Available online at ijci.wcci-international.org

International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction 14(1) (2022) 226-242

IJCI
International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction

Student youth participation in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme

Martha K. Nyang'au [a] *, Washington A. Ochola [b], Samson N. Maobe [c]

[a,b,c] *Kisii University, School of Agriculture and Natural Resources Management, 40200, Kisii, Kenya*

Abstract

The idea of "student voice" in decision making and change efforts of schools, has emerged as a potential strategy for improving learners' outcomes. It is expected in its participatory curriculum implementation of secondary school agriculture programme could transfer scientific knowledge through classroom teaching thus attain its academic objective, Also, impart vocational skills in student youth through demonstration of best practices and implementation of agricultural projects in the school farm. However, past studies show that youth that have gone through school agriculture curriculum are inadequately equipped with vocational agricultural skills necessary for self-reliance hence the need for improvement. The objective of this study is to determine the influence of participation of student youth in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme and to suggest measures to improve its impact on the vocational objective. Student youth are school form fours studying agriculture subject and implementing projects for the Kenya certificate of secondary school examination (KCSE) 2019 which is a national test. Student youth were selected from three categories of schools offering agriculture subject, spread in five typical of Kenyan farm types found in Kisii and Nyamira counties region, Kenya. Cross-sectional survey design was used. Proportionate, stratified, purposive, and simple random sampling procedures were used to select a sample of 361 student youth as respondents for the study. Data was collected using questionnaires, analyzed by descriptive and inferential statistics at significance level of 0.05 using SPSS version 21. Results show that student youth rate their level of participation in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme at a mean score of 6 out of 10 indicating that there is still room for improvement on the same. Student youth rated as very important the five strategies proposed to enhance their engagement in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme with some plans being ranked more significantly very important. There is a strong positive correlation between level of participation in decision making and level of implementation of the agriculture programme. The high rating of strategies proposed indicates the need to address the pertinent issues in them to enhance quality of participation of student youth in decision making on implementation of the programmes. The strategies ranked as more significantly very important are 5, 4 and 2. These findings will be useful to improve transfer of knowledge, skills and thus attain the vocational objective. Also to enhance learning and developmental outcomes in young people for self-reliance.

Keywords: Student-youth, decision-making, school agriculture programme, strategies

© 2016 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (**http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/**).

* Corresponding author: Martha K. Nyang'au.
E-mail address: *marthakemunto64@gmail.com*

1. Introduction

The concept of student voice entails many ways in which learners can actively participate in the school decisions that will shape their lives and those of their peers (Mager & Nowak, 2012). The United Nations (UN) Convention on the rights of the child 1989 also supports the concept, and promotes the right of involving young people in decisions that affect their lives (United Nations, 1989). The idea of "student voice" in decision making and change efforts of schools, has emerged as a potential strategy for improving student outcomes. Student participation is defined by Mager & Nowak (2012) as involvement in collective decision-making process at the school or class level that includes dialogue among them and other decision-makers and is not confined to individual decision making. Further, Mager & Nowak (2012) note that participation is said to occur when students have some influence over the decisions being made and actions being taken rather than a student "taking part" or "being present". Mager & Nowak (2012) also explain that, one-off consultations and simple forms of student participation such as answering questions and taking part in activities are not considered participation in the context of decision-making. Mitra (2004, 2005) provides some of the first empirical data on student youth participation in student voice efforts by identifying how they contribute to "youth development" outcomes. Mitra (2004, 2005) found that efforts to increase student voice can create meaningful experiences that help to meet the developmental needs of youth, particularly for those students who otherwise would not find meaning in their school experiences. Further, that participating in groups instills agency in students and makes them belief that they could transform themselves and the institutions that affect them, enable them to acquire skills and competencies to work toward these changes. Also, to establish meaningful relationships with adults and peers hence creating greater connections to each other. The effects of student participation can be positive, neutral or negative. Young people's, participation in youth programs offers them a broad range of chances that creates the potential for personal gain such as opportunities to be of service to others, to gain confidence, to reach their goals, and to increase self-esteem. The opportunities provide a pathway to personal development through social and personal responsibilities to self and to others (Borden *et al.,* 2006).

In Kenya, Secondary school agriculture curriculum entails a student taking theory in classroom and practical lessons on the subject in the school farm. Skill attainment in both is tested in the end of fourth year through a theory written examination, and implementation of a field supervised agriculture project in the school farm for the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE). However, from past studies, Konyango *et al*., (2015), Konyango and Asienyo (2015) note that participatory curriculum implementation of school agriculture programme has not made an impact on the practical aspects of the subject on imparting skills, suggesting shortfalls in the attainment of the vocational objective of the curriculum.. There is thus a distortion

between what is taught in school agriculture and what society expects from curriculum as result of the apparent negligence of the vocational objective. Konyango *et al*., (2015), Konyango and Asienyo (2015) emphasize a need for participatory approach in decision making on implementation of school agriculture curriculum as solution, noting that it may improve: communication between participants, promote community support, facilitate acquisition of skills and knowledge and also lead to sustainable implementation strategies. In the present study, the ineffectiveness of the curriculum has been attributed to what Hart (1992) refers to as decorative and tokenism nature of student youth participation in decision making on matters that concern them. That brings about a situation where the youth don't influence the action that is taken as solution and this forms the basis for the present research. To better understand how to improve self reliance outcomes in student youth from secondary school agriculture programmes, research is needed to determine background factors that motivate or inhibit their engagement especially in decision making process on its implementation. Konyango *et al*., (2015), Konyango and Asienyo (2015) note that implementation of practical school subjects like agriculture should set the students for productive life and make tangible contributions to sustainable community livelihoods. However, Konyango *et al*., (2015), Konyango and Asienyo (2015) shows that the current status of the subject in schools does not reflect scientific and practical ideals of agriculture but rather the emergence of theoretical teaching of the subject contrary to the expectations, suggesting that it may be the source of deficit in skill attainment for self-reliance in youth. As solution in this study, it is suggested that if the student youth participate more in decision making in school agriculture programme, the shortfall would be overcome as their involvement in planning and implementation would be with ownership thereby improving learning and developmental outcomes. Arising from the foregoing, this research investigated the influence of student youth involvement in decision making on implementation of secondary school agriculture programme towards improving student outcomes.

1.1 Statement of problem

The initiative by the Kenyan government to have agriculture as a subject in the secondary school education curriculum is commended by UNESCO (2012), World bank (2000), Eisemon and Nyamete (1990). School agriculture curriculum implemented through participatory approach would ensure that a critical mass of the human population who are school-youth are imparted with the basic knowledge and skills and thus prepared for the kinds of existing jobs in rural areas as observed by Konyango *et al*., (2015), Konyango and Asienyo (2015). School agriculture programme is unique from other subjects offered for the KCSE national examinations in Kenya because it entails academic and vocational objectives. The later is attained through fieldwork by students through demonstrations on the best production and new improved technologies and

agripreneurship in the school farm. Also, through students implementing supervised agricultural projects to acquire skills for self-reliance. However Konyango *et al*., (2015), Konyango and Asienyo (2015) note that there has been a persistent lack of interest by student youth in school agriculture as a preferred subject of study and those that have gone through the programme demonstrate inadequacy in vocational skills for self-reliance hence defeating the purpose for which the subject was introduced in the curriculum. The United Nations (2003) indicates that any programme targeting youth should seek for their views in order to make implementation process successful for gainful outcomes. Participation of student-youth in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme would entail drawing on their ideas, fears, concerns, interests and aspirations to ensure appropriate decisions and policies are made to guarantee successful implementation arrangements for their own benefit, their societies and the nation as a whole. However, a study by Konyango (2015) shows neither that school agriculture teachers are neither teaching the subject practically nor putting emphasis on learning by doing which is the guiding philosophy of the subject. The study indicates a decline in the support and enthusiasm in the teaching of agriculture as a practical subject hence most agriculture teachers have shifted their interest in the teaching of biology because it is less cumbersome and requires less institutional support. There is thus an increased number of unemployable youth who lack skills in agriculture as result of which they are also not innovative enough to take it up as a business like any other venture for self-reliance. The initial objective of imparting the student youth with basic skills in school agriculture for independence is not being attained. The shortfall has been attributed partly to their ineffective participation in decision making on matters of concern to them in the implementation of the curriculum especially the vocational component coupled with the theoretical teaching of the subject. Decisions on implementation of school agriculture programme are commonly left to be done by curriculum experts, consultants and the Ministry of Education technocrats with the school youth being sidelined as lacking experience and too young to consult on curriculum matters. The outcome is that the vocational objective of school agriculture is scantly achieved. This is attributed to low participation by the student-youth in the implementation process of school agriculture programme owing to exclusion of their interests and aspirations in the execution of the vocational objective.

1.2 Objective of the study

To determine the influence of participation of student youth in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme for acquisition of vocational skills for self-reliance.

1.3 Hypothesis

The following hypothesis was tested at significance level of 0.05.

Ho_1: There is a non-significant influence of the level of participation in decision-making by student youth on the level of implementation of school agriculture programme.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Study area

The study was carried out in Kisii and Nyamira counties region, Kenya in 2019. Jaetzold and Schmidt (1982) characterized the Kisii and Nyamira region into five agro-ecological zones that reflect different farm types. The characterization into five agro-ecological zones is done using production potential of the area, cropping, livestock production systems and taking into account climatic factors of rainfall and temperature, and soils found in different zones. In this study, the farm type zones were adopted as different and unique sampling locations. They were used as sample locations to obtain diverse student youth segments with varied exposures, opportunities and experiences in participation in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme. Different categories of secondary schools offering agriculture as a study subject are distributed in these farm types and thus have opportunity to practice, demonstrate varied cropping and livestock production systems, giving rise to diverse exposure, experience, skills and student youth segments.

The farm types indicated by the agro-ecological zones are typical of similar ones found in the Kenyan highlands and therefore representative of major agricultural systems available to youth. The specific farm types in the region are as follows:

1) Tea-dairy zone
2) Tea –coffee zone
3) Maize-pyrethrum zone
4) Coffee-banana zone
5) Marginal-sugarcane zone

2.2 Study Population

The study involved school youth as respondents. Those involved were form four students registered in agriculture subject for the Kenya certificate of secondary school examination (KCSE) 2019, offered by the Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC). The student youth are in their fourth year of secondary education and thus involved in implementing school agriculture project offered for the national test. The three categories of secondary schools from which student youth were proportionately sampled are as follows:

1) Extra- county
2) County
3) Sub-county.

There were 302 secondary schools in the five farm types of which 25 were extra-county, 88 county and 189 sub-county schools. The distribution of the schools and the student youth in the five farm types were: tea-dairy zone had 76 schools and 1493 student youth, maize-pyrethrum had 52 schools with 1006 student youth, tea-coffee area had 48 schools with 910 student youth, coffee-banana farm type had 50 schools with 1066 student youth, while the marginal sugarcane zone had 76 schools with 1837 student youth. The population of form four student youth registered for agriculture subject in the KCSE, 2019 in the three school categories was 6,312 of which 1,300 were in extra-county, 1,906 in county and 3,106 in sub-county secondary schools. Student youth per farm type were: Tea-dairy zone, 1493; Maize-pyrethrum, 1006; Tea-coffee, 910; Coffee-banana, 1066; and Marginal sugarcane, 1837.

2.3 Research Design

The investigation adopted a cross sectional survey design. The study used questionnaires filled by respondents to collect information. A cross-sectional survey approach was considered most convenient research tool to investigate the influence of student youth participation in decision-making on implementation of school agriculture programme for their own vocational benefit.

2.4 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

The study adopted a sample size of 30 schools, according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) who suggest 30 cases as the least sample size. From the population of 302 schools and the 30 sample size adopted, proportionate stratified random sampling procedure resulted in 19 sub-county schools, 9 county and 2 extra-county schools to participate in the study. However, to represent extra-county category in each of the farm types, 5 extra-county schools were purposefully sampled in instead of the 2 proportionately arrived at. Stratified random sampling procedure resulted in 8, 6, 5, 6 and 8 schools being drawn from; tea-dairy, maize-pyrethrum, tea-coffee, coffee-banana and sugarcane zone respectively according to their proportions in the populations. Using the table in Krejcie and Morgan (1970); Kathuri and Pals (1993) which summarizes the population and recommended sample sizes, 361 form four agriculture student youth was the adopted sample from a population of 6,312 learners registered for KCSE agriculture subject. Proportionate stratified random sampling technique resulted in 74, 109, 178, student youth being sampled from extra-county, county and sub county schools respectively. Further, proportionate stratified random sampling, gave sample sizes of 86, 58, 52, 60 and 105 school youth being drawn from tea-dairy, maize-pyrethrum, tea-coffee, coffee-banana and sugarcane chewing and crushing farm types respectively. Simple random sampling procedure was used at school level to select 15, 13 and 12 youth from extra-county, county and sub-county categories respectively to participate in the study from class lists provided by the agriculture teachers.

2.5 Instrumentation and data collection procedures

Data was collected using a questionnaire because student-youth respondents involved were literate and, therefore could read the questions and respond appropriately by filling. Daniel, (2004) indicates that with questionnaires the participants can fill at their own convenience, and that it allows some time for the respondents to familiarize with the questions and think about the answers. The questionnaire that was used was closed type and had two likert rating scales; one coded from 1 to 10, that was used to measure the level of participation of youth in decision making and the level of implementation of school agriculture programme. The second scale was coded, 1 to 5 and it was used to rate the strategies proposed to increase the level of participation of student youth in decision making on school agriculture programme. The questionnaire was left with the school agriculture teachers in charge of form four students. The school agriculture teacher had been briefed on the procedure of administering the questionnaire. This was occasioned by the tight schedule in secondary schools as the form fours were preparing for the national examinations which were about to start.

2.6 Data Analysis

The following qualitative and quantitative statistical tools were applied in data analysis: percentages, two tailed t-test, analysis of variance, Tukey post hoc test, Spearman correlation two tailed and linear correlation. The two tailed t- test was used to determine the differences in gender of in and out of school youth in decision-making on implementation. The F-test was used to establish if there were significant differences among student youth in level of participation in decision-making on implementation of school agriculture programme as a result of age, agro-ecological zones (farm type zone), and approximate parents' land sizes. Then Tukey post hoc test was applied in mean separation where there were significant differences. Spearman rank correlation coefficient two tailed test was employed to determine the relationship between the level of participation in decision-making and the level of implementation of school agriculture programme. Tables and a scatter plot graph were used to present the results.

Five strategies were proposed to increase participation of student youth in decision making on implementation of secondary school agriculture programme. Percentages were used to describe responses to the strategies proposed. The strategies were ranked on a five point likert scale. Where: 1=Not Important; 2=Least important; 3=Important; 4=Very Important, 5=Extremely Important. The frequencies of the respondents, who ticked the scale of 1 to 5, were used to calculate a mean score for each individual strategy. Depending on the mean scores, strategies were described as not important if the average score was less than 1.50, least important if mean rating was between 1.50 and 2.50, important if the mean score of the factor fell between 2.50 and 3.50, while a factor whose

mean rating was between 3.50 and 4.50 was described as very important and extremely important if mean rating was between 4.50 and 5.00.

3. Results

3.1 Level of participation of student youth in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme by parents' land size

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) F-test result in Table 1 (F = 0.428, P =0.829) shows a non-significant difference in the level of decision making among student youth on implementation of school agriculture programme due to parents' land size. Therefore the level of participation by student youth in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme is similar irrespective of background on parents' land size.

3.2 Level of participation of student youth in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme by school category

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) result, Table 2, indicates that school category did not show significant differences in the level of participation of student youth in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme. Therefore, irrespective of school category the student youth did not differ notably on level of participation in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme.

Table 1. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) F-test results on the difference of student youth on level of participation in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme by parents' land size

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.473	5	2.495	.428	.829
Within Groups	2070.464	355	5.832		
Total	2082.936	360			

Table 2. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) results on the difference of student youth on level of participation in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme by school category

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	16.352	2	8.176	1.403	.247
Within Groups	2057.297	353	5.828		
Total	2073.649	355			

3.3 Strategies proposed to increase participation of school youth in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme

The analysis of variance F-test result (F = 10.539, P value < .001) of mean ratings by student youth indicates that there are highly significant differences in the

ranking of the five strategies proposed to increase their level of participation in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme (Table 3). Tukey post hoc test provide the mean separation of the strategies (Table 4). The result shows that strategies 5, 4 and 2 have similar and significantly higher mean ratings of M=4.1058, M = 4.0724 and M = 4.0447 respectively compared to the rest. Strategies 3 and 6 are similar in their mean ratings of M=3.7799, and M=3.7744, respectively and strategy 1 had significantly lowest mean (M=3.6556) compared to all the rest. Therefore, strategies 5, 4 and 2 are considered very important in increasing school youth participation in decision making on school agriculture programme.

Table 3. ANOVA F-test results on the difference of the ratings of strategies proposed to increase participation of student youth in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme

Sources of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	65.671	5	13.134	10.539	.000
Within Groups	2677.008	2148	1.246		
Total	2742.680	2153			

Table 4. Tukey post hoc test result on the differences amongst the ratings of strategies proposed to increase participation of student youth in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme

No.	Strategies proposed for increasing participation of student youth in decision-making on implementation of school agriculture programme	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
			1	2
1	Adults to view student youth as actors in decision-making now and involve them rather than avoiding them as immature people who should be seen and not heard	360	3.6556	
6	Including student youth on matters of the school farm will give them a chance to suggest better use rather than being used to administer punishments	359	3.7744	
3	A bottom-up approach in decision-making on matters of curriculum will ensure student youth air their views on having agribusiness and ICT in school agriculture	359	3.7799	
2	The views of student youth to be listened to and be seen to influence the implementation of school agriculture especially the selection of KCSE agriculture projects	358		4.0447
4	If school administration can listen to the voices of student youth it will build confidence for free discussions on the challenges faced in implementing school agriculture	359		4.0724
5	A school administration that recognizes student youth and seeks for their ideas on how products from their school farm agriculture projects should be used like those from KCSE	359		4.1058
	Sig.		.669	.978

3.8 Relationship between the level of participation in decision making and the level of implementation of school agriculture programme by school youth

Spearman correlation coefficient two tailed test result (r_s (359) = .682, p value < .001) indicates that there is a strong positive relationship between level of participating in decision making and level of implementation of school agriculture programme, by student youth (Table 5). Therefore, the level of implementation of school agriculture programme by student youth would increase with rise in their level of participation in decision making on the programme.

Table 5. Relationship between level of participation in decision making and level of implementation of school agriculture programme by student youth correlations

			Level of participation in decision making	Level of implementation of school agriculture programme
Spearman's rho	Level of participation in decision making	Correlation coefficient	1	.682**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	361	361
	Level of implementation of school agriculture programme	Correlation coefficient	.682**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	361	361

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

4. Discussion

4.1 Strategies proposed to increase participation of student youth in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme

The student youth rated all the six strategies proposed to enhance their participation in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme, as very important (Tables 3 and 4). The findings confirm the need to improve the quality of student youth participation in decision making on implementation of the programme. This might make school agriculture programme more effective in achieving its objectives particularly the vocational one. The observation is in concurrence with Borden *et al*., (2006) who states that time spent in youth programmes is the most consistent predictor of positive developmental outcomes in young people. In a study carried out in the United States minority communities by Scales, Benson, Leffert, & Blyth, (2000) it was noted

that compared to family and community factors, participation in decisions of youth programs contributes to enhanced self-esteem, increased school performance and aspirations to attend college, the ability to overcome adversity and the willingness to engage in efforts to help others. The observation that student youth rated all the six proposed strategies as very important, may be indicative that they are not adequately involved in decision making on school agriculture programme and its implementation in a satisfactory manner. A study by Kus (2015) in Tukey indicates that centralized decision making by the ministry of national education and school management with autocratic structures were responsible for low levels of student participation in issues of determining teaching methods, selecting course book and determining school rules. The same trend has been observed in other parts of the world. According to studies by Thornberg & Elvstrand (2012), administrators and teachers make decisions on school policies without the views of student youth. Thus, Hyman & Snook (2000) advocate for more democratic models of schooling which actively encourage participation of students in decision making processes. Rudduck & Flutter,(2000) indicate that schools that actively invite and respond to the ideas of student youth on policy, curriculum and day-to-day school procedures experience improvements in attendance, academic progress, test scores and student behavior. School agriculture programme, is a participatory implementation curriculum (Konyango, 2015). When youth do not have a say, quality is likely to be compromised during implementation and thus hinder the programme from achieving the dream of transferring skills meant for self-reliance among a critical mass of Kenyan youth, for purposes of benefiting them, their societies and the nation as a whole.

In the study, student youth rated strategies 5, 4 and 2 as more significantly very important than the rest including strategy 3 that is on decision making (Tables 4). Strategy 5 states that school administration should recognize student youth and seek for their ideas on how products from their school farm agriculture projects should be used. The Kenya national examination council (KNEC) guidelines on KCSE agriculture projects stipulate that the secondary fourth year students who are to undertake the projects should have a say on the fate of the products from their agriculture projects conducted in the school farm (KNEC 2019). However, the consensuses in responses from student youth in this study seem to suggest that school principals and agriculture teachers possibly use the products without consulting them. The observation is in agreement with the MYSA (2007), and Mutuku (2011) who observe that young people in Kenya are marginalized in decision making. According to UN (2003) marginalization of youth in decision making occurs in families, schools, local communities, in programmes, local, regional and national governments. Thus, Mutuku, (2011) recommends for a radical change towards respecting the participatory rights of youth in all spheres of life if the issues that affect them are to be addressed effectively. Where views of youth are not sought for or respected especially on aspects in which they have invested their time and

energy and in matters that affect them, they may feel missed as a cheap source of labour and hence resentment. This finding might be one of the reasons for low participation of student youth in school agriculture programmes. Strategy 4 notes that if school administration could listen to the voices of student youth it will build confidence for free discussions on the challenges faced in implementing school agriculture programme. From the results it appears that school principals do not listen to the voice of youth and incidences of victimization of those students who speak their mind might be real thus making them to fear. In such a scenario the challenges student youth face during implementation of school agriculture programme go unaddressed leading to none attainment of the intended objectives more so the vocational one. Mager and Nowak, (2015) observe that victimization of students when they voice their concerns has negative effects on participation since it leads to disillusionment, disappointment and frustrations. Listening to student youth is important in ensuring that secondary school agriculture programme is implemented as a hands-on subject in order to achieve the intended objective, of inculcating skills among youth for self-reliance (Kenya Institute of Education (KIE), 1989) and national development. Strategy 2 states that the views of youth should be listened to and be seen to influence the implementation of school agriculture especially the selection of KCSE agriculture projects. This is an indication that youth are not listened to nor consulted in decision making even on matters that concern, possibly the reason for the high rating of the strategy. If the student youth are listened to, then possibly their views are not taken into consideration in which case they do not influence their concerns. Hart (1992); Jensen and Simovska, (2005) state that such decorative and tokenism type of participation of youth in decision making does not improve expected outcomes. When the voice of young people is not heard then they are forced to implement other peoples' ideas, leading to lack of interest and failure of the programme in achieving its aim, the vocational objective in this case. The findings on this strategy corroborate those by MYSA, (2007); Wood, Larson & Brown, (2009) who advocate for the inclusion of youth in decision making on programmes that concern.

4.2 Relationship between the level of participation in decision making and the level of implementation of school agriculture programme by student youth

There is a strong positive correlation between level of participation in decision making and level of implementation of school agriculture programme (Table 5). Thus, the implementation is significantly improved by engaging student youth in decision making on school agriculture programme. The finding confirm that student youth are more likely to implement school agriculture programme better and with enthusiasm if they are involved in decisions making on it and this might lead to better acquisition of skills and knowledge attainment for self reliance thereby meeting the vocational objective. The response may be an indication that the student youth may be having issues in the

manner school agriculture programme is implemented. Their participation in decision making on implementation will therefore provide them space to air their views on some critical aspects of the programme freely as a result of being recognized by the school administration. This probably will build confidence among the student youth and eliminate the negative attitude they harbour towards school agriculture as a result of being part and parcel of solution providers to the problems they face.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

i) Student youth background on parents' land size and category of school attended make non-significant difference in their level of participation in decision making on implementation of school agriculture programme
ii) There is a strong positive correlation between level of participation in decision making and level of implementation of school agriculture programme by student youth. Therefore, increased level of student youth participation in decision making on implementation of the programme will improve effectiveness in imparting agriculture skills to young people for self-reliance.
iii) Student youth rated as very important the five strategies proposed to enhance their participation in decision making on implementation of secondary school agriculture programme for its effectiveness in its vocational objective with strategies 5, 4 and 2 outstanding in that context.

These findings will be useful in addressing student youth participation issues in decision making on the implementation of secondary school agriculture programme to improve its effectiveness in transfer of knowledge and skills, and to enhance learning and developmental outcomes in young people for self reliance, thus achieving the vocational objective of school agriculture.

6. Acknowledgements

This article is extract of the objective one of PhD thesis of the first author. We are grateful to the Vice Chancellor, Kisii University for providing a study leave to the main author to undertake the reaesrch. The Department of Agricultural Education and Extension and Dean, School of Agriculture and Natural Resources Management are all gratefully acknowledged for availing facilities that enabled this research work to be done.

References

Borden M. L., Perkins F. D., Villarruel A. F., Carleton-Hug A., Stone R. M., and Keith G. J. (2006), Challenges and Opportunities to Latino Youth Development: Increasing Meaningful Participation in Youth Development Programe. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences. DOI: 10.1177/0739986306286711. http://hjb.sagepub.com/content/28/2/187.

Buijs G. J. (2009), Better schools through health: Networking for health promoting schools in Europe. *European Journal of Education,* 44, 507–520

Charles A., and Haines K. (2014), Measuring young people's participation in decision making: What young people say. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, *22*(3), 641–659. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718182-55680022

Cohen, L. Manion L. and Morrison K. (2007), *Research Methods in Education*. Education (Vol. 55). http://doi.org/10.111/j.1467-8527.00388_4.x Croom Helm Ltd, London.

Cook-Sather A. (2006), Sound, presence, and power: "Student Voice" in Educational Research and Reform. *Curriculum Inquiry,* 36, 359–390

Daniel M. (2004), Doing Quantitative Research in Education, Sage Publications, 241 p.

De Acedo Lizárraga M. L. S., De Acedo Baquedano M. T. S., and Cardelle-Elawar M. (2007), Factors that affect decision making: Gender and age differences. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, *7*(3), 381–391.

Eisemon, T., & Nyamete, A. (1990). School Literacy and Agricultural Modernization in Kenya. Comparative Education Review, 34(2), 161-176. Retrieved February 9, 2021, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1187951

Hart A. R. (1992), Children's Participation: From tokenism to citizenship Florence, Italy: UNICEF International Child Development Centre (Innocenti Essays No. 4).

Hyman I. A., and Snook P. A. (2000), Dangerous schools and what you can do about them. Phi Delta Kappan 81(7):489–501.

Ingleby E. (2012), Research Methods in Education . Professional Development in Education. http://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2011.643130.

Jaetzold R., and Schmidt H. (1992), Farm management Handbook of Kenya: Natural Conditions and Farm Management Information. Volume II/A. West Kenya (Nyanza and Western Provinces). Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya, in Cooperation with the German Agricultural

Jensen, B. B and Simovska,V. (2005). Involving students in learning and health promotion processes - clarifying why? what? and how? Promotion & Education, vol. 12, 3-4: pp. 150-156.

Jensen M., Mattheis A., and Johnson B. (2012), Using Student Learning and Development Outcomes to Evaluate a First-Year Undergraduate Group Video Project, CBE—Life Sciences Education, Volume 11, 68–80, Spring.

Kathuri N. J. Pals D. A. (1993), Introduction to research. Njoro, Kenya: Educational Media centre, Egerton University

KCSE. (2019). Kenya National Examinations Council (KCSE), KCSE agriculture project instructions. Nairobi: Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC).

KIE. (1989). Kenya Institute of Education (KIE). Secondary school agriculture syllabus. Nairobi: Kenya Literature Bureau (KLB).

Konthari C. R. (2004), Research Methodology. *Methods and Techniques*. New age International Publishers. New Delhi: India. 401p.

Krejcie R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970), Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308.

Kathuri, J.N. and Pals, D.A. (1993). Introduction to Educational Research. Njoro: Egerton University Press.

Konyango J.J. J.O and Asienyo O. B. (2015), Secondary School Agriculture: Participatory Approaches to the Implementation of Secondary School Agriculture curriculum in Kenya Between 1959 and 2012: *International Journal of Scientific Research and Innovative Technology*. 2 (1): 1-11.

Konyango J. J. J. O., Onyango, C.A, and Asienyo, B. O (2015). Resources and Facilities for Secondary School Agriculture: A Beacon for Rural Transformation and Development in Kenya. Int. J. Innovation Appl. Stud. 2:1.

Krejcie, R.V. and Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement. 30*(3): pp 607-610. doi:10.1177/001316447003000308

Kus, Z. (2015), Participation Status of Primary School Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *177*(July 2015), 190–196. ttps://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.381.

Levin B. (2000), Putting students at the centre in education reform. *Journal of Educational Change*, 1, 155–172

Lodge C. (2005), From hearing voices to engaging in dialogue: Problematising student Participation in school improvement. *Journal of Educational Change*, 6, 125–146

Mager U. and Nowak P. (2012), Effects of student participation in decision making at school. A systematic review and synthesis of empirical research. *Educational Research Review, 7* (1), 38–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2011.11.001.

Making. *The Wold Programmeof Action for Youth to the Year 2000 and Beyound*. New York, United. Nations. 271-288.

Mugenda O. M and Mugenda A. G. (2003), *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches.* Nairobi: African Centre for technology Studies (ACTS).

Mitra, D. L. (2004). The significance of students: Can increasing "student voice" in schools lead to gains in youth development. *Teachers College Record, 106*(4), 651–688.

Mitra, D. L. (2005). Increasing student voice and moving toward youth leadership. *The Prevention Researcher, 13* (1), 7–10.

Mutuku C.M. (2011), Youth Empowerment in Kenya: A Policy Science Analysis of Government Values and Priorities. *Youth perspectives on their empowerement in sub - saharan Africa. The Case of Kenya.* Saarbrücken, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishers.

MYSA (2007). Ministry of State and Youth Affairs, Republic of Kenya *(*2007), *Kenya National Youth Policy*. Retrieved in September 15 2020, from http://www.Youthaffairs.go.ke/.national

Nyangau M.K., Kibett J. K. and Ngesa F. U. (2011), Comparison of Perceptions of School Principals, Teachers and Learners Towards Factors Influencing Implementation of Secondary School Agriculture Projects in Kisii District of Kenya. African Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences 3 (2): 57 - 62. ISSN: 2079 -2034.

Rudduck R. and Flutter J. (2000), Pupil participation and pupil perspective: 'Carving a new order of experience'. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 30(1):75 89

Rudduck J. and Fielding M. (2006), Student voice and the perils of popularity. *Educational Review* 58, 219–231

Scales P. C. Benson P. L. Leffert N. and Blyth D. A. (2000), Contribution of developmental assets to the prediction of thriving among adolescents. *Journal of Applied Developmental Science*, *Vol. 4, No. 1*, 27–46.

Simon M. and Goes J. (2013), Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success. DO - 10.13140/RG.2.1.5089.0960. www.dissertationrecipes.com

Simovska V. (2007), The changing meanings of participation in school-based health education and health promotion: The participants' voices. *Health Education Research*, 22, 864–878.

Team (GAT) of the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ), Nairobi, Kenya. 408 p.

Thornberg R. and Elvstrand, H. (2012). Children's experiences of democracy, participation, and trust in school, 2012, International Journal of Educational Research, (53), 44-54.http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2011.12.010.

Thornberg R. and Elvstrand H. (2012), Children's experiences of democracy, participation, and trust in schools. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 53, 44–54

United Nations (1989). Convention on the Rights of the Child. Nov.20, 1989, 1577 U.N. T.S. 3.

United Nations (2003), World Youth Report Chapter 10: Youth Participation in Decision making.

United Nations (2003). World Youth Report Chapter 10: Youth Participation in Decision Making. The Wold Programme of Action for Youth to the Year 2000 and Beyond. United Nations. New York. PP 270 -288.

Wood D., Larson R. and Brown J. R. (2009), How adolescents come to see themselves as more responsible through participation in youth programs. *Child Development*, 50, 295–309.

World Bank. 2000. Can Africa Claim the 21st Century?. Washington, DC. © World Bank. ://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/22962 License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.

Wiersma W. (2009), Introduction to research methods in education. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 40

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (**CC BY-NC-ND) (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/**).