

Principals' Influence on Disciplinary Measures Adapted In Students' Discipline Management in Secondary Schools in Kiambu County: Kenya

Judith Oriya Ogweno
University of Nairobi
Kenya

Abstract

This study was conducted to establish the influence of the principals' adaptation of disciplinary measures on students' discipline in secondary schools in Kiambu County, Kenya. The study adopted a descriptive survey method and employed questionnaires and interview schedules to collect data. The study sample consisted of 15 principals, 21 deputy principals, 55 class teachers and 375 students from selected schools in the County. The quantitative data from questionnaires was analysed with the aid of SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) and presented using tables. From the principals' interviews, research questions were analysed along thematic lines and presented using frequencies tables while some were reported verbatim. The findings established that: there were a variety of disciplinary measures differing in effectiveness being applied in students' discipline. Also there was discrepancy on what measures each stakeholder considered effective. Finally, negative disciplinary measures which have been considered as counterproductive in discipline management were applied in students' discipline.

Key words: Disciplinary measures, Adapted, Secondary school, Principals, Kiambu County, Kenya, Discipline Management

1. Introduction

Discipline is a key component in the management of any organization (Ouma, Simatwa & Serem, 2013; Masista, 2008). The absence of discipline in a school is displayed in acts such as destruction of school property, poor attitude towards learning, truancy, bullying, drug abuse and other immoral behaviour (Ali, Dada, Isiaka, & Salmon, 2014; Ouma, Simatwa, & Serem, 2013). Studies shows that the levels of indiscipline has gone up globally (Moyo, Khewu & Bagaya, 2014; Rahimi & Karkami, 2015); specifically, in public schools in countries like United Kingdom and South Africa (Maphosa & Mammen, 2011), United Arabs Emirates (Karanja & Bowen, 2012) India and Uganda (UNESCO, 2014). Notably in Kenya too in the last few years' cases of indiscipline such as burning of schools have been on the rise (Tiego & Kamore, 2015; Njoroge & Nyabuto, 2014). A study by Njoroge and Nyabuto (2014) also indicated that a majority of students agreed that lack of disciplinary measures were a cause of indiscipline among students.

Studies reveal that the practices a school principal allows has a direct impact on how students' discipline is maintained (Knapp, Copland, Plecki & Portin, 2006; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson & Wahlstrom, 2004). The principals, therefore, ought to ensure that the teachers are in-serviced on effective disciplinary strategies such as guidance and counseling (Kiprop, 2012) and classroom management (Irungu & Nyagah, 2011). Some of the disciplinary strategies used in schools included: detention, suspension; manual work, parental involvement; privilege withdrawal, professional support like counsellors and psychologists; effective instruction, reinforcement of good behaviour by praise and ignoring unwanted behaviour; verbal and non- verbal interventions among other strategies (Njoroge & Nyabuto, 2014). Other measures included: student mentoring by responsible adults; students expected to apologize for wrongs they committed, getting support groups and peer counselling among other measures (KEMI, 2014a).

Some studies, however, noted there were schools where some teachers still meted out counter-productive disciplinary methods which negatively affected students (Njoroge & Nyabuto, 2014; Kiprop, 2012).

This was also brought out in a study by African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse (ANPPCAN) which revealed that teachers resorted to methods such as pulling students ears, scolding, forcing students to kneel on the floor among other counterproductive methods (Kiprop, 2012). Eggleton (2001) indicated that other measures such as suspension and expulsion seem to be ineffective methods of dealing with misbehavior because they do not appear to be a deterrent for future misconduct.

The presence of indiscipline in schools in spite of the attempt by the MoEST to stump it out and the counterproductive methods of discipline still being practiced shows that there is a gap between theory and practice. It puts to question the effectiveness of the disciplinary methods being used in the schools. To address this gap, this study, therefore, sought to establish how the principals' influence students' discipline by adapting certain disciplinary measures in discipline management in secondary schools in Kiambu County Kenya.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Notably in Kenya in the last few years cases of indiscipline such as burning of schools have been on the rise (Tiego & Kamore, 2015; Njoroge & Nyabuto, 2014). This is despite the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) ensuring that disciplinary measures in schools were regulated by providing guidelines (Republic of Kenya, 2013; Republic of Kenya, 2010). In addition, MoEST had also undertaken the in-servicing of deputy principals to update them on alternatives in discipline management; a move that was geared towards improving discipline management (KEMI, 2014a). This rise in indiscipline, therefore, calls for a review in how disciplinary measures are carried out in the schools.

2. Research objectives

This study identified the following research objectives:

1. To determine the type of disciplinary measures principals allowed for students' discipline management in the schools.
2. To determine the effectiveness of the disciplinary measures in students' discipline management.
3. To establish the positive and negative measures used in students' discipline management.

3.1. Methodology

The study utilized descriptive survey design. Wimmer and Dominick, (2013) note that descriptive survey is used to display the conditions on the ground which was the target of this study. To select the number of respondents needed, the study applied Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sampling method to get a total of 15 principals, 21 deputy principals and 375 students, and Central Limit Theorem to get the 55 class teachers from 21 public secondary schools in Kiambu County. To gather information from the principals, in-depth interviews consisting of structured open-ended questions were used, while questionnaires were used to collect data from the deputy principals, class teachers and students.

3.2. Instrumentation

According to Best and Kahn (2006) using various methods or techniques to gather data helps in avoiding bias. At the same time it adds rigour, depth and richness to the research design and data collection (McMurray, Pace & Scott, 2004). The study, therefore, applied questionnaires and interviews in line with the research questions. The questionnaires consisted of questions on the types of disciplinary measures applied in school and the effectiveness of the measures. The rating scale used was as follows: very effective, effective, rarely effective and ineffective. In addition, the study used an interview guide to collect data from the principals.

3.3. Reliability and validity of instruments

Creswell (2002) states that reliability is the consistency or stability of a measure. After the questionnaires were collected from the respondents during the pretesting, the split half method was used to test reliability. The scores were correlated using the Spearman- Rank formula which deemed them as reliable. Fawcett (2013) indicates that when a test is successful in measuring what it purports to measure, then it is valid. To ensure content validity the researcher ensured that the questions, both in the questionnaires and interview schedule, were well constructed and sufficiently addressed the research objectives of the study. In addition, they were also subjected to the expert and professional judgement of university supervisors and colleagues.

4. Results and Discussions

Disciplinary measures employed on students: principals’ perspective

In their interviews the principals were asked on what disciplinary measures their teachers applied on the students and the effectiveness of the measures. They each gave different responses which are presented under similar themes as follows:

The principals’ responses are presented in Table 4.1:

Table 4.1. Disciplinary measures employed on students: principals’ perspective

Disciplinary measures	School category			Frequency %	Effectiveness			
	National	Extra County	County		Very Effective	Effective	Rarely effective	Percentage
1. Discipline committee	2	7	6	15(100)	2	7	4	86
2. Guidance and counselling	2	7	6	15 (100)	2	5	3	67
3. Professional support	2	7	6	15(100)	2	4	3	60
4. Peer counsellors	2	7	6	15(100)	2	6	3	73
5. Keeping punishment record books	2	7	6	15(100)	1	4	3	53
6. Manual work	1	6	6	13(87)	1	5	3	60
7. Teacher mentoring	2	5	6	13(87)	2	5	4	73
8. Involvement of parents	2	5	6	13(87)	2	6	5	87
9. Suspension	2	4	5	11(73)	1	4	3	53
10. Kneeling	0	3	3	6(40)	0	2	3	33
11. Shouting/ slapping	1	0	4	5(33)	0	0	1	6

- From Table 4.1., all the principals indicated that the disciplinary measures most applied were: professional support, which involved getting assistance from counsellors, psychologists, spiritual leaders and peer counsellors. Yet in terms of the effectiveness of the measures there was great disparity.

“I normally involved a variety of professionals to help me keep these students in check, for example, pastors, counsellors and even motivational speakers.” (Principal No. 6).

“Yes in order to maintain discipline in the school, the school counsellor is tasked to come up with the time table indicating who is coming to give a talk to the students.” (Principal No. 5)

- When asked how they vetted the speakers to ensure the ones they brought in were qualified. Some responded as follows:

“Most of the time we require that the speakers come with letters from the institutions they are working with.” (Principal No. 8)

“Sometimes we do a background check on the speaker once we identify that they can speak to the students.” (Principal No. 10)

- A majority of the principals (87%) indicated they allowed disciplinary measures like manual work but only 60% felt it was an effective way of maintaining discipline. On being asked what type of manual work the students did one responded:

“For us manual work involves washing corridors and classes, picking litter within the school compound, weeding flower beds and getting manure to the school farm.” (Principal No. 6).

Some principals indicated that most students feared manual work as they viewed it as hard labour and embarrassment from being seen by other students. Hence, it served as a restraint from getting into discipline issues. However, some indicated that the danger with manual work was that students could use it as an excuse to keep away from the lessons they did not like; hence, the school tried to limit the punishment to out of class hours.

4. The findings also revealed that a few (33%) of the principals indicated that their teachers had slapped or shouted at students, though most of the principals indicated that they had reprimanded them since these were negative measures. Principals No 7, 8 and 10 indicated that where the teachers considered the discipline issues chronic or complicated, some of them referred the students with disciplined issues to the principals' offices that they could have a one on one talk with them; especially where the teachers felt that the student was reacting because of some problems from his or her home background.
5. Most principals noted that parental involvement was an effective (87%) way of handling discipline management; a view shared by Nyabuto and Njoroge (2014). Two principals, however, noted that a few parents supported the students in their misbehavior instead of working with the school administration to help the students; so they were hesitant in involving parents in discipline management.
"Personally I've had quite a rough time with handling parents, they abuse teachers in front of the students, how can I trust them to help their own children. However, I am not saying one should not involve them..." (Principal No. 1)
6. A large number (87%) of the principals indicated that they had teacher mentoring groups to help the students in the school and these were also referred to as family units; however, a fewer number (73%) viewed the method as effective in discipline management. The principals, however, agreed that these groups were helping them in discipline management and they were seeing students open up and build cordial relationships with the teaching staff. As a result discipline was being maintained as fewer cases were being reported to their offices.
"I am very excited, I have just reconstituted the groups and eager to meet my group. Family units are really a great strategy in discipline management for me." (Principal No. 4)
"I meet my family once every two weeks and that helps me know how they are doing as well as the issues that could affect discipline in the school."(Principal No. 2)
However, due to wide syllabus that needed to be covered, time for the meetings was often a challenge according to most of the principals.
7. Peer counselling was also being explored by all the principals. They indicated that students were better counselled by their peers. The study reveals that the peer counselling in the schools were fairly effective (73%) in reducing discipline cases. There was about twenty seven percent who did not indicate that it was effective. This implies that Huffman, Vernoy and Vernoy (2000) view that peer counselling works best during adolescent stage needs to be interrogated further to find out the kind of peer counselling that was taking place in schools.
8. Other disciplinary measures like suspension were in also use. The study found out that suspension was effective at 53% which tends to show that it was generally counterproductive in the discipline management. This seems to agree with Eggleton (2001) view that suspension resulted in many students getting worse in behavior.

4.2. The deputy principals’ responses on disciplinary measures applied on the students

The deputy principals’ responses on disciplinary measures that teachers applied on the students are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2. Deputy Principals’ responses on measures used in schools and their effectiveness

Measures	Availability of measure		Effectiveness of measure				
	Yes %	No %	Very effective (f)	Effective (f)	Rarely effective (f)	Total percentage of effectiveness	Ineffective (f)%
1. Teacher mentoring	20 (95.2)	0 (0.0)	10	6	0	16(76.19)	0 (0.0)
2. Discipline committee	19 (90.5)	2 (9.5)	8	7	1	16(76.19)	0 (0.0)
3. Peer counselling	19 (90.5)	1 (4.8)	8	8	0	16(76.19)	0 (0.0)
3. Guidance & Counselling	20 (95.2)	1(4.8)	8	7	0	15 (71.43)	0 (0.0)
4. Teacher counselling	19 (90.5)	2 (9.5)	6	9	0	15(71.43)	2 (3.6)
5. Keeping punishment records	18 (85.7)	3 (14.3)	9	6	0	15(71.43)	0 (0.0)
6. Professional support	18 (85.7)	3 (14.3)	7	7	0	14 (66.67)	0 (0.0)
7. Weekly class meetings	19 (90.5)	2 (9.5)	5	9	0	14 (66.67)	0 (0.0)
8. Involving parents	17 (81.0)	4 (19.0)	7	5	0	12 (57.14)	1 (4.8)
9. Manual work	17 (81.0)	4 (19.0)	3	8	1	12 (57.14)	2 (9.5)
10. Suspension	15 (71.4)	6 (28.6)	3	6	2	11 (52.38)	1 (4.8)
11. Reprimanding	15 (71.4)	6 (28.6)	4	4	2	10 (47.62)	1 (4.8)
12. Chasing of offenders	14 (66.7)	7 (33.7)	3	1	5	9 (42.86)	1 (4.8)
13. Parading offenders	13 (61.9)	8 (38.1)	5	3	1	9 (42.86)	8(38.1)
14. Withdrawing privileges	11 (52.4)	10 (47.6)	6	2	1	9 (42.86)	2 (9.5)
15. Detaining students	13 (61.9)	8 (38.1)	1	6	1	8 (38.1)	0 (0.0)
16. Apology	13 (61.9)	8 (38.1)	1	6	1	8 (38.09)	0 (0.0)
17. Ignoring students	11 (52.4)	10 (47.6)	4	1	1	6 (28.57)	3(14.3)
18. Shouting at students	10 (47.6)	11 (52.4)	2	3	1	6 (28.57)	2 (9.5)
19. Abusing students	7 (33.3)	14 (66.7)	1	2	0	3(14.29)	2 (9.5)
20. Caning	6 (28.6)	15 (17.4)	1	1	0	2 (9.52)	2 (1.8)

Table 4.2., shows the measures that were applied in most schools in terms of their popularity and effectiveness in discipline management according to the deputy principals. Notable from the findings was that teacher mentoring of students (92.2%) and guidance and counselling (95.2%) were the most available disciplinary methods. However, teachers mentoring (76.19%) was more effective than the guidance and counselling (71.43%). The challenge that seem to face teacher mentoring was that most teachers felt they had heavy workloads hence reducing the time they could spend mentoring the students. The discipline committee (76.19%) and peer counselling were also rated among the most popular and effective strategies. The discipline committees could be effective because they were composed of teachers who knew students and at the same time, they had a chance to discuss the students’ issues before rendering their verdict. The effectiveness of peer counselling (76.19%) is also noted by the deputy principals in agreement with Mwamwenda, (1996) and Huffman, Vernoy and Vernoy, (2000) that peer counselling is effective and peaks at adolescents. However, there is need to train peer counsellors for them to be more effective. It was also observed that peer counsellors were generally few in schools (Nyabuto & Njoroge, 2014). Weekly class meeting were popular (90.5%) but they were not rated as very effective in discipline management. In addition, whereas guidance and counselling was available (95.2%) as recommended by the MoEST (KEMI, 2014b), the effectiveness ((71.43%) was not as expected.

This indicates that there were problems with that strategy of discipline management a view held by Kirui Mbugua and Sang (2011) that majority of teacher counsellors were not professionally trained. It could also be due to the large populations of students compared to the few teacher counsellors in the schools.

The fact that some deputy principals found negative measures such as ignoring errant students (28.57%), shouting at students (28.57%), abusing students (14.29%) and caning (9.52%) effective reveals gap in discipline management. This could imply that they had not undergone training that was offered by the Kenya Management Institute which discourages such punishments (KEMI, 2014) or they were just contravening the Education Act (2013). The presence of these negative measures proves Kiprop (2012) observation that there were schools in Kenya where some teachers meted out counterproductive disciplinary methods which negatively affected students and could be responsible for some of the upsurge in indiscipline experienced. The principals ought to have encouraged all the teaching staff to apply measures that were not psychologically torturous to the students in discipline management in line with the Teachers Conduct of Regulations and the Education Act (2013).

4.3. The class teachers' responses on disciplinary measures applied on the students

The class teachers' responses on disciplinary measures and students' discipline are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3. Class teachers responses on discipline measures and their effectiveness

Measures	Availability of measure		Effectiveness				
	Yes % f	No % f	Very effective (f)	Effective (f)	Rarely effective % f	Total percentage effectiveness	Ineffective % f
1. Discipline committee	49 (89.1)	4 (7.3)	23	17	3	43(78.18)	0 (0.0)
2. Peer counselling	51 (92.7)	1 (8.1)	23	18	1	42(76.36)	2 (1.8)
3. Punishment records	48 (87.3)	6 (10.9)	20	20	1	41(74.55)	2 (3.6)
4. Teacher Mentoring	45 (81.8)	8 (14.5)	26	11	2	39(71.00)	0(0.00)
5. Involving parents	48 (87.3)	7 (12.7)	23	12	3	38(69.09)	2 (3.6)
6. G&C	47 (85.5)	8(14.5)	20	14	3	37(67.27)	2 (3.6)
7. Teacher counselling	49 (89.1)	4 (7.3)	19	14	4	37(67.27)	2 (3.6)
8. Weekly class meetings	45 (81.8)	10 (18.2)	14	19	3	36(65.45)	4 (7.3)
9. Professional support	47 (85.5)	6 (10.9)	19	13	4	36(65.45)	2 (3.6)
10. Reprimanding	43 (78.2)	11 (20.0)	16	16	4	36 65.45)	1 (1.8)
11. Suspension	39 (70.9)	16 (29.1)	9	17	4	30 (54.54)	4 (7.3)
12. Withdrawing privileges	38 (69.1)	17 (30.9)	10	13	4	27(49.09)	4 (7.3)
13. Manual work	37 (67.3)	18 32.7)	10	9	4	23(41.81)	5 (9.1)
14. Chasing of offenders	32 (58.2)	23 (41.8)	11	4	7	22 (40.0)	5 (9.1)
15. Caning	22 (40.0)	33 (60.0)	13	6	2	21(38.18)	1 (1.8)
16. Parading offenders	23 (41.8)	32 (58.2)	10	5	4	19(34.55)	32(58.2)
17. Detaining students	20 (36.4)	35 (63.6)	1	7	3	11 (20.0)	5 (9.1)
18. Apology	20 (36.4)	35 (63.6)	1	7	3	11 (20.0))	5 (9.1)
19. Ignoring students	17 (30.9)	38 (69.1)	3	4	2	9 (16.36)	5 (9.1)
20. Shouting at students	20 (36.4)	35 (63.6)	0	4	4	8 (14.55)	11 (20)
21. Abusing students	15 (27.3)	40 (72.7)	2	1	3	6 (11.0)	6 (10.9)

Table 4.3, shows the class teachers' view on disciplinary measures and their effectiveness in discipline management. The most effective method was the presence of the discipline committee (78.18%) yet it was not the most available (89.1%). Its effectiveness could be explained as follows; probably because as observed by KEMI (2014a) and Davis and Brighthouse (2008) a lot of thought is taken into its composition thus providing the student a fair chance of investigation before decisions concerning their discipline are made. The class teachers also saw peer counselling as most available (92.7%) and second most effective method. This view agrees with Huffman, Vernoy and Vernoy (2000) as an effective disciplinary method. It is notable that guidance and counselling was ranked as sixth most available and effective at 67.25% which could imply that it was not being applied as recommended by MoEST that every school was to have a guidance and counselling department (KEMI, 2014a). The fact that the most available methods were not seen as the most effective could explain the presence of indiscipline among secondary school students.

On the other hand, the class teachers findings also revealed the use of counterproductive methods of discipline management in the schools, for example, ignoring of errant students which was available at 30.95% and effective at (16.36%), shouting at students effective at 14.55% and abusing at 11% respectively. These are against the government directives in schools (Republic of Kenya, 2013). Concerning ignoring indisciplined students and shouting at them, Eggleton (2001) observes that it will only cause things to get worse for the teacher. Effective teachers understand that discipline ought to be something that is not used to crush a student, but rather to motivate that student to avoid negative behavior. Therefore, effective teachers do not let things get out of control and rarely do they get involved in power struggles and yelling matches with their students. The fact that some teachers found these methods effective indicates that the principals had not fully sensitized them to the dangers they were posing to students and eventually their discipline management (Kiprop, 2012; Republic of Kenya, 2013). This could also imply that the principals had not ensured all teachers were trained in proper disciplinary methods or they were not monitoring what was happening in schools. The principals needed to stamp out negative measures and strengthen the use of positive measures effectively to enhance students' discipline.

4.4. The students' responses on disciplinary measures

The students' response on disciplinary measures and their effectiveness are presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4. Students responses on disciplinary measures and their effectiveness

Measures	Availability of measure		Effectiveness			
	Yes %	No %	Very effective f	Effective f	Rarely effective f	Total of effectiveness SS (f) %
1. Involving parents	328(87.5)	46 (12.3)	150	66	55	271(72.27)
2. Peer counselling	321 (85.6)	52 (13.9)	123	75	59	257(68.53)
3. Teacher counselling	314 (83.7)	61 916.3)	121	102	33	256(68.27)
4. G &C	313 (83.5)	62 (16.5)	133	72	42	247 (65.67)
5. Weekly class meetings	286 (76.3)	89 (23.7)	93	89	47	229(61.07)
6. Suspension	312(83.2)	61 (16.3)	84	93	48	225(60.0)
7. Apology	319(85.1)	56 (14.9)	71	74	78	233(59.47)
8. Detaining students	165(44)	210(56)	30	12	41	83(58.4)
9. Manual work	323(86.1)	52 (13.9)	75	68	76	219(58.4)
10. Discipline committee	277 (73.9)	97 (25.9)	100	71	38	209(55.73)
11. Chasing of offenders	305(81.3)	69 (18.4)	61	60	86	207(55.2)
12. Punishment records	308 (82.1)	66 (17.6)	91	57	58	206(54.93)
13. Professional support	247 (65.9)	128(34.1)	95	73	36	204 (54.4)
14. Teacher	208 (55.5)	167(44.5)	83	53	31	122(44.53)
15. Mentoring						
16. Withdrawing privileges	275(73.30)	97 (25.9)	58	48	59	165 (44)
17. Parading offenders	239(63.7)	135(36.0)	60	46	55	161(42.93)
18. Reprimanding	230 (61.3)	145(38.7)	37	55	56	148 (39.47)
19. Caning	194(51.7)	181(48.3)	47	30	45	122 (32.53)
20. Shouting at students	181 (48.3)	188(50.1)	21	12	31	64(17.07)
21. Abusing students	142 (37.9)	230(61.3)	22	13	19	64(14.4)
22. Ignoring students	79 (21.0)	293(78.1)	14	6	17	37 (9.87)

Table 4.4., shows the response from the students on the most available measures of students' discipline and their effectiveness. Top on the list for the students was involving of parents (87.5%) and the method was effectiveness at 72.27%. Second in effectiveness was peer counselling (68.53%); though the percentage shows that it was not as effective. Guidance and counselling and weekly class meetings were available but scored below 70% in effectiveness. These findings indicate the following: on involvement of parents in discipline management; the views concurred with Bosire, Sang, Kiumi & Mungai (2009) observation that 78% of principals were perceived as involving parents in managing students' discipline and this seemed to be working positively. Moreover, the students did not find peer counselling as effective as their teachers did putting to question how well trained the peer counsellors were. The effectiveness of the guidance and counselling (65.67%) was also wanting suggesting that the measure was not meeting the required standards. The impact of weekly class meetings (61.6%) on discipline was not very effective yet these are smaller groups within the schools that should help in the management of the school. The implication could be that the students did not participate actively in airing their views in these meetings. In addition, KEMI (2014a) indicates that some forms of manual punishments could be effective in reforming students' behavior; however, this study shows that it was effective at 58.4% only. This means that the principals needed to check on the kind of manual work the students were given.

The study also notes that even among the students counterproductive measures were mentioned, for example, shouting at students (48.3%) abusing of students (37.9%) and ignoring of errant students (21.0%). In addition, some students found the measures effective in discipline management.

It is noted that these figures were considerable high and were likely to affect students’ discipline negatively considering that they are counterproductive (KEMI, 2014b). The practices were probably going on because the students feared telling the principals for fear the teachers concerned might get back at them. The principals therefore, needed to open channels of communication that instilled confidence in the students.

4.5 Comparing respondents responses to the different measures

Table 4.5. Comparing respondents responses to the different disciplinary measures

Measures	Effectiveness				
	Principals %	Deputy Principals %	Class teachers %	Students %	Total of effectiveness (f) %
1. Peer counselling	73	76.19	76.36	68.53	80.27
2. Discipline committee	86	76.19	78.18	55.73	77.53
3. Keeping punishment records	53	71.43	74.55	54.93	75.23
4. Guidance and counselling	67	71.43	67.27	65.67	72.84
5. Professional support	60	66.67	65.45	54.40	71.63
6. Involving parents	87	57.14	69.09	72.27	71.38
7. Teacher counselling	-	71.43	67.27	68.27	69.14
8. Teachers mentoring	73	76.19	71.00	44.53	68.68
9. Weekly class meetings	-	66.67	65.45	61.07	64.40
10. Manual work	60	57.14	41.81	58.4	61.09
11. Suspension	53	52.38	54.54	60.00	59.98
12. Reprimand	-	47.62	65.45	39.47	50.85
13. Parading offenders	-	42.86	34.55	42.93	48.00
14. Chasing offenders out of class	-	42.86	40.00	55.2	46.02
15. Withdrawing privileges	-	42.86	49.09	44.00	45.32
16. Apology letters	-	38.09	20.00	59.47	39.19
17. Detaining students	-	38.10	20.00	58.4	35.63
18. Caning	-	9.52	38.18	32.53	25.65
19. Shouting	6	28.57	14.55	17.07	23.30
20. Ignoring errant student	-	28.57	16.36	9.87	18.27
21. Abusing students	-	14.29	11.00	14.4	12.93

Table 4.5., indicates the effectiveness of the disciplinary measures as summarized from the views of the various categories of respondents. It shows there was a big discrepancy in what each category regarded as most effective in terms of discipline management with a few exceptions. For example, all the categories namely: principals, deputy principals, class teachers and students agreed that peer counselling was among the top three measures in discipline management. This finding supports Huffman, Vernoy and Vernoy (2000) observation that peer counselling works best during the adolescent stage in life. However, there was need to train the students counsellors more to make it very effective. Then, three of categories of the respondents indicated that discipline committees were effective in discipline management. It is notable that guidance and counselling did not top the list in spite of the government endeavouring to ensure that it is effective in all schools (KEMI, 2014b). This qualifies Kirui, Mbugua and Sang (2011) view that there was a challenge with the guidance and counselling in schools due to the presence of unqualified counsellors. The fact that students felt that involving parents was at the top of the most effective measures (72.27%) is worth noting. This implies that the principals ought to explore this avenue to enhance discipline in schools. This will agrees with Githu (2014) who indicated that when parents are involved in their children lives there is marked improvement in achievement of higher grades, better school attendance, homework completion rates, more positive attitudes and decreased anti-social behaviour.

The fact that suspension which is an accepted way of discipline (Republic of Kenya, 2013) was not rank among the top methods agrees with Eggleton (2001) observation that suspension in itself was not an effective way of deterring future misconduct; hence, the need to review its use. However, in schools where it has been combined with professional support and guidance and counselling it has been found to be fairly effective.

Also notable is the observation that manual work which is used in most schools (Njoroge & Nyabuto, 2014) was not very effective in terms of discipline management. This calls for a review on the work that should be given to students to deter them from engaging in acts of in-discipline.

The fact that three categories of respondents namely: deputy principals, class teachers and students found counterproductive methods such as caning (25.65%), shouting at errant students (23.30%), ignoring errant (18.27%) students and abusing (12.93%) supports that view that due to lack of knowledge on proper disciplinary measures, teachers were hurting students emotionally ; a factor that contributes to students indiscipline (Kiprop, 2012). The canning of students was still going in spite of The Kenyan government banning of physical and psychological abuse through the enactment of the Children's Act in 2001 in Legal Notice No. 56. In addition, Githu (2014) notes in a study by Human Rights Watch that corporal punishment led to higher levels of immediate compliance and aggression, and lower levels of moral internalization and mental health.

The MoEST needs to follow up on its training with deputy principals on alternative means of disciplinary measures as stated in its training manual (KEMI 2014a). Further, it should also implement a training or in-service for all class teachers.

5. Conclusion

From the findings, the principals seemed to be putting in place disciplinary measures that were helping in managing students' discipline. However, the measures were not highly effective in all cases. There was also need for the principals to watch out against negative measures like slapping and shouting at errant students as these were likely to influence discipline negatively. On the other hand, they needed to explore more on ways of disciplining that were productive like guidance and counselling and teacher mentoring to make them fully effective in discipline management. The fact that some teachers found negative methods effective indicates that the principals had not fully sensitized them to the dangers they were posing to students or they were not monitoring what was happening in schools and eventually the discipline management. The principals also needed to open channels of communication that instilled confidence in the students. Generally, the students who were the recipients of the disciplinary measures had lower scores on their effectiveness. This means there is need for the principals to strengthen the use of the measures in order to curb cases of indiscipline.

Recommendations

Based on the finding of the study, the following recommendation have been made:

1. The Ministry of Education Science and Technology through its quality assurance and standards office should ensure that principals reinforce the implementation of positive discipline measures.
2. The Kenya Education Management Institute should review its training curriculum on disciplinary measures to include class teachers, who are mostly present with the students in class, and the discipline committees to empower them more on discipline management strategies.
3. There is need for all the stakeholders in the school to come with collaboration to ensure that the disciplinary measures used in a school are viewed as effective by all.
4. The schools should have a programmed timetable to enable effective teacher mentoring of students.
5. There is need to carry out a detailed study on the basis on which the various respondents rated each method as being effective.

References

- Ali, A. A., Dada, I. T., Isiaka, G. A., & Salmon, S. A. (2014). Types, causes and management of indiscipline acts among secondary school students in Shomolu Local Government Area of Lagos State. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, 8 (2), 254-287. Retrieved from <http://www.infinitypress.info/index.php/jsss/article/download/790/379>
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education*. (10th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education
- Bosire J., Sang A.K., Kiumi J.K. & Mungai V.C. (2009): The relationship between principals' managerial approaches and student discipline in secondary schools in Kenya. *African Research Review*. 3(3) 399-413.
- Creswell, J. C. (2003). *Research design, qualitative. Quantitative and mixed method approaches*. (2nd Ed) California: Sage.
- Davis, B., & Brighouse, T. (2008). *Passionate leadership in education*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- DCSF, (2009). The impact of school leadership on pupil outcomes, research report DCSF-RR108, Nottingham, Department for Children, Schools & Families. Available at dera.ioe.ac.uk/11329/1/DCSFRR108.pdf.
- Fawcett, A. L. (2013). Principles of assessment and outcome measurement for occupational therapists and physiotherapists: Theory, skills and application. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com>
- Eggleton, T. (2001). *Discipline in schools*. U. S. Department of Education: Education Resources Information Center. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED451554.pdf>.
- Eshetu , A. A. (2014). Indiscipline problems of high school students: The case of Ethio-Japan Hidasse Secondary School (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia) .*Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(37),23-28. Retrieved from <http://www.iiste.org>
- Huffman, K., Vernoy, M. & Vernoy, J. (2000). *Psychology in action*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Irungu, M. N., & Nyagah, G. (2013). Determinants of academic performance in Kenya certificate of secondary education in public secondary schools in Kiambu County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4, (12).
- Karanja, R., & Bowen, M. (2012). *Student indiscipline and academic performance in public secondary schools in Kenya*. Daystar University Centre for Research and Publications. Working Paper Series Number DU/2012/002. Accessed: Aug 20, 2013.
- Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) (2014a). *Diploma in education management: Child friendly schools; module 4*. Nairobi: KEMI
- Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) (2014b). *Diploma in education management: Guidance and counselling. Module 8*. Nairobi: KEMI.
- Kiprop, C. (2012). Approaches to management of discipline in secondary schools in Kenya. *International journal of Research in Management*, 2. (2). Accessed: January 3, 2014.
- Kirui, R., Mbugua, Z., & Sang, A. (2011) Challenges facing head teachers in security management in public secondary schools in Kisii County in Kenya: *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* ,(1) 15 [Special Issue – October 2011],
- Knapp, M. S., Copland, M. A., Plecki, M. L., & Portin, B. S. (2006). *Leading, learning, and leadership support*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D, W. (1970) Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 1970, 30, 607-610. Retrieved 14th, June, 2014. http://home.kku.ac.th/sompong/guest_speaker/KrejcieandMorgan_article.pdf
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K.S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation. Available at www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/How-Leadership-Influences-Student-Learning.aspx. Retrieved: 6 June, 2014.
- Maphosa, C., & Mammen, K. J. (2011). How chaotic and unmanageable classrooms have become: Insights into prevalent forms of learner indiscipline in South African schools. *Anthropologist*, 13(3): 185-193 Accessed: 5 June, 2014.
- McMurray, A.J., Scott, D. and Pace, R.W. (2004). The relationship between organizational commitment and organizational climate in manufacturing. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15, 473-488.

- Masitsa, G. (2008). Discipline and disciplinary measures in the Free State township schools: Unresolved problems. *Acta Academica*, 40(3), 234 - 270. Retrieved from http://reference.sabinet.co.za/sa_epublication_article/academ_v40_n3_a10
- Moyo, G., Khewu, N. P. D., & Bayaga, A. (2014). Disciplinary practices in schools and principles of alternatives to corporal punishment strategies. *South African Journal of Education*, 34 (1), 1 -14. Retrieved from <http://www.ajol.info/index.php/saje/article/viewFile/106653/96564>
- Mpofu, E., Oakland, T., & Gwiyari, P. (2010). Temperaments styles in Zimbabwean early adolescents: A Rasch measurement model analysis. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 40 (1) 44-53. Retrieved: May 29, 2014.
- Mwamwenda, T. S. (1995). Educational psychology. An African perspective (2nd ed.). Durban: Butterworth.
- Njoroge, P. M., & Nyabuto, A. N. (2014). Discipline as a factor in academic performance in Kenya. *Journal of Educational and Social Research* MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy, 1 (4). Retrieved: 25 January 2014.
- Ouma, M. O., Simatwa, E. W., & Serem, T. D. K. (2013). Management of pupil discipline in Kenya: A case study of Kisumu Municipality. , 4(5) , 374-386. Available at <http://www.interestjournals.org/ER>
- Republic of Kenya. (2013). *Basic education act 2013*. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Republic of Kenya. (2011). Ministry of gender children and gender policy. July, 2011.
- Rahimi, M., Karkami, F. H. (2015). The role of teachers' classroom discipline in their teaching effectiveness and students' language learning motivation and achievement: A path method. , 3(1), 57-82. Available at www.urmia.ac.ir/ijltr
- Tiego, P.M., & Kamore, S. K. (2015). Efficiency of guidance and counseling departments in promotion of discipline in high schools in Kiambu County, Kenya. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* MCSER Publishing: Rome-Italy. Vol. 4, No 3 November 2015. Available online at Kiambu County g & C pdf Reader. Retrieved 24th November, 2016.
- TSC. (2006). Teachers Code of conduct and ethics. http://www.kenya_schoolforintegratedmedicine.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Code-of-Regulations-for-Teachers.pdf
- UNESCO. (2014). Systematic monitoring of education for all. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,(UNESCO).
- Wimmer, R., & Dominick, J (2013). Mass media research (10th ed.). Retrieved from <http://books.google.com>