

Extent of Student Participation in Management of School Curriculum in Secondary Schools in Tharaka-Nithi and Nairobi Counties, Kenya

Kagendo Dinah Alexander¹, George Onyango² & Dorothy Kyalo³

^{1&2}*Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies, Kenyatta University*

³*School of Continuing and External Studies, University of Nairobi*

Corresponding Author: Kagendo Dinah Alexander

Abstract: Student participation in management of the secondary schools they attend is construed to include aspects of school curriculum management. The main objective of this study was to determine the extent to which student participate in management of school curriculum in secondary schools. The study employed mixed method design, specifically triangulation method. Stratified random sampling, simple random sampling, purposive and convenience sampling were used in drawing the samples. The Krejcie and Morgan's table for determining large sample size was used to determine the sample size of students. The sample consisted of 38 secondary schools, 38 head teachers, 293 teachers, 753 students, 72 student leaders and 24 parents. Data collection instruments included questionnaires, interview guide and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) guide. Content validity was determined by seeking expert judgement from educational management. Cronbach's alpha was used to establish the reliability of the instruments. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics while qualitative data were organized into themes and presented using descriptions and quotations. The study found that the extent of student participation in selection of the subject to study was high. Moderate levels of student participation in decision making were found in areas of setting academic targets, nature of assignments, and number of internal examinations while there were low levels of student participation in drawing the school programme and grading system. The study concluded that, on average student participation in management of school curriculum was moderate. The study therefore recommends that the Ministry of Education should provide a policy on student representation in the Parents' Associations, staff meetings and any other important committees in schools that deals with matters of school curriculum. Secondary school managements should actively involve students in all areas decision-making under school curriculum.

Keywords: Student participation, Management, School curriculum, Secondary school, Extent

Date of Submission: 10-06-2020

Date of Acceptance: 28-06-2020

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the four core principles that should guide the implementation of the right to education is the right of children to express their views in all matters affecting them and for their views to be given due weight in accordance with their age and maturity.¹ Most countries that are signatories to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, (UNCRC) have made statutory provisions for children to participate in decision-making and some have developed structures that represent the views of students at various levels.² These include countries in Europe³ such as Norway, France⁴, Sweden, United Kingdom and Northern Ireland⁵, Finland⁶ where schools establish Student Councils through which they voice their views on matters that affect them. Closer home in South Africa, it is a requirement of the law that every public school should establish a governing body which should include learners' representatives from the eighth grade or higher. It makes provision for a representative Council of learners in each ordinary public school that offers instruction in the eighth grade or higher.^{4,7} This arrangement, however, presumes that the children of lower grades do not need to be heard or even be represented in the student governments.

It is noted that Tanzania was one of the first African countries to provide for student participation in decision-making in the schools through representation in decision-making committees. The schools have Councils whose membership and functions are specified in the National Policy on School Councils.⁴ Student Council is therefore viewed as a vehicle through which students participate in decision-making at school. Many researchers have advanced arguments in favour of student participation in decision-making on matters affecting them in the schools they attend.^{8,9,10}

In Kenya, the Ministry of Education made student participation in the management of the schools they attend a legal requirement. Chapter 8 of Sessional Paper No.14 of 2012 lists several challenges that were facing the governance of the education sector and provides three policies to address the same. In section 8.11 the paper outlines several strategies that the government was to employ in order to implement the three policies listed in sub-section 8.10. Of relevance to this study is number (xiii) of subsection 8.11 which required the government to establish and strengthen Student Councils for educational and training institutions with effective representation.¹¹ In addition, the Basic Education Act of 2013 provides for student participation in management of school through their Student Council representatives in the Boards of Management (BOM).¹² BOM are charged with management of secondary schools at institutional level. The fact that students are represented in the BOM, is an indication that they are supposed to be involved in management of curriculum in secondary schools.

There is an abundance of existing research already suggesting strongly that student participation in decision-making in school tends to enhance the learning experiences.^{13, 14, 15, 16} This has positive effects for the learners, who benefit from a strong sense of being trusted in school. Harber, (1995)¹⁷ observes that in democratic schools, students have some say both over what is learned and how it is learned. This suggests that students should be involved in deciding the contents for their learning and the methods of teaching employed by the teachers for the curriculum delivery. They need to be involved in the selection of subjects and the topics to be studied individually or in groups within the subjects.

From a health perspective it is important, among other things, to involve learners in everyday school life, including overall strategies for making decisions.¹⁸ Thus, the emphasis in a school needs to be placed on teaching and learning process, the whole school atmosphere, management structures and physical environment. In the work of Fielding (2001)¹³, on Students as Researchers project, students contended for the curriculum as a joint making of meaning. They felt that their views should be incorporated in the school curriculum. Student participation in decisions in school promotes learning. Studies have shown that participative activities in school enhance school attendance, self-esteem, motivation to learn, engagement with learning and attainment among the students.¹⁴

Research has shown that students are not involved in decisions relating to some aspects of school curriculum. A study on the extent of student participation in management of secondary schools in Kenya, a sample of 15 schools, found that students were not involved in decisions relating to the choice of textbooks, teaching methods, nature of assignments and grading system. The choice of the text books is done at the Ministry of Education (MOE) level.¹⁹ Huddleston, (2007)²⁰ affirms that school curricula and evaluation criteria are decided by the state or regional authorities. Therefore, students hardly participate in such decisions. Backman & Trafford, (2006)²¹ noted that the students they interviewed felt that there was very little opportunity for them to influence curriculum content or teaching methods. This is because in most countries, the content of the curriculum is decided by the state or the ministry concerned with education and the teaching methods are left to the teachers to decide. As a matter of fact, there are many areas under school curriculum in which students can participate in decision making. These include nature of assignments, assessment strategy and marking.²¹

As far as evaluation of learning is concerned, the students' inputs are rarely sought in matters to do with the number of examinations given to them in a school term. Tikoko & Kiprop (2011)¹⁹ found out that students were not involved in deciding the number of examinations done in a school term. Similar findings were reported in a study done in Kericho West Sub- County in Kenya.²² Given that the aforementioned studies used descriptive survey design, this study employed the mixed method design, specifically triangulation to determine the extent of student involvement in determining the number of examinations given in a school term. Triangulation methods helps in validation of the data collected using both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods.

In a study done in Zimbabwe, most of the students reported that they had no say in the choice of the subjects they studied in school, a position that was confirmed by most of the teachers and all the head teachers.²³ In contrast, a study done in Eastern Region of Kenya, researchers found that the students participated in selection of the subjects they studied in secondary schools.²⁴ Student participation in selection of the subject is important considering that they know better the areas of interest in terms of the career they would like to pursue in future.

In relation to the school programme, Wango, (2009)²⁵ underscores the importance of programmes in the organization and notes that they strengthen the overall institutional management. He stresses that the programmes and activities should transfer decision-making to the ultimate beneficiaries, in this case the learners. The students should therefore be involved fully in drawing the school programmes of their schools. They need to influence decisions relating to duration of preps, and weekend programmes of schools with boarding facilities.

Student participation in decisions relating to school curriculum is one of the least explored areas of student participation. Usually school curriculum is determined by government or Ministry concerned with

education. This leaves no room for students to participate in decision-making. According to Hannam, (1998)³, in his sample of sixty schools, it is in only one school where pupils were fully involved together with teachers in curriculum planning and review. It is assumed that when students' opinion are respected and valued, they are more committed to their learning and take greater responsibility of their behaviour. Huddleston, 2007²⁰ notes that there are assumptions that, students have a legitimate interest only in student-specific issues and that they have no right to decide the areas of decision making in which they want or do not want to participate in. This assumption is not right in the light of UN convention on the right of the child that gives the children the right to express their views in all matters that affect them and for their views to be given due weight in accordance with their age and maturity.

Student participation in decision-making is touted as one of the most important ways of minimizing or even eliminating student indiscipline and discontent in schools. In Kenya, it has since been implemented in most schools through the formation of Student Councils and enactment of laws to support the same^{11, 12} but even with that, the mass indiscipline of students in Kenyan secondary schools has continued unabated. The literature revealed scanty information on the extent of student participation in management of the school curriculum. This study therefore intended to fill the gap by determining the extent of students' participation in decisions relating to school curriculum with a view of informing educational practices in Kenya. The main objective of this study is to determine the extent to which students participate in management of school curriculum. The following question was formulated to address the stated objective: What is the extent of student participation in decisions relating to school curriculum?

II. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The study used mixed method design, specifically triangulation method in which both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods were implemented simultaneously. Triangulation method was appropriate for this study because data collection involved three different methods implemented simultaneously in the same institutions. This was the best way to validate the data obtained and gain a deeper and wider understanding of the findings from the study. The study targeted 214 head teachers, 2433 teachers, 81582 students and 81582 parents in Tharaka-Nithi and Nairobi counties. Stratified random sampling, simple random sampling, purposive and convenience sampling were used in drawing the samples. The table for determining large sample size by Krejcie & Morgan, (1970), was used to determine the sample size of the students. The sample consisted of 38 public secondary schools, 38 head teachers, 293 teachers, 753 students, 72 student leaders and 24 parents. Data collection instruments included questionnaires, interview guide and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) guide. Content validity was determined by seeking expert judgement from educational management. The instruments were submitted to experts iteratively for consideration and their suggestions on different items and sections used to refine them and increase validity. The questionnaires were further refined after the pilot study conducted in four schools in order to improve their comprehensibility, relevance and clarity. Cronbach's alpha was used to establish the reliability of the instruments. Cronbach's alpha was 0.923 for head teachers and teachers' questionnaire and 0.900 for students' questionnaire, which indicated a high level of internal consistency (reliability). The closer the alpha is to one (1), the higher the level of consistency. Any coefficient correlation of more than 0.7 is considered reliable.²⁶

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study sought to determine the extent of student participation in decision-making in six areas of interest under curriculum management in secondary schools. These included drawing of the school programme, setting of academic targets, nature of assignments, number of internal examinations, grading system and selection of subjects. The views of head teachers, teachers and students on student participation in decision-making were sought on a five point Likert scale ranging from No participation to Extensive participation. The data obtained was transformed from five point Likert scale to three point Likert scale (low, moderate and high participation, respectively). The study used the following mean scale: 1.0-1.4 = Low participation; 1.5-2.4 = Moderate participation; 2.5-3.0 = High participation. The results are discussed in the sections that follow:

3.1 Head teachers' views of the extent of student participation in curriculum Management

The results of the head teachers on student participation in management of school curriculum are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Head teachers' views of the extent of student participation in curriculum management

Decision-Making area	N	Mean	LP		MP		HP	
			n	%	n	%	n	%
School programme	38	2.16	10	26.3%	12	31.6%	16	42.1%
Setting academic targets	38	2.39	9	23.7%	5	13.2%	24	63.2%
Nature of assignment	38	1.76	20	52.6%	7	18.4%	11	28.9%

Extent of Student Participation in Management of School Curriculum in Secondary Schools ..

No. of internal exams	38	1.84	16	42.1%	12	31.6%	10	26.3%
Grading system	38	1.61	24	63.2%	5	13.2%	9	23.7%
Subject selection	37	2.78	3	8.1%	2	5.4%	32	86.5%

Key:

LP - Low participation; MP - Moderate participation; HP - High participation

Results in Table 1 reveal that majority, 32 (86.5%) of the head teachers reported high participation of students in selection of subjects. The mean of 2.78, is an indication that students participated in high levels in selection of subjects. In relation to the student participation in setting academic targets, majority, 24 (63.2%) of the head teachers reported high levels of student participation. The mean of 2.39, is an indication of moderate level of student participation in decision-making. Majority, 16 (42.1%) of the head teachers were of the view that the extent of student participation in decision-making was moderate in drawing the school programme. The mean (2.16) indicates moderate level of participation in decision making. Although majority 24 (63.2%) and 20 (52.6%) of the head teachers reported low levels of student participation in grading system and nature of assignments, it is however notable that the means (grading system = 1.61 and nature of assignments = 1.76) indicate moderate levels of student participation in decision making in both cases. This implies that according to the head teachers, students participated moderately in decisions relating to grading system and nature of assignments. It is worthwhile noting that the head teachers reported either moderate or high levels of student participation in all areas of decision making under school curriculum. This implies that the head teachers recognize the importance of involving the students in decision making process in as far as school curriculum management is concerned.

3.2 Teachers' views of the extent of Student Participation in Curriculum Management

The results of the teachers on student participation in management of the school curriculum are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Teachers' views of the extent of student participation in curriculum management

Decision-Making area	N	Mean	LP		MP		HP	
			n	%	n	%	n	%
School programme	287	1.69	154	53.7%	67	23.3%	66	23.0%
Setting academic targets	289	2.30	81	28.0%	41	14.2%	167	57.8%
Nature of assignment	282	1.67	163	57.8%	50	17.7%	69	24.5%
No. of internal examination	283	1.55	187	66.1%	35	12.4%	61	21.6%
Grading system	284	1.28	234	82.4%	20	7.0%	30	10.6%
Subject selection	285	2.67	40	14.0%	15	5.3%	230	80.7%

Key:

LP - Low participation; MP - Moderate participation; HP - High participation

Results in Table 2 reveal that majority, 230 (80.7%) of the teachers were of the view that the extent of student participation in selection of subjects was high. The overall mean of 2.67, is an indication that students participated in high levels in selection of subjects in schools. The results further shows that majority, 167 (57.8%) of the teachers reported high levels of student participation in setting academic targets. However, the overall mean (2.30) indicate that the extent of participation of students was moderate. Other areas of decision making with moderate levels of student participation according to the teachers' point of view were drawing the school programme (mean =1.69), nature of the assignment (mean = 1.67) and number of internal examination (mean = 1.55). However, it is notable from Table 2 that contrary to the head teachers, majority, 234 (82.4%) of the teachers were of the view that the extent of student participation in grading system was of low level. The overall mean of 1.28 confirms that the extent of student participation in grading system was low. This may imply that the teachers do not think that it is important to involve the students in determining the system of grading in their schools.

3.3 Students' views of the extent of Student Participation in Curriculum Management

The results of the students on student participation in management of school curriculum are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Students' views of the extent of student participation in curriculum management

Decision-Making area	N	Mean	LP		MP		HP	
			n	%	n	%	n	%
School programme	725	1.28	588	81.1%	69	9.5%	68	9.4%

Setting academic targets	724	2.34	191	26.4%	93	12.8%	440	60.8%
Nature of assignment	720	1.65	446	61.9%	83	11.5%	191	26.5%
No. of internal examination	724	1.63	457	63.1%	78	10.8%	189	26.1%
Grading system	722	1.45	528	73.1%	66	9.1%	128	17.7%
Subject selection	707	2.49	150	21.2%	60	8.5%	497	70.3%

Key:

LP - Low participation; MP - Moderate participation; HP - High participation

Results in Table 3 show that majority, 497 (70.3%) of the students were of the view that student participation in selection of subjects was high. The mean (2.49) confirms that indeed the extent of student participation in selection of subject was high. Similarly, majority, 440 (60.8%) of the students were of the view that the extent of participation in setting academic targets was high. However, the mean (2.34) indicate moderate level of student participation in setting academic targets. The other areas of decision making with moderate levels were nature of assignments (mean = 1.65) and number of internal examinations (mean = 1.63). It is notable from Table 3 that majority, 588 (81.1%) of the students were of the view that they participated in low levels in drawing the school programme. The mean score (1.28) is an indication that the participation in drawing the school programme was low. This position was affirmed by the student leaders through Focus Group discussions (FGD).

From the foregoing, it is clear that all the respondents were in agreement that there were high levels (head teachers' mean = 2.78, teachers' mean = 2.67 and students' mean = 2.49) of student participation in selection of the subjects to study. These results were corroborated by the student leaders through the FGDs. The student leaders acknowledged high levels of student participation in selection of the subjects. However, in some schools they said that the decision on the choice of the subjects was made in consultation with the parents and teachers. In connection with this, one student leader said,

In our school, we select the subject in form three and we do it together with our parents and teachers. The teachers and parents give us guidance as we select the subjects to specialize in.

Some of the students felt that they were compelled to take some subjects they didn't like, since they were required to meet the minimum grade set for each subject by the subject teachers. In this regard, one of the student leaders said,

We choose the subject but we must attain the minimum grade required for that subject. If one chooses a subject and does not attain the minimum grade for the subject, they are not allowed to do it. This is unfair to us because you end up doing another subject that you don't like.

In both of the foregoing scenarios, the students were clearly involved in selection of the subject to take, though there were some schools which were limiting the students in the choice of subjects by pegging selection to the academic performance. This is likely to impact their career choices later in life. The findings are consistent with those of Mulwa *et al.*, (2015)²⁴ and Ong'ino, (2014)²⁷ which found that students participated in selection of their subjects in secondary schools.

The study found that students participated moderately in setting academic targets as indicated by the head teachers (mean = 2.34), the students themselves (mean = 2.39) and the teachers (mean = 2.30). These results were corroborated by those from the Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) from which it also emerged that in some schools, the academic targets were set with consultation with the students, teachers and parents during academic meetings. During one FGD, one student leader said,

We set the academic targets in consultation with the teachers and the parents. This keeps us on our 'toes' always. We have to work extra hard to meet our targets.

Supporting this view of the student leaders, one parent who participated in the interview said,

When we go for academic meetings in school, we discuss the academic performance with our children and teachers, and then we ask them (children) to set the grade and the points they would be targeting to achieve at the end of the term or year. This has to be agreed upon by all the parties.

From the foregoing, it is clear that students were involved in setting the academic targets. The study further found from the student leaders that the academic targets were in two folds, that is, the individual academic target that each student targets to achieve and the class academic target. In some schools, they set individual targets and then from them they were able to calculate the class target. In other schools, they start with setting the class targets, and then the students were encouraged to set the individual targets that would enable the class to meet its target. The students were also encouraged to set academic targets for every subject. It was established that targets were set based on the previous achievements and aimed at continuous improvement. This meant that students could not set a target lower than what they had attained previously in a particular subject or in overall mean grade or mean score. Similar findings were reported by Tikoko and Kipro (2011)¹⁹ and Ong'ino (2014).²⁷ Setting of the academic targets motivates the students towards achieving them and

therefore teachers and parents would want to encourage this since this will consequently impact positively on academic performance of the school.

The extent of student participation in drawing of the school programme appeared to be viewed differently by the respondents. The head teachers (mean = 2.16) and the teachers (mean = 1.69) reported moderate levels of participation by students while the students (mean = 1.28) said the extent of participation was low. Thus, the head teachers and teachers perceived that they were involving the students in decision-making while the students felt excluded from the same. Student leaders from most of the schools that participated in FGDs confirmed the reports of students that the extent of students' involvement in drawing the school programme was indeed low. In the cases where students acknowledged being involved in drawing the school programme, it was noted that they participated in drawing the programme for the non-class school hours only. For example, in one of the schools, the students said that the 4.00 - 6.00 P.M. school programme was student-centred, that is, they have lessons during that time based on the time table they make themselves. In the same school, they also talked of the 'Keshu programme' which takes place from 9.00 P.M to 11.00 P.M during week days and up to 9.00 P.M during the weekends. In this regard one student leader commented,

The Keshu programme is made by form 4 students and it starts from 9.00 P.M - 11.00 PM during the week days and up 9.00 P.M. over the weekend. The form 4 students lead the other students in making the academic programme. These are discussion groups for different subjects and the teachers also come to class.

One of the student leaders from another school said,

We participate only in deciding the duration of the preps, that is, the morning preps and the evening preps. We are not involved in drawing the rest of the school programme.

The findings reflect conflicting views between the students on one hand, and the head teachers and teachers on the other. The students feel excluded while the head teachers and teachers portray themselves as democratic. Though some schools through the FGDs with the student leaders acknowledged involvement in deciding the time of the preps, after 4.00 P.M programme and weekend programme, majority of the student leaders were of the view that the extent of participation was low. Similar findings were reported, in a study where majority of the respondents said that the Student Councils were not involved in deciding the time of the preps.²⁸ The reasons for failure to involve the students could be traditional tendencies of the administrators and teachers who were not involved in such decisions themselves.²⁹ This leaves the students with a feeling of exclusion from such important decisions that affects them in school. Such experiences do not encourage independence and self-discipline among the students. It has been argued that good programmes should transfer decision-making to the ultimate beneficiaries, i.e. the learners in the case of the secondary school.²⁵

In relation to the number of internal examinations done in a school term, all the respondents (head teachers mean = 1.76, teachers mean = 1.67 and students mean = 1.63) were in agreement that the extent of student participation was moderate. The results were corroborated by those of the student leaders through FGDs. From the FGDs, the study found that some schools held demonstration because they were opposed to the timing and the number of the internal examinations given to them. In relation to this, one of the student leaders said,

The students had a demonstration because they did not want to do the openers (examinations scheduled for the beginning of the school term) and supplementary exams. They feel unprepared for the opening examinations since they are done immediately after opening the school.

A student leader from another school that participated on FGDs commented,

We should be involved in deciding the number of the exams done in a term. We are over burdened with so many exams, such that we don't have adequate time for preparation. The number of the examinations should be reduced.

This implies that the students were demanding for more involvement in scheduling of the internal exams and the decisions regarding the number of internal examinations done during a school term. After a school holiday, the students feel unprepared to sit for any form of examination. They were of the view that they needed to be given more time to prepare for them. The findings of this study that students participated moderately in decision making contradict the findings of earlier studies,^{19, 22} which found that students were not involved in decisions relating to the number of examinations done in a school during any given school term. The study by Tikoko and Kipro, (2011)¹⁹ was done before the enactment of Sessional Paper No. 14 of 2012 and the Basic Education Act of 2013 that provides for the establishment of the Student Councils in secondary schools while the Chemtai and Chumba, (2014)²² study, the Student Councils could have been in their formative stages of implementation. Therefore, the findings of this study that the participation was moderate can be attributed to the rolling out of the Student Councils in majority of secondary schools which are used as avenues for student participation in decision making.

In relation to the nature of assignment, all the respondents (head teachers' mean = 1.76, teachers' mean = 1.67 and students' mean = 1.65) were in agreement that the extent of student participation in decision making was moderate. The findings of this study contradict those of an earlier study that found students were not involved in determining the nature of assignments given to the students in school.²² This disparity can be

attributed to the fact that by the time this study was done, majority of the schools had established the Student Council which is used as a vehicle for student participation in decision making. Huddleston, (2007)²⁹ points out that the curriculum experienced in the classroom setting, and the learning methods used provides variety of opportunities for students to participate in decision making. These may include participation in decisions relating to the nature of assignments to be done by the students among others. At times, students are given so many assignment by different teachers and from different subjects, all to be completed at the same time, like for example during evening preps and they are expected to be handed in to the respective teachers the following day. In such a situation, the students may ask the teachers to give them less demanding work in terms of time needed to complete it. This may entail changing the nature of assignments to meet the demands of the students.

Regarding the grading system, the head teachers (mean = 1.61) and students (mean = 1.45) reported moderate levels of participation while the teachers (mean = 1.28) were of the view that the extent of student participation was low. Given that grading of the students work is done by the teachers, then the views of the teachers could be portraying the true status of the extent of student participation. From the FGDs, the student leaders confirmed that the extent of participation in grading system was indeed low. This implies that the extent of student participation in grading system was low. Similar findings were reported earlier by Chemtai and Chumba (2014)²², who found that students were not involved in decisions concerning the grading system. This implies that these decisions are left exclusively for the teachers. Involving students in deciding the system of grading in school may motivate them to work towards achievements of those grades. Openness in the grading system is important and teachers need to practice it.

From the FGDs, student leaders felt that they should be involved fully in management of their school curriculum. In addition, the students through the FGDs felt that they needed to be involved in deciding on the teaching and learning methods used in delivery of the curriculum content. They complained that, there were subject contents that they never understood simply because they were not being exposed to practical experiences in the subjects that were practical oriented. They also observed that at times, some teachers did not complete the syllabi as expected and they had no avenues of airing this. In connection with this, one student leaders said,

Most of the times we are listening to the teachers, rarely are we given an opportunity to express ourselves. Whenever an opportunity is offered to us to speak, we do it with fear of retaliation.

These sentiments imply lack of trust between the students and their teachers probably stemming from the fact that the students are rarely involved in decisions concerning teaching and learning methods. If their views are taken into account in coming up with the final decision, it will build their confidence and trust in their teachers. The findings of this study are similar to those reported by Huddleston, (2007)²⁹ where the students felt that there was very little opportunity availed to them to influence learning methods among other things. The student said that trying to influence the curriculum content or learning methods was a bad experience, no one listened to them and that the reaction of the teachers was negative.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concludes that students are allowed to participate in a majority of the decisions relating to school curriculum with exception of decisions relating to drawing school programme and grading system. On average, the extent of student participation in management of school curriculum was moderate. The extent of student participation in selection of subjects to study was high since this is likely to impact their career life in future. Participation in setting academic targets, nature of assignments and determining the numbers of internal examinations are considered important as they impact positively on academic performance of the school. The study therefore recommends the Ministry of Education should provide a policy on student representation in the Parents' Associations, staff meetings and any other important committees in schools that deals with matters of school curriculum. Secondary school managements should actively involve students in all areas decision-making under school curriculum.

REFERENCES

- [1]. United Nations, Convention on the Rights of the Child. United Nations: 1989.
- [2]. United Nations, Committee on the Rights of the Child. In *General Comment NO. 12: The right of the child to be heard*, United Nations.: Geneva, 2009.
- [3]. Hannam, D. In *Democratic processes in Education. Values Education for Democracy and Citizenship.*, Gordon Cook Foundation Conference, University of the Strathclyde, Glasgow, University of the Strathclyde, Glasgow, 1998.
- [4]. Carr, I. A. *From policy to praxis: A Study of the Implementation of Representative Councils of Learners in the Western Cape, from 1997 to 2003, doctoral thesis.*, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, 2005.
- [5]. Alderson, P., School students' views on school councils and daily life at school. *Children & Society* 2000, 14, 121-34.

- [6]. Shatilova, I. How Students' Voice Can Be Heard in the Finnish Context: The Case of Primary, Lower Secondary and Upper Secondary Schools in Jyväskylä. University of Jyväskylä, 2014.
- [7]. Mabovula, N., Giving voice to the voiceless through deliberative democratic school governance. *South African Journal of Education*, 29, 2009, 219-233.
- [8]. Fletcher, A. (2005). Guide to students as partners in school change. *Meaningful student involvement* Retrieved July 4th, 2016, from <http://www.Soundout.org/MSIGuide.pdf>
- [9]. Griebler, U.; Nowak, P., Student councils: a tool for health promoting schools? Characteristics and effects. *Health Education*, 112 (2), 2012, 105-132.
- [10]. Manefield, J.; Collins, R.; Moore, J.; Mahar, S.; Warne, C., Student Voice: A Historical Perspective and New Directions. Department of Education: Research and Innovation Division, Melbourne, 2007.
- [11]. Republic of Kenya, Sessional Paper No: 14. (2012) on Reforming Education and Training Sectors in Kenya. Ministry of Education and Ministry of Higher Education, S. a. T., Ed. 2012.
- [12]. Republic of Kenya, The Basic Education Act. 2013.
- [13]. Fielding, M., Students as radical agents of change. *Journal of Educational Change*, 2, 2001, 123-141.
- [14]. Hannam, D. *A pilot study to evaluate the impact of student participation aspects of the citizenship order on standards of education in secondary schools*. London, 2001.
- [15]. Lodge, C., From hearing voices to engaging in dialogue: Problematizing Student participation in school improvement. *Journal of Educational Change*, 6, 2005, 125-146.
- [16]. Rudduck, R.; Flutter, J., Pupil Participation and Perspectives: 'Carving a new order of experience'. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30 (1), 2000, 75-89.
- [17]. Harber, C., *Democratic Education and the International Agenda*. Education now Publishing Co-operative: Derby, 1995.
- [18]. Simovska, V., Student participation: a democratic education perspective experience from the health-promoting schools in Macedonia. *Health education research. Theory and Practice* 2004, 19 (2), 198-207.
- [19]. Tikoko, B. J.; Kiprop, C. J., Extent of Student Participation in Decision-making in Secondary Schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(21)2011, 92-99.
- [20]. Huddleston, T. *From Student Voice to Shared Responsibility. Effective practice in democratic school governance in European schools*; London, 2007.
- [21]. Backman, E.; Trafford, B., *Democratic Governance of Schools*. Council of Europe: Strasbourg, 2006.
- [22]. Chemutai, L.; Chumba, S., K., Student Councils Participation in Decision-making In Public Secondary Schools in Kericho West Sub County, Kenya. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 2 (6). 2014, 850-858.
- [23]. Shumba, J.; Maphosa, C.; Shumba, A., Curriculum Decision-making Decentralization Policy in Zimbabwe; how involved are students in deciding curriculum content? *Africa Education Review Journal*, 5 (1) 2008, 48-69.
- [24]. Mulwa, D. M.; Kimosop, M. K.; Kasivu, G. M., Participatory Governance in Secondary Schools: The Students' Viewpoint in Eastern Region of Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6 (30) 2015, 59-65.
- [25]. Wango, G., *School Administration and Management: Quality Assurance and Standards*. The Jomo Kenyatta Foundation: Nairobi, 2009.
- [26]. Fraenkel, J. R.; Wallen, N. E.; Hyun, H. H., *How to design and evaluate research in education*. The McGraw Companies Inc: New York, 2012.
- [27]. Ong'injo, V. K. *Influence of Students' Participation in School Management on Academic Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Kadibo Division, Kisumu County, Kenya*, project report, University of Nairobi, 2014.
- [28]. Kilonzo, D. K. *Influence of Student Councils' Involvement in School Governance on Studnet District in Public Secondary Schools in Kathonzweni Sub- County, Kenya*, project report, University of Nairobi, 2017.
- [29]. Huddleston, T., *From Student Voice to Shared Responsibility. Effective practice in democratic school governance in European schools*. Citizenship Foundation, London. 2007.

Kagendo Dinah Alexander, et. al. "Extent of Student Participation in Management of School Curriculum in Secondary Schools in Tharaka-Nithi and Nairobi Counties, Kenya." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(6), 2020, pp. 32-39.