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ABSTRACT

This study was focused on the views of the various stakeholders in the secondary schools of Migwani division, Mwingi District as pertains to the effectiveness of the school administrators in maintenance of discipline in their institutions. It sought to identify the causes of indiscipline, how indiscipline is handled in schools and the degree to which school administrators are efficient in their role of managing discipline.

The rationale and motivation for carrying out this study was based on the premises that erratic indiscipline cases had been reported in the secondary schools in the division in the recent past and as it would be expected, this had limited education success in the institutions concerned. It is for this reason that this study attempted to examine school administrators' abilities of mobilizing human and physical resources in their institutions to enhance discipline amongst learners.

Purposive stratified sampling was used to obtain a representative sample of eight (8) secondary schools in the division. The respondents in the sample schools included; school administrators, teachers and students. By administering questionnaires, data were obtained from respondents. Data obtained were subjected to analysis using the descriptive statistics to enable
the study come up with conclusions and recommendations for the existing situation.

The major findings were that indiscipline is caused by; peer pressure, drug abuse, inconsistency of punishment administration, poor up-bringing of pupils and poor student-student relationship.

Based on the study findings, the main recommendations were: School administrators needed to be consistent and exercise impartiality when handling student disciplinary issues, they needed also, to facilitate through a participatory approach the establishment of; effective punishment or discipline policies, strong school culture based on respect rather than fear, and reinforcement program for desirable behaviour among students.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

In the contemporary society, it has been observed that for any social system to run smoothly and achieve objectives of its establishment, members of such a system would require to adhere to norms of an acceptable behaviour pattern necessary for actualization of maximum performance. Such an acceptable behaviour pattern varies from one social system to another and it is dynamic rather than static. It is also overt that the management of any social system plays a paramount role in fostering and enforcing an acceptable code of behaviour amongst all the members of the organization.

A code of behaviour is enshrined in what is commonly referred to as code of conduct, regulation and ethics. Strict adherence to acceptable behaviour as provided for by written or unwritten, formal or informal code of conduct, regulation and ethics of a given organization amount to discipline while on the converse indiscipline is a consequence of infraction of code of conduct, regulation and ethics of an organization. Thus, to judge individual(s) of a particular social organization as disciplined or indisciplined is pegged on the degree to which their behaviour is individually or collectively consonant to
the established code of conduct, regulations and ethics governing the members in the organization in question.

Discipline effects permeate all dimensions of an organization influencing the positive performance of an organization. Manifestations of good discipline as a consequence of good leadership and efficient management results not only to actualization of organizational aims and objectives in a cost-effective manner but also it leads to existence of an integrated and harmonious social system upon which individuals in an organization derive their social needs. Indiscipline on the other hand has the effect of increasing the cost of production or running the organization and ultimately limiting the extent of achievement of organization aims and objectives.

On close examination of our education system, one might be tempted to say that our education sector seems to be slowly but surely headed for a major crisis. This is because norms, values and practices that are supposed to govern smooth running of our education institutions as social systems are no longer in place and thus indiscipline amongst learners has escalated at all levels of our education system. In fact to hear, to read about or to witness acts of indiscipline emanating from our secondary schools is becoming normal despite the constant expression of dissatisfaction and disapproval of acts of indiscipline by the society.
Its evident that indiscipline is not a preserve for selected specific schools, rather its being manifested amongst small and big schools, some of which are traditionally renowned prestigious secondary schools. Table (I) below shows the number of secondary schools, which experienced student unrest of diverse gravity in the year 2000/2001 only.

**Table 1: Number of Schools which Experienced Students unrest by Province in the year 2000/2001.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Existing no. of secondary schools</th>
<th>No. of schools that experienced students unrest</th>
<th>Percentage of school that went on strikes</th>
<th>Gravity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Violent and Destructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>Destruction of school property and loss of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02.6</td>
<td>Destruction of school property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyanza</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02.6</td>
<td>Destruction of school property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rift valley</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>08.0</td>
<td>Violent and destructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>04.7</td>
<td>Minor damage of school property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>093</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Minor damage of school property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North eastern</td>
<td>021</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>Destruction of school property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Daily nation, Wednesday family magazine Wednesday January 19th 2002, section 2
Table (I) indicates that the number of schools that experienced students' unrests and the percentage of schools that went on strikes across the whole country in 2000/2001 were relatively high and the repercussions of this were enormous to the education sector.

To normalize the situation in our schools, the Minister for Education gave strict directives to education administrators to increase their vigour and be more vigilant in maintenance of order in their respective schools. Meanwhile, as various dimensions of causes of indiscipline in our institutions are being discussed, debated and analysed at different forums, it is apparent that the Ministry of Education and the whole society in general seem to concur on a number of pertinent issues. Among the paramount issue at hand is credibility and effectiveness of educational administrators in stamping out indiscipline or otherwise maintaining discipline in their institutions. This study will be based on these premises.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
Persistent strikes, unrests and general disturbances that have characterized our schools in the recent past is an indicator of presence of indiscipline amongst learners. These acts of indiscipline have led to loss of life, destruction of property in form of school infrastructure etc. and uncalled for wastage of enormous time and energy all which have the implication of delimiting the achievement of our national goals of providing education.
Indiscipline amongst learners is not only a disturbing issue to the teachers, school administrators, parents and government, but also a major concern to all Kenyans because products of our education system are graduating at different levels after a considerable large amount of tax payer money has been used to educate them yet their conduct, behaviour and level of attainment of skills for life is not as envisaged.

Our education sector is thus in a perplexing situation because indiscipline and its ramifications are consistently manifested in our schools at times erratically or in a wave yet the major stalkholders cannot accurately pinpoint the root causes of indiscipline in schools.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to examine school administrators in their commitment to identifying and addressing causes of students deviant behaviour in their schools. Specifically, this study will aim at meeting the following specific objectives;

i) To identify the main causes of indiscipline among learners in secondary schools.

ii) To identify how causes of indiscipline are handled in secondary schools.
iii) To analyze the efficiency of various leadership styles used by school administrators in the management of indiscipline in their institutions.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS
The following research questions guided the study:
(a) What are the main causes of indiscipline in secondary schools?
(b) How are the main causes of indiscipline handled in schools?
(c) How effectively have school administrators played their roles in managing discipline in their schools?

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY
The study offers administrative-oriented resolutions and recommendations upon which self-evaluation can be based on by concerned school administrators within the region of the study and this should culminate in conscious actions directed towards restoring or otherwise maintenance of discipline amongst learners in schools.
1.6 LIMITATIONS

In conducting this study, the researcher encountered the following limitation

a) **Funds constraint**

The researcher was to meet all the expenses to be incurred in producing this piece of work at all levels. These expenses included; traveling, stationary, typing, binding, subsistence etc.

If funds were not a limitation, the researcher would have hired a research assistant on temporal basis and increased sample size besides covering other expected costs.

b) **Time constraint**

There was no sufficient time for preparing and conducting a comprehensive research covering all the secondary schools within the region of the study. This is more so given that the researcher was a classroom teacher with a high teaching load.

1.7 DELIMITATIONS

In carrying-out this study, the researcher delimited himself to:

a) The secondary schools in the region under study (i.e. Migwani division of Mwingi district) and focused on the administrators of these schools.

b) The administrative-oriented factors as pertaining to discipline.
1.8 ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were made in this study: -

a) The schools under the study had school rules and regulations.

b) The administrators used varied disciplinary approaches to enforce discipline.

c) All the schools under study had some form of indiscipline amongst learners.

d) Effective administration leads to good discipline amongst learners.

e) Consistent application of preventive measures by school administrators leads to good discipline in schools.

1.9 DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions hold true for the terms used in this study:-

a) Discipline - learners' conformity to rules and regulations of the school.

b) School Administrators- those who are in charge of running the school i.e. Principals or Head teachers and their deputies.

c) Participatory leadership- type of leadership where the school administrators consults with all teachers and students in making decisions.

d) Preventive discipline measures - administrative actions taken by school administrators to encourage students to follow rules and regulations of the school.
e) **Corrective disciplinary measures** - administrative actions taken by school administrators to discourage further infringement of rules and regulations of the school by students.

f) **Corporal punishment** - all forms of punishment that inflict pain to the student
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The researcher reviewed various documents written from different sources and these acted as sources of secondary data. The documented works on discipline management in schools included; textbooks, past thesis and projects work, education policy papers, educational magazines, newspapers and journals.

The literature review was divided into two main areas. First, there was literature concerning causes of indiscipline amongst learners, and secondly literature on management of discipline in schools as manifested in styles of leadership of education administrators.

2.2 CAUSES OF INDICLINE AMONGST LEARNERS

A fundamental issue when attempting to probe indiscipline amongst learners is to understand its cause. When addressing the issue of indiscipline in schools Ozigi (1978, P.40) cautions that, the symptoms of indiscipline in schools are easily recognizable, but the causes are more subtle, hence, he gives example of symptoms of indiscipline as; pupil's demonstration (peaceful or violent), general unrest, mass disobedience, deliberate breaches of school rules, drug use, delinquency, drunkenness, stealing, truancy, absenteeism,
persistent lateness, bulling or laziness. On the other hand, he says that there are many causes of indiscipline, including such factors as bad and inadequate food, ineffective teaching, bad staff behaviour, authoritarian methods of administration, harsh school rules, the influence of home or society, harshness of school prefects, unsatisfactory curricula, poor examination results or poor communication between the school administration, staff and pupils. Okinda et al (1995, P.36) assert that indiscipline in schools can be caused by:

i) Negative teachers.

ii) Parents who are unable to bear the burden of school fees and see the head as the cause.

iii) Politicians who may want heads whom they can control and manipulate thus admitting failures to keep the M.P. popular.

iv) The lazy and incompetent heads can cause indiscipline in that students can see through you. There are some heads who are weak and they try to please students at the expense of other teachers.

v) Ministry of Education antagonizes school heads by announcing publicly that they released grants and bursaries but maybe they have only sent Ksh10,000 while the needy parents
and students will be expecting a lot.

vi) Perhaps teachers have not been posted to teach certain subjects, The students may not wish to understand.

vii) Negative influence by other students who for reasons best known to themselves have realised that they are failing and would want the whole lot to sink with them.

The above causes of indiscipline have somehow been summarized by Tabitha W. in her M.Ed thesis entitled “A special study of discipline problems affecting secondary schools of Thika” (1986, P.15) where she argues out that, indiscipline of students have causes that exist in schools, in the society and in the psychological state of student. One would thus say that indiscipline amongst learners has a multiplicity of causes that emanate from the environment i.e. Society and school where the learner was brought-up and is studying respectively, which ultimately influence the psychological state of the learner negatively. According to Farrant (1980, P.68) environment like the blacksmith’s forge, tempers and alters our natural characteristics, environment moulds and alters us according to the treatment given. A Conclusive fact would therefore be that students indiscipline is a manifestation of what is happening in the school and society at large yet unfortunately they have little control over this.
Different scholars concur that it is difficult to quantify the degree of contribution of the school and society in inculcating discipline or otherwise indiscipline to the learner. However, it's apparent that the school plays a critical role in educating (facilitating acquisition and development of desired knowledge, skills and attitudes) to the learner through the school curriculum. In the school context the Head Teachers Manual (1975, P.30) emphasis is made very clear that;

*The Head bears the ultimate responsibility for all school discipline.*

As the Heads Manual put it, the head teacher is responsible for school discipline because the smooth running of a disciplinary system depends on a well-defined basic policy established by the head in the consultation with the staff. This policy must be enforced fairly and consistency by all persons in authority. To this extent, a head teacher becomes a cause of indiscipline if he or she is ineffective in his or her entire leadership and managerial roles. Bruce and Shelley (1971, P.217) document that, factors often pointed as causing school discipline problems are arbitrarily imposed authoritarian methods, disorderly classrooms, and in decisiveness or favourism and unfairness on the part of the school staff members.

A head teacher who fails to consult intensively at different levels and forums with his or her student, staff, guardians, PTA, and BOG on the establishment
and enforcement of school rules and regulations will be promoting indiscipline in the school. Olembo and Cameron (1986, P.56) stress that, the head teacher must realize that his school is a social institution where both teachers and students interact for special purposes. For these purposes and objectives to be realized, there is need for some restrictions. The head teacher must determine and administer together with students and teachers the policies, restrictions and discipline. The participation of all stakeholders is essential. On their part, Okinda and Owuor (1995, P.2) note down that;

*Many head teachers make a crucial error in that they ignore their juniours and only pay homage to the senior officers... they forget that success will depend on the support of others; teachers, students, parents, the community, Ministry officials and the subordinate staff.*

Indeed Ochieng' (1997, P.16) acknowledges and advises that;

*The successful functioning of institution is not one man's job, ... it calls for instillation of team work spirit.*

Lack of teamwork spirit in the formulation of school rules and regulation compounded with the inconsistency in the enforcement of the set rules is a cause of indiscipline in schools. The document of the “Task Force on Student Discipline and unrest in secondary schools” (2001, P.47) noted that;
Where students are not involved in the formulation of school rules, there is lack of ownership resulting in resentment and ultimately open defiance.

(Some school) rules are undemocratic, vague and oppressive and were at times applied selectively. In some cases, these rules were not documented and that schools were operating on existing traditions.

On the basis of the above, recommendation 108 of the “Task Force” was that, school rules be reviewed from time to time and students be involved in their formulation, the draft school rules should be presented for discussion in the open forum (BARAZA). Once the rules have been adopted, every student should be given a copy to be signed in the presence of the parent/guardian as binding contract.

Lack of consultative forums for the review of school rules and regulations leads to existence of absolute, unpurposeful, unenforceable rules and regulations that act as spring board for proliferation of indiscipline in a school.

Griffin in his book “School Mastery” (1994, P.29) says that;

Lack of communication is the greatest single factor causing school strikes.
He (Griffin) recommends to the head teachers that they should explain “Why” if you make a new rule, explain why it is necessary if you are having a problem in filling a teacher vacancy, or in obtaining much needed equipment, or in providing the usual food and what actions you have attempting to overcome it, when this is done students feel that they are trusted and can be relied on, consequently, they give loyal support. Fail to do this and the inevitable result is misunderstanding and ill will which culminate to indiscipline.

Okumbe (1998, P.119) uses the analogy of the “Hot stove rule” as advocated by MCGregor. Thus, (Okumbe) comes up with five main principles of setting good disciplinary actions (punishment), hence; a disciplinary action should be applied immediately, must be consistently applied, must be objective, should be impersonal, must avoid entrapment and should allow right of appeal. In support of these principles, a document by the Ministry of Education entitled “Training for School Management, a series of training modules for head teachers and trainers” (2000, P.29) States.

*Clearly defined rules are an important element of a good school.*

*As far as possible, staff, parents and the school committee should be in agreement on the type of punishment that is given where rules are broken.*
Olembo and Cameron (1986) recommend that the head teacher should make sure that all his teachers know exactly what punishment they can give to a pupil for what reasons and the procedure they should follow. Thus, a school should have a punishment policy and the head teacher is to make sure that all teachers go by it.

Thus, a major cause of indiscipline in schools is not only due to lack of consistency in checking indiscipline among students but also due to inconsistency in application of (known) disciplinary actions to offenders. Where lack of consistency in checking indiscipline is exercised by the administration, this have the unfortunate effect of tricking down to all members of staff, so, some will punish unreasonably severely while others will not punish, some will decide to advice while others will openly reprimand, others will even decide to ignore indiscipline behaviour. To this extent, Roberson (1986) in his book “Effective Classroom Control” caution that, every time a rule is broken without a penalty, it becomes more difficult subsequently to enforce it.

Mbiti (1984) observed that;

There is no point in having rules or setting goals in connection with discipline unless we have some way of enforcing them. Consequences must accompany all rules and regulations. If a consequence always
follow certain behaviour, the child will learn to connect the two and pattern his behaviour accordingly.

Ozigi (1978, P.36) rightly point out that;

An inconsistent application of a disciplinary action may do harm than good to an organization by inadvertently reinforcing ... undesirable behaviour.

On the issue of punishment, the Head's Manual (1979, P.31) recommends that, each school should have a system of punishment, which is applied fairly and consistently. Wangeri (1986, P.15) in her thesis entitled "A special study of Discipline problems Affecting Secondary Schools in Thika" Cautions that; when punishing students for observable (overt) behaviour, one should look beyond this to understand the covert behaviour (motivational) states that lead to (mis-behaviour). By attempting to analyze the cause of behaviour i.e. "Behaviour analysis" we are able to pinpoint and address motivational state that leads to mis-behaviour. For instance, students who see very little of their head teacher teaching or who are openly reprimanded for making noise during night preps in poorly lighted classroom will be frustrated and will consequently take the slighted opportunity to project their frustrations. They can refuse to attend to their meals under the pretext that the food is badly cooked, will bully the junior and weaker students purporting that they are
arrogant, they can organize a boycott of classes, strike or even burn the administration block under the pretext that there are no enough books in the school library. The point here is that, punishing mis-behaviour is not an end by its self rather it can be a cause of further mis-behaviour until and unless the original motivational states that lead to mis-behaviour is comprehensively addressed. There is evidence in our schools that little effort is done to identify and address the motivational state that lead to mis-behaviour.

It is usually said that teachers are the greatest assets to the head who want to succeed. The document "Training for Schools Management" (2000, P.22) from the Ministry of Education stress this fact by saying;

*The key to effective Management is the ability to encourage and motivate your staff. If the relationships within the school are poor and staff feel that their efforts are not appreciated, even the most carefully planned programme will fail.*

Indiscipline in a school can emanate from poor co-operation extended by the teachers to their head teacher due to demotivation of teachers by their head teacher. Teachers can be demotivated by their head teacher via a variety of avenues. A head teacher who is not open, sincere and honest with teachers, and who also fails to create an atmosphere of reconciliation, understanding
co-operation and good-will, creates very fertile grounds for teachers withdrawal resulting to passive support in the formulation and the enforcement of school rules and regulations. By extension, a head teacher who is not strict and fair to all his staff, have favourites among his staff, considers ethnic and unprofessional factors when delegating responsibilities and making internal appointments etc will be demotivating teachers among his staff who cherish professionalism in the teaching fraternity.

An effective administrator should aim to check indiscipline in their institution by being ready to listen, guide and effectively motivate the guidance and counselling teachers. The Koech education commission of inquiry into the education system in Kenya (1999, P.61) observed that, the increase in the anti-social behaviour in schools is due to inadequacy of handling guidance and counselling throughout the country. Thus, in an institution where the administration care less to establish a motivated, guided and vibrant guidance and counselling department/committee, then it is undisputable that the learners will be deprived of the much needed advice, counsel and guidance which essentially check indiscipline in a school.

Management of discipline requires collective efforts not only from the members of staff but also from the prefect body. Ozigi (1978,P.36) point out that;
Prefectorial system is one of the most effective ways of involving pupils directly in the administration of the school because they are constantly in touch with other students.

A demotivated prefect body irrespective of being made-up of the best student leaders will not be effective in its roles but rather will engage itself in disciplinary practices such as vernacular speaking against school rules and regulation. These have the effect of enhancing indiscipline in the whole school. Thus, where the administration does not have a system of motivating, supporting, and directing its prefect body, indiscipline will persist in the school. Griffin (1994, P.29) advised the head teacher that;

*Train your prefects and have a close relationship with them ... seize every chance of bestowing praise (to them).*

Having a relationship with prefect would mean having frequent consultative meeting of addressing challenges and problems they face, reviewing the events of the week and planning for any special activities or event in the week a head.
2.3. MANAGEMENT OF DISCIPLINE IN SCHOOLS

Management of discipline in schools is a major task that effectively puts into test the leadership and management skills of the school administration. Griffin (1994, P.22) put it this way,

A head’s public and professional reputation will depend more on the standard of discipline in his school than any other single factor — for good discipline brings good results in every field of school results.

Further, Griffin (1994) cautions the head teachers that, even though its reflected in the Heads Manual that discipline and the supervision of the prefects is the role of the deputy head teacher, theirs is a more paramount role of providing ultimate leadership for the propagation and proliferation of desirable behaviour in the whole institution.

Administrative systems in our schools exhibit different styles of leadership as determined by their abilities and skills. Leadership styles evident in schools include; laissez-faire, autocratic, participative, consultative and democratic. Each of this leadership style have its repercussions on the student discipline and it is wise for administrators to lean on the best style so as to optimalize actualization of discipline in their institutions. Nengley et al (1969, P.35) avers that,

The administrator who wishes to be successful in the administration ... must be familiar with the various concepts of leadership and
must become adept to performing desirable leadership roles.

2.3.1 Autocratic leadership style

As far as autocratic leadership is concerned Bennaars et al (1994, P.250) summarize autocratic leadership as below,

... Autocratic leaders usually demand unquestionable obedience from all within an organization, the members have no say in matters that affect their welfare. This is typical of what happens when leaders are appointed to serve the interest of those who appointed them ... any head teacher who dictate to staff members is seen as an autocratic leader.

In a school, an administration exercising autocratic management style will hardly allow teachers and pupils to freely exchange views on discipline related matters, he will make almost all decisions and give instructions on what need to be done. James et al (1969, P.140) in his book entitled "Secondary School Administration" says that an administrator with authoritarian leadership have the basic belief that he must tell others what to do since he is the appointed head of the school and thinks that he knows the best. An autocratic administrator will therefore draft school rules and regulations, review them if need be and demand or expect pupils, staff and guardians to play their part of following or enforcing them. Such an
administrator will by extension play unnecessary active role in appointment of the prefect body and assignment of their roles.

Bruce and Shelley (1971, P.427) argue out that, among the factors responsible for causing school discipline problems is arbitrarily imposed authoritarian methods. In the East African Standard issue of 2nd April, 2002, Nyamira District Education Officer (D.E.O) took issue with some head teachers whom he accused of practising dictatorship, he said that this played a leading role in causing unrest in schools as students felt sidelined and victimized. He advised head teachers to engage in dialogue to help curb-escalating incidences of violence in schools. In disapproval to the use of authoritarian leadership in schools. Benaars et al (1994, P.257) says,

The head teacher as the leader of the school must devote time to address the students, listen to their feeling and views and take action where necessary. Let the students see the school as an extended family home where the head teacher takes the role of the father or mother. Student must be comfortable in the presence of the head teacher who cares for them.

On his part, Ozigi (1978, P.39) asserts that, authoritarian methods of controlling student behaviour mainly via force and physical punishment may
work to some extent, but it is a disciplinary method based on fear. Once the fear is removed or the pupil gets used to it, the externally imposed punishment, rather than serve as corrective measure, will produce only negative results of compounded mass indiscipline. In conclusion therefore, one would say that autocratic leadership in schools is not an effective method of Management of discipline. In this study, attention was directed in establishing whether we had autocratic school administrators and the consequences thereof as might be manifested in the educational institutions.

2.3.2 Laissez-Faire leadership style
Under the management of discipline via the laissez-fair style, the administration makes very few rules and regulations and tends to allow events to take place without much consideration. Okumbe (1998, P.98) points out that, laissez-faire leader tends to avoid power and authority; the leader depends largely on the group to establish goals and means for achieving progress and success.

If teachers and student were given unquestionable power and authority, we would end-up with a chaotic system where everyone would do as he wishes without taking responsibility over it, consequently, indiscipline would be insurmountable. Griffin (1994,P.36) disapproves laissez-faire leadership in schools by saying that teachers must not be allowed to send pupils out of class and should be forbidden to invent and use punishment that are bizarre
or unduly humiliating like keeping a child kneeling in front of blackboard during the lesson. Laisse-faire leadership style promotes inconsistency in handling discipline in a school and this acts as a good precedence for indiscipline of pupils. This research was aimed at unveiling the degree to which school administrators had tended to give excess power and authority to their teachers and student leaders in handling discipline issues to the detriment of effective discipline management in their institutions.

2.3.3 Participative leadership style
As the words suggest, participative leadership style is manifested via the involvement of all participants in the institution when making decisions and enforcing them. This style of leadership is also called consultative since the administration consults and incorporates the perception of all stakeholders in identifying and finding solutions to problems. Okumbe (1998, P.94) asserts that, in participative leadership, the leader consults with the subordinates and embodies their suggestions in decision-making. Kochhar (1972, P.125) concurs with Okumbe (1998) when he says that,

*The principal (school administrator) is a group leader who knows how to involve people, how to arrange conditions and initiate processes that will bring out the best in each participant*
... the principal is the group leader to direct and stimulate group effort.

A school administration system that cherishes participatory leadership will strive to unite all members of staff as a body of professionals with one common objective, it will seek effective avenues of involving not only pupils and guardians in discipline management but will also involve the ancillary members of staff and the community surrounding the school. Jones (1966, P.25) avers that, successful school administration value teamwork in furthering the goals of the institution, the days of the one-man show are over, and some would say it really never existed.

Jones (1966) gives essential ingredients of teamwork as below

(a) *Must have a goal, purpose, cause, or objective identified, accepted, understood, and desired by all the team*

(b) *Must have spirit, morale and the desire to win even at considerable individual sacrifice.*

(c) *Lines of authority and responsibility must be both clearly defined and understood.*

(d) *Channels of communication must be established.*

(e) *The leadership must discover and utilize to the fullest*
extent the creative abilities of each of the individuals and wield them into a smooth working team.

Brown (1984, P.21) in his advocacy for participation model of leadership argues out that the rationale of participative leadership is that people tend to be most enthusiastic and most productive in activities when they have a voice in what is happening to them and their programs.

In a participative environment, all members of staff purposefully work together and inculcate virtues of good behaviour to the learners both inside and outside the classroom. They impress the student community by setting good example of disciplined behaviour to be emulated. The administration acts as a role model by setting very high standards of desirable behaviour for both teachers and students to copy, such a standard of behaviour would have its premises from a clear discipline policy emanating from a consensus. James et al (1969, P.349) gives an example of how an administrator can handle Guidance and Counselling to address indiscipline in his institution via participative approach, thus,

In order to make a counselling program work the administrator must consider himself the “counselor’s counselor”. The administrator must provide the leadership for developing:

(i) a written statement of the goals and purpose of the guidance
programme and its relationship to the total school program,

(ii) an organizational plan for guidance that is consistent with its goals,

(iii) a job description for guidance positions, and (iv) policy statement about the program. He must interpret the program to others (whole school community).

As far as treatment of pupils is concerned, Docking (1980, P.800) says that, in participatory leadership, teachers need to respect their pupils as persons with their own destiny, this involves creating an atmosphere whereby they can raise their concern and giving them room to make choices based on advice and counsel given, this aids in developing a relationship with them and making them feel that they are responsible for their actions. In support of this, the 15-member Task Force on Student Discipline and Unrest in Secondary Schools which was headed by Director of Education one Naomi Wangai recommended among other things that, periodic consultative meetings be held between prefects, teachers and the school administration and the minute of this meetings be tabled at BOG meetings.

The involvement of parents or guardians as a stakeholder in the management of student discipline as advocated by the participative leadership is important because a number of students become deviant
because of conflict between home rules or culture and school rules. Catherine (1998, P.124) in her M.Ed. thesis entitled "An investigation of the disciplinary styles and problems of Nairobi parents with children in standard eight, Nairobi" found that, sixty-five per cent of parent felt they were to blame and 31.6 per cent of the parents felt that they were not to blame for their children indiscipline.

Some students find that some of the behaviour which they are rewarded at home is deemed improper or immoral by the school authority; as a result, they become victims of negative transfer of learning. For instance, behaviour such as drinking alcohol and smoking cigarette may be accepted in certain homes but when children from such homes join church-sponsored schools or even public schools, such behaviours are condemned. Such a scenario can best be addressed with active involvement of the guardian. The challenge here is; does the administration cherish this and does it have time, skills and confidence to engage the guardian into dialogue that culminates to acceptance of school rules.

Dale (1993, P.7) have it that, critics of participative decision making in school set-up purport that the participation will undermine the administrator's ability to lead. To some extent, maybe this is the mentality the school administration has when they delimit participation in their leadership. But
to the contrary, Brown (1984, P.21) advices that, the concept of participation does not mean people want to take over the institution or that the leadership must surrender its overall responsibility, rather, it suggests instead the value of leaders who are aware that the people in an organization are most important to institutional creativity, problem solving and new programme implementation and that a system of decentralized leadership is the most likely to ensure the needed high level of motivation.

In conclusion therefore, one would be tempted to observe that the degree to which indiscipline is manifested in a school is directly related to the ineffectiveness to which the institution administration have been unable to establish and enhance various avenues for harmonious participatory relationships among members of school community. In this study, attempts were made to evaluate the extent to which school administrators had embraced participatory approach in discipline management in their institutions.

2.3.3 Democratic leadership style

Some authors consider that democratic leadership is synonymous to the participative or consultative leadership, which is based on the premises of decentralizing power and authority. However, Bennaars et al (1994, P.251) is very emphatic that,

*This style (democratic) is built around the view that power and*
authority must come from the governed people ... a person should have demonstrated that he has the ability and motivation to fulfill the requirement of a leadership position before being given such a position.

In many occasions, the above criterion is ignored when appointing school administrators. The Task Force on Student Discipline and Unrests in Secondary Schools (2001) was informed that some head teachers are not appointed on merit but as a result of other considerations, among these were; political patronage, religious influence, tribalism, clannism, bribery (some heads buy their way in kind or otherwise) or crisis appointment (abrupt need for replacement).

The above, is a complete digression from the rudiments of democratic leadership. More often, not a leader who does not merit his position will be loyal to the “forces” that influenced his appointment than to the institution he is supposed to serve, will also create resentments from his subordinates or colleagues who might not provide the necessary co-operation or support (unless they are bribed, say with some privileges or some power and authority). By extension, such a leader will further be tempted to make internal appointments in his institution with little regard to merit, more so where he feels that his power and authority or otherwise his ability can be challenged. The consequences of undemocratic leadership in school are very
costly and include presence of administrative systems that cannot be trusted to be able to maintain discipline in institutions where this was the culture or effectively restore discipline where there is indiscipline.

Kochhar (1972, P.10) describe a head teacher appointed under democratic considerations as below,

... a man of character, an excellent organizer, a skilled administrator,

a model teacher ... should be able to inspire, those who work

under his direction ... is known by the personalities it (he)

enriches, not by those it (he) dominates or captivates.

The above attributes of a school administrator imply that the administrator in consistently a winner himself before he expects others i.e. teachers, students, parents etc to be winners. He cherishes self-discipline and democratically inspires others towards a powerful positive school spirit, which can be self-perpetuating. A democratic administrator is approachable; gives room for new ideas, constructive criticism and challenges where due from all stakeholders; he gives prompt recognition, appreciation, support and correction as circumstance demand. Such an administrator would instill with ease teamwork spirit and will observe merit and fairness when handling all stakeholders in the school community. In an institution where these virtues are cherished by the administration, they trickle-down to other stakeholders and indiscipline becomes something of the past.
The challenge that presents itself in our schools is that quite a good number of administrators are benevolent democrats who would set very high standards (sometimes unreasonable) of discipline on papers and in their polished speeches and then expect that students, staff and guardians to reach and maintain such standards yet the same administrators manifest actions that rank them poorly as role models. Okinda and Owuor challenge such administrators, thus,

*The head should be the first to practice what he preaches ....*

*Actions speak louder than words.*

Democratic leadership requires one to manifest consistently what he expects of others, any masquerading democratic administrator will be inviting an institutional environment that is devoid of trust and where the subordinates are passive (for convenience) when addressing issues like discipline. The leader will not be having moral authority to force adherence of formulated discipline policy unless he wants to imagine that he can suppress covert resistance from his staff which unfortunately erupts when it is least expected in form of mass indiscipline like strikes that are violent, destructive or otherwise. This study, aimed to establish the extent to which school administrators cherish establishing democratic avenues for maintaining discipline in their schools and hence the degree to which they are perceived by their students and teachers as being democratic.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of secondary school administrators in maintaining and/or restoring discipline in their institutions in Migwani Divisions of Mwingi District. The methodology adopted in this study was as per the following subsections.

- Research design
- Location of the study
- Sampling procedures
- Research instruments
- Pilot study
- Data collection Procedures
- Data analysis

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

This study used descriptive survey design. This design is put forward by Gay (1981, P 155) who defines a survey as, "an attempt to collect data from members of a population in order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variables." This design enabled the researcher to identify and assess the attitudes, opinions, beliefs, views and perceptions held by different stakeholders responsible for pupils' discipline
paying much attention to school administrators ability to mobilize other stakeholders.

Gay (1981, p. 12) says that, a descriptive study determines and reports the way things are, this is done via administration of specific data collection instruments such as questionnaires, interview or observation guides, which aid in obtaining the much needed descriptive data for analysis and thus making conclusions. This study mainly employed questionnaires in collecting data from various stakeholders in regard to presence and maintenance of discipline amongst learners in secondary schools.

3.3 LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA

This study was carried out in Migwani Division of Mwingi District, in Eastern province. Migwani Division is approximately 200 km North East of Nairobi city, the district and by extension the division falls under the eastern block of the Kenyan arid and semi-arid region. Migwani Division is predominantly inhabited by the Akamba ethnic community who are mainly engaged in small-scale farming of legumes and cereals, in addition to keeping indigenous livestock.

Mwingi District and more specifically Migwani Division had been preferred for this study for several reasons:

i) The researcher was familiar with the study area having worked here for several years
ii) It is economical and time saving given that the researcher was based there.

iii) The Division has many as well as various types of secondary schools:

Boys, Girls, Mixed, Day and Boarding Schools

iv) No other research of this type and magnitude had ever been carried out in this area.

3.4 POPULATION OF THE STUDY

This study was based in Migwani Division in Mwingi District. The division has twelve schools i.e. four boys, three girls and five mixed secondary schools. These schools are either day or boarding; one to three streamed; provincial or district schools as shown in the table (ii) below.

Table II: Secondary Schools of Migwani Division, in Mwingi District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Girls (G)</th>
<th>Boarding (B)</th>
<th>Provincial (P)</th>
<th>No. of Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Itoloni Sec School</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migwani Sec School</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P/D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nzauni Sec School</td>
<td>B/G</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyamboo Sec School</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B/D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyome Boys Sec School</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyome Girls Sec School</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thitani Sec School</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P/D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musuani Sec School</td>
<td>B/G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndaluni Sec School</td>
<td>B/G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngutani Sec School</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katoteni Sec School</td>
<td>B/G</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngongoni Sec School</td>
<td>B/G</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sample schools were as follows:

1. Migwani Boys Secondary
2. Kyome Girls Secondary
3. Nzauni Mixed Secondary
4. Thitani Girls Secondary
5. Musuani Mixed Secondary
7. Kyamboo Secondary School
8. Ngutani Secondary School

3.5 SAMPLING PROCEDURES

Out of the twelve schools in the division, (8) eight schools were identified from which the study sample was drawn. The schools comprising the sample were picked using purposeful stratified sampling procedures. Megeath (1939, p. 151) asserts that, "when a population is composed of distinct identifiable groups, stratified sampling can be the most efficient method of sampling that population." Gay (1981 p. 96) says that, stratified sampling techniques involves dividing population into mutually exclusive categories, then selecting a sample of elements from each category such that each category is represented in the same proportion as it exists in the population.

Based on the reasons of size (big and small schools are considered), sex (boys and girls schools are represented) and status (provincial, district, mixed day
or mixed boarding schools are all considered), a representative sample for this study was obtained.

Thus, Thitani Girls S.S and Migwani Boys S.S had three streams and are the biggest both as provincial/district schools in the division. Kyome Girls S.S and Ngutani Boys S.S are boarding, one streamed district schools. While Nzauni mixed S.S, Kyamboo mixed S.S and Ndaluni mixed S.S are single streamed district schools but they are day, boarding/day and boarding schools respectively. Musuani mixed S.S was the smallest and latest established school in the division.

By paying attention to the variables within the schools of the division, a representative sample of the schools was arrived at with respondents whose diversity is representative. For example, head teachers in the sample size represented all headmasters and headmistresses in the whole division.

In the sample schools, the respondents the researcher targeted were as shown in table (iii) below;
Table III: Respondents for the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of respondent</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School administrators</td>
<td>i) Head teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Deputy head teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching staff</td>
<td>i) Guidance and counselling teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Boarding masters/mistresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Games masters/mistresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student leaders</td>
<td>Prefects in form three and four</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

3.6.1 School Administrators

In the eight sampled schools, the researcher targeted the head teachers and their deputies. A total of sixteen out of twenty four school administrators (67 %) in Migwani Division were to form a major component of the sample size that was to give ideal and precise representative views on any discipline issue in the area of study.

3.6.2 Teaching Staff

All staff members in sampled schools were of prime importance for this study, however, this study specifically concentrated on guidance and counselling teachers, games and boarding masters/mistresses. Guidance, counselling, games and boarding teachers deal directly with the students and school
administrators on issues related to management of students welfare and more so indiscipline.

The above were well placed to give balanced views on any aspect related to management of students discipline in their institution. At least three staff members with the responsibility of guidance, counselling, sports and boarding duties in each school were used in this study, the total sample in this category was twenty four respondents.

3.6.2 Students

In carrying out this study, prefects views were sought. At least five students leaders were identified with assistance of school administrators in each sample school. The five students leaders were obtained from upper Forms i.e. form three and four, this comprised a big proportion of the student leaders in any school.

Given that, such students had been in secondary school for over two years, it was expected that they had made salient observations on issues related to discipline, hence, they were trusted in providing unbiased information insofar as student discipline management is concerned in their schools. This category of respondents were forty in total.
Table IV: Total Sample Size for the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators: H/T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and D/HT Members of Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

For the purpose of primary data collection, questionnaires were used. The researcher prepared structured and open-ended questions for each group of respondents. Bless and Achola (1987) in their book "Fundamentals of social research methods: An African Approach" asserts that, a questionnaire is suitable as a method of data collection because;

i) Respondents anonymity ensures that they give honest answers.

ii) Respondents have time for reflection before answering questions hence avoid hasty responses.

iii) Large populations can be covered within little time and with little personnel thus reducing cost.

The structured questions provided a good avenue for the researcher to obtain specific responses and clarifications without giving room to the respondents to write what they wished.
Open-ended questions were used to enrich structured questions by giving respondents an open avenue to give as much information as they wished on a given item. Different questions for different respondents aimed at eliciting specific information, however, specific items were repeated for different respondents as a means of counter checking information across all the respondents.

3.8 PILOT STUDY

In conducting this study, the researcher consulted subject matter specialist, for instance, the teachers of English and University supervisors to ensure and enhance the clarity and flow of questions in the questionnaire for all respondents.

All the research instruments were pretested in two schools within the region of study i.e. Kyome boys and Katoteni secondary schools. These two schools were not used in the actual study but their comments on the extent to which questions are vague or confusing or other problems were considered and incorporated in the restructuring the research instruments to make them more valid for the study.
During piloting, the following observations were made and thus addressed during the actual data collection process:

(i) All respondents preferred the use of unmarked questionnaire and envelopes for confidentiality and anonymity.

(ii) Majority of respondents (especially teachers) requested for a brief explanation on the purpose of the information sort for and the criteria for their selection amongst other teachers.

(iii) Two categories of respondents (teachers and students) were tempted to discuss particular items, but in the presence of the researcher, this was avoided. Hence, in the actual data collection, the researcher ensured that questionnaires were mostly filled in this presence.

(iv) To complete the questionnaire, the students, teachers and school administrators required on average 10, 20 and 25 minutes respectively. Thus, they could be filled out as the researcher awaited completion.

3.9 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

To facilitate data collection, the researcher obtained a letter of introduction or otherwise clearance from the university and from the office of the D.E.O - Mwingi. Accompanied with the said letters, the researcher travelled to all the sample schools where upon he sought permission to conduct the research from head teachers.
Upon being granted permission to conduct the study in respective schools, the researcher administered all the questionnaires to all the respondents after briefing them of the importance of the study, this increased return rate of questionnaires.

Enough envelopes with the researcher's signature were issued for each questionnaire and respondents were requested to enter the questionnaires and seal the envelopes upon filling their questionnaires.

The above data collection procedure ensured that there was transparency and where need be safeguarded the respondents against victimization ultimately enabling the researcher have access to unbiased and un-doctored information.

3.10 DATA ANALYSIS

Data obtained by the research instrument were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics were employed because they enabled the researcher to present data in a simplified manner for interpretation and making conclusions. Frequencies and percentages were used to summarize data on close-ended items and open-ended items by first converting qualitative data into quantitative form for tabulation. Rummel (1964,p.321) assert that, one method for organizing quantitative data consists of the preparation of a frequency distribution, which may be presented either in
tabulation or graphical form. Tabulation and narration were used highly in the data analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Presented in this chapter are the data collected from the various respondents by means of questionnaires. All the questions in the questionnaires were highly correlated to the specific objectives and the research questions of this study as highlighted in chapter one, selection 1.4 and 1.5 respectively.

The data analyzed was collected from eight secondary schools of Migwani division, Mwingi district targeting school administrators (Principals and their deputies), teachers (with the responsibilities of couselling, boarding and sports) and student leaders (prefects in form three and four). The total sample size was supposed to be eighty respondents as shown in table (iii) in chapter three. However, the return rate for the questionnaire was 96.25% (77).

Three questionnaires in the category of the school administrators were not filled. Precisely, two head teachers were out of their stations despite two visits being made by the researcher. In the last case, a head teacher of a three streamed school perused the items in the questionnaire in the presence of the researcher only for him to purport that he was busy to complete the questionnaire even after further staying with the same for over 24 hours.
4.2 ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data obtained from the questionnaires were mainly analyzed by using frequencies and percentages. The findings were organized under sub-headings derived from the research questions, thus;

- General information on the respondents
- Main causes of indiscipline
- Approaches or ways of handling indiscipline.
- Assessment of the efficiency of school administrators in the management of student discipline.

4.2.1 General Information on the Respondents

General information relating to student leaders and teachers was sought by question one and two in the respective questionnaires while questions one to three in the school head/deputy head teachers' questionnaire provided school administrators general information. All these information is summarized in tables (v) to (x)

Table V : Prefects status and prefect hood experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of respondents (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Form three</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Form four</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Below 3 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Above 3 months</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (v) indicates that, majority 28 (70%) of the prefects used in this study were in form four, also shown is the fact that, majority 37 (92.5%) of all prefects used in the study had prefecthood experience of above 3 months.

Table VI: Academic qualification of teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Number of respondent (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Ed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Sc with PGDE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip. Ed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII: Teachers duration of stay in their current station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
<th>Number respondents (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A look at table (vi) and (vii) reveals that all (24)-100% teachers used in this study are professionally trained and majority of them have been teaching in their respective stations for a duration of over one year.

Table VIII: School administrators' duration of stay in their current stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
<th>Number of respondents (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over three years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IX: Academic qualification of school administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Number of respondents (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc, with PGDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip. Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table X: School administrators' experience before their promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of respondents (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) As head of department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Less than one year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 1-3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) over 3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) not applicable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) As senior teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Less than one year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 1-3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Over 3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Not applicable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salient observations about school administrators used in this study can be made as reflected on the tables (viii), (ix) and (x). Table (viii) indicate that majority (8) 61.5% of the school administrators have been in their current stations for a duration over 3 years while only two (15.4%) and three (23.1%) of the respondents have been in their current station for a duration less than
one year and 1-3 years respectively. Table (ix) shows that, except for one respondent (7.7%) with B.A. qualification, all other respondents are qualified to hold their administrative position with a majority 9 (69.2%) being B.Ed degree holders. Table (x) summaries information relating to duration of experience gained by educational administrators in prerequisite educational administrative position before their promotion to their current status, it is indicated that 8 (61.5%) of the respondents were promoted directly from status of classroom teacher i.e. without the experience of being a head of department or senior teacher. Only two respondents (15.4%) had experience of being a head of department and senior teacher for a duration of over 3 years and 1-3 years respectively.

4.2.2 Main Causes of Indiscipline

Before soliciting for information relating to the main causes of indiscipline amongst the learners, it was wise to inquire from the school administrators whether in their stations there was any form of indiscipline, thus, in response to question 4(i), all 13 (100%) school administrators concurred that they had indiscipline cases in their schools. When asked in question 4(ii) to indicate the three most serious or rather common cases of indiscipline, their responses were: sneakers 11 (35.5%), drug abuse 7 (25.5%) and both theft and vernacular speaking were ranked equally i.e. each having a frequency of 3 (9.7%), others were as shown in table 4.2.2 (a) below.
### Table XI: Common indiscipline cases as per the school administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indiscipline</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Cumulative (cum)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sneaking</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernacular speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thefts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper dressing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying of weak students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boycott of school programme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to do assignments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In question 21, school administrators were provided with four well documented causes of indiscipline amongst learners. They were requested to rank them in the order of 1-4 as it would apply in their institutions, their responses are shown in the table (xii). The table reveals that over-protective guardians were ranked by eight (61.5%) as contributing mostly to students mis-behaviour, lack of facilities and poor-student-teacher relationship were ranked in the second position by six (46.2%) of the respondents, however, five (38.5%) compared to one (7.7%) of the respondents ranked poor student-teacher relationship and lack of facilities in position 3 thus, indicating that poor student-teacher relationship had more gravity than lack of facilities in the school as a cause of student mis-behaviour. Table (xii) also shows that
poor teaching was ranked by majority seven (53.8%) as contributing least to student mis-behaviour.

Table XII: Causes of students indiscipline as per the school administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indiscipline cause</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor student teacher relationship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-protective guardians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In section (b) of the teachers' questionnaire, question 25(a) sought the teachers' view on the main causes of indiscipline in their schools. Given that this was an open-ended question, numerous views were given as summarized in table (xiii) The table indicates that, the two main leading causes of indiscipline are; inconsistency of administration of punishment to students and poor pupils' background or parental care, each contributing to indiscipline by 9.8%. Closely followed by these causes is peer pressure 8.5% and drug abuse 6.1%.

Withdrawal of corporal punishment, poor administration and admission of indiscipline transfer students, all contribute to indiscipline equally by 4.9%. Other causes of indiscipline included; Teachers laxity, lazy student, lack of proper guidance and couculling, poor role modeling from teachers and closeness of pupils/schools to students' homes or towns. By extension, table (xiii) reveals that there were some other minor causes of indiscipline but whose cumulative effect is significant.
Table XIII: Causes of indiscipline as per the teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indiscipline cause</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor diet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment withdrawal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of outings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistency of punishments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness of school to home/town</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor cooperation from parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor role models (teachers)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of respect of teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstrict teacher on duty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of weak pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak prefect bodies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy after physical punishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of guidance and counselling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers laxity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance of school rules</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No rewarding of desirable behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistency by administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-protective guardians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of religious morals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor student-teacher relationship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very harsh prefects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of powerful support staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor background/parental care</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-scholars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of indiscipline transfer costs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was also felt that since student leaders play a critical role in the management of students affairs and are always in touch with the teachers and school administrators, they were also well placed to recognize causes of
indiscipline in their different schools. Question 10(i) in section (b) of the students' questionnaire asked prefect to note down main causes of indiscipline among students in their schools. In response to this question, many respondents tended to repeat a certain indiscipline cause, in different wording, maybe as emphases, nevertheless, two respondents were categorical that there were no indiscipline causes in their school except "the normal problem". The table (xiv) show causes of student indiscipline as per their student leaders.

Table XIV: Causes of indiscipline as per the student leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indiscipline causes</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug taking (abuse)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badly behaved teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad influence from other school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor student-teacher relationship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and fee related problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor student-student relationship</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of respect to prefect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unserious guidance and couseling teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to punish wrong doers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple/easy punishment to wrong doers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstrict teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggle for their rights</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing-off amongst students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailability of school administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistency of punishment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libido</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor academic performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance of school ruler</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of freedom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As reflected in the table (xiv), student leaders felt that indiscipline in their schools was mainly as a result of five cause; peer pressure (20) 20.8%, drug abuse (14) 14.6%, poor student-student relationship (8) 8.3%, unserious guidance, counselling teachers (7) 7.3% and inconsistency of punishment administration (6) 6.2%. Several remarks were made to illustrate this, such as;

- "Students copy other bad behaviour from her fellow student"
- "Drinking/taking of drugs such as alcohol after sneaking"
- "There is lack of punishment for a particular offence"
- "Student lack adequate guidance and counselling"
- "Student are not punished regularly after breaking the school rules"
- "Students want to show off i.e. differentiate themselves from others"

It is rather unfortunate that even after guidance and counselling teachers (7) 7.3% are said to be lax with their work, student leaders further perceived that: badly behaved teacher, lack of strictness by teachers and poor student-teacher relationship each contribute to indiscipline by 5.2%, 3% and 4.2% respectively. Student leaders also directly blamed their school administrators or otherwise teachers for cause of indiscipline emanating from; unknown school rules and regulations (3.1%), failure to punish identified wrong doers (3.1%) and use of simple/easy (ineffective) punishment to the wrong doers (4.2%).
4.2.3 Approaches or Ways of Handling Indiscipline

After identification of indiscipline causes, the study also addressed the issue of how indiscipline cases are handled in the sample schools. The views of the student leaders and the teachers to this extent were sought using question 10(ii) and 25(b) respectively in their respective questionnaires. These views or responses were summarized as in the tables (xv) and 4 (xvi) below.

Table XV: Approaches of handling indiscipline as per the student leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical punishment</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice, guidance and counselling</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent home for parents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering religious teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XVI: Approaches of handling indiscipline as per the teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice, guidance and counselling</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical punishment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent home parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering prefects to punish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep students busy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having pastoral services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having PTA frequently</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as role models</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From tables (xv) and (xvi), it's evident that teachers concurred with student leaders on the three major approaches used to handle indiscipline i.e. use of physical punishment, suspension and either advice, guidance or counselling of indiscipline students. Nevertheless, while a majority 31 (33.8%) of student leaders felt that physical punishment was the main method used to handle indisciplined students, teachers (20.1%) had in mind that indiscipline in their schools is mostly handled via either advising, guiding or counselling students.

In very simple terms therefore, student leaders actual perception was that mostly physical punishment was being used more than either advice, guidance or counselling in handling indiscipline students while the converse was true for the teachers. Maybe this scenario can be explained or justified by the observation that student leaders 7.3% (see table (xiv) had indicated that they felt that their guidance and counselling teachers were lax and consequently a cause of indiscipline in their schools.

On the issue of the physical punishment administration as a means of handling indisciplined students, both teachers and student leaders, gave a number of examples of physical punishment used in their schools, these included; cutting grass, digging holes, washing floors, sweeping the paths, digging terraces, cutting firewood and watering flowers.
A further look at the tables (xv) and (xvi) shows that teachers had put in more approaches for handling or reducing indiscipline even though student leaders did not recognize them. It is also noted that student leaders and teachers are in agreement on other numerous ways of handling indiscipline as; expulsion, warning, caning, sending indiscipline students home for their parents and offering religious or pastoral services in school.

In the literature review, Wangeri (1986) is noted to have cautioned that "punishing mis-behaviour is not an end by itself, rather it can be a cause of further mis-behaviour". In view of this, an attempt was made to evaluate the effectiveness of the various approaches used for handling indiscipline as put forward by either student leaders or teachers. To the student leaders, the researcher posed the question 10(iii), thus, "of the measure/methods (of handling indiscipline) you have... listed is there some which students are completely used to and cannot therefore make them change their indiscipline behaviour?", (21) 52.5% of the student leaders were in agreement with this statement while (19) 47.5% were not in agreement. In the same vein, teachers were asked in question 21, if their schools had habitual indisciplined students who seemed not to reform irrespective of punishment administered to them, of the 24 respondents, 83.3% (20) felt that their schools had such students while 16.7% (4) felt that their schools did not have such students.
As an avenue of either confirming or rather verifying information given by students and teachers on the approaches of handling indisciplined students, question 20 in section (b) of the school head/deputy head teachers questionnaires requested the school administrators to rank some documented methods of handling indiscipline as they would apply in their schools. Their responses are as per the table (xvii) below.

Table XVII: Approaches of handling indiscipline as per the school administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 f %</td>
<td>2 f %</td>
<td>3 f %</td>
<td>4 f %</td>
<td>5 f %</td>
<td>6 f %</td>
<td>N/A f %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual labour</td>
<td>2 15.3</td>
<td>1 7.7</td>
<td>6 46.2</td>
<td>3 23.1</td>
<td>1 7.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 23.1</td>
<td>5 38.5</td>
<td>5 38.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal punishment</td>
<td>2 15.3</td>
<td>3 23.1</td>
<td>2 15.3</td>
<td>3 23.1</td>
<td>1 7.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 15.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>6 46.2</td>
<td>3 23.1</td>
<td>2 15.3</td>
<td>1 7.7</td>
<td>1 7.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny privileges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 15.3</td>
<td>4 30.8</td>
<td>3 23.1</td>
<td>2 15.3</td>
<td>2 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give strict warning</td>
<td>3 23.1</td>
<td>6 46.2</td>
<td>1 7.7</td>
<td>1 7.7</td>
<td>2 15.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above in table (xvii), school administrators coincidentally agree with the same percentages i.e. 46.2% (6) on the three main approaches of handling indiscipline in the order of: counselling, giving strict warning and rise of manual labour. Question 15 in the teachers' questionnaire sought for the fair judgment of teachers towards their school administrators on the issue of banning of caning by the ministry of education. The respondents
were asked if their school administrators would have agreed or disagreed, with the statement "caning should never have been banned by the ministry of education because it was the most effective punishment in controlling indiscipline in this school" nineteen (79.2%) of the teachers felt that their respective administrators would have agreed with the statement while five (20.8%) would have disagreed.

To subject somehow the sentiments of school administrators on the usage of punishments and counselling, question 3 was posed to the student leaders, seventeen (42.5%) of the student leaders felt that their school administrators always emphasized, explained and advised on the need to adhere to the school rules and regulations (counselling oriented), while twenty three (57.5%) felt that their school administrators always emphasized that strict punishment be given to those students who breaked school rules and regulations (punishment oriented).

While the above evaluation of school administrators was carried forward to the teachers using question 14 in the teachers questionnaire, twelve (50%) of the respondents thought that their administrator always expected students to behave well and if they mis-behaved they are punished (punishment oriented) while nine (37.5%) perceived their administrators in the light of always encouraging the students to behave well and correcting mis-behaviour
appropriately (counselling oriented), lastly, three (12.5%) thought that their administration always reminded students of the harsh repercussions of breaking school rules and regulation (punishment oriented).

In view of the foregoing observations, it would only be fair to say that school administrators in the sample schools were punishment rather than counselling oriented even though they considered themselves otherwise.

4.2.4 Assessment of the Efficiency of School Administration in the Management of Students Discipline

In chapter two, it was noted that emphasis is given in the Head Teachers Manual (1975, p.30) that, "...the Head bears the ultimate responsibility for all school discipline." It was also acknowledged by Ochieng' (1997, p.16) that, "the successful functioning of an institution is not one man's job, it calls for installation of team spirit".

Based on the above premise, the researcher posed numerous closed-ended questions and a few open-ended questions to all the three categories of respondents. This was deliberate attempt to obtain information or views that would directly or indirectly assist in assessing the efficiency of the school administrators in their roles of management of the student discipline. The domain that were given weight and responses thereof obtained from the respondents were as below:
4.2.4.1 Domain of school rules and regulations

Mbiti (1984) observed that;

There is no point in having rules or setting goals in connection with discipline unless we have some way of enforcing them.

The assertion above emphasizes the importance of having school rules and regulations that are enforceable by concerned participants in an institution. It is in this light that question 5 in the school administrators' questionnaire sought information in respect to reviewing of school rules and regulations. In response to this question, eleven (84.6%) and two (15.4%) of the school administrators admitted having reviewed and not having reviewed their school rules respectively. Asked who they had consulted as per the question 6, all (100%) school administrators who had reviewed (84.6%) said that they consulted their respective staff members. However, when teachers were asked in question 13 of the teachers' questionnaire if they were involved in drafting or reviewing of their school rules and regulations, thirteen (54.2%) confirmed, their being involved while eleven (45.8%) felt that they had never been involved. In the light of these responses, one might be tempted to say that school administrator use specific members of staff to review their school rules and regulations.

According to the manual for secondary school heads (1979), every school must have a set of school rules drawn by head master with the help of teachers, the
pupils and staff must know the school rules which should be prominently displayed in each classroom and in the staffroom. When school administrators were asked how many school rules and regulations they had (question 9) and where they had the copy/copies of school rules placed in their institutions (question 8), a majority nine (69.2%) and a minority four (30.8%) of them said that they had over 10 and between 3-10 school rules respectively. As to the responses of where their school rules and regulations are placed, four (23.5%) of the school administrators indicated that they placed them in every classroom while others placed them as reflected in the table (xviii) below.

Table XVIII: Placement of school rules in institutions as per the school administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where school rules are placed</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) In every classroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) On the general notice board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) In the staffroom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) In deputy &amp; headteacher's office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) a-c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) a-d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Each student has a copy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When student leaders were asked in question 4(i) if they knew how many school rules and regulations their school had, 22 (55%) responded 'yes', 14 (35%) 'no' and 4 (10%) said that they had never been told. When they were asked if they were given a copy of the school rules and regulations during
their first week stay in their school, 30 (75%) said 'yes' while 10 (25%) said "no". The conclusion that can be drawn from these observations is that significant efforts have been made to ensure that students have copies of school rules and regulations however, one notes that the student leaders have not mastered the school rules and regulations, a situation that can lead to un-enforceability of the same.

On the other hand, when teachers were asked in question 3(i) and (ii) if they were given an orientation kit for new members of staff and a copy of school rules when they joined their respective schools, a majority of 18 (75%) and 21 (87.5%) indicated that they were not given an orientation kit or a copy of school rules respectively. This is an overt weakness on the part of the school administration, a copy of school rules and an orientation kit forms the basic fundamental documents of inducting any teacher in a new school.

It is through a copy of school rules and orientation kit that new members of staff come to know the vision, mission, goals, norms, culture etc of their new station other than also knowing key school policies in regard to issues like student discipline management and related issues, ultimately these documents make new teachers settle down fast, be positive to their new station, committed and efficient.
If teachers were not given copies of school rules and regulations (87.5%) or orientation kits 87.5% detailing pertinent issues about the school, then one would have expected that among the documents permanently pinned on the teachers staffroom notice board is the copy of school rules and regulations. But since all (100%) of the school administration [see table (xviii)] had not done this, the only avenue for new teachers to know rules and regulations governing the student conduct is by checking the school notice board.

To this extent, question 24 (d) in the teacher questionnaire sought to establish if their school general notice board had a copy of school rules and regulations. Fourteen (58.3%) consented while ten (41.7%) of the respondents did not consent. This is not a healthy situation for effective enforcement of institutional rules because it implies that (41.7%) of teachers depends on hearsay when handling student discipline issues, indeed they might be forgiven if they introduced their own innovations to suit themselves particularly when on duty.

In a school environment, prefects are always refereed to as the "eyes" of the school administrators and teachers, but one might ask, "eyes" to "see" what? and for what purpose?. This prompted the researcher to ask the teachers' question 23 i.e. whether prefects had written task description known by all members of staff. A majority sixteen (66.7%) of the teachers indicated that,
prefects in their schools did not have written task description while a minority eight (33.3%) indicated that they had. In other words, majority of the prefects in the sample schools did not have guidelines on what to "see" and inevitably this reduced the efficiency of not just prefects but also teachers and school administrators. Maybe this explains why some teachers considered their prefect bodies as being very harsh and others as being weak as to be a cause of indiscipline [ref. table (xiii)].

Questions seven and four in the school administrators and teachers questionnaires respectively sought to establish whether in the sample schools there were some rules and regulations that were found difficult to enforce. Their responses were, while 69.2% (nine) and 70.8% (seventeen) of the school administrators and teachers respectively admitted that their schools had some un-enforceable school rules and regulations, a meagre 29.2% (seven) and 30.8% (four) of teachers and school administrators reported that all their school rules and regulations were enforceable. When both respondents were requested to give examples of un-enforceable school rules and regulations as per the question 4(ii) and 7 (ii) in their respective questionnaires, the following examples were given.

- "All students should speak English language".
- "Students should only be visited on prescribed visiting days"
- "No smoking and drug abuse by students"
- "All students should be in school uniform always"
- "Visiting teachers houses by students of opposite sex is prohibited".
- "All students should sit and pass all exams"
- "Male students should not talk or walk with female students in a manner to suggest that they have hidden relationship"
- "All students should be in games kit after classes"
- "Staffroom is out of bounds to all students"
- "Students should not sneak out of school compound"

Existence of unenforceable school rules and regulations is a self-defeatist situation on the part of school administrators because there would be no justification for enforcement of other rules from the pupils' perceptive. Nganje (2000) in her study of the attitudes of primary school pupils towards physical punishment in selected schools of Mombassa Municipality, noted the following after observing such a situation, "every time a rule is broken without a penalty, it becomes more difficult subsequently to enforce it. A teacher may be regarded as inadequate if he/she fails to notice offenders or "soft" if he/she obviously notices but takes no action. The child who receives it read it as unfair, because others have previously escaped unsettled".
4.2.4.2 Domain of handling indiscipline students

Ministry of Education, modules for head teachers and trainers No. 3 notes that, "clearly defined rules are an important element of a good school, as far as possible, staff, parents and the school committee (BOG) should be in agreement on the type of punishment that is given where rules are broken". In view of the foregoing, it was felt important to investigate the extent to which school administrators have facilitated actualization of standardized punishments for dealing with indisciplined students.

Both questions 6(i) and 11 in the students' and teachers' questionnaire respectively sought to establish whether school administrators advocated and administered standardized punishment. In response to these questions, (15) 62.5% and 23 (57.5%) of teachers and student leaders respectively felt that there were no standardized punishments in their schools, while (7) 37.5% and (17) 42.5% of the same respondents respectively thought that the administrators had uniform punishment for particular indiscipline cases.

To internally check the responses of teachers to the question 11 above, the researcher had posed question 5(i) requesting the teachers to indicate if they sensed some double standards being shown by school administrators when dealing with student affairs. Fifteen (62.5%) teachers felt that their respective school administrators and only seven 37.5% felt otherwise. When
teachers were apparently asked to validate their claims, the following few remarks were made;

- "Bright students and prefects often get favours from administration"
- "Two students committed a similar offence one was sent home and the other was not"
- "Hesitation in disciplining some officials like the head boy"
- "Suspending some students and later punishing others for the same offences"
- "Some first offenders are sometimes given warning and some punished"
- "Sometimes students of a particular faith are treated well"
- "When a student was harassed by a group of students: the members of the group were suspended and later expelled while one of the member was retained in the school after being warned only"
- "Some students committing the same offence in school but only a few are punished by suspension while others enjoyed liberty as if they did not break the same rules"

This study also wanted to have the perceptions of student leaders on the existence and usage of uniform punishment in the whole school, this was done using question 5. While 60% (24) students felt that their schools don't have uniform punishment, 40% (16) students felt otherwise. The students
that felt that their administrators had standardized punishment gave the following examples;

- "Depending on the type of indiscipline the punishment will (would) be decided how harsh it will be"
- "Because someone who has come to class, late will (would) not be given a punishment equal to a sneaker"
- "Stealing leads to suspension of two weeks"
- "If you are caught as a sneaker in the school you are given suspension for two weeks then you meet the BOG members and after that you are given a severe punishment"

To confirm the claims by students and teachers on the issue of standardized punishment, the researcher narrowed down to the school administrators and asked them whether they had a system put in place of standard operating procedures known by all students and staff for dealing commensurately with indisciplined students. Seven (53.8%) of the respondents admitted that they don't have such a system while, six (46.2%) felt that they had such a system. It can thus be concluded that a partial majority of the schools in the study sample don't have standardized punishment or punishment policy, a situation that does not augur well in handling indiscipline issues amongst students.
Its one thing to know the right thing, say it or tell others to do it. However, it is quite another thing to personally implement what you know and say or want other people to do. Thus, Okinda and Owuor (1995) rightly point out that, "The head should be the first to practice what he preaches... actions speak louder than words".

In view of the foregoing comments, question 8 in the teachers' questionnaire sought to know from teachers whether there exists some kind of dissonance between what is said and what is actually done by the school administration as pertains students' discipline management. While an equal percentage of teachers (five) 20.8% felt that there is and there is no dissonance, a majority of fourteen (58.3%) of teachers perceived their administrators as exercising some kind of dissonance in management of students discipline affairs. In this regards, it can be fairly said that, slightly over majority of the school administrators in the study sample are not very keen in implementing all what they say in respect to student discipline management, this is a bad precedence in discipline management.

4.2.4.3 Domain of leadership-training, supervision and motivation
Griffins (1994) advised that, school administrators have the paramount role of providing ultimate leadership for propagation and proliferation of desirable behaviour in the whole institution. From this background, a number of questions to various respondents sought to establish the kind and quality of
leadership manifested by the school administrators. It was observed that while four (30.8%) of the school administrators had some pre-service training in education administration prior to their appointment, five (38.5%) had not. For reasons unknown to the researcher, two (23%) of the school administrators left this item unresponded to and a further one (7.7%) administrator wrote "Not applicable". The school administrators also indicated that, 61.5% of their guidance and counselling teachers are qualified while 30.7% were not, a further 7.7% attended seminars on guidance and counselling.

When the school administrators were asked to ascertain how often their guidance and counselling teachers address their students on the school assembly advising them on the need for good behaviour (question 6), the responses were: very often, seldom and when the need arises with the percentages of 46.2% (6), 38.5% (5) and 15.3% (2) respectively. For teachers to be effective, they equally need motivators just like training, question 20 in the teachers' questionnaire wished to establish the degree to which school administrators were perceived as motivation of guidance and counselling teachers, the respondents responded as; 50% (12), 37.5% (9) and 12.5% (3) for the responses of need to improve, high and very high respectively. Asked how often the school administrators encouraged the students to visit and talk with guidance and counselling teachers, teachers responded; very often 41.7%,
seldomly 50% and never at all 8.3%. The implications here are that, even though school administrations considered counselling as the main approach for handling indiscipline in their schools [ref table 4.2.3 (c)], there is no significant effort shown both in directing the students to the counselling teachers and motivating their teachers in their responsibilities, consequently, the concerned teachers are not very effective.

James et al (1969) advises that, in order to make a counselling program work the administrator must consider himself the "counsellor's counselor" and provide effective leadership. Teachers were also asked in question (6) how they ranked their administrators acting as a model for their staff in controlling indiscipline in the school, they responded as; 45.8% (11) fairly, 37.5% (9) need to improve and 16.7% (4) very highly.

It had been noted elsewhere in this study that school administrators needed to forge a team spirit in order to be successful in running their institutions. Using the teachers' ranking was done on the school administrators' abilities in enhancing participatory leadership as a means of actualizing teamwork in discipline management, 41.7% (10) teachers indicated that, school administrators needed to improve, while (8) 33.3% and (6) 25% ranked them as fair and very highly respectively. Their (teachers) ranking was put into test by asking the same respondents whether they would describe the process
of prefect selection as participatory or semi-participatory, their responses were: ten (41.7%) semi-participatory and fourteen (58.3%) participatory. Participatory leadership requires the recognition of the contribution of every member to guarantee cohesion and unity of purpose. When the school administrators were asked in question 12 to describe the cohesion of their staff in addressing indiscipline among students, seven (53.8%) described it as fair while six (46.2%) described it as firm.

The above observations from both teachers and school administrators imply that the schools under study are run by administrators who had not fully cherished embracing principles of participatory leadership, subsequently, forging a teamwork spirit with their respective stakeholders in student discipline management issues was an effort in futility for them.

An effective prefectorial system is established via the training of prefects, this can only be attainable if the school administration constantly and consistency consulted with its prefect body. When school administrators were asked how often they meet with their prefects' body for consultation, the responses were: seven (53.8%) "as the need arises, four (30.8%) on weekly basis and two (15.4%) after a month. Asked if they had specific time known to students when they can visit their office for whatever reason, the school administrators responded; eight 61.5% "yes" and five (38.5%) "No". Ironically,
student leaders noted that, majority 36 (90%) of the students feared to go to the head teachers' office to explain their problems; only a minority 4 (10%) would not fear head teachers' office, also a partial majority 13 (54.2%) of teachers indicated that, majority of students feared their administrators while 11 (45.8%) of teachers felt otherwise. These responses imply that school administrators are not completely in touch with their prefects or students via dialogue on whatever issue, a situation that can be fertile for indiscipline proliferation.

The above observation can be said to hold because when teachers were asked as per the question 9 in their questionnaire whether they perceived their school administrators as having created enough friendly avenue for receiving students' sentiments promptly, the responses were; thirteen (54.2%) "not very", four (16.7%) "no" and seven (29.1%) "yes". Further, the same respondents (teachers) when they were asked in question seven, if their school administrators reacted to students' complains fast enough, while ten (41.7%) responded "most of the times yes", seven (29.2%) responded "most of the times no" and another seven (29.2%) thought that "it depended".

Positive reinforcement towards desirable behaviour is considered as an avenue for not only boosting desirable behaviour but also reducing undesirable behaviour and thus indiscipline. Using some few questions, this
study addressed itself to the issue of extrinsic motivation or positive reinforcement of desirable behaviour to the students. In question 10, seventeen (70.8%) teachers indicated that their respective school administrators had never had an agenda in a staff meeting to identify and discuss how well behaved students could be rewarded, nevertheless, seven (29.2%) indicated this happened in their schools. Asked how often rewarding of well behaved students was done, of the seven teachers who had indicated that positive reinforcement was done in their schools, three (42.8%) reported that it was done on yearly basis while an equal number of teachers felt that reinforcement was done on termly basis (2) 28.6% and when students have completed their course (2) 28.6%.

The above questions were also posed to the school administrators in a different format (question 18 and 19). While eight (61.5%) of the school administrators indicated that they didn't have a system of reinforcing well behaved students, five (38.5%) indicated that they had it. Of the five (38.5%) school administrators that had such a system, three (60%) and two (40%) had their well behaved students reinforced yearly and termly basis respectively. From this information emanating from teachers and the school administrators, it was apparent that positive reinforcement of desirable behaviour was not given significance as an avenue of managing discipline.
The education Act (1980), the education (school discipline) regulation No. 10 states that:

*The Board of Governors of a school may make administrative rules appertaining to discipline of pupils and may prescribe appropriate punishment for breach of or non-adherence to such rules.*

In the light of the above legislation, this study would not have been concluded without asking the school administrators whether they had any problem with their respective BOG and local community in stamping out indiscipline (question 22 and 23). While eleven (84.6%) school administrators did not have any problem with their BOGs, two (15.4%) had problems. When the two school administrators who had problems with their BOG were asked to elucidate briefly as in question 22 (b), the following two remarks were given:

- "Not serious (BOG) in school deliberations, late attendance of meetings, not motivating teachers"
- "Only seen in the compound on BOG meetings, rarely, just some; one or two members come on students indiscipline cases but not the chairman"

On the issue of supportive local community, twelve (92.3%) school administrators felt that their respective local communities are supportive as far as discipline management is concerned.
Nevertheless, one (7.7%) school administrator felt that the local community is un-supportive but unfortunately when she/he was requested to explain as in question 23 (b) she/he wrote "Not applicable". Those schools administrators who had supportive local communities gave several remarks to justify themselves, this included:

- "They always come to report major indiscipline cases"
- "They report to me any student found doing wrong outside"
- "Local community usually report some sneakers and those who buy cigarettes/drugs in town", "local community also report any cases of indiscipline e.g. during cross-country those who eat mangoes not given to them"
- "Being a day school, they do report any indiscipline cases they come across. They also advice on the same"
- "By reporting indiscipline on students when outside the school and by not peddling drugs and other substances prohibited in the school"

In view of the above remarks on the BOGs and school local communities, it is in order to conclude that most of the school administrators have been successful in establishing a positive relationship with their respective BOGs and local communities and this has helped them in student discipline
management. However, more cooperation is needed particularly for the schools (15.4%) with un-supportive BOG and where local community seems not to support the school administration.

Three sets of data were collected from the older teachers as well as from the young ones. Twenty-four (24) teachers with the responsibilities of teaching, tutoring, and sports and thirty-five (35) school administrators. The research assistant and the researcher personally data collected were analyzed and clearly written as percentages and frequency distribution tables.

It was shown that in all the 24 schools, student teachers had major influence in the hands of the teachers with a result of part времени. About 21.8% of student teachers had

enrollment 85% from graduates and non-teachers teachers. 7.3% said
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION
The primary concern of this study was to examine the management of students' discipline in the secondary schools of Migwani division, Mwingi district. Special focus was given to the school administrators in their broad role of maintaining students discipline in their institution. The study sought to investigate from student leaders, teachers and school administrators as to the causes of indiscipline, approaches of handling indiscipline students and how efficiently school administrators were in facilitating effective student discipline management in their schools.

Three sets of questionnaires were used to collect the data from respondents drawn from eight schools i.e. forty (40) student leaders in the upper forms; twenty-four (24) teachers with the responsibilities of counselling, boarding, and sports; and lastly, thirteen (13) school administrators. The researcher administered the questionnaires personally, data obtained were analyzed and mainly presented via narration, percentages and frequency distribution tables so as to enable the study bring forth the research findings.

5.2 SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS
It was shown that there are numerous causes of student indiscipline in schools. Student leaders indicated that the main causes of indiscipline were as a result of; peer pressure 20.8%, drug abuse 14.6%, poor student-student relationship 8.3%, lax guidance and counselling teachers 7.3% and
inconsistency of punishment administration 6.2%. Other unfortunate causes of indiscipline that were of concern to the student leaders included; badly behaved teachers 5.2%, and 4.2% for poor student-teacher relationship, lazy students, lack of respect to the prefects, use of simple (effective) punishment and showing-off amongst students.

Teachers on the other hand perceived the main causes of indiscipline as; inconsistency of punishment 9.8%, pupils poor parental care or up-bringing 9.8%, peer pressure 8.5%, drug abuse 6.1%, withdrawal of corporal punishment 4.9%, poor administration 4.9% and admission of indisciplined students on transfer 4.9%.

The school administrators indicated that the most common indiscipline cases in their school were; sneaking out 35.5%, drug abuse 2.5%, theft 9.5% and vernacular speaking 9.7%. They ranked over-protective parents, poor student-teacher relationship, lack of facilities and poor teaching as contributing to indiscipline of students in that order.

On the issue of handling indiscipline students, there was near consensus on the approaches used in all the sample schools. While the student leaders indicated that the main approaches used included; physical punishment 33.8%, counselling 29.4%, suspension 20.7%, sending pupils home for their
parents 10.9% and expulsion 9.8%. Teachers had that the five main approaches used are; counselling 20.9%, suspension 11.7%, physical punishment 10.9%, expulsion 4.7% and canning 2.3%. The school administrators 46.2% mainly considered counselling as the main approach of handling indiscipline in their schools, they also indicated that other approaches used and their order of usage were as; giving strict warning, manual labour, denial of privileges, verbal punishments and lastly corporal punishment.

However, it was noted that, even though the school administrators considered counselling as the main avenue for handling indiscipline in their institutions, student leaders felt that, their school administrators are more punishment oriented 57% than counselling oriented 42.5%. This was also shown by teachers who indicated by majority 62.5% that their respective school administrators are punishment oriented than counselling oriented 12.5%.

In respect to school rules and regulations, it was shown that majority of the schools 69.2% had over ten school rules and regulations, some of which have proved un-enforceable as indicated by the majority of the teachers 69.2% and school administrators 70.8%. It was also found out that, even though 84.6% of the school administrators indicated that they had reviewed their school rules
and regulation after consulting their respective staff members, a good proportion of teachers 45.8% indicated that they had never been involved in either drafting or reviewing of their school rules and regulations. It was further revealed that, all the schools in the sample did not have a copy of school rules and regulations pinned on the staffroom notice board.

Even though majority 75% of the student leaders indicated that in their schools students are issued with copies of school rules and regulations on admission, a good number of the student leaders 45% did not know the number of school rules and regulations their school had. Majority of the teachers i.e. 75% and 87.5% in the sample schools were never given a copy of school rules and orientation kit respectively when they joined their station of work. Also majority of teachers 66.7% revealed that their prefect bodies did not have specific written task description for each specific prefect to guide them in their responsibilities.

As for the existence of punishment policies or standardized punishment is concerned in the sample schools, this study found that; majority 62.5% and 57.2% of the teachers and student leaders respectively found their school administrators not to be administering or even advocating for the use of standardized punishment on indisciplined students committing the same undesirable behaviour. A very unfortunate situation revealed was that,
62.5% teachers felt that their respective school administrators exercised double standards while dealing with students discipline issues. To apparently justify themselves, they gave credible examples as shown in section 4.2.4.2. Further to these observations, a slight majority 58.3% of teachers revealed that they considered their school administration as exercising some kind of dissonance in student discipline management.

Not all school administrators had pre-service training in education administration prior to their appointment. Out of the thirteen school administrators used in this study, only four (30.8%) had such training, interestingly or otherwise, on the item requesting for this information, two school administrators did not respond and one wrote "Not applicable". On the converse, it was encouraging to note that the school administrators 61.5% had qualified guidance and counselling teachers. However, on the issue of motivating the guidance and counselling teachers and encouraging pupils to visit them, half (50%) of the teachers felt that the level of motivation needed to be improved, the same number of teachers (50%) also revealed that seldomly will school administrators encourage students to visit their guidance and counselling teachers.

It was found out that, a partial majority 53.8% of the school administrators did not consider their staff as cohesive in addressing indiscipline issues
among students. Teachers (41.7%) perceived their school administrators as semi-participatory in issues like prefect body selection, indeed the same number of teachers (ten) 41.7% wished if their teachers would improve in embracing participatory leadership in student discipline management issues.

On the area of how school administrators relate with their prefect bodies and student communities, 54.2% teachers felt that their school administrators had not created enough friendly avenues for receiving students sentiments, further it was revealed by a majority 90% of student leaders that students' feared to go to the head teachers' office to explain their problems, this is despite the fact that 61.5% of the school administrators had indicated that they had specific time known to students when they can visit their offices. Only four (30.8%) of the school administrators meet their prefect bodies on weekly basis for consultation otherwise a partial majority 53.8% school administrator meet their prefect bodies "when the need arises".

Positive reinforcement of desirable behaviour was found to be given negligible attention. A majority 70.8% of the teacher had never witnessed their respective administrators having agenda on the identification of well-behaved students for extrinsic reinforcement. In fact, 61.5% of the school administrators admitted that they don't have a system of reinforcing well-behaved students.
By majority, 84.6% and 92.3% of the school administrators indicated that their BOG and local communities respectively were very supportive insofar as student discipline management is concerned. Remarks were given to substantiate this support as indicated in section 4.2.4.3.

There was need for more improvement in the relationship between school administrators and respective BOG(s) and local communities in addressing student discipline management issues, given that 15.4% of the school administrators perceived that their BOG(s) and local communities as being unsupportive.

5.3 CONCLUSION
Based on the summary of the research finding as presented in section 5.2, the researcher arrived at the following conclusion.

(i) The main causes of student indiscipline in the schools of Migwani Division are; peer pressure, drug abuse, inconsistence administration of punishment, poor parental care or up-bringing of pupils, and poor student-student relationship. Other causes with considerable effect are; ineffective guidance and counselling teachers, admission of indisciplined students on transfers and poor school administrators.

(ii) The main approaches used in handling indisciplined students are; physical punishment, counselling, suspension, sending pupils home for
their parents, expulsion. Others are; warning, denial of privileges, rebuking and caning.

(iii) Many of the school administrators are more physical punishment oriented in their discipline management endeavors than counselling oriented. However, they think otherwise.

(iv) Many school administrators are inconsistent in handling their student discipline related issues. Generally speaking, most of the schools don’t have punishment or discipline policies for helping to actualize effective student discipline management.

(v) School administrators have not completely embraced the principles of participatory leadership as reflected by the lack of complete involvement of teachers in the selection of their prefect bodies and reviewing of school rules and regulation. Many schools have more than ten school rules and regulations but some of these rules are unfortunately un-enforceable.

(vi) There is poor induction of teachers. It was revealed that most school administrators don’t cherish the importance of giving new teachers a copy of school rules and regulations and/or orientation kit for the school.

(vii) Majority of the prefects have not mastered the school rules and regulations, don’t have their task description and their school administrators are not in consistent consultation with them, thus,
these compromises their efficiency. Majority of students also are not free with the school administrators.

(viii) Majority of the school administrators did not have formal training in education administration specialty prior to their promotion. However, most of the guidance and counselling teachers are qualified but they are not adequately motivated, hence, their productivity is not fully actualized. Further, most schools have fairly un-united teachers in respect to addressing student discipline issues.

(ix) There is poor reinforcement of desirable behaviour among student community in most of the schools, consequently, good behaviour is taken for granted.

(x) Majority of the BOG(s) and local communities in respective schools have help a great deal in the management of student discipline.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the above drawn conclusions, the researcher recommends the following.

(i) There is need for school administrators to be consistent when handling student discipline related issues. The school administrators should facilitate the establishment of punishment or discipline policies via consultation with their all staff members. The policies should be explained to all students.
(ii) School administrators should fully cherish participatory leadership and should always consult with all members of staff in issues such as; selection of prefect body and reviewing of school rules and regulations.

(iii) School administrators should create enough friendly avenues for receiving students' sentiments, they should appear genuinely fair and friendly but strict to all students so that they can be respected rather than feared. They should always be in consultation with their prefect bodies on weekly basis and should strive to establish a strong school culture. The school administrators should also consult with all teachers so as to come up with task description for all the prefects in their school, the prefects should all be briefed on their tasks and given copies indicating their task descriptions.

(iv) There is agent need for all school administrators to be role models to their teachers, to actively provide leadership, and motivation particularly to guidance and counselling teachers so as to invigorate them in their responsibilities.

(v) School administrators should consult with their staff members so as to come up with a comprehensive consistent program of positively reinforcing desirable behaviour among students. The students should know such a programme. Students on transfer should be screened to ensure no admission of indisciplined students expelled from elsewhere.
(vi) To positively influence new teachers to the success of the school. School administrators should ensure that the induction process of new teachers entails giving them copies of school rules and comprehensive school orientation kit or file. A copy of school rules should be permanently pinned on the staff and school notice boards.

(vii) There is apparent advantage for the school administrators to go for further training in education administration specialization. It is also highly advisable that school administrators should always attend all KESI organized training programmes or workshops and be seen to practice what they learn.

5.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

(i) This study covered only one division, there could be some benefit if the same research was carried out in other divisions of Mwingi District or even at a wide scale. In doing this, one can increase the sample size and compare the findings.

(ii) There is room for doing research as to correlate the effect of indiscipline to students' academic performance. This can convince the school administrators that discipline precedes success.
(iii) Other studies can be done on the same topic but other than enlarging the sample size, also aim at diversifying the sample e.g. include subordinate staff in the school.
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INTRODUCTION

You are an important participant in the above mentioned study carried out by an independent researcher who wishes to request you to think carefully, be honest and sincere on a number of issues that pertains to students' discipline. To facilitate this, fill the questions in the questionnaire as instructed. Fold the completed questionnaire, put it in the serialized envelope without indicating your name anywhere and seal it.

SECTION A:

Put a (✓) inside the brackets adjacent to the most appropriate response for the following questions.

1. In this school how long have you been a prefect?
   (a) Less than 3 months ( )
   (b) More than 3 months ( )

2. In which form are you?
   (a) Form three ( )
   (b) Form four. ( )

3. Were you given a copy of the school rules and regulations during the first one week of your stay in this school?
   (a) No. ( )
   (b) Yes. ( )
4. (i) Do you know how many school rules and regulations your school has?
   (a) No. ( )
   (b) I have never been told. ( )
   (c) Yes. ( )

(ii) Which of the following statements is true for the majority of the students
   (a) Will fear to go to the head teacher's office to explain their problems. ( )
   (b) Will not fear to go to the head teacher's office and would therefore go there to explain the problems. ( )

5. Is there uniformity of punishment as administered by school administration for the same kind of indiscipline?
   (a) Yes. ( )
   (b) No. ( )

6. i) Do your school have particular punishment for particular indiscipline cases?
   (a) Yes. ( )
   (b) No. ( )

ii) If 'yes' above, please give one example:

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
7. Which of the following two statements is the most true of your school administration?

(a) Will always emphasize that strict punishment will be given to those students who break school rules and regulations. ( )

(b) Will always emphasize explain and advice on the need to adhere to school rules and regulations. ( )

8. Do you think that the Guidance and Counselling teacher(s) in the school have helped to solve students' problems and therefore reduced indiscipline in the school?

(a) No. ( )

(b) Yes. ( )

9. Do prefects have written task descriptions indicating their roles?

(a) No. ( )

(b) Yes. ( )

SECTION B.

10. (i) What are the main causes of indiscipline among students in your school?

(a) 

(b) 

(c)
(ii) List down the common measures/methods used by the members of staff and administration to deal with the indiscipline cases listed in 10(i) above:

(a) 

(b) 

(c) 

(d) 

(e) 

(iii) Of the measures/methods you have listed in 10(ii), is there some which students are completely used to and cannot therefore make them change their indiscipline behaviour:

(a) No. ()

(b) Yes. ()

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION.
MANAGEMENT OF STUDENTS DISCIPLINE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS:
TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION.
You have been chosen to be part of a sample of teachers to be used in the above-mentioned study. Please, may I request you for your co-operation and commitment in completing this questionnaire. Please, take your time to respond on each item based on what you think and not what you feel others think, I can assure you that your responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality, thus you are provided with serialized envelope to enclose and seal your completed questionnaire then submit it back.

SECTION A: Please, tick the most appropriate response for each of the following responses

1. (i) Are you a qualified teacher?
   (a) Yes. ( )
   (b) No. ( )

(ii) Please indicate your qualification
   (a) M. Ed. ( )
   (b) B. Ed. ( )
   (c) Dip. Ed. ( )
   (d) P (1) ( )
   (e) P (2) ( )
   (f) S (1) ( )
   (g) Others - please indicate ____________________________
2. How long have you been teaching in this school?
   (a) Less than one year. ()
   (b) 1-3 years. ()
   (c) Over 3 years. ()

3. During your first week stay in this school, were you:
   (i) Given a copy of school rules and regulations?
       (a) Yes. ()
       (b) No. ()
   (ii) Given an orientation Kit/file for new members of staff?
        (a) Yes. ()
        (b) No. ()

4. (i) Are there some school rules and regulations you have observed that are unenforceable by teachers?
    (a) Yes. ()
    (b) No. ()
    (ii) Please give one example:
         _______________________________________________________
         _______________________________________________________

5. (i) Have you ever sensed some double standards being shown by school administration when dealing with students affairs?
    (a) Yes. ()
    (b) No. ()
(ii) Please give one example:

6. During the orientation week for the form one students, do the school administrators take time to meet the students and explain the school culture, rules and regulations?
   
   (a) Yes. ( )
   
   (b) No. ( )

7. Do you feel that the school administration react to students' complaints fast enough?
   
   (a) Most of times, Yes. ( )
   
   (b) Most of the times, No. ( )
   
   (c) It depends. ( )

8. Is there some kind of dissonance between what is said and what is actually done by administration as pertains students' discipline?
   
   (a) Sometimes Yes. ( )
   
   (b) No. ( )
   
   (c) Yes. ( )

9. Do you think that the administration has created enough friendly measures for receiving students' sentiments promptly?
   
   (a) No. ( )
   
   (b) Not very. ( )
10. (i) Has your administration ever had an agenda in staff meeting to discuss and identify the well-behaved students for rewarding?

(a) Yes. ( )

(b) No. ( )

(ii) If your response in 10 (i) above is yes, how often is the said exercise done?

(a) Yearly basis. ( )

(b) Termly basis. ( )

(c) When students have completed their course. . ( )

11. Do you have standardized punishment or approaches of dealing with indisciplined students as advocated by your school administration?

(a) Yes. ( )

(b) No. ( )

12. How often would the school administration follow up teachers for not implementing aspects agreed upon in the staff meeting and which concerns students' indiscipline?

(a) Not often. ( )

(b) Not very often. ( )

(c) Often. ( )

13. Are/were members of staff involved in drafting and re-viewing of school rules and regulations?
14. Which of the following is most applicable for your school administration?

(a) Will always remind students of the harsh repercussions of breaking school rules. ( )

(b) Will always expect the students to behave well and if they misbehave they are punished accordingly. ( )

(c) Will always encourage the students to behave well and correct misbehaviour appropriately. ( )

15. Do you think your administration will agree or disagree with this statement “Caning should never have been banned by the Ministry of Education because it was the most effective punishment in controlling indiscipline in this school?”

(a) Will agree. ( )

(b) Will disagree. ( )

16. How do you rank your administration in acting as a model for his/her staff in controlling indiscipline in the school?

(a) Very highly. ( )

(b) Fairly. ( )

(c) Need to improve. ( )

17. Rank your school administration ability in enhancing participatory approach in maintenance of discipline amongst pupils?
18. How often does the school administration encourage the students to visit and talk with guidance and counseling teacher(s)?

(a) Very often. ( )
(b) Seldomly. ( )
(c) Never at all

19. How often does the school administration address discipline cases than discipline cases?

(a) Not often. ( )
(b) Very often. ( )
(c) Often. ( )

20. How would you rank your school administration efforts in motivating and directing the guidance and counseling teacher(s) to help students in their problems?

(a) Very high. ( )
(b) High. ( )
(c) Need to improve. ( )

21. In your school, do you think there are habitual indisciplined students who seem not to reform irrespective of punishment administered?

(a) No. ( )
(b) Yes. ( )
22. How would you describe the process of selection of the prefect body?

(a) Semi- Participatory. ( )

(b) Participatory. ( )

23. Do all prefects have written tasks description known by staff members?

(a) No. ( )

(b) Yes. ( )

24. By putting a tick (✓), indicate if the following statements are true, false or not applicable in your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Students speak vernacular because there is inconsistency of how</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vernacular speakers are punished by staff and administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Physical punishment is a common practice of checking indiscipline in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Majority of students fear the administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) There is a copy of school rules on the school general notice board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION B.

25. (a) What are the five main causes of indiscipline in your school in the order of gravity?

(i)

(ii)

(iii)

(iv)

(v)
(b) List down the common measures encouraged and advocated by administration in dealing with the above cases

(i) 

(ii) 

(iii) 

(iv) 

N/B – Check that you have answered all questions

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION.
MANAGEMENT OF DISCIPLINE IN SECONDARY SCHOOL

SCHOOL HEAD/DEPUTY HEAD TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION
Your school has been chosen to be part of a sample of schools to be used in the above-mentioned study. This study is meant to help identify limitations, problems and challenges faced by school administrators in maintaining discipline in their institutions, and thus offer resolutions and recommendations for the prevailing situation. I request for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire, information given will be confidential. Please fill the questionnaire appropriately fold it, put it in an envelope provided and seal the envelope, then submit it back.

SECTION A

INSTRUCTIONS: Put a tick (✓) inside the bracket adjacent to the most appropriate response for the following questions.

1. How many years have you been in this school?
   (a) Less than one year ( )
   (b) 1-3 years ( )
   (c) Over 3 years ( )

2. What is your highest professional qualification?
   (a) M. Ed ( )
(b) B. Ed ( )
(c) Dip Ed ( )
(d) P1 ( )
(e) P2 ( )
(f) S1 ( )

(g) Others please indicate __________, __________, __________

3. Before your promotion as a school Head/Deputy Head teacher, how many years had you served as

(a) Head of department

i) Less than one year ( )

ii) 1 – 3 years ( )

iii) Over 3 years ( )

iv) Not applicable ( )

(b) Senior teacher

i) Less than one year ( )

ii) 1-3 years ( )

iii) Over 3 years ( )

iv) Not applicable ( )

4. (i) Do you have any form of indiscipline cases in your school?

(a) Yes ( )

(b) No ( )
(ii) Please indicate the most serious indiscipline cases you have ever had in your school.

1. ___________________ 2. ___________________ 3. ___________________

5. Have you ever reviewed the school rules and regulations that you found in place in this institution?
   (a) Yes ( )
   (b) No ( )

6. If yes in No. 5 above, who did you consult when reviewing or coming up with new rules and regulations to check indiscipline
   (a) Deputy Head Teacher ( )
   (b) Members of staff ( )

7. (i) Are there some rules and regulations you have considered particularly difficult to enforce?
   (a) Yes ( )
   (b) No ( )

(ii) If "Yes" to question 7(i) above, please specify

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

8. Where have you placed the institution's school rules and regulations
   (a) In every class ( )
   (b) On the general notice board ( )
(c) In the staff room ( )
(d) In the Deputy’s and head Teacher’s offices ( )

9. How many school rules and regulations do you have?
   (a) 1-5 ( )
   (b) 3-10 ( )
   (c) Over 10 ( )

10. Prior to your appointment as Head teacher had you received any pre-
    service training in education administration?
    (a) Yes ( )
    (b) No ( )

11. Do you have qualified staff for guidance and counselling
    (a) Yes ( )
    (b) No ( )

12. How would you describe the cohesion of your staff in addressing
    indiscipline among students?
    (a) Firm ( )
    (b) Not very firm ( )
    (c) Fair ( )

13. How often do you meet with your prefect body for consultation?
    (a) As the need arises ( )
    (b) On weekly basis ( )
14. Do you have specific times known to students when they can come to the office for whatever reason
   (a) No ( )
   (b) Yes ( )

15. How often do you handle indiscipline cases referred to your office by staff members for action or guidance?
   (a) Not very often ( )
   (b) Seldom ( )
   (c) When the need arises ( )

16. How often would your guidance and counselling teacher(s) address the student on the school assembly advising them on the need for good behaviour
   (a) Very often ( )
   (b) Seldom ( )
   (c) When the need arises ( )

17. Do you have a system put in place of standard operating procedures known by all students and staff for dealing commensurately with indiscipline cases? E.g. all vernacular speakers will be required by the teacher on duty to perform twice their normal morning manual duties.
   (a) No ( )
   (b) Yes ( )
18. Do you have a system put in place and known to staff members and students for positively reinforcing well-behaved students?
   (a) No ()
   (b) Yes ()

19. How often are well-disciplined students positively reinforced via physical rewards? E.g. five best behaved students as per the staff members’ consensus to be rewarded with a new set of school uniform.
   (a) Yearly bases ()
   (b) Termly bases ()
   (c) Weekly bases ()
   (d) Not applicable. ()

20. Below is a list of measures on how school administration might encourage their staff to handle indiscipline students. Rank these measures as in the sequence they are used in your school, where applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE HANDLING MEASURE</th>
<th>RANKING 1, 2, 3..............6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Manual labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Corporal punishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Verbal punishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Counselling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Deny privileges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Give strict warnings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. The following are some of the factors (causes) that make students misbehave. Rank them as in the sequence they apply in your school, where applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>RANKING 1, 2, 3, 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Poor student-teacher relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Poor teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Lack of facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Over-protective guardians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C

22 (a) Do you have any problem with your B.O.G. as far as helping you to maintain discipline is concerned?

(i) No ()

(ii) Yes ()

(b) If “Yes” to question 22 (a) above, please explain briefly -

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
23. (a) Is the local community supportive in your efforts to stamp out indiscipline in the school?

(i) Yes ( )

(ii) No ( )

(b) If "Yes, please explain briefly. -

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION.
Dear Sir,

RE: RESEARCH PERMISSION FOR MWANIKI SOLOMON GITONGA—E55/7019/2001

The above named person is a student in this University. He has completed his research proposal satisfactorily and it is felt that he should go to the field to collect the relevant data for his project entitled: MANAGEMENT OF STUDENTS DISCIPLINE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS. A CASE OF MIGWANI DIVISION, MWINGI DISTRICT.

It will be appreciated if permission is granted to facilitate his studies.

Thank you.

Kenyatta University

Date: 15/04/03
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

MR MWANIKI SOLOMON GITONGA TSC 364509

The bearer of this letter is authorised to visit and collect information as concerns "MANAGEMENT OF STUDENTS DISCIPLINE" in our secondary schools in Migwani Division of Mwingi District.

It will be appreciated if the teacher is granted any assistance.

Thank you.

DD T Mbithi

For: DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER

Mwingi