

EO2 went on to say,

There is need for democracy and students' views should count to minimize students' opposition and to enhance buy in” (A Male Education Officer aged 46 years).

The investigator concluded then that from the voices of the education officers, who controlled education in the field, there was need to vary direct appointment and voting as selection modes for students 'leaders. To minimize students 'opposition there is need to allow students to vote especially in position that are very sensitive to enhance students buy in decision making. The school principals had divided views with five supporting direct appointment while three in favor of students voting similar sentiments as P1-P5 said,

—the selection mode should be varied between students voting and direct appointment depending with the sensitivity of positions and also to enhance democracy and a sense of belonging! Too late! (five principals held this position).

—three principals preferred voting by students for ownership purposes and adherence with policy guidelines (Three principals).

On the question on how do modes of selection of student leaders influence their participation in school management EO1

“The sub-county directors indicated that seeing themselves important in management, motivating them enables them to own the process outcomes”. (A Male Education Officer aged 44 years). EO2 went on to say,

—Mode of selection has an influence on school management outcomes, students voting assures democracy and students’ views should count to minimize students’ opposition and to enhance buy in” (A Male Education Officer aged 46 years).

On the question on How do modes of selection of student leaders influence their participation in school management all the principals agreed Mode of selection had an influence on school management outcomes P1-P8

—Mode of selection has an influence on school management outcomes, students voting assures inclusivity and students’ views should count to minimize students’ opposition/ Indisipline, strikes and to enhance buy in” (All eight principals).

So, from the voices of school principals and Sub county directors the mode of selection whether direct selection or student voting had an influence on school management outcomes since it created sense of ownership and inclusivity on the side of the students.

The data presents the distribution of the modes used to select council of students ‘members for the Head of Departments. Out of the total 49 HODs, the majority (80%) are selected through direct appointment, while a smaller portion (20%) are chosen through student voting. The data indicates that the primary mode used to select council of students ‘members for the Head of Departments is direct appointment. Based on the frequencies and percentages for two categories: "Direct appointment" and "Student voting." This mode of selecting members has the highest frequency and percentage, with 111 instances and 65% of the total selection process. Student voting is the second mode used in selecting members, with 60 instances and comprising 35% of the total selection process.

CONCLUSION

The HODs participants' responses suggest a moderate level of agreement with the involvement of student leaders and councils in various aspects of school policies, co-curricular activities, and decision-making processes. However, there is a considerable variation in opinions, indicating the presence of different perspectives among the participants. There is moderate

agreement among student leaders on most of the selection criteria, with some variability in the responses. However, the direct appointment of student leaders by teachers and the ease of infrastructural management through direct appointment receive relatively lower agreement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the data, it is recommended to school management to further explore and assess the views and preferences of stakeholders, including students, teachers, and parents, regarding the selection criteria for student leaders. This can help in developing a more inclusive and effective approach that promotes student participation, involvement, and representation in decision-making processes, policy formulation, and co-curricular activities.

REFERENCES

- Brauckmann, S. & Pashiardis, P. (2011). 'A Validation Study of the Leadership Styles of a Holistic Leadership Theoretical Framework'. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25 (1), 11–32. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541111100099>
- Bush, T. (2007). *Educational Leadership and Management: Theory, Policy, and Practice*. *South African Journal of Education*, 27 (3) 391-406.
- David, L. (2011). *Regulation & Regulatory Management. Handbook on the Politics of Regulation*, London; Edward Elgar.
- Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice* (8th Ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Kindiki, J. (2009). Effectiveness of boards of governors in curriculum implementation in secondary schools in Kenya. *Educational Research and Review* Vol. 4 (5), pp. 260
- Kythreotis, A., Pashiardis, P., & Kyriakides, L. (2010). The influence of school leadership styles and culture on students' achievement in Cyprus primary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(2), 218-240. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231011027860>
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 202-227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565829>
- Macky, K., & Johnson, G. (2003). *Managing Human Resources in New Zealand (2nd Ed.)*. North Ryde: McGraw Hill.
- Menon. M. E. (2005). Students view regarding their participation in University Governance: Implication for distributed leadership in Higher education. *Tertiary education and management*. Vol. 11. p. 167-182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2005.9967145>
- Muli, M. (2011). *The Role of Prefects in the Management of Public Secondary Schools in Machakos Central Division, Machakos District, Kenya*. Unpublished masters' thesis, Kenyatta University, Kenya.
- Muthamia, J. (2001). Handling Adolescents. *School Digest Jan-April* No. 9 p. 13-14.

- Obondo, A. (2013). *Politics of Participatory Decision-Making in Campus Management*. School of Education. University of Nairobi.
- Sithole, S. (2003). *The participation of students in democratic school management*. In *Democratic management of public schooling in South Africa* (pp.93-114). Natal: Education Policy Unit.
- Smylie, M., Conley, S., & Marks, H., (2002). *Exploring new approaches to teacher leadership for school improvement*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Weindling, D., & Dimmock, C. (2006). Sitting in the “hot seat”: new headteachers in the UK. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(4), 326-340. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230610674949>
- World Bank (2008). *Management, management, and accountability in secondary education in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank (2008). *Management, management, and accountability in secondary education in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington DC: The World Bank