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ABSTRACT

This study looked into the strategies adopted by teachers in disciplining students in Langata District of Nairobi. It used mixed method research paradigm. Eight Private and 4 public secondary were used as samples alongside their principals while 92 teachers were sampled using stratified sampling. Data collection instruments were Questionnaire, Interview guide and Document analysis guide. The reliability test of the questionnaires have coefficient of reliability as 0.72 and 0.8 for the teachers and principals respectively. Quantitative data were analyzed descriptively using frequencies and percentages while qualitative data were analyzed thematically. Chi-square test for independence was used in testing the hypothesis and the results showed that there was no significant difference in strategies used by male and female teachers and between the private and public schools. Findings revealed that teachers use all the six strategies but rated cognitive and supportive strategies as very effective and punitive strategy as moderate. Major challenge faced by teachers in disciplining students after the ban of corporal punishment is students being unaffected and not wanting to change with the minor punishments given to them. Teachers suggested that partnering with all stakeholders and employing professionals in guidance and counseling will be of great help in improving students’ discipline. Based on the finding the researcher recommended a whole school community approach where all stakeholders will be involved in students’ discipline. Ministry of education should provide practical guidelines on students discipline and review Child’s Right. Marvin Marshal and Curwin and Mendler’s Models was also recommended for teachers use.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Managing students’ behaviour has been a great challenge and concern to many teachers, parents and entire society. Many schools face the challenges related to disruptive and antisocial students’ behaviour such as fighting, verbal abuse, bullying, sexual harassment, rule violation and destruction of school property (Osher, Bear, Spague and Doyle, 2010). Their disruptive behaviour could hamper the atmosphere for teaching and learning in school. This could lead to loss of time for classroom learning, threaten school safety and ruin students’ chances of becoming successful in their academic pursuit and life in general. Osher, Bear, Spague and Doyle, (2010) also identified teacher burnout as one of the effects of disruptive behaviour of students. For a school to be very productive and effective, the discipline of both the learners and educators are very important. Once discipline is a problem, it tells in all activities that go on in the school and in turn the outcome is hampered. Supporting this Blomberge (2012) expressed that school that is safe, supportive and gives an opportunity for children to learn and grow is a top concern for everyone in the field of education.

It is important also to note that the learning outcome of any school depends to a large extent on the school culture and climate which in turn is directly proportional to the disciplinary tone of the school. Chaplain (2003) opined that the headteacher along with the senior management team are charged with planning strategically, determining the direction the school should take and organizing the daily affairs of the school. All these make important contributions to creating and maintaining a well behaved school. Supporting this Mbiti (2007), notes that school discipline is central to school administration. Thus, the principal as
the leader of the school must have a clear policy of what he/she wants for the school without ignoring disciplinary tone of the school. Chaplain further notes that “what forms part of the headteachers leadership component includes being proactive in the development of an effective behaviour policy, ensuring that staff have appropriate professional support and resources to support the policy at all levels” (p. 104).

Researchers such as Kiumi, Bosire and Sang (2009) also stated that the learning outcome of a school depends on the quality of students’ discipline because it gives direction to learners. They also note that in spite of the important role played by disciplined behaviour in school overall outcome, the conditions of students’ discipline in Kenya has been disheartening. They also outlined the forms of defiant behaviour of students in secondary school level which include destruction of school property, assault, indecent behaviour like rape and in extreme cases death of students.

Kenyan Government in 1991 and 2001 set up two task forces that were mandated to establish the causes of indiscipline in school and to find out ways of tackling the problem (Republic of Kenya, 1991; Republic of Kenya 2001). Kariuki (2000), Warigi (2001), Republic of Kenya (2001) and Ruto-Korir (2003) in their various works outline the causes of students’ indiscipline in Kenya as drug abuse, poor parenting and negative influence by mass media and politics. Despite all effort made by researchers to find out the causes of indiscipline among students and on how to curb them the nation still experiences a high rate of students’ defiant behaviour in schools ranging from physical assault to verbal assault among students and their lack of respect for their teachers.

Hardly a term goes by without a media report of students’ mischievous acts. National television (NTV) news on 30th April 2013 highlighted the increase of crime committed by
youngsters especially those in high school at Korogocho slums in Nairobi. They reported that they killed a man on 23rd of April 2013 when he refused to hand in his computer to them. They continuously snatch people’s bags in broad day light using fire arms.

With the persistent misbehaviour of students it became necessary to have more in-depth study on the strategies adopted by teachers to discipline students. It was assumed in this study that teachers past experiences influence their manner of disciplining student. There is an English adage that the oppressed becomes the oppressor. Thus, teachers with hard and harsh experiences in the past are likely to be in favour of traditional approach to discipline.

Citizen online news of 2nd November 2012 reported three different incidents of defiant behaviour of students. It reported that three students from Kiaga were arrested on Thursday 1st of November 2012 in the evening in possession of petrol which they wanted to use in destroying the school facility. Other ten students from Kiburi were also arrested after they caused chaos in the school by destroying the school property. They also reported that schools unrest has been on the increase especially during the period of national examinations.

The star online media (2012) news on students’ unrest, as reported by Kiharu MP Mwangi during his meeting with the heads of schools in his county said that about 115 schools in central province were closed down because of students’ unrest. In Murang’a County, more than 15 schools went on strike with about 14 students taken to court for allegedly setting the school property worth millions of shillings on fire. One cannot but wonder why all these are on the increase despite the teachers effort to instill discipline and good moral in students. There are questions like what strategies are the teachers putting in place to curb all these indiscipline cases? What is working in their disciplinary approaches to managing students’ defiant behaviour? What is not working?
Kenyan government had put in place several measures to curb indiscipline in schools after the ban of corporal punishment. Among the measures were the establishment of guidance and counseling units in all schools, good classroom management practice, effective teaching methods and inclusion of learner in making school rules (MOEST, 2005). Despite the fact that Kenyan Government had put in place all these to deal with students’ discipline, yet disciplinary cases are on the rise. Is this as a result of lack of implementation of such policies or that teachers’ are not well prepared and equipped with alternative approaches to corporal punishment that can help them to groom these students.

This research was conducted using secondary schools in Langata District. This district is one of the major districts in Nairobi city of Kenya. It is Located south west of the City of Nairobi which is the capital and the largest city in Kenya (County Edition, 2012). Refer to Maps in Appendices 6, 7 and 8

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Many African countries that are member state of United Nations have in requirement of their fulfilling the act of declaration of human rights banned corporal punishment in schools. Kenya being a member state also banned corporal punishment in 2001. This was stipulated in a Legal Notice No. 56 of Kenya Gazette supplement No. 25: 199 of 30th March 2001.

However, abolition of corporal punishment in schools has posed great challenge to teachers in instilling discipline in school. Prior to the abolition of corporal punishment, most of these teachers only knew corporal punishment as a strategy to enforce discipline and it instills fear in students rather than train them to become responsible citizens. Thus, some teachers are in a difficult situation as regards enforcing discipline and some teachers feel stripped of their right and authority over students. This comes out clearly in Kenyan Secondary
Schools Heads Association Conference held in Kisumu in 2001 where they expressed that the removal of corporal punishment has resulted to increase of indiscipline in Kenyan schools. Supporting this Mottapi (2007) expressed that teachers feel disempowered with the banning of corporal punishment.

The Government of Kenya has done a lot by putting in place policies to guide teachers in student discipline. Despite all these measures schools still experience a lot of indiscipline. Many researchers such as Kindiki (2009), Mwery (2010), Kiprop and Chepkilot (2011) expressed great concern on the serious decadence in discipline in Kenyan schools. Kindiki attributed this to ban of corporal punishment while Mwery attributes it to lack of proper training of teachers on alternative approaches to discipline after the ban of corporal punishment.

Moreover, up until now many teachers still do not implement fully the required rule against the use of corporal punishment in schools. The Kenyan Human Rights Watch (1997; 2007) still reported on the rampart use of corporal punishment in Kenyan Schools and they asked the government to do something about this. Mwery (2010) also noted that teachers in Kenya still make use of corporal punishment even though they were very much aware that it has been banned because they believe that it is for the good of the child and that parents approve of it. Is corporal punishment the only way to enforce discipline? Are there other methods teachers can use to attain discipline in schools?

Many researchers have done a lot of studies on the causes of students indiscipline and the different management approaches schools adopt to instill discipline, but very little has been done on the strategies the teachers are using and what influence their choice of strategy. It becomes important to find out what strategies teachers are using to discipline students after
the ban on corporal punishment in schools and to find out if teachers’ life experiences as regards discipline affect their strategy to disciplining students. It was also evident that most of the researches on students discipline were carried out in other parts of Kenya apart from Langata District. This research was to fill the gap found in many other studies in Kenya on students’ discipline. It answers questions such as: Are there strategies such as preventive strategy, corrective strategy, supportive strategy, cognitive strategy, rewards and punitive strategies in place? Or do teachers wait until an event comes up before they plan on consequences to administer for each situation? Are these strategies effective or not? Are these strategies in resonance with government policy document on school discipline? The study further established how teachers’ life experiences influenced their strategy and also the challenges they are facing in trying to instill discipline. It also tried to recommend better strategies in instilling discipline.

1.3 Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are male and female teachers’ strategies to discipline of students in Langata District?

2. How effective are teachers’ strategies in instilling discipline in secondary schools in Langata District?

3. How are the discipline strategies adopted by public and private secondary schools in Langata in resonance with the Kenyan Government policy on school discipline?

4. How do teachers’ past and present life experiences influence their strategy to discipline in Langata secondary schools?

5. In what ways are teachers challenged in practising alternative discipline approaches?
6. What are the suggestions of teachers for the best way to instill discipline?

1.4 Research Hypothesis

I. There is no significant relationship between teachers’ strategies to discipline when categorized by gender in Langata secondary schools.

II. There is no significant relationship between teachers’ strategies to discipline when classified by school ownership.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Many schools globally are facing a lot of challenges in trying to inculcate good moral behaviour in students. Ward (2007) reiterated that teachers are facing challenges in their efforts to educate children properly. Classroom management and disruptive behaviour have posed a great concern to teachers and managers of schools and a lot of researchers have done several works on related topics at global levels such as Harvey (2013) and Anderson, Berkowitz, Donnerstein, Huesmann, Johnson, Linz, Malamuth, and Wartella (2003) researched on violence in the media and the effects on student’s behaviour in the classroom and the influence of media violence on youth. The research indicated that exposure of students and youths to media violence does affect their behaviour.

This study has practical significance in comparing the traditional methods of instilling discipline and the alternative strategies in view of what is working and what is not working. It will contribute a lot to the Ministry of Education (MOE) in redefining the discipline policy and putting in place programme that will help teachers be better equipped with alternative disciplinary strategies. It will be relevant for the Board of Management (BOM) and school principal in formulating school rules and regulation together with other stakeholders such as the students, teachers, parents and the community. It will also help the stakeholders in
becoming conversant with the policy statement on school discipline and take their rightful place.

Teachers will also benefit from this work because it will help them to find out the better strategy which is more effective and holistic in its approach. It will also portray the experience of teachers in trying to discipline students thereby creating a medium for their experiences to be shared with the public and their plight made known. It will also contribute to theory and practice in the field of educational administration and planning.

More so, it will be beneficial to the students who are the direct recipient of good discipline strategy. This is because when teachers adopt the right strategy which is effective in disciplining students it will expose them to learn how to behave responsibly. It will benefit parents and the entire community in the long run if teachers are able to train the students to be responsible and good citizens.

1.6 Scope and Delimitations of the Study

This research concentrated on public and private secondary schools in Langata District Nairobi, Kenya. The choice of private and public schools was to help the researcher have a wider view of strategies which teachers use and to find out similarities and differences according to school ownership (private and public school). This study focused on strategies which teachers use in disciplining students in Langata District of Nairobi. It was delimited to the classroom teacher, school discipline masters/mistresses who are mostly the deputy principals and school principals because they were the key people that manage discipline cases in schools.

Majority of researchers did their work on discipline mostly in other districts outside Langata District. Thus it became necessary to study what happens in Langata schools. It
focused on studying the strategies adopted by teachers to instill discipline in secondary schools at Langata District because majority of researchers dwelt on different approaches and management of indiscipline without much on the strategies in terms of preventive/proactive, corrective, supportive, punitive and reward and cognitive strategy. This showed that there was inadequate information and research in this area.

1.7 Theoretical Framework

This research was anchored on Canters Assertive theory (1992). It contains some elements of a behaviourist approach to discipline but cannot be described purely as behaviourist in nature (Mottapi, 2007). It focused on assertiveness and insistence on desired behaviour by the teacher. Canter & Canter (1992) termed this approach “Assertive discipline”. Thus Assertive teachers react confidently and quickly to situations as they arise. Canter (1979) suggests that teachers drop a marble in a large jar whenever students demonstrate good behaviour and when the jar is full the teacher should prepare to reward the students by giving them more free time or organizing a mini party or doing anything else that will keep the students happy. Canter (2012) maintains that the key to this technique is catching students being “good”, recognizing and supporting them when they behave appropriately and on constant basis letting them know you like what they are doing.

Canter discovered that lack of training teachers on discipline techniques is part of the problem why indiscipline is on the rise in schools. This prompted him to study how effectively teachers deal with student behaviour. He found that the master teachers were assertive; they taught students how to behave. They established clear rules for the classroom, they communicated those rules to students and they taught the students how to follow them. They also have mastery of skills in positive reinforcement, and they praise every student at
least once a day. Assertive teachers believe in their abilities and their rights, they are firm and take charge of their classroom in the best interest of learners. They know how and when to instill good behaviour. Finally when students choose to break the rules, these teachers used firm and consistent negative consequences- but only as a last resort (Canter, 1979).

Non assertive teachers are passive, inconsistent, timid and non-directive in classroom and hostile teachers view learners as adversaries and they use abrasive, sarcastic and hostile style when dealing with them (Canter, 1996).

The key ideas of Canter’s Theory as highlighted by Mottapi (2007),

The students have the right and they need a caring educator who will provide warmth, attention and support. Educators also have rights; they must teach in an environment that is conducive to learning and enjoy support from both parents and learners. (p. 31)

Canter believes that teachers have the right to determine what is best for the learners and they expect them to comply. He emphasizes on teachers using rules and consequences which are stated clearly for students to understand. The rules should be specific and easily understood by learners. No student has the right to prevent a teacher from teaching or keep a fellow learner from learning. Therefore, student’s compliance helps to create and maintain an effective and efficient learning environment (Canter, 1979&1996).

Thus teachers must be assertive and communicate their needs freely. In explaining this further Canter and Canter (1992) express that teachers have the educational rights in their classrooms to establish optimal learning environments, to request and expect appropriate behaviour from students and also receive help from administrators and parents when it is needed. Students on the other hand have the basic rights to have teachers who help to limit
inappropriate behaviour and the right to choose how to behave understanding fully what the consequences of their action will be. Canter and Canter (1998) stated that

Learners have the right to an educator who will be firm, consistent, provide positive encouragement and motivate good behaviour. Learners also have the right to learning that calmly and consistently enforces rules of conduct to learning where an educator makes calm but firm declarations. (p. 13)

To achieve discipline at the time it occurred teachers need to have a plan to make learners responsible for their behaviour and its consequences. An assertive educator responds to a child’s misbehavior by communicating that clearly to the child by disapproval of such behaviour and then stating to the child what is required of him/her to do (Duke and Meckel 1980).

Assertive discipline includes; identification of expected behaviours, expressive affirmation or disapproval of behaviour, use of firm tone of voice, maintain eye contact, use non-verbal gestures in support of verbal statements and be assertive in confrontations with students (Canter, 1996). Teachers in practicing assertive discipline should set limits and consequences, use follow-up procedures that are consistent and ask school administrator and parents for support in an effort to help students. This discipline is premised on the notion that teacher’s attitude influences his/her behaviour that in turn influences learners’ behaviour (Mottapi, 2007). For teachers to be assertive they need to insist on decent responsible behaviour from their students which are needed by all stakeholders such as students, parents and the community at large.

Canter and Canter (1992) identified five steps to assertive discipline which includes; Recognizing and removing roadblocks to assertive discipline. Roadblocks include the
teachers’ negative expectation of student’s behaviour which can be removed by teachers recognizing that they can influence the behaviour of all students under their direction in favourable ways; no matter what the initial problems may be. Practising the use of assertive styles: there are three styles of response that most teachers use during their interaction with students that misbehave: The non-assertive response is where a teacher gives in to students or feels that it is wrong to place strong demands on student’s behaviour. They neither establish clear standards nor back up their standards with appropriate actions.

The hostile response is when a teacher uses aversive techniques such as sarcastic words and threats to students. They hurt students’ feelings and cause them to be disrespectful. Such a teacher fails to meet students’ needs for warmth and security thereby, violating students’ rights such as their right to positive limits on self-destructive behaviour and the right to choose their own behaviour with full knowledge and understanding of its consequences.

The assertive response: this protects the right of both the teacher and student. With this style of response teachers are clear in making their expectations known to students and they follow-up their set standards with actions. Learning to set limits: According to Canter (1989) “no matter what the activity, in order to be assertive you need to be aware of what behaviour you want and need from students”. Thus, as a teacher you need to identify specific behaviour which you expect from students as well as the inappropriate behaviour and set clear limits and decide the consequences for both compliance to standards and non-compliance; Learning to follow through on limits: this can be achieved by teachers through making promises, not threats and selecting appropriate consequences in advance; Implementing a system of positive or favourable consequences.
To maintain good discipline, Canter (1989) emphasized on the use of positive or optimistic consequences which according to him are better than negative assertions and consequences. Successful involvement with students when they behave appropriately builds influence with the students, leads to a decrease in the amount of problem behaviour and makes for a happier and more productive classroom.

This model integrates ideas and techniques from several other models. Such ideas include positive reinforcement from skinners model and logical consequences, behaviour as choice and addressing the situation rather than the student’s character.

1.7.1 Strengths of Assertive Discipline

The major strength of assertive discipline is that it is simple and easy to administer. This is very helpful for beginning teachers because of its simplicity. Once the discipline plan of a teacher is approved by the school administrator, it aids him/her to know how to react to disciplinary situations without responding emotionally or inconsistently. Thus, Canter’s model helps teachers to treat all students fairly and alike.

Canter assertive theory provided a system of dealing with behaviour at the time when it occurs; this remarkably sets it apart from other discipline theories. When a teacher uses assertive discipline it shows that he/she has a clear sense of how students should behave so as to enable him/her achieve their teaching objectives says Mottapi (2007). Assertive discipline addresses students’ behaviour rather than making value judgments about motivation or character of the student. According to Andrius (2012), this theory provides a very powerful system of corrective discipline. It also helps teachers to gain support from school administrators and parents before the first day of implementing the plan.
Assertive discipline according to McIntyre (2006) is a structured, systematic approach which is designed purposely to assist teachers in running an organized, teacher-in-charge classroom environment. It therefore helps teachers to have their classes under control.

**1.7.2 Critique of Assertive Discipline**

According to Mottapi (2007) this model may not be very effective in handling behaviour problems that happen outside the classroom settings since assertive discipline is designed primarily for use in the classroom. She also expresses that “majority of learners behavioural problems that alarm teachers happen outside the classroom” p. 33. For this reason the researcher will compliment this theory with Marvin Marshall’s Theory which is more encompassing in approach.

It laid much emphasis on teacher control thereby lacking the ability to give learners an opportunity to develop self-control or inner control of their behaviour. Thus, learners are not given full opportunity to become fully responsible for their behaviour (Duke and Meckel, 1980)

Learners are not involved in planning and making the classroom rules. This will somehow affect them because they may not own the rules and may feel forced to keep them since it is not coming from them.

**1.7.3 Application of Assertive Discipline**

This theory was applied in this study to find out if teachers are structured in their strategy to discipline. It was useful in finding out if teachers plan their strategy and are able to teach class rules and consequences. It also aided the researcher to find out how consistent they are in their administering of consequences. Canter and Canter (1992) stressed that planning is essential to good teaching and to good discipline. Planning of discipline helps the teacher to
be consistent and not choose a consequence at the time of misbehaviour. This also will help the teacher to treat all students fairly without responding differently to students from different socioeconomic, ethnic or racial background.

To apply Canters assertive discipline properly, the teacher on the first day of class develops classroom or school wide discipline plan. In developing this plan the teacher takes into cognizance the behaviour he/she wants the students to eliminate, the consequences that will be appropriate for any inappropriate behaviours tracked.

The steps the teacher should take during developing the plans as outlined by Canter and Canter (1992) includes- first step: teacher needs to seek approval from the school administrator and also plan on how to notify parents. The essence of this is to gain support of both the school administration and the parents so that the plan will succeed. The second step involves establishing of classroom rules by the teacher. These rules must be observable, enforceable throughout the day. The rules should be appropriate with age and it should cover typical discipline situations. Rules must teach students appropriate classroom behaviour.

Third step involves developing positive reinforcement. This helps to create more productive classroom environment and minimize the frequency of problem behaviour and teacher’s influence over students. Fourth step involves providing consequences for these students who choose to disobey the rules of the class. Canter and Canter (1992) emphasized that the teacher must prepare to deal with misbehaviour calmly and quickly. They also propose some guidelines in selecting consequences. This guideline stipulates that consequences should not be more than five and it must be something that students dislike. It should not have harmful physical or psychological effect on students. The consequences do
not have to be severe to be effective and negative consequences should be applied every time a student chooses to behave inappropriately.

Consequences should be applied through a discipline hierarchy as follows: first time of misbehaviour the student receives warning. The second time of breaking of rules, the consequence will be heavier such as making the student lose 10 minutes of break time writing on behaviour journal explaining the offence he/she committed, the reason for committing such offence and what he/she thinks he/she should have done better. The third time of misbehaviour the same day, the whole time of break will be denied him/her. The fourth time, the student’s parents should be called while the fifth time the student is sent to the office.

The fifth step is known as a severity plan which is used for a few exceptions of students whose misbehaviour could be serious. Serious or severe misbehaviour involves all deeds that can place teachers and students in danger such as drug use in school or fighting with weapon. This demands immediate removal from the classroom and assistance from the school’s administrator.

1.7.4 Justification of Assertive Discipline

This theory was used in this research since it helped the researcher to ascertain how teachers make rules and policies that are being used in the school and how much awareness the students have about the school disciplinary policies and classroom rules. Furthermore, this theory also helped the researcher to find out if teachers make use of assertive discipline to improve students’ behaviour. Assertive discipline also has most of the discipline strategies which the researcher was interested in such as the preventive, corrective and reward strategies.
1.8 Conceptual Framework

In this research the conceptual framework will guide us into understanding the different strategies adopted by teachers in managing students’ behaviour. It was modeled on Canters’ assertive discipline and Marvin Marshall’s discipline without stress, punishment or reward. The different strategies were looked at from the perspective of Preventive/Proactive, Supportive, and Corrective strategies, which are found in Canters’ Assertive discipline. Then a structured and systematic strategy built into the curriculum will follow Marshall’s theory and Punitive/Reward which is an old practice simply known as traditional strategy.

The strategies studied in this work includes preventive or proactive strategy, supportive strategy, corrective strategy, punitive/reward as a strategy and structured and systematic strategy embedded in teaching curriculum which the researcher will refer to as ‘cognitive strategy’. All these strategies lead to students disciplined behaviour as shown in Figure 1.1. The researcher tried to find out how teachers use these strategies in disciplining secondary school students in Langata district and how effective they find each of the strategies.

The preventive or proactive strategy implies that teachers from the first day in class preempt students’ behaviour and put in measures to curb it by providing stimulating curriculum that involves students and captures their attention. Teachers need to make their teaching method very enjoyable bearing in mind that students crave fun, belonging, freedom, power and dignity. Teachers need to be helpful to students, involving and empowering them by asking them for input. Clear understanding should be reached on classroom behaviour and conduct. Teach and discuss and practise behaviours agreed upon by the class and

**Figure 1.1 Relationships between Teachers’ Strategy and Students’ discipline.**

Source: Adapted from Assertive discipline: positive discipline for today by Canter and Canter (1992, p.20) and Marvin Marshall’s discipline without stress, punishment or reward (1998, p. 166)

Supportive strategy is employed to help students who are at times subject to temptation to break the rules. When signs of misbehaviour appear, bring supportive discipline into play. This facet of discipline assists students to develop self-control and get back on task. Supportive discipline could be exhibited in different ways through the use of non-verbal cues to give signal to the students. Showing interest in the students’ work and challenging them to work better and harder. It is also important to acknowledge students’ good behaviour in appropriate way and time and using humour when a lesson is becoming boring and tiring.
Other supportive strategies include guidance and counseling; listening to students to understand them and tracking students’ behaviour using record with the aim of helping them develop better behaviour (Canter, 1992 & Charles, 1999).

Corrective strategy happens when students breach the class or school rules. All misbehaviour cannot be totally eliminated even with the best preventive and supportive strategy. Corrective measures should be used to deal with misbehaviour expeditiously and to stop such behaviour from occurring or repeating (Canter, 1992). Charles (1999) and Canter (1992) propose talking with the students and using appropriate agreed upon consequences. The consequences should be administered in a consistent manner.

Punitive/Reward: this is an old and traditional strategy to discipline which majority of modern day discipline theorist frown at. In punitive strategy the teacher resorts to physical punishment such as caning, kneeling the student down, asking the student to clean the school toilet, suspending the student from class or from school. On the other hand reward is used to acknowledge a student’s good behaviour. Reward could be in form of gift of material thing or praise and recognition of student in front of others.

Structured and systematic (cognitive) strategy was added as an angle to look at Marshall’s strategy. It is systematic because it begins with teaching students the vocabulary that made up the four levels of social behaviour hierarchy; ABCD. A stands for Anarchy and B stands for Bullying and C stands for Cooperation and complying while D which is the highest level stands for Democracy. After teaching the students the vocabulary for social behaviour the teacher through effective questioning checks out if students understood what was taught. This is followed up with guiding students practically on making a self responsible choice when inappropriate conduct occurs. The teacher needs from time to time to engage the
students in meetings to foster social skills and teach values that help students to gain self respect and dignity as well as respecting others.

As the researcher intends to identify the different strategies adopted by teachers the research questions are guided by this concept. The policy statement on school discipline from the Department of Education and Children’s Service, Kenya (DECS, 2007) which is meant to guide schools in managing discipline cases has similar philosophy with Canter and Marshall’s Theory. Since the researcher intends to explore how teachers’ strategy is in resonance with the government policy on students discipline it became pertinent to adopt these two theories in this conceptual framework.

1.9 Operational Definitions of Terms

In this research the major key words include: Strategy, Teachers, Manage, Teachers Experience and Discipline. These terms in this research are explained in context as follows:

*Strategies*: all the interventions that the teachers and the school principals use to help students improve their behaviour and create conducive learning environment.

*Teachers*: this includes all teaching staff and the school principals and deputy principals whose major responsibility it is to train students in school.

*Manage*: this involves all effort teachers put in place as regards disciplining students.

*Teacher’s experience*: these include all that the classroom teachers and school principals pass through in handling students’ defiant behaviour. It also has to do with their past experiences in life as regard how they were disciplined.

*Discipline*: this involves all practices that help make students follow a set standard, obey rules and regulations and training them to develop a sense of responsibility and inner self control.
School principals: These are those whose job involves organizing and supervising what goes on in the school.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter discussed discipline theories, the application of theories and gaps in the theories. It also discussed empirical studies which are related to the topic and then identification of gaps in those studies.

2.1 Discipline Theories

Behaviour management over the years has been a great concern for teachers all around the world. As a result of this, many behaviour management theories and programs have emerged (Charles, 2002). There are several works done in the past as regards school discipline and the theories guiding them. These theories could be looked at in four categories; the behaviourist models, the cognitivists’ models, the constructivists’ models and mixed method. Psychologists from a behaviourist orientation study human behaviour in order to understand the processes that bring about change in behaviour (Tuckman, 1992). The behaviourist theorists believe that paying attention to good behaviour helps to reinforce such behaviour and this also happens when one pays attention to bad behaviour.

Batten (2012) opines that a parent or a disciplinarian should never display inappropriate behaviour, anger, frustration, or disappointment when a child misbehaves. Thus, they should not be paying attention to bad behaviour. He further suggests that parents and disciplinarians should use only positive reinforcement, create a positive environment and should not in any way react, pay attention to or punish misconducts so as to extinguish such act. The rationale of the behaviourist’s theories is that students who misbehave are seeking the reward of attention. A parent or a disciplinarian who fails to pay attention to such misconduct
fails to reward the student or the child. Eventually the child begins to realize that she/he could not get the attention he/she needs. The student or child can now withdraw on his/her own. Behaviourists believe that with positive reinforcement a child’s behaviour changes through positive self image and attitude.

Furthermore, Batten (2012) expressed a concern that:

As the behaviourist theories inundated the school system of America, discipline in the schools broke down. Students discovered that they could display a wide variety of bad behaviour and expect little reprimand. Students learned they were relatively immune to any severe consequence and quickly lost respect for any adult in the school. Laughing at teachers as they try to maintain discipline with positive reinforcement becomes a game of seeing how far a teacher can be punished before they break down or explode with anger. (p. 1)

There are several discipline theories that fall under the behaviourist model. These include: Skinner’s model, Kounin’s classroom discipline model and Canter’s assertive discipline. Canter’s assertive theory was used in this study for the main reason that it is mostly practised in schools even when teachers may not call it Canters’ strategy of disciplining students.

Cognitivists believe that learning is a change in individual’s mental structures which helps them to show changes in their behaviour. What thought pattern is behind a learners behaviour is a major concern of cognitivists (Haberkorn, 2012). Mottapi (2007, p. 33) expressed that “cognitive scientists in educational field study the type of behavioural problems that require different kinds of student cognition. If teachers were able to understand how learners successfully/unsuccessfully think about these problems they could be taught to
think right and better”. Gage & Berliner (1992) explained that cognitivists make effort to determine what goes on in the minds of learners in order to understand how they read, do mathematics or understand instructions. Cognitivists according to Tuckman (1992) view learning as using mental structures to process information.

The theorists under the cognitivists’ model include William Glasser’s three educational theories, Gordon’s model, Dreikurs’ mistaken goal model and Marvin Marshall’s Theory. The researcher employed Marvin Marshall’s theory as one of the theories that guided this study.

Disciplinary model to be recognized under constructivist is Ginott’s model of cooperation through communication. For constructivist, people get knowledge and understanding in a unique way which helps them to create a new knowledge. It emphasized on child’s development & understanding of social processes and relationship (Mottapi, 2007).

Mixed method approach is not in favour of any particular method. It believes that human behaviour is complex and cannot be tackled successfully with just one method. It needs combination of different disciplinary strategies to be able to modify students’ behaviour. The mixed method approach is harnessed by Jones model and Curwins’ and Mendler’s model. In this study Curwins’ and Mendler’s model were used. This helped the researcher to see how teachers are able to discipline students while at the same time upholding their dignity as human.

The researcher chose Canter assertive model which is one of the behaviourist theories of discipline, Marvin Marshall model which is Cognitivists approach and Curwins and Mendler’s theory which adopted mixed method approach as the basic theories for this study.
The essence of using the three was for complementarities and to view students discipline in a wholistic way.

2.1.1 Marvin Marshall’s Theory

Marvin Marshall’s behaviour management theory is known as Discipline without Stress, Punishment and Reward. It evolved through his personal experience as a classroom teacher over the years. His teaching and administrative experience helped him to know what teachers need in the area of managing students’ behaviour. He opined that teachers need a system of classroom management and not a group of disjointed strategies. He contended that good classroom management is seen as a talent which some teachers possess while others lack such talents. He suggested that even the talented teachers need a systematic plan to meet the needs of today’s diverse students and teachers need in order to maintain a productive classroom environment.

Marshall (1998) based this discipline theory on the philosophy that in the past children receive grooming at home on social skills one needs to be successful in the classroom and entire society but today students no longer get such training at home. Therefore, it becomes the responsibility of teachers to teach students social skills. His idea is that the efforts of teachers and administrators to motivate students through advice, rewards, exhorting, demanding, cajoling and punishing them are external approaches which never help students to be responsible. Students only comply with teachers and behave well once an authority figure is with them. This makes students to lack the skills to be responsible for their behaviour without an external influence. He believes that the real power of a teacher is in what the students do when teachers are not with them. Thus, the goal of Marshall’s discipline model is
to inculcate in students the proper skills to be responsible in school and out of school (Marshall, 1998).

He suggests that the traditional method of discipline which involves giving rewards when students comply; punishing them when they disobey and administering consequences is coercive and manipulative. For him, rewards and punishment teach students not to be responsible for their own actions and choices. He opposes giving students reward because it teaches students that responsible behaviour on its own is not good for its own sake therefore one needs to receive something in order to be motivated to act appropriately and responsibly. He also opines that the focus of his discipline management theory is on internal motivation which he believes is what changes behaviour.

To help students move from behaviour that is based on personal desires and goals to behaviour based on increasing social responsibility, Marshall (2004) created a hierarchy of social development- a way to explain human social behaviour in simple terms everyone would understand (Marshall 1998). This hierarchy is based on ABCD of social development where A= Anarchy, B= Bullying or Bothering, C= Conformity and D=Democracy. Level A is the least desirable level
Note: Level A and B are unacceptable while C and D are acceptable

**Figure 2.1 Marshall’s Hierarchy of social development**


**Anarchy**- it is the lowest level of Marshall’s hierarchy. It is the least desirable of social behaviour. Any class/school operating at this level is at social disorder. Students fail to follow commands, they are noisy and they move around without permission. Teachers who are found in a class operating at this level are known as unprepared and they lack the wit needed to put the classroom in order. Substitute teachers and student teachers may sometimes lack control of students who are looking for authority from the adults, leading to chaos in classroom if they are not able to take charge of it.

**Bullying**- this is the second level of Marshall’s social development hierarchy. It is at this stage that students bully other students and in some cases, the teachers as well. Such
students make up their own rules and boss others and violate their rights. They only obey when there is an authority figure around (Marshall 2004). With this kind of behaviour, irresponsible and provocative behaviours are repeated- students learn a pattern which they could exhibit throughout their life.

To arrest or help students who bully others, Marshall (2004) suggested that teachers should never label or call a student “bully”, thus teachers should focus on the behaviour of the student and not the character of the student and teachers are to identify the behaviour as “bullying or bothering behaviour” and help students take responsibility for behaviour.

**Cooperation/ Conformity-** this is the third level of behaviour where behaviour is acceptable and desired. When students cooperate and conform to the guidelines and rules it helps the classroom to be functional and conducive to learning. The students are more connected to the teachers and each other. Conformity happens when students accept external influences such as expected standards of behaviour. Since conformity is a result of external influence, it is not the highest level of the hierarchy. When students are seeking approval of peers, they may get onto unacceptable behaviour by conforming to peers’ standards. Marshall (2004) pointed out that it is important to create awareness of students at this level to understand that their behaviour is controlled or influenced by external factors. This helps them to gain liberation. Through awareness and discussions about the impacts of allowing others to influence their decisions, adolescents can resist socially irresponsible acts.

**Democracy-** this is the highest level at Marshall’s hierarchy of social development. At this stage students are able to differentiate between right and wrong thing to do. At this stage students grow and develop values that prompt their becoming civilized. They internalize values and take responsibility for their own behaviour. Students feel motivated from within
and no longer rely on external motivators to influence their behaviour. They feel rewarded not with gift or praise but from self-satisfaction when they act responsibly.

2.1.2 Strength of Discipline without Stress, Punishment or Rewards

The emphasis of self-discipline and personal responsibility is a boost to this model. Teachers and school administrators appreciate this a great deal (Gevirtz, 2012). Since it aims at teaching students to have self-discipline its use in disciplining students extends beyond classroom level because students wherever they are can control themselves. Therefore this theory fits well in general school discipline.

It makes use of instructional method and evaluating understanding which is not new to teachers, thus it fits in so well with school system. Teachers will find it easy to use since it follows the same pattern of normal classroom teaching.

2.1.3 Critique of Marshall’s Theory

The emphasis on the use of standards and expectation over rules poses a concern for many teachers. They argue that students need to know and understand that there are natural consequences in breaking rules even in the wider society (Gevirtz, 2012).

Marshall overlooked the aspect of underlying causes of students’ behaviour when he maintains that students choose to act or respond in certain way. He ignores the fact that some students act out of some underlying factors such as drug abuse, child abuse, malnourishment, and rejection, and insecurity, effect of violence in the family, and loneliness or emotional distress.

Bullying which is the second level is a distinct behaviour and issue of great concern to parents, teachers and administrators. It is used to refer to a wide variety of misconduct and
disruptive acts. Critics suggest that such vocabulary be replaced by another better term such as behaviour problem or controlling behaviour (Gevirtz, 2012).

2.1.4 Application of Discipline without Stress, Punishment or Reward

Marvin Marshall’s theory helped the researcher to find out if teachers are able to employ any strategy embedded in the curriculum that has to help students in thinking about their behaviour, taking responsibility of their choice of behaviour and getting self-driven from within to behave well.

There are three phases of discipline without stress, punishment or rewards; teaching vocabulary and concepts which is proactive teaching, checking for understanding of concepts and vocabulary taught through use of effective questioning and using guided choices (Marshall, 1998).

Teaching the concepts: This involves teaching students the different levels of hierarchy of social development. Marshall (1998) advises that the manner in which the concepts are taught will depend on the age of the students, their maturity level and the subject matter. During this time of teaching the concept and vocabulary, teachers need to involve students in activities in which they are able to relate their own experiences to the various levels and construct examples of each level specific to their situation.

Checking for Understanding- at this point the teacher uses appropriate questions to check if students are able to understand the concept. It is also important to use life situation of students to test if they really understood what was taught. If any event happens in class/school, it is good to relate them to the different levels. Checking for understanding is used as an intervention for students who are still at level A and B. Once a student demonstrates socially unacceptable behaviour, the teacher should pay attention to such
behaviour and through the use of proximity control and non verbal means, help the student to begin to pay attention to his/her deeds. If the unacceptable behaviour continues, the teacher then uses questions to check for understanding. The essence of this is to guide students in acknowledging the level of behaviour they are in. The dialogue should not be confrontational.

Marshall (2004) notes that many students lack understanding of why they behave the way they do. It becomes important that teachers take sufficient time to teach the concepts and vocabulary of the social development hierarchy. Thus, the second element of checking for understanding is required only for few students. He also notes that once students acknowledge the level of behaviour, it helps them to stop the behaviour.

Guided choices- Marshall (2004) maintain that choice, self control and responsibility go together and that one significantly affects the others. Self-control is enhanced or diminished depending on the capability of the student to make a choice or not. Guided choice is designed by Marshall to provide choice to students and to foster responsible behaviour.

By using Guided Choice the teacher maintains authority without being confrontational to the students. The teacher should uphold the rights of students and also acknowledge that they can make their own choices. Thus the teacher avoids confrontation at any time. Guided choices are meant to be used when students have acknowledged that their behaviour is at the A or B level of the social developmental hierarchy and yet they continue with such behaviour. At this level students not only understand the level of their behaviour but are asked to move further to evaluate the choices they are making. In this stage the teacher uses questioning as strategy to offer choices to students. Such questions include what did I do? What can I do to prevent it from happening again? And what will I do in the future?
These questions help students to reflect and think, it also helps them to make future plans on how to avoid such misconduct. When a student finishes writing answers to the questions, a time is organized by the teacher to have discussion with the student. After this if the student continues to disrupt the classroom, a self-diagnostic referral is now used. In this form an in-depth analysis of the behaviour is done using questions suggested by Marshall (1998).

- What happened that resulted in your being required to complete this form?
- What was the level of your behaviour and did that behaviour meet the standards of this classroom?
- Is this level of behaviour helping you get the things you need from this class?
- On what level should you have acted to be socially responsible?
- What is your plan to show responsible behaviour?
- What are your procedures to implement the plan?

If a student after filling this form for the first time continues to misbehave a second form is given and at this time a letter is sent to the parents with the first and second forms filled. If the student has to fill the form the third time, a second letter is sent to the parents alongside the three forms filled indicating that the teacher has exhausted every means to foster socially responsible behaviour in the student and is being referred to the principal for further action.

Guided Choice fulfils four purposes: It helps to stop classroom/school disruption and it isolates the student from the class/school activity. It gives the disrupting student a responsibility by producing activity to encourage reflection and it allows the teacher to return to the lesson promptly.

Eliminating Punishment- Marshall advocates non-punishment of students because he believes that punishment is counter-productive to a teacher/student relationship (Marshall
and Weisner 2004). Punishment deprives young people of taking responsibility for their own actions. It only makes a student stop a disruptive act temporarily. Marshall (2004) opined that classroom disruptions should be seen as an opportunity to teach students social responsibility. To promote a positive classroom environment, Marshall (1998) suggested four strategies to complement discipline without stress, punishment or rewards – that teachers: evaluate their instruction, conduct class meetings to promote democracy in the classroom, identify standards for appropriate behaviour and use praise and rewards appropriately.

To identify Standards for Appropriate Behaviour: Marshall (2004) maintained that the use of rules and consequences are counter-productive to producing the type of relationship desired in the classroom. He suggested that rules can actually create problems if rules are unclear and are perceived as unfair or inconsistently enforced. Rules can cause students to look for loopholes around the rules and rules require consequences, for when the rule is broken Marshall, advocates for proactive approach which could replace rules and consequences. This involves explaining standards and expectations as they connote a positive orientation. Thus if emphasis is laid on standards it subsumes negativities that is always emphasized using rules and consequences.

Using Praise and Reward Appropriately- Marshall agrees that rewards can serve as great incentives but he stressed that they should not be used for expected standards of behaviour because this is counter-productive for fostering social responsibility. He instead advocates the use of acknowledgments, recognition and validation as they encourage and motivate without placing a value on the person. Acknowledgment fosters self-satisfaction because they give recognition to what the student has done well.
2.1.5 Justification of the Theory

Marvin Marshall’s model of Discipline without Stress, Punishment and Reward is one of the most recent theory on school discipline and most part of Kenya discipline policy are in line with the philosophy of Marvin Marshall. The researcher intended to work with this philosophy and to see if teachers in Langata schools are able to follow the policy document in their strategy for discipline.

2.2 Curwins’ and Mendler’s Theory: Discipline with Dignity

Discipline with dignity as proposed by Curwins and Mendler is to help students take responsibilities of their action and at the same time build their sense of dignity, hope and motivation. Curwins and Mendler view students who are chronic in misdeeds as those who are less motivated. They named those whose misbehaviour prevents them from learning as “behaviourally at-risk”. They suggest strategies that will help minimize students’ misbehaviour holding in cheek their dignity. Van (2000) expressed that once students’ dignity is hampered it touches on their morale and motivation to learn which could lead to increase in resistance and seeking revenge.

Fundamental to Curwin and Mendlers’ model is that every student is meant to be treated with dignity. To be able to achieve this Curwin and Mendel pointed out the need of creating a school environment where both students’ and teachers’ needs are meet. They also outlined four different needs of teachers and students: *personal identity*- which can be fulfilled when one is able to build his/her self image positively, *connectedness* which is achieved through positive affiliation with others, the *need of power* which is fulfilled when one has a sense of control over one’s own life and the *need of achievement* academically.
In their opinion all classroom/school misbehaviour is as a result of a need which students seek to fulfill. It then becomes very important to develop plans to prevent discipline problems from occurring while at the same time plan on how to curb misbehaviour when it happens.

They developed twelve guidelines for effectively utilizing discipline with dignity in classroom. It emphasized on teachers being responsible, varying their styles, starting afresh each day, refusing to accept excuses for important class work or homework not finished or done. Teachers are to offer choices to students, using humor to de-fuse tensed situations, have a listening ear to students thinking & feelings, allow students to take responsibility for themselves (Fiegen, 2010).

There are three general reasons which Curwins and Mendler (1984) state as the major cause of failure in providing appropriate consequences. They identified school wide rule established by school committee in which the teachers and students are not involved. It makes teachers and students not own such rules thus they fail to follow whatever procedure mapped out as consequences. Another reason is the teacher’s failure to address disruptive behaviour that happened in class while he/she was busy or distracted with something else. This will give the students the opportunity of repeating those unacceptable acts when next the teacher is busy or distracted. The third reason is that teachers often resent being on the lookout for students indiscipline. They don’t want to be acting as the police by moving round the hall to maintain students discipline rather they will prefer going out for tea or any other relaxing event than watch students. Since students are still under the stage of formation, they require the direction of an adult to be able to make responsible choices.
2.2.1 Strength of Curwins’ and Mendler’s Discipline with Dignity

This model is based on values and not on rewards and punishment said Bunchwacky (2008). It forms part of its best strength since value system is more central to it. Both teachers and students are valued, and effort is made to boost students’ responsibility using this value system. It makes discipline more lasting in the life of students and not just an easy or quick fix of misbehaviour which may not last long.

Another important strength of this theory is that it looks at teachers’ contribution to discipline situation and requires them to look into their value system and their interaction with students. It is also more balanced because it adopted both behavioural approach and cognitivists approach.

Discipline with dignity has five goals which include effective communication, defusing potentially explosive situations, reducing violence, preparing children for their future and valuing and protecting opportunities for learning. This makes it more useful as a school wide disciplinary theory (Fiegen, 2010).

2.2.2 Critique of Curwins’ and Mendler’s Discipline with Dignity

Critiquing this model, it can function very well with students who are above the age of 10 than those who are under 10 years because they are yet to develop to the extent of making reasonable decisions such as setting rules for themselves and for their teachers. Teacher control is also central in this approach which may not support democracy in classroom. Again the aspect of students making rules for the teachers is questioned by some teachers because they believe that it is the duty of teachers to make rule with the students being part of the process (Blumefeld-Jones, 1996). It also emphasizes more on getting students to do what they
are supposed to do and not on helping them think of what they are supposed to do thereby reducing the chances of building their self responsibility (Kohn, 1996)

2.2.3 Application of Curwins’ and Mendler’s Discipline with Dignity

Curwin and Mendler provided three dimensional discipline plans which they believe will help in meeting the needs of students. This plan focuses on prevention of disciplinary problems from happening, providing an action plan to take when discipline issue arises and resolution on how to manage students who fail to respond to established consequences by providing individual contracts with particular students who are not responding to classroom social rules (Curwin, 1995).

Prevention is designed to minimize or prevent classroom problems from occurring by providing structure and direction in the classroom while accommodating the daily issues that arise. In this plan, it is most important to establish and implement a system for managing the classroom designed to enhance human interaction in the classroom. This system of management is what Curwin and Mendler called social contract. In this social contract, students are allowed to participate in making decisions which will affect them. It helps them to own the rules and regulations created to guide their classroom activities or school wide activities (Curwins and Mendler 1988).

The creation of social contracts begins with establishment of classroom principles that represent the value system of the classroom. These principles cannot be enforced rather they define the attitudes and expectations for long-term behavioural growth. After the classroom principles are derived then specific rules which follow the principle values are derived. These rules represent the value system of the teacher which Curwin called Flag-rules. These flag rules are non-negotiable. The students then develop rules for each other and for the teacher.
These rules are very critical for proper classroom management which if not set clearly leads to discipline situation (Curwins and Mendler, 1984)

Once students develop a list of rules, the class votes on the rules and 75% agreement before a suggested rule becomes a classroom rule. After establishing generally accepted classroom rules, consequences for each rule are established as well. For Curwin and Mendler (1988) each rule should have a range of consequences. These consequences should be instructional rather than punitive and should be regarded as natural and logical extensions of the rules. These consequences should be stated clearly and specifically for the purpose of teaching students that misbehaviour produces effect. It is also important to note that the consequences apart from being clear and specific should have a range of alternatives, be natural and logical while preserving student’s dignity.

Action is the second dimension to handle discipline in schools. This dimension has two major purposes. The first purpose is when a discipline case occurs; something must be done to stop the problem. The second purpose is dealing with the problem quickly and effectively preventing minor problems from escalating.

The action dimension comes into play when a problem occurs. An implementation of already set consequences in the prevention dimension is used to stop the behaviour as soon as it happened. For a consequence to be administered effectively teachers should be conscious of their tone of voice, proximity to the student, their body posture, use of eye contact and other nonverbal gestures. Thus, Curwin and Mendler (1988) established nine principles to guide the implementation of consequences. These principles include: consistency of the teacher in administering discipline; avoid scolding; teacher being closer with students; maintaining eye contact in class; use of soft voice; acknowledging appropriate behaviour; avoid embarrassing
students in front of peers; teacher has to be calm and avoid anger; teacher must implement agreed consequences of indiscipline behaviour.

Resolution is the third dimension of discipline with dignity. 100% of students will not follow the rule and 100% of those who broke the rule will not adhere to every established consequence. The few students who despite administering the consequences continue to break the rules are termed defiant or difficult students. Resolution according to Curwins and Mendler is meant to work with students who do not respond to the established consequences. At this point a personal or individual contract is established with the particular student who fails to follow the social contract. The educator needs to negotiate primarily with the student to find out the reason behind such misdeeds and the two works together to establish means of preventing such from happening in the future. The needs of such a student should be deciphered and met by the teacher. Other school professionals such as social workers, guidance counselors, administrators and the student’s parents must be involved in the resolution phase.

2.2.4 Justification of Curwin and Mendler’s Theory

This theory fitted well in this research as it compliments Marvin Marshals’ and Canters Assertive theories. The theory also emphasizes teachers’ contribution to discipline, and the passing on of the teachers own values to the students. Thus, the aspect of teachers’ experience which will be studied in this research is covered in this theory.

2.3 Students’ Behaviour and Discipline

Behaviour according to UNESCO (2000) is a way in which an individual acts or conducts herself/himself. Skinner (2005) sees behaviour as a difficult subject matter not because it is inaccessible but rather it is extremely complex. Since it is a process, it cannot
easily be held still for observation because it changes. Behaviour could be termed as good or bad, normal or abnormal according to societal norms. Some other authors use the word challenging behaviour to mean disruptive or dangerous behaviour that are chronic, resistant to common interventions (UNESCO, 2000 & Moreno, 2011).

“Each society has acceptable ways of life which are known as norms. The way one conforms to or deviates from these norms will form good or bad behaviour” UNESCO (2000, p. 18). Students who do not conform to the school rules and norms are termed defiant. Defiance ranges from verbal abuse, bullying, fighting, drug use, to destruction of school property and at worse causing other peoples death.

Some students exhibit a lot of character that is in opposition to schools laid down rules and the norms of the society. Orsati and Causton-Theoharis (2012) explain that many literatures describe serious misconduct, behaviour problems, aggressive behaviour, misbehaviour or challenging behaviour as meaning students who do not comply with rules or the norm expected for their behaviour. Such behaviour of students goes a long way in disrupting the peaceful atmosphere of the classroom and the entire school. Many educators have reported that substantial amount of time and energy goes into trying to instill discipline in classroom. Gunderson (2012) expressed that despite all attention given to such students by educators such as teachers, school specialists, parents and school administrators that there is often little or no improvement in either their behaviour or academics. Most of the new teachers who left teaching profession were as a result of students’ defiant behaviour and lack of support by parents and school administrators (Gunderson, 2012).

Moreno (2008) expresses that when an early intervention is used for students with challenging behaviour that they respond better to it and make a positive change. Barnhill
Frey and Wilhite (2005) outline several reasons why a student misbehaves in class which includes seeking attention, obtaining an object or item desired, wanting to escape from an unwanted task or environment and meeting a sensory need. Discipline in school is done to ensure that the school environment is conducive for teaching and learning. Once discipline is not introduced in a school system, the peaceful atmosphere of such school will face the danger of being hampered by defiant students.

Gray (1983) explored the different definitions of discipline by different educators. Discipline from his findings involves courage to do what is right, firmness in carrying out what the rule stipulates and consistency in putting in practice all the time what was decided upon as disciplinary tone. Discipline does not mean strictness or being permissive, rather it involves cause and effect relationship. Olsen (1949) describes discipline as growth thus if schools are able to apply good discipline the outcome will promote growth emotionally, socially and intellectually.

Gray (1983) also highlighted the three main components of discipline which include the process of discipline, the prerequisites of discipline and the goals of discipline. The process of discipline involves courage to tackle disciplinary issues without turning away from it or handing the problem to others to tackle. Part of the prerequisite involves courage and concern. Educators are to be concerned about students’ behaviour and have the courage to discipline them.

The major goal of discipline is to help students to grow socially, emotionally and academically. It is also used to instill in them self-discipline. Hunt (1952) stressed this by saying that the goal of good discipline and good mental health is to produce a balanced human being who is emotionally mature, happy and responsible, a person who functions in a
harmonious way not a person who responds automatically to issues without thinking it through; a person with a good value-judgment and social awareness. Thus discipline develops one’s character and personality.

2.4 Teachers Experience and School Discipline

Any good school is known to have high standards, high expectations and a caring and safe environment. In such school, misbehavior is dealt with immediately in a fair and open manner. School discipline involves every member of the school community; parents, students, teaching and non-teaching staff and school administrators. There are proper understanding of the schools discipline policies, rules and regulations by all members of the school community. Everybody knew what is required by the rules and each work hard to abide by it (Ubben, Hughes and Norris, 2001)

In as much as the entire school community is involved in maintaining good school climate and culture, it is the sole responsibility of the school principal to see that the positive student control is put in place. Thomason and Pederson (1984) supporting this, express that the responsibility of school discipline rests on the school administration. Okumbe (1999) also opined that for a school to achieve its objectives it requires all school communities to adhere strictly to every behaviour rules and regulations stipulated for them to achieve maximum performance. Despite all effort put in place to maintain discipline in school some teachers, students and non-teaching staff may still disobey and fall short of the school’s standards. Thus it is the sole duty of the school principal to make sure that the school standards are respected and kept by all involved (Ubben, Hughes and Norris, 2001). Mbiti (2009) also expressed that school discipline is a topic that is very central to school administration for smooth running of the school.
Apart from the school administrators being the major ones shouldering the responsibility of discipline in school, teachers are also the very ones to carry out disciplinary act on a daily basis at classroom level. They are the people to implement the school’s disciplinary policies and rules and regulations. Teachers find it difficult to establish code of discipline and most especially new teachers. Researchers Bechuke and Debeila (2012) and Cochran (1983) pointed out that it is very challenging for teachers facing responsibility on a daily basis to instill discipline and create conducive, positive and productive classroom atmosphere.

Chamberlin and Somerville (1988) noted that the major challenge of new teachers in Ohio schools is on how to handle difficult students. They recommend that students of education department should be helped to develop skills and strategies for avoiding or preventing discipline problems while in college. They also deem it necessary that universities and colleges of education should teach prospective teachers how to handle difficult students.

Bechuke and Debeila (2012) also emphasized that since the outlaw of corporal punishment in schools, many teachers find it difficult to find suitable alternative to maintain discipline in schools. On account of this they sometimes risk setting very rigid classroom rules instead of considering individual situation. Tassel (2011) expressed that since abolition of corporal punishment; teachers are not very much conversant with alternative discipline methods that could increase students’ autonomy and what such alternative can offer to them as teachers.

2.5 Teachers Discipline Approaches

It is the responsibility of teachers to help students learn and to become responsible human beings. Barbette et al. (2005) opined that helping students to learn is a primary responsibility
of teachers. Bechuke and Debeila (2012) expressed the difficulty of learning taking place in a chaotic environment. Teachers face challenges daily with maintaining the right atmosphere that promotes learning. To tackle these challenges teachers are meant to fully understand and make use of suitable behaviour management strategies and approaches which will boost teaching and learning. In our schools today many teachers find it difficult to adopt the best method of discipline especially after the ban on corporal punishment.

Mbiti (2007) outlined three disciplinary approaches which are worth looking at in this research work. According to him, discipline could be viewed from three points; the traditional technique, the free expression technique and the modern technique. The traditional technique involves discipline through the use of punishment or rewards. In this technique use of force and physical punishment is seen as the best way to train a child. It helps a child to deter from misdeeds and become obedient. Another way of making a child to behave well using the traditional technique is by rewarding the child. Through rewarding a child’s good behaviour they learn to keep it up.

Some critiques of traditional technique see physical punishment as what should be abolished completely by parents and school teachers. Cooper (2005) asserts that spanking as a way of discipline interrupts learning process. She sees corporal punishment as a short-term remedy for misbehaviour. It works at the moment to stop what was going on but it teaches a child to hit others and learn how to be sneaky as well and some time will want to retaliate. It does not help a child to learn how to solve the problem of misconduct and acquire the proper skills needed to accomplish desired behaviour.

Some other critiques of traditional discipline technique such as the American Academy of pediatrics or mental health association and Mbiti (2007) saw corporal
punishment and spanking as what could promote aggressiveness in a child even to the extent of harming or hurting others. It is also a hindrance to learning because it puts in the students fear, anxiety, resentment and hostility towards schooling. It also gives more formidable authority to teachers thereby making them more authoritarian in their approach to control students’ behaviour. It could also lead to giving a child a permanent scar or damage on the body. On the other hand rewarding a child materially may not produce a responsible and self-controlled child but rather it could condition the child to behave in a particular way so as to earn a reward.

Another approach is free expression or permissive technique. The proponents of this method proposed that every child is born good and should be allowed the freedom of expression in order to grow and develop its maximum potential. There should be no restriction of any kind such as using rules and regulations to restrict them both in school and at home. Training of children in school and at home should be child centered where all methods of instruction should involve love and persuasion.

Critiquing this form of discipline, Mbiti (2007) pointed out that every child is born amoral and ignorant and thus needs to be guided by adults to acquire the right way of living as they grow. Any society without rules and laws will end up in chaos. Therefore schools should have clear set rules and regulations guiding its activities.

The third technique of discipline is the modern technique which is more widely accepted as the positive method of disciplining a student. In this disciplinary view, discipline is more than punishment and reward. It is more of helping a student to develop an inner self control. The individual uses reasoning to make right judgment and decision. To uphold this modern view of discipline, teachers are to help students cultivate the culture of respect for
authority and other students. This promotes peaceful atmosphere that is conducive for teaching and learning. Thus discipline is taught and learnt. This technique “emphasizes on teaching of good conduct, the understanding of one’s responsibility and obligation under the existing authority and more so the fear for the consequences of bad conduct” (Mbiti, 2007 p. 83)

Modern discipline technique is seen as the most effective technique because it helps children to develop some inner potential to control one’s self and to be responsible children. The modern disciplinary technique is mostly reflected in choice theory laid down by Glassier and in a more recent theory by Marvin Marshall’s discipline without punishment, stress and reward.

Bechuke and Debeila (2012) emphasized that choice theory is all about using assertive discipline to teach students to accept the consequences of their actions. Appropriate behaviour is reinforced through a system of rewards & punishments whereby learners are helped to understand the consequences of their behaviour and are taught to be responsible.

2.6 Empirical Studies on Teachers and Discipline

These empirical studies will be based on the research questions. It will be critiqued and the gaps will be identified. Many people have done a lot of research in the area of school discipline at global level, regional level and at national level. Few of these researches will be reviewed so as to discuss this work alongside the already existing research.

2.6.1 Teachers Disciplinary Strategies

At global level Oplatka and Atias (2007) explored the gendered views of managing discipline in school and classroom. In their study they looked at male and female principals’ views of classroom and discipline management from the perspective of gender. They used 16 primary
school principals from Israel and using semi-structured interview they explored the differences between how a male principal handle discipline issues and how a female principal handle them as well. In their findings male use more of rational method which is more related to assertive and behaviour modification technique while female principals view discipline from relational technique which is more in line with guidance and counseling technique. However, Opalatka and Atias (2007) failed to acknowledge in their study that a male teacher can also use relational approach and some female teachers can use Assertive and rational approach. The instrumentation is not also enough for this study. Questionnaire would have been added for a better and more informed research. The 16 primary schools used may not have been representative enough for the entire country of Israel to have come to their conclusion. This research only deals with discipline method from gender perspective and other variables which may contribute to their choice of method such as their life experience and their skills are not taken into consideration. This study tried to find out many other strategies adopted by teachers and how their experiences influence their choice of disciplinary strategies.

Way (2011) conducted a research on school discipline and disruptive classroom behaviour: the moderating effects of student perceptions in Mexico. The relationship between school discipline and student classroom behaviour was examined using the traditional deterrence framework and normative perspective. The traditional deterrence framework believes in the use of severe punishment to reduce misbehaviour while the normative perspective suggests that compliance depends upon commitment to rules and authority, with perception of fairness and legitimacy. The study was conducted using Mexican school and
individual level data from the National Education longitudinal study of 1988 and multilevel regression modeling.

The outcome of the research supports the normative perspective which shows that students who perceive school authority as legitimate and teacher-student relations as positive and fair are rated less disruptive. They suggested that school which uses more severe punishment may unintentionally generate defiance among certain young people. The researcher is in concordance of Marshall (2004) which suggested that the use of severe punishment will generate more defiant behaviour among students. However, the use of data from study done in 1988 may not be relevant in the contemporary school disciplinary approach. This work shows an aspect of the school factor which may cause defiance among students. It reveals student perception about their school discipline in terms of being severe or harsh with punishment, strict with rules and the fairness of discipline, their attitudes towards the legitimacy of school-based authority, and student perceptions of teacher-student relationship. Way (2011) looked at the punitive strategy and preventive strategy to discipline; other strategies such as corrective, supportive, rewards were not covered. This present research included these other strategies and also looked at how the experience of teachers past and present influence their choice of strategy.

Ofoyuru and Too-Okema (2011) studied the strategies of managing student discipline in secondary schools in Gulu district of Uganda. The researchers used the two paradigms: the qualitative and quantitative research paradigms. They identified the strategies as rewards, punishment, communication and counseling by using cross-sectional parallel sample survey design. They involved 377 respondents including headteachers, teachers and students. Research instruments used include questionnaire and interview guide. The findings revealed
that in Gulu district the strategies adopted in managing students discipline in both faith-based and non-faith based schools include rewards, punishment, communication and counseling. This research still left a gap on educators’ life experience which influences their choice of discipline strategies.

Moreso, students’ indiscipline and academic performance in public schools in Kenya were researched by Karanja and Bowen (2012). The study employed qualitative and quantitative research paradigm using survey design as its major research design. Their findings revealed that 90% of respondent did not support going back to use of Corporal Punishment but rather they preferred the strategy of counseling as a means to help students move away from indiscipline. The measures adopted by schools with students’ unrest to deal with such issues in schools include open system management where students are given a forum to air their grievances, school authorities making sure to address students’ concerns and parents’ participation in their child’s school affairs. It was noticed that counseling was not a measure used by schools to curb indiscipline.

The researchers then recommended the use of counseling to aid students to be disciplined. However they ignored other relevant strategies which can be used to instill discipline in school. Such strategies include corrective, preventive/proactive and rewards and consequences. Gap found in this research which was addressed with this present study was that in all these measures adopted by schools to curb indiscipline there is lack of evidence on the strategies adopted by teachers to improve discipline in schools and whether they are in line with the requirements stated in Kenya Government policy statement on school discipline.

Simatwa (2012) researched on the management of student discipline in secondary schools in Kenya, a case study of Bungoma County. He investigated on the methods used by
headteacher in managing student discipline. He sampled 125 Headteachers and 1575 Teachers. He also sampled 2075 school prefects and 20,107 students. Questionnaire, interview schedule and document analysis were used as data collection tools. Data collected were analyzed descriptively. The findings reveal that Headteachers and Deputy Headteachers in Bongoma County adopt variety of school discipline methods. These methods include corporal punishment such as canning, kneeling, slapping, pinching and smacking. They also use some alternatives like guidance and counseling, reprimanding and maintaining the wearing of school uniform. He then recommends that school management should use what he termed “whole school” approach in managing student discipline. This approach involves discipline in every aspect of the school system. The researcher is in agreement with Simatwa’s recommendation of “whole school” approach which suggests that the entire school curriculum and activities should include aspects of discipline. This is in line with Curwins and Mendler’s Discipline theory which supports wholistic approach to discipline. The strategies adopted by teachers are still not looked at in this research which the present study dealt with.

Ajowi, Enose and Simatwa (2010) conducted a study on the role of guidance and counseling in promoting student discipline in secondary schools in Kisumu district, Kenya. The study sampled 4570 students, 65 head teachers, 65 deputy head teachers and 65 heads of Guidance and counseling department from all 65 secondary schools in the district. They used questionnaire and interview schedule as data collection instrument. Data collected were analyzed descriptively and interpretations were given to the qualitative data thematically. The findings reveal that guidance and counseling were not optimally used whereas corporal punishments were widely used. It was also noted that the Ministry of Education (MOE) has no guidelines put in its policy document on how guidance and counseling should be used.
The researchers based on their findings recommend that Ministry of Education should provide guidelines on the use of guidance and counseling in schools to manage discipline issues. They also request that more efforts should be put in place by MOE and quality assurance and standards to supervise and monitor school regularly on the ban of corporal punishment. This research only dealt with one strategy to managing students’ discipline in schools but left out several other strategies. Thus, this present study looked into many other strategies which teachers adopt in disciplining students.

2.6.2. Effectiveness of Teachers Disciplinary Strategies

Busienei (2012) carried out a research on alternative methods to corporal punishment and their efficacy. The researcher set out to find what alternatives to corporal punishment is used by teachers and their view on its efficacy. The entire 10 public secondary schools in Eldoret Municipal Council and 161 teachers were used for the study. The result of this work showed that teachers in Eldoret schools use other alternatives to corporal punishment such as in-school suspension, out of school suspension, rewards, establishing rules and consequences, communication of rules and consequences to students, making their teaching interesting, rebuking students, parading student in front of others when they misbehave, giving the child minor chores such as sweeping, cleaning the toilets, weeding the school farm, trimming flowers in the garden and asking students to apologize openly. Majority of teachers view all these strategies to be less effective in handling students’ misbehaviour when compared with corporal punishment.

The researcher recommends that more awareness need to be created on alternative methods and the danger of corporal punishment. To improve on this research finding this
present study tried surfacing the teachers’ life experience which influences their choice to discipline strategy.

2.6.3 Kenya Government Policy on School Discipline and Teachers Strategies

At the national level, Bosire, Sang, Kiumi and Mungai (2009) conducted a research on the relationship between principals’ managerial approaches and student discipline in secondary schools in Kenya. The purpose of their research was to find out if the principals discipline management is inclusive or exclusive of teachers and parents as is stipulated in the Kenyan Government policy on school discipline. They sampled 211 teachers, 28 principals and 22 chairpersons of the parents teachers association from Laikipia and Nyandarua district using simple random sampling. Questionnaires were used as data collection instrument which were analyzed descriptively and hypothesis were tested using T-test and one way ANOVA at alpha level of 0.05. Data collected were based on three variables; principals’ discipline management, Teachers and Parents Input and Level of students Discipline.

From their findings majority of the principals involve stakeholders in managing students’ discipline thus they are perceived to be democratic in their style of management. It also shows that principals who were within 10-15 years of experience of headship and Female principals were more inclusive in their method. It was also found that there is no significant difference in level of students’ discipline management in male compared to female headed schools. They recommend that principals should continue to receive more induction courses to update their skills on managing emerging and unfamiliar students’ behaviour. Looking at the sampling technique used in this study simple random sampling is not very appropriate rather purposive sampling could have been a better technique. Reason being that the population in the study is predefined. More so, the research deals more on the management
style of principals in terms of their being inclusive but this study dealt with surfacing the
different strategies adopted by teachers in disciplining students as well as how teachers’ past
and present experiences interfere in their choice of strategy. It also used some of the policies
in the Kenyan schools discipline policy document to find out how schools discipline strategies
are in line with government discipline policy.

2.6.4 Challenges Faced by Teachers in using Alternative Approaches

At regional level Bechuke and Debelia (2012) researched applying choice theory in fostering
discipline in South African schools. In their study they compared the challenges teachers face
in their current strategies to foster discipline in school and the demands of choice theory in
managing and modifying students’ behaviour. They used only 2 secondary schools as a case
study. Data was collected using document analysis guide, observations and interview. Results
reveal lack of coherency in strategy used in managing students’ behaviour which as a result
gives rise to challenging learners’ behaviour and discipline problem. They suggest that choice
theory can be applied as a remedy to the problem by carefully planning and implementing
strategies and conducting in-service training for teachers.

The study used only 2 secondary schools as a case study and their findings where
generalized which is against the rule of research because 2 secondary schools are not a good
representation of the entire school population in South Africa. Thus, this present study
adopted mixed paradigm research so as to have a wider and deeper understanding of the
strategies adopted by teachers and how their experience influences their choice of strategy.
The findings were generalized.

Also in South Africa, Maphosa and Mammen (2011) researched the topic- How
Chaotic and Unmanageable Classrooms Have become. It tried to bring out the insights
teachers have about prevalent forms of learner indiscipline in South African Schools and how these reflect on school safety and security. 125 teachers from 15 schools in Mathatha district in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa formed the sample. The instrument for data collection was semi-structured questionnaire and interview. Noisemaking, non-submission of work for marking, leaving learning materials at home, talking without teachers’ permission, teasing other learners, absenteeism, swearing at others and non-completion of assignment were prevalent in schools that participated in the study. Other major forms of indiscipline which were also prevalent in the schools under study were truancy, bullying, threatening other learners, theft, verbal attacks on teachers, substance abuse, sexual harassment, and indecent assaults of female learners.

The researchers then recommended that teachers should be on the lookout for different forms of learners’ indiscipline in schools and classes in an attempt to create conducive learning environment. The researchers were able to identify different forms of learners’ indiscipline but were not able to propose any strategy to curb the identified learners’ problem behaviour. Thus, this study made more contribution by looking into the different strategies adopted by teachers in curbing indiscipline in schools.

Challenges facing Head teachers in enhancing pupil discipline in primary schools in Kibera slum, Nairobi were studied by Njura (2004). The study sought to identify pupils discipline problems as experienced by headteachers. It also looked into the disciplinary measures which headteachers use in curbing indiscipline and most especially it studied the challenges which the headteachers are facing in school. The researcher sampled 10 primary schools in Kibera and 20 education managers comprising 10 headteachers and 10 deputy headteachers. Questionnaire was used as data collection instrument.
The findings of the study on the strategies adopted by headteachers to discipline students include reward, having rules in place, teaching pupils smoothly and with better momentum. The researcher also identified the challenges that the school managers face as parents’ interference, non conducive teaching and learning environment, lack of interest in pupils in guidance and counseling, lack of support from district education officers, ridicule/humiliation and fine in courts, and lack of support from some teachers.

The research instrument adopted by the researcher may not be very good to identify challenges since it is part of the Head teachers’ experience. In the present study, the researcher included interview guide to be able to conduct an in-depth study on teachers’ challenges and other experiences.

2.4 Critique of the Literature and Knowledge Gap

Opalatka and Atias (2007) looked at male and female principals’ view of classroom and discipline management. From their findings male principals use more of rational method associated with Can ters assertive method while female principals use relational approach which is more in line with guidance and counseling. They studied the view of principals on discipline management which only gave their opinion while this study will look into what the teachers practice in terms of their strategies to discipline.

Way (2011) looked at the punitive strategy and preventive strategy to discipline, ignoring other strategies which could be of help to students such as corrective, supportive and rewards. Moreso, Ofo yuru and Too-okema (2011) in Gulu district of Uganda found that strategies adopted by teachers in disciplining students include reward, punishment, communication and counseling. How teachers experience influences their choice of strategy
was looked at in this present study. It gave a better understanding of why they chose a particular strategy to discipline more than others.

Karanja and Bowen (2012) revealed that 90% of participants did not support the use of corporal punishment but prefer counseling as a strategy to help students move away from indiscipline. They recommend the use of counseling strategy ignoring other relevant strategies such as preventive/proactive, corrective and rewards whereas Simatwa (2012) identified that schools still adopt corporal punishment, reward, guidance and counseling, but teachers experience which influences them in making choices is yet to be looked at.

Majority of the research reviewed dwelt more on the opinion of teachers and principals on different discipline methods whereas this present study looked into what the teachers are practicing in terms of the strategies they adopt to manage students discipline. More so, other studies made use of either qualitative or quantitative research design but this present study used mixed method research design to be able to get better knowledge of the study. Descriptive analysis was mostly used by the researchers but this present study made use of inferential analysis of data using Chi square test for relationship to see if there are differences or similarities in teachers discipline strategies when categorized by gender and school ownership.

This chapter dealt extensively with related theories to student discipline and empirical studies on students’ discipline. In all the empirical studies reviewed, there still remains inadequate information in study on strategies adopted by teachers in managing students discipline in Kenya and most especially in Langata District of Nairobi. None of the empirical studies reviewed employed Canters’ assertive discipline or Marvin Marshall’s theory of discipline without stress, punishment or reward which this study anchored on since some of
its principles and philosophy are similar to what the policy document on students discipline in Kenya is using.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presented the research design, target population, sample size and sampling
technique, description of research instruments and description of data collecting instruments.
It also showed the validity, pilot testing and reliability of instrument, data collection
procedure, the description of data analysis procedure and ethical consideration during
research.

3.1 Research Design

This study made use of mixed paradigms research which according to Creswell (2006)
…is a research design that possesses philosophical assumptions as well as methods of
inquiry, it involves philosophical assumption that guide the direction of collection and
analysis of data, making use of a mixture of qualitative and quantitative research
paradigm in a single study and as a method, it involves the focus on data collection,
analysis and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study. (p.5)

The use of mixed method approach helped the researcher to gain a better understanding of the
study. It helped the researcher to have a wider view of the topic through the use of mixture of
qualitative and quantitative instruments for data collection.

In the quantitative approach of the study, survey research design which according to
Best and Khan (2006) involved a method of data gathering from a relatively large number of
participants at a particular point in time was used for both teachers and principals. The survey
research design was employed to find out the strategies adopted by teachers and principals in
disciplining students in Langata schools. The survey design that was employed was both
cross-sectional and correlation designs. Cross-sectional survey design is a survey design that collects data to make inferences about the population of interest at one point in time (Hall, 2010). This method was adopted since it helped the researcher to collect and analyze data from a sample size representing the total population. The result obtained from this sample size was generalized to represent the entire population. On the other hand, correlation survey design was employed to find out if there is any relationship or variation in teachers discipline strategies by gender and school ownership.

The qualitative research design made use of phenomenological design which studies the lived experiences of individuals and groups. This design was employed by the researcher to aid in studying the life experiences of teachers as regards their present and past experiences of discipline.

3.2 Target Population

The population of this study involved all the principals and teachers in both private and public Secondary Schools in Langata district of Nairobi. The researcher used the teachers and principals because they are the main disciplinarian in schools. Whereas teachers operate at classroom level, the school principal oversees all discipline strategies school wide. The total population of public secondary schools in Langata district is 5 and private secondary school is 34 and the population of teachers in public and private secondary schools is 124 and 430 respectively (MOE, 2013).

3.3 Description of Sample and Sampling Procedure

Sample sizes as Best and Kahn (2006) explain have no fixed number or percentage of subjects that determine the size of an adequate sample. They agreed that samples of 30 and more are usually considered as large samples whereas samples below 30 are regarded as small samples.
Based on this information on sample size the researcher used 30% and above for sampling of the different participants in the study. Table 3.1 below shows the sample methodology matrix.

### Table 3.1

**Sample Methodology Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sampling technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Automatic inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private schools</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Stratified sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Automatic inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Masters/Mistresses</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Automatic inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Stratified sampling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3.1 Sampling Procedure for Schools

Sampling procedure for public secondary schools was done by automatic inclusion. This was because the total number of public schools in Langata District is very few to compare with the private schools. The total number of secondary schools in Langata District is 39 out of which 5 schools are public and 34 schools are private. The researcher used the entire population of public secondary schools in Langata so as to be able to compare the findings with the private secondary schools. The total 5 public Secondary Schools form 10% of the entire school population which is 39 schools.

Through stratified sampling the researcher selected 8 private schools which are approximately 24% of the total number of private schools in Langata District. The researcher used 24% for private since the already selected public schools are 10% of all secondary
schools in the District. This helped to make a comparison with hypothesis number 2 which stated that there is no significant relationship between teachers strategy to discipline when classified by school ownership. The stratified samples included 4 mixed private secondary schools, 1 Girls private secondary school and 3 Boys private secondary schools. This helped the researcher to get more comprehensive responses on strategies to discipline which teachers working with only girls or boys and those working in mixed schools are using.

3.3.2 Sampling Procedure for School Principals and Discipline Masters/Mistresses

The school principals of the sampled schools were automatically included as respondents. This was also applicable to the school discipline masters/mistresses who are the deputy principals. The sample size for principals will be the same for schools which is 30% of the total population of secondary schools in Langata.

3.3.2 Sampling Procedure for Teachers

Teachers were stratified by gender. This helped the researcher to be able to answer research question number 1 and hypothesis statement number 1 as well. The research question number 1 tried to find out the male and female teachers strategies to discipline in Langata District. The hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between teachers’ strategies to discipline when categorized by Gender.

The sample size for teachers in the sample schools was done by getting 30% of the total population of teachers in that school. This means that the researcher selected 30% out of the total number of teachers in all sampled schools which when added up gave a total of 166 teachers from the entire population of 554 teachers.
3.4 Description of Research Instruments

According to Creswell (2006) in describing the mixed paradigm research referred to the formulation of the instrument for data collection. The instrument employed both qualitative and quantitative paradigm instrumentation. The two paradigm instruments are mixed for better understanding of the study.

3.4.1 Semi-structured Interview for School Discipline Masters/Mistresses

In the semi-structured interview the participants were subjected to the questions already formulated before the interview (Kombo and Tromp, 2013). This was in form of interview guide. The researcher had set questions which were intended to achieve the study objectives. The questions were open ended to allow for the respondents’ views and additional experiences not captured in the questionnaire to be heard. The semi-structured interview questions will be used to answer questions 1 to 6 of the research question.

This instrument was only used with the school discipline Masters/Mistress who are also the Deputy Principals of the schools. The choice of these respondents was as a result of feasibility on the part of the researcher. They represent the different segments of the population whose major responsibility is to ascertain discipline in the entire school and not just at classroom level.

The researcher used this instrument to triangulate some of the questions that were asked in the questionnaire. It also helped the researcher for an in-depth understanding of the topic studied. This will be applicable in trying to surface the experiences of teachers in line with their strategy to discipline and the challenges they are facing in disciplining students.
3.4.2 Document Analysis Guide

The document analysis guide included analysis of government policy documents on school discipline, the school discipline policy document, classroom rules and regulation/code of conduct and punishment and reward books also known as black book. The document on school discipline policy by the Department of Education and Children’s Services of Kenya (DECS) (2007) was used. The researcher used this document to check out the similarities and differences in policy on strategies with different Secondary schools’ policy document on students’ discipline.

The second document that was analyzed is the school discipline policy for individual schools that were sampled for the study. The researcher tried to find out if sampled schools have their own school policy on discipline. This was also used to ascertain similarities and differences in policy with what the government stipulated in its own policy.

The third document reviewed was school rules and regulations and the code of conduct for students. This aided the researcher in finding out strategies which the schools are using as a school wide plan for discipline. These documents helped the researcher to surface the different strategies adopted by teachers to discipline students in the sample schools.

The last document was the punishment and reward record book (black book). The researcher only sought to know if sampled schools keep records of students’ behaviour by having a reward and punishment record book. This aided the researcher to find out the extent schools use punishment or reward strategy which is the traditional strategy to discipline.

The document analysis was done so as to find out the teachers strategy to discipline. It also helped the researcher to confirm some of the answers given by the respondents in the interview and questionnaire. Analyzing the school policy document and the government
policy document was also helpful to the researcher in answering research question No. 3 in chapter one which tried to find out if schools are complying with what the government has put in place as a guide to schools in disciplining students.

**3.4.3 Questionnaire for Teachers**

The questionnaire was constructed by the researcher for teachers. The questions asked were divided into different sections. Section A dealt with demographic information such as gender, age, number of years as a teacher.

Section B was designed in accordance with research question No. 1 which is on teachers’ strategies to discipline. While section C answered research question No. 2 on effectiveness of teachers’ strategies in instilling discipline. Section D on the other hand was used to answer research question No. 3. It was used to find out how teachers strategy to discipline fall in line with what the department of Education and Children’s Services (DECS) of 2007 stipulated.

Section E ascertained teachers past and present experiences and how they influenced their strategy to discipline. Thus, it answered research question No. 4. Section F was used to study research question No. 5 on teachers’ challenges in using alternative approaches to discipline after the ban on corporal punishment. While Section G was used to answer research question No. 6 which tried to get the suggestion of teachers on the best discipline strategies.

**3.4.3 Questionnaire for School Principals**

This comprised 31 questions apart from the demographic information. It was subdivided into sections. Section A required information on demography. The other sections were used to answer the different research questions as in chapter one. Sections B, C, D, E were used to
answer research questions No.1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively. The questions comprised both closed and open ended questions.

Questionnaire was used by the researcher because it helped in gathering data over a large sample. The questionnaire followed three scales and two scales which were used as an instrument to surface the strategies adopted by educators in disciplining students.

3.6 Validity, Pilot Testing and Reliability of Instruments

3.6.1 Validity of Instruments

Validity is the ability of a test instrument to measure what it was supposed to measure. It is the quality of the instrument or the procedure that enables it to measure what it is designed to measure (Best and Kahn, 2006 & Kombo and Tromp, 2013). The items in the questionnaire were subjected to face and content validity while the interview guide was validated through the use of credibility check. The researcher used two experts in educational administration and planning by giving them the questions ahead of time to critic each item, modify them and give suggestions which were implemented where change was necessary.

3.6.2 Pilot Testing of Instruments

Pilot testing involves trying out the research instruments on a small number of samples (Kombo and Tromp, 2006). After formulating the questionnaire and the interview guide, and after it has been validated, the researcher sampled 2 schools, 10 teachers and 2 principals and 2 deputy principals. These respondents were only used to pilot test the questionnaire items and the interview guide to check if the questions addressed the issues and also check if the questions are clear to the respondents. The two schools which were used during pilot testing were excluded from the proper research findings.
3.6.3 Reliability of Instruments

Best and Kahn (2006) define reliability of test instrument as the ability of the instrument to measure consistently the result of what it is supposed to measure. Mugenda (2008) explains reliability as a measure of the degree to which a research instrument produces consistent results or data after repeated trials.

The questionnaire instrument was tested for its reliability using the method of split-half. This was adopted in the grouping of data by dividing the items which are in closed form into odd and even numbers and using the SPSS for windows to find out the relationship among the questions. The questionnaire items used in split half method included all closed ended questions with multiple choices. These include questions from teachers’ questionnaire numbers 10 - 26, 28-33, 35-42 and 43-46. The questionnaire items used from the principals’ questionnaire include numbers 8-17, 19-24 and 26-38.

Spearman Rho correlation coefficient was used to find out the reliability using correlation coefficient score of 0.7 and above to confirm that the instrument is reliable. The generated result of reliability statistics from SPSS program is shown in tables 3.2 and 3.3 as follows:

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics for Teachers Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman-Brown Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The questions were divided into odd numbers and even numbers as follows:
a. The items are: Question No. 10, Question No. 12, Question No. 14, Question No. 16, Question No. 18, Question No. 20, Question No. 22, Question No. 24, Question No. 26, Question No. 28, Question No. 30, Question No. 32, Question No. 36, Question No. 38, Question No. 40, Question No. 42, and Question No. 44 and Question No. 46.
b. The items are: Question No. 11, Question No. 13, Question No. 15, Question No. 17, Question No. 19, Question No. 21, Question No. 23, Question No. 25, Question No. 29, Question No. 31, Question No. 33, Question No. 35, Question No. 37, Question No. 39, Question No. 41, Question No. 43, and Question No. 45.

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics for principals questionnaire</th>
<th>Reliability statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman-Brown Coefficient</td>
<td>Equal Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unequal Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guttman Split-Half Coefficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. The items are: Question No. 8, Question No. 10, Question No. 12, Question No. 14, Question No. 16, Question No. 20, Question No. 22, Question No. 24, Question No. 26, Question No. 28, Question No. 30, Question No. 32, Question No. 34, Question No. 36 and Question No. 38.
b. The items are: Question No. 9, Question No. 11, Question No. 13, Question No. 15, Question No. 17, Question No. 19, Question No. 21, Question No. 23, Question No. 27, Question No. 29, Question No. 31, Question No. 33, Question No. 35 and Question No. 37.

The result obtained for the Spearman-Brown correlation coefficient from the teachers and the principals’ reliability statistics are 0.72 and 0.81 respectively thus the correlation coefficient is greater than 0.7 then the instrument is taken to be reliable (Drost, 2011).
The open ended questions in the questionnaires, interview guide and document analysis guide were checked for their credibility and dependability through using triangulation. In triangulation the researcher adopted two approaches of triangulation which includes method triangulation and the use of iterative questioning. In method triangulation, the researcher used interview guide, document analysis and open ended questions from the questionnaire to explore the different strategies that teachers are using to discipline students in Langata District. The same questions in the interview guide were crosschecked for consistency with similar question in open ended questions in the questionnaires. In iterative questioning triangulation, the researcher asked the same question to the interviewee in different ways and the responses recorded thus were used to test its dependability by checking on the consistency of responses given (Patton, 2002). The two methods used produced consistency of responses which indicated that the instruments are credible and dependable.

3.7 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher received a letter of permit from her institution of study which she used in obtaining the national approval to embark on the study. The researcher employed an undergraduate as research assistant because of the bulky nature of the work. The research assistant helped in collecting data from two sample schools. The researcher used a day to train the research assistant on the data collecting instruments and on what the work entails.

The researcher first obtained appointment from the school authority and a date and time schedule for her coming to visit the school. The questionnaire was distributed to the participants through the help of the deputy principals of each school visited and collection of them was done within the same week and as was scheduled with the deputy principal. This was to allow the participants ample time to read and fill the questionnaire without so much
pressure to hand them back the same day. It took the researcher three weeks to go round the
schools for distribution and collection of data. The essence of going back within the same
week was to avoid losing most of the questionnaire due to teachers misplacing them or
forgetting entirely about them. Interview of the disciplinary masters/mistresses or the deputy
principals were done as scheduled with appointment with the respective participants. The
researcher took note of the information given by writing the points down. The document for
analysis was collected personally by the researcher.

3.8 Description of Data Analysis Procedures

Since the study adopted mixed method, analysis of data was also done using both quantitative
approach and qualitative approach. For quantitative data, which were collected through
questionnaire, data were analyzed both descriptively and through inferential statistics. In
descriptive analysis the numerical findings were analyzed using frequencies and percentages.
However the inferential statistics were done by testing the hypothesis of the study.

Chi square test for relationship was used by the researcher to test the statistical
significant relationship between two categorical variables in the hypothesis (teachers
discipline strategy and gender/school ownership). The level of significance was 0.05 (5%)
alpha levels for rejection of Null hypothesis. This is the standard mostly used in social science
researches. It indicates that the level of confidence is 95% (Best and Khan, 2006).

The researcher made decision based on the statistical findings whether or not to reject
the Null hypothesis. The researcher used computer software known as SPSS for windows to
analyze quantitative data using both inferential and descriptive analysis. The data were
arranged, coded and entered into the variable view and analysis done using the data view in
the package.
Data collected through the use of interview guide which is qualitative aspect of the research were analyzed thematically by identifying information from the data which are important for the study, categorized related topics, explained, interpreted and summarized key findings. On the other hand, content analysis was used in extracting systematically important information in the documents that were analyzed (Kombo and Tromp, 2011).

3.8 Ethical Considerations

The researcher adhered to the highest possible standards that guide educational research by making sure that the entire work was scientifically, scholarly and professionally done by deriving all knowledge and act in honest manner and with integrity (American Educational Research Association (AERA) 2011).

The researcher followed all legal procedures guiding conducting of research in Kenya by obtaining full permission and approval to conduct research from the appropriate Government body and institution before going to the field for data collection (Best and Khan, 2011).

Throughout the course of the research the researcher was mindful of how other people’s work were paraphrased or quoted by making sure that they are properly cited and duly acknowledged by crediting and referencing all author(s) so as to avoid any form of plagiarism. The researcher also avoided any incriminating act such as falsifying other people’s work and presenting them as her own or fabricating of information (Kombo and Tromp, 2013).

The researcher obtained an informed consent from all the schools used. This was done to make sure that they participate voluntarily. The researcher did this by calling or visiting the school Principals of all sampled schools early enough to seek their consent to make use of
their schools. Two schools that failed to give consent were dropped and alternative schools that consented were chosen. The aims and purposes of the investigation were communicated to the participants as well (Mugenda, 2008 & Best and Kahn, 2011).

The researcher made sure that confidentiality and anonymity were maintained with the respondents by not asking them to write their names in the questionnaire (AERA, 2011).

In reporting of research findings the researcher made sure not to omit any important information provided by the respondents nor falsify the participants’ information to suit the researcher’s opinion or preempted outcome (AERA, 2011a; Best and Khan, 2011b)
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the specific themes that emerged during the study. It presents the results from the interview guide for school discipline masters/mistresses and the questionnaire for the school principals and teachers. The data obtained from the individual interview were analyzed thematically. This was done by identifying information from the data which are important for the study, categorized related topics, and explaining, interpreting and summarizing key findings. While the data from questionnaires were presented in tables, bar charts and pie charts. The written documents collected from the selected schools such as the school rules and regulations/code of conduct and school discipline policies were also reviewed and the findings summarized. The findings are discussed alongside existing literature on the topic. This chapter was organized under five major headings such as the return rate of instrument, demographic information of the respondents, findings according to the research questions, hypothesis testing and document analysis.

4.1 Return Rate of Questionnaires

The total number of questionnaires distributed to 12 schools was 170 in number. The return rate was slightly above average. Thus, the total number of responses collected from teachers was 92 which accounts for 54% of the total number distributed.

The questionnaires for principals were distributed to 12 schools out of which 11 returned which is 91.66%. Individual interview with 10 out of 12 discipline masters/mistresses who are the deputy principals came to 83% as the other 2 were not available and disposed for the interview.
4.2 Demographic Information of the Respondents

The demographic information of the teachers and the principals are presented using table and charts. The demographic information of teachers determined in this study includes: the type of school, gender of the teacher, age, position in school, qualification, number of years in teaching, number of students taught in class, and allotted number of period in a week. Demographic characteristics of the principals from the sampled schools who took part in this study were also determined. These characteristics includes: type of school, type of student, and gender of the principal, age of the principal and highest qualification of the principal, principal’s number of years in teaching profession and the total number of students in each school. The findings for teachers’ demographic information are summarized in Table 4.1, and Interpretation and discussion of the findings were also done.

School type

According to information displayed in table 4.1 the total number of teacher respondents from private schools are 64 which accounts for 69.56% of the total respondents. However, 27 respondents were from the public school which is 30.44% of the total 92 respondents. This was done to gain more insight in the study on the different strategies used by each category to discipline students and also to further compare their challenges. From the findings both private and public secondary schools in Langata use all the strategies in varying degrees. This shows that they all use similar strategies.

Gender of teachers

The researcher also tried to ascertain the gender of the respondents since it will help in finding out the relationship in teachers discipline strategy by gender. The total male respondents among teachers were 55 and the female respondents were 37. This accounts for 59.8% and
40.2% respectively. From the result of the hypothesis both male and female teachers use the same strategies in disciplining students.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender of teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35yrs</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45yrs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55yrs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualification of teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate Diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher diploma</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5yrs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15yrs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16yrs and above</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average number of students taught in class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Age of teachers**

The age of teachers were bracketed as follows 25-35yrs, 36-45yrs, 46-55yrs and 56yrs and above. These are shown in Table 4.1. Majority 54(58.7%) of the teachers fall within the first age bracket which is 25-35years. Many 29(31.5%) were within the age of 36-45years and 6(6.6) where in age bracket 46-55 and only 1(1.1%) fall within the age of 56years and above.

The missing number was 2(2.2%) which accounts for the teachers that did not fill in their age. From the findings it shows that majority of teachers are in their vibrant age but may not have wealth of knowledge or experience that can help them in disciplining students. This may be part of the reason they are facing too many challenges in disciplining students.

**Number of years in teaching profession**

The teachers’ number of years as a teacher aids the researcher to find out their experiences in terms of their challenges and also the strategies which they are using in disciplining students. From Table 4.1 the greater number of the teachers 37 (40.2%) were within 1-5years in teaching. Thus they are less experienced and are still young in teaching profession. This is followed by teachers within 6-10years in the profession who account for 29(31.5%). About 10 teachers were within 11-15years in teaching which accounts for 10.9% of the total respondents. The remaining 15(16.3%) teachers were over 16 years in teaching profession.

**Average Number of students in class**

Majority 28(30%) of the teachers have between 41-50 students in class, many others 23(25%) have 31-40 students in class. However, 17(18.5%) teachers teach about 21-30 students in class. The remaining 7(7.6%) teachers teach students from 1-20 in a class. One of the teachers did not fill this section accounting for 1.1% missing number. In this study the average number of students taught in class aided the researcher to identify what challenges the teachers
handling larger classes are facing when compared to teachers handling lesser number of students in class.

**Teachers’ qualification**

Teachers qualifications were checked for and the findings were represented in Fig. 4.1

![Figure 4.1 Teachers Highest Qualification](image)

The teachers with Masters were 6(6.5%) and 2(2.2%) accounts for those with post graduate diploma in education (PGDE). Majority of the teachers were Bachelors degree holders which accounts for 71(77.2%). The remaining 8(8.7%) were higher diploma holders.

**Allotted number of teaching periods per week**

Findings of allotted number of teaching periods per week are represented in Fig. 4.2. Most of the teachers 53(57.6%) take up to 21-30 periods in a week. Many others 28(30.4%) teach within 11-20 periods per week. Some other 8(8.7%) takes 31 periods and above. The remaining 2(2.2%) teach within 1-10 periods per week. The missing number accounts for 1(1.1%) of the respondents.
Figure 4.2 Number of Teaching Periods per Week

Finding out the number of allotted periods per week aided the researcher to find out the challenges teachers who have a longer period to teach in a week are facing when compared to their counterparts that have less number of periods per week. The teachers who complained about lack of time to use alternative approach to discipline take up to 30 periods per week. This shows that they have less time to devote in disciplining students. It also explains the reason the most teachers go for punitive strategy which is very easy and quick to administer. Few teachers will devote their time in finding out the root cause of students’ misbehaviour in order to support them.

4.2.1 Demographic Information of Principals

The demographic information of the principals which were studied include; school type, type of students, gender and age of the principal, professional qualification of principal, number of years in teaching and average number of students in school.

Type of School

The distribution of principals according to type of school is shown in Fig. 4.3, the total number of principals who participated in this study is 11 out of which 8(72.7%) were from private schools and 3(27.3%) were from public schools.
The researcher made use of both private and public schools to be able to ascertain the relationship in discipline strategies according to school ownership. It also aided the researcher in finding out the similarities and the differences in the discipline strategies adopted by both private and public schools. Findings revealed that there is no significant difference in strategy between the two school ownership.

**Type of students**

The researcher also sought information from different categories of schools according to the type of students in each school. The responses of the principals who participated were represented in Fig. 4.4 as follows:
Figure 4.4 Distribution of Principals by Type of students

From Fig. 4.4 the majority of principals who participated in the study are from mixed schools 8(72.73%). This is followed by principals from boys schools 2(18.2%) and girls school 1(9.1%). The researcher made use of three boys’ schools, one girls’ school and 8 mixed schools. This was for the fact that majority of secondary schools in Langata are mixed followed by the boys’ schools. The girls’ schools are very few.

Gender

The result of the total male and female principals were represented in Fig. 4.5 as follows
The principals were 9(81.8%) male and 2(18.2%) female as is shown in Fig. 4.5 this was as a result that most of the sampled schools have male principals.

**Age of the Principals**

The age of the principals were from 25-30yrs, 31-35yrs, 41-45yrs, 46-50yrs and 51-55yrs. Majority of the principals were between the age brackets of 31-45years accounting for 6(54.6%). This is followed by last two age brackets from 46-55yrs which accounts for 4(36.4%) of the total respondents.

![Figure 4.6 Distributions of Principals by Age](image)

The least age was within the first age bracket of 25-30yrs which has only 1(9.1%) respondent. This shows that most principals are in their middle age. The researcher tried to find out the experiences of teachers in regard with their age.

**Principals’ Professional Qualification**

The professional qualification of teachers and principals help the researcher to compare teachers’ strategy according to their level of academic qualification which also is part of their experience in the field of education.
The principals with bachelors degree are the majority 5(45.5%), followed by those with Masters Degree 3(27.3%) and the least has higher diploma 1(9.1%). Two among the principals did not answer this question accounting for 18.2%.

**Number of Years in Teaching Profession**

The number of years the principals have spent in teaching profession was studied and the finding represented in Fig. 4.8 as follows:

In Fig. 4.8, majority of principals 4(36.4%) were 16 years and above in teaching profession. This is followed by 3(27.3%) principals who are within 11-15 years as a teacher and 1(9.1%) is within 1-5 years old in teaching profession. The missing number is 1(9.1%). This result shows that most of the principals are well experienced in teaching profession.
**Average Number of Students in School**

The total numbers of students in schools were bracketed from 1-100, 101-300, 301-500, 701-900 and 901 and above as shown in Fig. 4.2.7.
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**Figure 4.9 Average number of students managed in school**

Most of the principals 7(63.6%) have between 101-300 students, whereas 2(16.2%) have students within 301-500 and the remaining 2 principals have students between 701-900 and 901 and above respectively. This reveals that most principals have the number of the students that they can manage properly.

**4.3 The Strategies Adopted By Male and Female Teachers to Discipline Students in Langata Schools**

Research question one tried to find out the different strategies adopted by male and female teachers in disciplining students in Langata schools. These strategies were divided into five as follows: preventive/proactive strategy, punitive/reward (Traditional) strategy, corrective strategy, cognitive strategy and supportive strategy. The different items in the questionnaire under discipline strategies were also identified based on these five outlined strategies. The findings were presented in tables under the five different strategies.
**Preventive strategy**

The preventive strategies where answered using question numbers 10, 11, 16 and 23 in the teachers questionnaire while in the principals questionnaire the preventive strategies where question numbers 8, 9, 10 and 15.

Table 4.2

**Frequency Response of Teachers and Principals on Preventive Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Male n=55</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female n=37</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make clear class rules</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>94.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>02.17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan consequences for each rule</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>89.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>04.34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve student in making class rules</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let parents know the class rules and consequences</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74.54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Male n=9</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female n=2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have School code of conduct</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>01.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have planned reward and consequences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve students in planning school code</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide discipline documents for all stakeholder</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general responses of teachers and principals on their use of preventive strategies were represented in Table 4.2. It was observed that in preventive strategy question number 10 for teachers on making clear rules that majority of male (52) and female (32) teachers use it. This is followed by preventive strategy number 11 on planning suitable and clear consequences for each rule made by the teacher. The total number of 49 male teacher plans for consequences
for each rule while 32 female teachers do the same. On the other hand many teachers do not involve students in making class rules. The fourth preventive strategy is also practiced by most male (41) and female (24) teachers. They let parents know about set class rules and the consequences for breaking each rule. This is in line with Canters’ (1992) assertive discipline which requires that a teacher should gain support from parents after establishing class rules. From this result it became evident that teachers in Langata apply preventive strategy on the average but some greater numbers do not involve students in planning for class rules.

More so, the majority of male (7) and female (2) principals have a school code of conduct only 2 male principals do not have school code of conduct. They also plan for the reward and consequences of keeping or breaking the code of conduct but majority do not involve students in decision making when planning their school code of conduct. Only 3 male principals and one female principal involve students in decision making during planning of school code of conduct. An average number of Male principals (6) involve parents, teachers and Board of management (BOM) by giving them each a copy of school discipline document and the government policy on school discipline. Whereas the 2 female principals involved in the study do the same. Only 2 male principals do not practise this preventive strategy.

Further discovery on the preventive measures used by the principals and teachers include forming supervisory team to work on students’ discipline, form students’ council to help in identifying discipline cases, revisiting school rules and consequences and asking students to propose the school rules and consequences.

Most teachers and principals use all the first two preventive strategies studied in this work and are in line with the DECS school discipline policy of 2007 and Canter and Canter (1992) who proposed Preventive/proactive strategy. They stressed that planning of discipline
by teachers and the consequences are very important since they help the teachers to be consistent in the approach they use in disciplining students.

Less number of teachers and principals involve students when planning the rules and consequences. This contradicts what Curwins and Mendler (1984) suggested as what help schools to have conducive learning environment. For them involving students in making school rules or class rules is very important. It also defer from what the DECS (2007) stipulated should be done when planning for school rules and regulations. In their opinion when students are not involved in establishing school and classroom rules and consequences they may not own them. Thus the rules may not achieve the desired result.

**Punitive/ Reward (Traditional) strategy**

Punitive/ Reward strategies also known as traditional strategy was answered using four questions 14, 15, 17 and 18 from the teachers’ questionnaire and three questions 11, 12, 13 from the principals’ questionnaire. The findings are presented in Table 4.3.

Punitive strategy is widely practised by both teachers and school principals. From the result shown in table 4.3 it is observed that 50 out of 55 male teachers punish students who misbehave and 33 out of 37 female teachers do the same. The school principals both male (5) and female (2) also make use of punishment. More so, 30 male 20 female teachers send students outside during lesson when they are in the habit of disrupting the class.

As regards sending students on suspension majority of male (42) and female (26) teachers use this strategy while on the other hand 11 male and 8 female teachers do not use that. This shows that majority of both male and female teachers suspend students from school as punishment when they misbehave.
Table 4.3

*Frequency Distribution of teachers and principals on Punitive/Reward strategy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male n=55</td>
<td>Female n=37</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male n=9</td>
<td>Female n=2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish students</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>89.18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send students out of class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are sent on suspension</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>76.36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70.27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are rewarded</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83.63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70.27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are punished</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are expelled</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are rewarded</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the interview with the deputy principals who are the Discipline Masters/Mistresses, the punitive measures which surfaced were suspension and expulsion for extreme cases, corporal punishment, manual labour, point deduction, and denying students of what they like.

On further exploration on different strategies teachers and principals use it became more evident that punitive strategy is mostly used to discipline students. The punitive measures which are used in Langata schools include physical punishments such as kneeling, sweeping, cleaning school environment, slashing of grasses, washing kitchen utensil etc. This is followed by denying students of privileges and physiological needs like break time, food especially breakfast and lunch, sports/games time and detention from going home during mid-term break. Some other punishments include isolation of students for hours or days,
confiscation and destruction of prohibited items such as cell phones, point deduction, surcharging and corporal punishment. These findings are in line with the findings of Simatwa (2012) where punishment such as kneeling, sweeping, asking students to slash grass, wash the toilets alone or the dining room alone and some other corporal punishments is widely used by the school principals and their deputies as a strategy to manage students’ behaviour. It also confirms the report given by the Human Right Watch (2008) that punishment is still widely used in Kenya schools. Marshall and Weisner (2004) opined that punishment is counter-productive to a teacher-student relationship and it deprives students of taking responsibility of their action.

Reward as traditional strategy is also used by both male (46) and female (26) teachers. Likewise majority of the male (8) and female (2) principals use reward as a strategy to discipline students. This shows that traditional strategy is used mostly in Langata schools today. This could be as a result of lack of trust in the alternative approach to discipline or lack of training of teachers on the proper application of these modern methods of discipline. Reward makes students not to be self driven but rather are driven to behave well because of the reward they will get. It becomes important to create more awareness on the important of alternative strategies such as cognitive and supportive strategies which are very effective in disciplining students.

**Corrective Strategy**

The corrective strategies which were studied include consistent application of consequences on those who bridged the rules and reprimanding students openly. This strategy was only in the teachers’ questionnaire since this is mostly used in the classroom setting. The result is presented in Table 4.4 as follows:
Table 4.4

*Frequency Distribution on teachers Corrective Strategy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Male n=55</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female n=37</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently apply consequences</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81.81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprimand students openly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61.81</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exploration on teachers’ use of two corrective measures as a strategy shows that most male (45) and female (28) teachers consistently apply consequences with students who break class rules. However, less than average number of male (20) and female (18) teachers reprimand students in public.

The school discipline masters/mistresses use demerit book and warnings. Other corrective strategy which teachers and school principals use include open apology, letting students know their misdeed, reducing awarded discipline points from beginning of the year or merit and demerit record and recommend student for transfer. On the other hand the principals use warning letter and verbal rebuke.

The use of consistent application of consequences were opined by Curwins and Mendler (1984) and Canter and Canter (1992). In their opinion it helps teachers to be fair in disciplining students since they are consistent in their application of consequences. Thus the school teachers and principals use the corrective strategies that are in line with the theory on discipline with dignity and assertive discipline.
Cognitive Strategy

Cognitive strategies that were studied were derived from Marvin Marshall’s theory. It tried to answer questionnaire numbers 12, 20, 21 and 26 for teachers and question number 17 from the principals’ questionnaire.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Distribution on teachers and principals Cognitive Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students class rules and consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide students to make informed choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize class meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor students behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicate rules to students</th>
<th>Male n=9</th>
<th>Female n=2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.88</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questions from the teachers’ questionnaire include teaching students’ class rules and consequences, guiding students to make an informed choice, organize class meetings to discuss discipline issues and monitor students’ behaviour progress. The principals’ questionnaire number 17 sought to find out if principals communicate the school rules and
regulations to students, teachers and parents through school assembly, school newsletter and school handbook.

From the result in Table 4.5 majorities of the male 88.9% and female 100% principals communicate school rules and regulations to all stakeholders. This finding supported the findings of Ofoyuru and Too-Okema (2011) that identified communication as a strategy adopted by head teachers and teachers in managing students discipline in schools. This strategy is very important because communication is very necessary in every activity in school and it supports the requirement of DESC (2007) in involving all stakeholders in students’ discipline.

Four questions were used in teachers’ questionnaire to find out their use of cognitive strategy. Question number 12 tries to find out if teachers teach their students the school rules and make sure they understand them. From the result in Table 4.5 it shows that average number of male 34(61.81%) and female 23(62.16%) teachers use this strategy.

Another cognitive strategy on guiding students to make good behaviour choices as advocated by Marshall (2004) was also checked using question number 20. From the result majority of male 52(94.54%) and female 34(91.89%) teachers use this strategy. It is a worthwhile strategy which helps students to take responsibility and make right decisions for their life.

Most female 32(86.48%) and male 46(83.63%) teachers organize class meetings to discuss vital behaviour lessons with students. While Majority of female 34(91.89%) and male 52(94.54%) teachers monitor students’ behaviour by checking their progress over time. This is also in line with Marshall (2004) whose concern is on teachers using cognitive approach in disciplining students for a wholistic training of the student.
From the interview of the school discipline masters/mistresses further cognitive strategies were revealed which included; teaching and laying strong emphasis on school objectives, school rules and helping students to understand behaviour skills. Other cognitive strategies from the teachers include the use of behaviour contract by 2 principals and 7 teachers and 2 principals organize talks to teach students the value of discipline, sense of responsibility and mentoring programs. While 2 teachers use academic work such as more assignments and writing comprehension on good behaviour as a cognitive strategy. Another principal uses organizing regular meetings with students and other stakeholders to discuss discipline issues.

**Supportive Strategy**

Supportive strategy was checked using item numbers 19, 24 and 25 in the teachers’ questionnaire to find out the supportive strategies that teachers are using in school. While question numbers 13 and 14 where used to sought answers to supportive strategy that school principals use to maintain discipline in schools. The findings were presented in Table 4.6.

Majority of the male 7(77.77%) and female 2(100%) principals as shown in Table 4.6 organize workshops to train teachers on alternative approaches to student discipline. However, an average number of male principals 5(55.55%) have a functional guidance and counseling office. This supports what Ajowi, Enose and Simatwa (2010) found out that guidance and counseling are not optimally used in schools.
Table 4.6

_Frequency Distribution on teachers and principals Supportive Strategy_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question no.</th>
<th>Male=55</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female=37</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give students guidance/ counseling</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>89.09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to students</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>94.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep track of students behaviour</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principals**

| Questions | Male =9 | | | | Female=2 | | | |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Yes | % | No | % | Yes | % | No | % |
| Organize workshop for teachers on best alternative approach to discipline | 7 | 77.77 | 2 | 22.22 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Have guidance and counseling office | 5 | 55.55 | 4 | 44.44 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 |

The 2(100%) female principals have a functioning guidance and counseling office where students are helped. The deputy principals who were the major disciplinarians in schools through their interview 8 out of 10 make use of guidance and counseling and dialogue. One of the deputy principals uses disciplining with love as a support strategy and involving parents.

Further disclosure on other supportive strategies teachers and principals’ use were sought from questionnaire item number 27 and 17 respectively. From reviewing their responses it was observed that about 16 teachers and 2 principals involve parents and guardians, 5 engage students on dialogue, 3 pray for defiant students, 2 teachers and 3 principals use peer counseling and 1 involve students in extracurricular activities. Other supportive strategies which the principals surfaced include home visit and creating friendly forum for teacher-student relationship.
The findings on supportive strategies teachers use in Langata schools support the findings of Bosire, Sang and Mungai (2009) who reported that majority of principals in Kenya involve parents and guardians in managing students’ behaviour.

4.4.2 Effectiveness of Teachers Strategy in Instilling Discipline among Students

Research question number 2 dealt with the effectiveness of different strategies teachers and principals adopt in disciplining students in schools. This was analyzed and the result shown in Table 4.7.

From the result shown in table 4.8 most teachers 58(62.4%) rated cognitive strategy as very effective whereas less than average number of principals 5(45.5%) rated it as very effective. Cognitive strategy when ranked according to the number of teachers who are in favour of each strategy is number one. On the other hand it ranked number three for the principals. For 6(54.5%) of the principals cognitive strategy is moderately effective and none of the principals rated it as ineffective whereas 27(29%) teachers rated it as moderately effective and 4(4.3%) teachers saw it as ineffective. Further answers given by the teachers, deputy principals and principals on what other strategies that work very effectively for them show that using motivational talk for character education, having meeting with students, giving students relevant book to read and teachers living an exemplary life were listed by many teachers as very effective.

Supportive strategy ranked 2nd as very effective for most teachers 55(59.1%) and principals 6(54.5%) and some teachers 33(35.5%) and principals 4(36.4%) rated it as moderately effective. Very minor number of teachers 2(2.2%) and principal 1(9.1%) indicated that it is ineffective. Other supportive strategies that work effectively for teachers, deputy principals and the principals were listed by teachers as guidance and counseling, dialogue,
involving parents, school-home relationship, and peer counseling, praying for students, and paying closer attention to students.

Table 4.7

*Frequency Distribution of Teachers and Principals on Effectiveness of Strategy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Teachers n=92</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals n=11</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitive</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of the principals 7(63.6%) indicated that reward as a strategy is very effective and average number of teachers 52(55%) accepted that reward is very effective. On the other hand some teachers 32(34.4%) and principals 4(36.4%) rated it as moderately effective. None of the principals saw it as ineffective and only 3(3.2%) teachers indicated that it is ineffective. Since majority of principals saw reward strategy as very effective it raises a bit of concern on training of students to become self driven and taking responsibility in behaving well. Thus most of these principals using this strategy are only helping the students to behave well hoping to gain a reward and not because it is the right thing to do.

Preventive strategy ranked 3rd when arranged in descending order of effectiveness for teachers. Most teachers 53(57%) indicated that it is very effective whereas below average number of principals 4(36.7%) saw it as very effective and thus it ranked 5th in effectiveness for them. Many principals 6(54.5%) rather indicated that it is moderately effective and some teachers 35(35.5%) also saw it as moderately effective. Negligible number of teachers 2(2.2%) and principals 1(9.1%) indicated that preventive strategy is ineffective. Other preventive strategies that teachers and principals use that work effectively for them are setting clear guidelines, involving students in setting class rules and consequences, having open discussion with students and forming school governing body.

Less than average number of teachers 39(41.9%) and principals 5(45.5%) indicated that corrective strategy is very effective. Many teachers 48(51.6%) indicated that it is moderately effective and the remaining 4(4.3%) saw it as ineffective. The same number of principals 5(45.5%) that rated it as very effective also rated it as moderately effective and only 1(9.1%) principal saw it as ineffective. Other corrective measure that works effectively for teachers is students making an open apology and promising to change.
Punitive strategy was rated by many teachers 41(44.1%) and principals 5(45.5%) as moderately effective. The other 29(31%) teachers and 2(18.2%) principals indicated that it is very effective whereas 19(20.4%) teachers and 4(36.4%) principals rated it as ineffective. In as much as punitive strategy ranked the least in effectiveness it is prevalently and widely used as a strategy to discipline students in Langata Schools. This finding supports Curwins and Mendler idea that punishment is counter-productive. Thus is least effective in handling students’ behaviour. Cooper (2005) also opined that punishment as a discipline strategy produces a short-term remedy to misbehaviour. On further exploration into other strategies that work very effectively for teacher 13(14.13%) teachers outlined different punitive strategies that work very effectively for them. These involve isolating students, denying students of food and hobbies/privileges, moderate caning, manual labour and expulsion.

4.4.3 Discipline Strategies of Teachers and its Resonance with the Kenyan Government policy on school discipline

There are eight questions drawn from the policy document of Department of Education and Children’s services (DESC, 2007) which form the basic policy statements on students discipline in Kenya. These questions were whether BOM, Teachers, Students are always involved in deciding the code of conducts for students. Are students taught the skills to enable them to take part in development, implementation and review of school’s behaviour codes? Are Students taught social responsibility across the curriculum? Do teachers teach students the values of honesty, trust, respect and cooperation? Do schools have consequences for both responsible and irresponsible behaviour? And are consequences applied consistently? Do schools have well established expectations for their students? And do schools send Students with serious problem behaviour to Department of Education and Children’s services (DECS)
to be given special support. These eight questions were analyzed and the results were presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers n=92</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals n=11</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result on how teachers’ strategy in disciplining students is in resonance with the Kenyan policy on school discipline from the Department of Education and Children’s Services (DECS, 2007) revealed that majority of teachers and principals practise what the
policy document indicated. The document statements include involving of stakeholders in deciding school code of conducts and teaching students skills that will enable them take part in development, implementation and reviewing of school codes. Students are taught social responsibilities across the curriculum, they are taught the values of honesty, trust, respect and cooperation, school develop consequences for students’ behaviour and schools have well established expectations for the students. Many teachers 48(52.2%) said no to the question on if students with serious behaviour problem are given special support by the DECS and only 33(35.9%) of them said yes.

Some of the findings in this section contradict earlier responses of teachers on involving students when they make school rules. In this section it indicates that most teachers 57 teacher involve students and other stakeholders in creating school codes of conducts. This contradicts their response in the earlier question under the strategies adopted by teacher in table 4.3 where only 43 teachers were involving students in making class rules.

4.4.4 Teachers Past and Present Experience

Six and four closed ended questions were used for the principals and the teachers respectively to draw out how their present and past experiences influence their strategy to discipline students. These questions include question numbers 33 – 38 for the principals and question numbers 43 – 46 for the teachers. These questions were analyzed and the result shown in Table 4.9.

From the result in Table 4.9 Most teachers 72(78.3%) accepted that how they were groomed growing up helped them a lot and that they use the same method to discipline their students. On the contrary most principals 6(54.5%) do not like how they were disciplined but majority 7(63.6%) accepted they like using the same method to discipline their students. Few
of the teachers 30(32.6%) and an average number of principals 6(54.5%) hate giving students physical punishment because it never helped them when they were student but more than an average number of teachers 56(60.9%) have a contrary view. Thus they give students physical punishment because it was helpful in forming them during their time.

Table 4.9

*Teachers Experience and Discipline Strategy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Teachers n=92</th>
<th>Principals N=11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like using the same method of discipline I received to discipline my students</td>
<td>72(78.3) 14(15.2) 6(6.5)</td>
<td>8(72.7) 3(27.3) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate giving students physical punishment because it never helped me</td>
<td>30(32.6) 56(60.9) 6(6.5)</td>
<td>5(45.5) 6(54.5) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on what kind of punishment/ reward to give student as the incidence happen</td>
<td>76(82.6) 12(13) 4(4.3)</td>
<td>7(63.6) 4(36.4) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow rules and consequences stipulated to discipline students</td>
<td>56(60.9) 32(34.8) 4(4.3)</td>
<td>8(72.7) 3(27.3) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of teachers 76(82.6%) and some principals 6(54.5%) decide on what kind of punishment or reward they give to their students as the incident happens whereas very few
teachers 12(13%) do the contrary. However, 56(60.9%) teachers and 8(72.7%) principals follow strictly the rules and stipulated consequences for each offence or good behaviour in disciplining students.

Further findings from teachers, deputy principals and principals showed that majority were given corporal and physical punishment of all sorts such as caning, heavy manual labour, suspension, withdrawn from class, denial of privileges such as food and sports, sanctioned and surcharged. It was also noticed that teachers who were disciplined using physical punishment such as denial of privileges and manual work use the same method to discipline their students because they believed that it helped to shape them. Most of them do not use corporal punishment because of the law but they see it as very effective during their own days.

It became evident that teachers past and present experience influences their choice of discipline strategy. This also explains why teachers use traditional strategy a lot since majority believes that it helped them. To counteract this idea that teachers have about being helped with corporal punishment and they are using similar method to discipline their students today. It will be important that they understand that this age and generation is very different from those days when corporal punishment works very effectively in disciplining students. In as much as they use punitive strategy a lot in disciplining students many teachers also rated it as ineffective. The question then is since is ineffective why continuing with what does not help?
4.4.5 The Challenges Teachers Face in Practising Alternative Discipline Approaches

Teachers, principals and deputy principals in Langata Secondary schools face a lot of challenges in using alternative approach to discipline students since the ban on corporal punishment. These challenges are summarized in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10

Summary of teachers challenges in using alternative approach to discipline students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>n=95</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Students repeat mistakes and are not ready to listen.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Non corporation and lack of support from parents.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Is time consuming, demanding and tiring.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Slow in effectiveness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Sick and physically challenged students take advantage of their situation and misbehave</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Students from well off families are boastful, put teachers down, threatens them and are rebellious</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Administrative control/management policy limit teachers from disciplining students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>Too much Child Right and protection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>Lack of outlines by MOE on alternative discipline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>Diverse nature of students’ background and upbringing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>Students from problem homes pose a lot of challenge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>Limited choices in alternative approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>Teachers lack of skills in guidance and counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.</td>
<td>Teachers face court charges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>Tension being created among stakeholders because of different understanding on how to discipline students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>Lack of support from stakeholders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii.</td>
<td>Cultural gap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii.</td>
<td>Lack of trust in alternative method by teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix.</td>
<td>Creates soar relationship between students and teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx.</td>
<td>Students abscond from school when they are sent home to bring their parent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.</td>
<td>Overloading of guidance and counseling office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii.</td>
<td>Lack of support from colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiii.</td>
<td>Lack of support from school prefects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv.</td>
<td>Ambiguity in the role teachers in the area of discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv.</td>
<td>Upsurge of technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of 92 teachers 75 answered this question and out of 11 principals who participated in the study 10 answered the question as well. All the 10 deputy principals answered this question. Thus the total number of those who gave their opinion to this question is 95.

From the findings as presented in Table 4.10 teachers major challenge is that students have become so undisciplined because they are not ready to listen and they repeat over and over again the same mistake knowing that they will receive minor punishment. Some other teachers put it that students tend to enjoy the simple punishment given to them therefore it makes them not ready to change. Some students who have less interest in schooling tend to abscond from school when they are sent home to bring their parents.

Another challenge which many teachers pointed out is non corporation and support from parents. Some parents they say always side their children while some others threaten the teacher and others interfere negatively when their child is being disciplined. They also complain that parents no longer do their duty of training their children on important social values and skills.

The next challenge which some teachers expressed was that using alternative approach was time consuming, demanding and tiring. They also saw it as very slow in effectiveness. It does not produce immediate result like corporal punishment. Further findings showed that majority of teachers who saw alternative approach as time consuming have longer periods to teach in a week.

Other challenges mentioned by the teachers include too much Child Right and protection together with policies has tied the teachers and has limited them in disciplining students. There is too much administrative control on disciplining students. Lack of outlines on alternative ways of controlling students’ behaviour by the ministry of education after the
ban on corporal punishment has led to ambiguity in the role of a teacher in the area of discipline.

Students from well off families put teachers down, some threaten their teachers and others undermine them. The diverse nature of students’ background and upbringing makes it hard for teachers to know what method will be suitable in disciplining students. Some Sick and physically challenged students take advantage of their situation and misbehave while students from problem homes pose a lot of challenges to teachers. They also mentioned that there are limited choices in alternative approach to discipline.

More so, teachers said they lack the skills needed for counseling and thus the guidance and counseling department is overloaded with discipline cases because teachers no longer get so much involved in disciplining students. One of the deputy principals also said that due to a lot of child right and ban on corporal punishment teachers now send all discipline cases to his office thereby overloading him with so much to do.

Other challenges mentioned by the teachers are lack of proper knowledge of students’ background and health history, teachers being taken to court, lack of support from school prefects, upsurge of technology, lack of support from colleagues, tension being created among stakeholders because of different understanding of how to discipline.

A principal said that one of his greatest challenges was that teachers with long years in teaching and those from schools where the outdated discipline approach are still in use have no trust in the alternative and modern approaches to discipline. Moreover, the cultural gap has made it not easy for teachers to maintain the principles and guidelines of the new approach. They are used to easy and quick method of discipline and not a long-term thought out planned strategies.
4.4.6 Suggestions on How to Improve School Discipline

There are several suggestions made by teachers, deputy principals and school principals on how to improve discipline situation in schools. Their suggestions were subdivided under the five major strategies being studied. The total number of teachers that answered this question was 72 and 10 principals. Also 10 deputy principals gave their opinion on this question. These were summarized and presented in Table 4.11.

Most common suggestions is to use cognitive strategies such as mentoring and giving students motivational talks as well as teaching students social skills, self awareness and leadership skills was also being suggested by many teachers. This should be done by inviting role models and important persons from the society to give students talk from time to time. Students should be given strong moral formation both at home and in school to instill common sense into students mind so that they become self-driven. It was also suggested that students be given more academic work as a way to discipline them and keep them busy. This indicates that teachers are in support of using cognitive strategy in disciplining students. It becomes very necessary to train teachers on a better cognitive strategy as suggested by Marvin Marshal (2004).

Supportive strategy such as employing professionals in schools for guidance and counseling and helping students get an individual guidance instead of group counseling was suggested by many teachers as well. This should be done by strengthening guidance and counseling unit in all schools to form the basis for disciplining students. They also suggest that parents should be involved in counseling their children and churches or other moral institutions to be involved in counseling students. More so, teachers are to understand students’ background, keep their profile and history in order to monitor their progress.
Table 4.11

Summary of teachers’ suggestions on how to improve discipline in Langata schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Teachers suggestions</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Supportive Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Employ professionals for guidance and counseling in schools</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Parents to be involved in their child’s counseling.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Train and encourage peer counseling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Understand students background, keep their history/profile and monitor their progress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Preventive strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Involve all stakeholders in formulating discipline policy, school rules, regulations and consequences</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Communicate and Dialogue with all stakeholders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Rules and regulations should be made clear to students before implementation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>Set discipline committees that must be active</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>Draft rules that must be strictly adhered</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>Have tough consequences for each rule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>Vet new students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>Set high standards for students from their day one of resumption</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>Set school culture that is wholistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.</td>
<td>Schools should form a strong PTA body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>Use school uniform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>Use of routine in classrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Punitive/ Reward strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii.</td>
<td>Reintroduce corporal punishment with regulations and monitoring</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii.</td>
<td>Denying students of privileges and physiological needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix.</td>
<td>Use of suspension and expulsion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx.</td>
<td>Reward good behaviour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cognitive strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.</td>
<td>Use of cognitive approach such as mentoring, motivational talks, teaching students social skills, self awareness and leadership skills</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii.</td>
<td>Use academic work to discipline students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiii.</td>
<td>Give students moral formation both at home and in school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Corrective Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv.</td>
<td>Consistency in handling indiscipline cases in fairness to avoid compromising</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv.</td>
<td>Help students to understand their mistakes and the reason for punishing them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvi.</td>
<td>Pay attention to students and use positive reinforcement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers’ suggestion on the use of supportive strategy is in line with what is required in the policy document of Department of Education and Children’s Services (2007). They emphasized more on involving all stakeholders in students’ discipline which will go a long way in making students discipline a whole school community affair.

This was followed by preventive/proactive strategy such as involving students, teachers, parents and all other stakeholders in formulating discipline policy, school rules, regulations and the consequences. This will help in getting full support of all stakeholders. The agreed upon rules must be strictly adhered to. It was also suggested that the rules and consequences should be made clear to students before implementation. This is in line with what Canter and Canter (1992) requires of teachers in there assertive discipline theory. Setting rules and regulations and involving students in the process will help in making students become more responsible and own the rules and regulations with its consequences.

The next suggestion that has weight for teachers was reintroduction of corporal punishment which they also said should be monitored and regulated. They suggest that the law on corporal punishment should be amended. Other punitive strategies suggested by teachers include: Denying students of privileges’ and physiological needs such as food and the use of suspension and expulsion. Teachers who are in support of corporal punishment are mostly those who believe that they were helped during their school days because they were disciplined with corporal punishment. It become necessary to help these teachers by training them in other approaches to students’ discipline which they attested is very effective. They need to have trust in the new approaches and also know that there is a great generation gap between their time and today.
Other suggestions include schools to form discipline committee that must be active. Students are to be trained as peer counselors. Schools should set high standards for students, do thorough vetting of students before intake, and set school culture that is wholistic. Corrective measures such as being consistent in handling discipline cases in fairness to avoid compromising and helping students to understand their misconduct and the reason for punishing them. Rewarding of good behaviour should be included in school discipline policy as a positive reinforcement for students.

Furthermore, use of school uniform and use of routine in classrooms should serve as a disciplinary measure. Teachers need to be close enough and pay attention to students in order to monitor their behaviour properly and also be good examples to them. Teachers Dialogue with students, parents and other stake holders and communicate discipline issues properly to them. Teachers should be objective in judging discipline cases and be fair and consistent in applying consequences.

**4.5 Hypothesis Testing**

Two hypotheses were tested on the strategies teachers adopt in managing students discipline. The first hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between teachers' strategies to discipline when categorized by gender in Langata District secondary schools. The second hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between teachers' strategies to discipline when classified by school ownership.

Chi-square test of independence was used in analyzing the data using SPSS program. The result produced indicated the Pearson Chi-square which is the calculated Chi-square, the degree of freedom and the P-value which is also known as the significance value.
**Alpha value:** This is measured at 0.05 and the tests of significance were measured using p-value against the Alpha value of 0.05. The choice of alpha 0.05 is mostly because this research is a social science work and it mostly uses 95% of confidence level which accounts for 0.05 Alpha levels.

**Decision rule:** The rule of rejection is when p-value is less than or equal to 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is significant difference between the variables being tested.

4.5.1 Discipline Strategy and Gender

There are six major strategies which were used to test the hypothesis. These strategies involve preventive/proactive strategy, supportive strategy, corrective strategy, punitive strategy, reward strategy and cognitive strategy. The null hypothesis tested is stated as follows;

**$H_0$:** There is no significant difference in teachers discipline strategies in Langata Secondary schools when categorized by gender.

**Preventive Strategy**

Three preventive strategies where tested. Preventive strategy one is on making clear rules for students. Preventive strategy two deals with planning suitable and clear consequences for each rule and preventive strategy three is involving students in making class rules and setting consequences. Table 4.12 shows the result of the hypothesis testing on preventive strategy when categorized by gender.
Table 4.12

Chi-Square Tests of Preventive Strategy by Gender of the Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive strategy</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df.</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Strategy Two</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df.</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Strategy Three</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.443c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of valid cases is 92

a. 4 cells 66.7% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.
b. 4 cells 66.7% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.21.
c. 4 cells 66.7% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.

In table 4.12 the result on three preventive strategies are as follows; preventive strategy one has the chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistic calculated to be 1.443 at 2 degree of freedom (df). The significance value (p) associated with the data was 0.486. Since p>0.05 we fail to reject the $H_0$: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ strategies to discipline when categorized by gender in Langata secondary schools.

Preventive strategy two has ($\chi^2$) statistic calculated to be 0.395 and df is 2 while the p-value is 0.821. since p>0.05 we fail to reject the $H_0$. More so, the Preventive Strategy Three has ($\chi^2$) statistic calculated as 1.443 and df = 2. The P-value = 0.486.

**Result:** the p-Values of the three preventive strategies are greater (> ) than Alpha 0.05.
**Decision:** From the results in the three preventive strategies the Null hypothesis is not rejected.

**Conclusion:** This means that there is no significant difference between the preventive strategy of Male and Female teachers. Therefore both male and female teachers have similar approach on preventive strategies.

**Corrective Strategy**

The corrective strategies tested where two which includes corrective strategy one: teachers consistently apply consequences with students who break the rules. Corrective strategy two involves reprimanding students openly.

Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrective Strategies</th>
<th>Corrective Strategy One</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.061^a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrective Strategy Two</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.567^b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of valid cases is 92

a. 2 cells 33.3% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.21.

b. 2 cells 33.3% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.

Two corrective strategies were studied and the results were presented in table 4.13. From the findings the $\chi^2$ calculated is 1.061 and 1.567 for the first and second Corrective strategies respectively. Their P-value at 2 degree of freedom each is 0.588 and 0.594.

**Result:** p-Values are greater than the Alpha ($\alpha$) 0.05.

**Decision:** Then the Null Hypothesis ($H_0$) is not rejected.
Conclusion: This shows that there is no significant difference in the corrective strategies adopted by both male and female teachers.

Punitive strategy

Three punitive strategies which were tested include punitive strategy one- use of physical punishment, punitive strategy two- sending students out of the classroom and punitive strategy three- send students on suspension.

Table 4.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Punitive strategies</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.107^a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Punitive Strategy Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Punitive strategies</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.530^b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Punitive Strategy Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Punitive strategies</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.861^c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of valid cases is 92

a. 4 cells 66.7% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.

b. 2 cells 33.3% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

c. 2 cells 33.3% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.01.

The punitive strategies that were studied using question numbers 14, 17 and 18 yielded the following results as presented in Table 4.14. Punitive Strategy One has $\chi^2$ calculated at 0.107 and p-value is 0.948. Punitive Strategy Two has $\chi^2$ calculated at 1.530 and p-value is 0.465 and Punitive Strategy Three has $\chi^2$ calculated at 0.861 and p-value is 0.650. All is at 2 degree of freedom.
**Result:** The three Punitive strategy has p>0.05

**Decision:** since p-Value is greater than the alpha 0.05 therefore, the Null hypothesis is not rejected.

**Conclusion:** there is no significant different in punitive strategy when categorized by gender. This implies that both male and female teachers use the same punitive strategies.

**Reward Strategy**

One reward strategy was tested and the result is shown in Table 4.15 as follows:

Table 4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward strategy</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.307</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of Valid Cases is 92

a. 2 cells 33.3% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.

The reward strategy on table 4.15 has Chi-square calculated as 2.346 and the degree of freedom is 2 with p-value at 0.309.

**Result:** p-value> 0.05

**Decision:** Since the p-value is greater than alpha 0.05 the Null Hypothesis is not rejected.

**Conclusion:** Therefore, there is no significant difference in reward strategy between the male and female teachers.

**Cognitive strategy**

Four cognitive strategies were used to test if there is any significant difference in teachers’ strategies when categorized by gender. Cognitive strategy one deals with teaching students social skills. Cognitive strategy two is on guiding students to make good behaviour choices.
Cognitive strategy three is on organizing class meetings to discuss vital behaviour lessons and
cognitive strategy four deals with monitoring students’ behaviour by checking their progress
over time.

Table 4.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Strategy One</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.430a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.419</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Strategy Two</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.503b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Strategy Three</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.337c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Strategy Four</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.503d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of valid cases is 92.

a. 2 cells 33.3% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.61.
b. 4 cells 66.7% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.
c. 3 cells 50.0% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.
d. 4 cells 66.7% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

Four cognitive strategies were studied and the results for its hypothesis tested were presented
in table 4.16. The $\chi^2$ calculated are 2.430, 1.503, 0.337 and 1.503 and the p-values are 0.297,
0.472, 0.845 and 0.472 respectively at 2 degree of freedom.

**Result:** From all the four cognitive strategies their p-values>0.05 therefore.
Decision: The Null hypothesis is rejected.

Conclusion: There is no significant difference in cognitive strategies by gender.

Supportive Strategy

Three supportive strategies which were tested against gender include use of guidance and counseling, listening to students to understand why they behave the way they do and maintaining a written record to help in tracking students’ behaviour. These were represented in table 4.18 as supportive strategy one, two and three respectively.

Table 4.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests of Supportive Strategy by Gender of the Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Strategy One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Strategy Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Strategy Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: number of valid cases is 92

a. 4 cells 66.7% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.21.

b. 4 cells 66.7% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.

c. 4 cells 66.7% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.

Table 4.17 shows the chi-square analysis results for three supportive strategies when categorized by gender. The $\chi^2$ calculated are 1.268, 0.962 and 0.200 and the p-values are 0.531, 0.618 and 0.905 respectively and all the three supportive strategies have 2 degree of freedom.
Result: p-value >0.05 in all three supportive strategies

Decision: Thus, the Null Hypothesis is not rejected.

Conclusion: Therefore there is no significant difference in supportive strategies adopted by male and female teachers in disciplining students in Langata Secondary schools.

From all the strategies analyzed results showed that there is no significant difference in strategies adopted by male and female teachers in Langata Secondary schools. This is in contrast with the findings of Oplatka and Atias (2007) who studied the gender view of school principals in India on discipline management. Their findings show a difference in discipline management between the male and female principals.

4.5.2 Discipline Strategies and School Ownership

Further hypothesis testing on the relationship between the strategies adopted by teachers in disciplining students’ in schools when classified by school ownership was done using the same six different strategies which are preventive/proactive strategy, punitive strategy, reward strategy, corrective strategy, cognitive strategy and supportive strategy. These strategies are already being described in the previous section 4.5.1. The findings are shown in different tables under each strategy. The null hypothesis tested is stated as follows;

\( H_0 \): There is no significant difference in teachers discipline strategies in Langata Secondary schools when categorized by school ownership.
Preventive Strategy

Preventive strategies one, two and three are already described in the previous section. Refer to section 4.5.1.

Table 4.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Strategy</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Strategy One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.301(^a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.861</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Strategy Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.956(^b)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>8.130</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Strategy Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.668(^c)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of valid cases is 92

- a. 7 cells 77.8% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.
- b. 6 cells 66.7% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.
- c. 5 cells 55.6% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

The three preventive strategies studied and analyzed have \( \chi^2 \) calculated as 1.301, 8.906 and 0.668 while their p-values are 0.861, 0.062, 0.955 and the degree of freedom for the three strategies is 4. From all the Preventive strategies the p-values > 0.05

**Decision:** The Null hypothesis is not rejected.

**Conclusion:** Thus there is no significant relationship between teachers’ preventive strategies and school ownership.
**Corrective Strategy**

Corrective strategies one and two are already described in the previous section. Refer to section 4.5.1.

Table 4.19

*Chi-square Test for Corrective Strategy and School Ownership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrective strategy</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corrective Strategy one</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.891</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.644</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corrective Strategy two</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.981</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.316</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: number of valid cases is 92

a. 5 cells 55.6% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

b. 5 cells 55.6% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

Two corrective strategies studied have $\chi^2$ calculated as 4.891 and 1.981 with p-values as 0.299 and 0.456 respectively. The degree of freedom is 4.

**Result:** The p-values > 0.05

**Decision:** Thus the Null hypothesis is not rejected.

**Conclusion:** There is no significant difference in corrective strategies when classified by school ownership. This shows that both private and public school use similar corrective strategies.

**Punitive Strategy**

Punitive strategies one, two and three are already described in the previous section. Refer to section 4.5.1.
### Table 4.20

**Chi-square Test for Punitive Strategy and School Ownership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Punitive strategies</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.521&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Punitive Strategy Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>3.632&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>4.043</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Punitive Strategy Three</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.810&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Number of valid cases is 92

a. 7 cells 77.8% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

b. 5 cells 55.6% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

c. 5 cells 55.6% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

Three punitive strategies were also studied and the Chi-squares are 0.521, 3.632 and 0.810 with p-values at 0.971, 0.458 and 0.937 respectively. The degree of freedom was 4 in all the three strategies.

**Result:** The p-values are > 0.05

**Decision:** Therefore the Null hypothesis is not rejected.

**Conclusion:** There is no significant difference in punitive strategies when classified by school ownership.

**Supportive Strategy**

All three supportive strategies are described in the previous section. Refer to section 4.5.1. The result of the relationship of supportive strategy and school ownership is shown in Table 4.21
### Table 4.21

**Chi-square Test for Supportive Strategy and School Ownership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive strategies</th>
<th>Supportive Strategy One</th>
<th>Supportive Strategy Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.915(^a)</td>
<td>2.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Strategy Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.791(^b)</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Number of valid cases is 92

a. 7 cells 77.8% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

b. 7 cells 77.8% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

c. 7 cells 77.8% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

The supportive strategies have $\chi^2$ calculated as 2.915, 0.791 and 0.996 with p-values at 0.572, 0.940 and 0.910 respectively. Their degree of freedom is 4.

**Result:** The p-values are $> 0.05$

**Decision:** Thus the Null hypothesis is not rejected.

**Cognitive Strategy**

Cognitive strategies one, two, three and four are described in the previous section. Refer to section 4.5.1. The findings on the relationship of teachers’ cognitive strategy and school ownership are represented in Table 4.22.
Table 4.22

*Chi-square Test for Cognitive Strategy and School Ownership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive strategies</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive strategy One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.677(^a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive strategy Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.973(^b)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>4.816</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive strategy three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.704(^c)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive strategy Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.809(^d)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of valid cases is 92

a. 5 cells 55.6% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

b. 7 cells 77.8% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

c. 6 cells 66.7% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

d. 7 cells 77.8% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

There are four cognitive strategies with Chi-square calculated as 1.677, 4.973, 0.704 and 2.809 with p-values at 0.795, 0.290, and 0.951 respectively. Their degree of freedom is 4 for each strategy.

**Result:** The four p-values were > 0.05

**Decision:** Thus the Null hypothesis is rejected.

**Conclusion:** There is no significant difference in teachers’ cognitive strategies when categorized by school ownership.
**Reward Strategy**

Reward strategy has already been described in the previous section. Refer to section 4.5.1.

Table 4.23

**Chi-square Test for Reward Strategy and School Ownership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward strategy</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.252</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>7.883</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of valid cases is 92

a. 5 cells 55.6% have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

The reward strategy has $\chi^2$ calculated as 8.252 with degree of freedom at 4 and the p-value at 0.083.

**Result:** The p-value is $> 0.05$.

**Decision:** Therefore the Null hypothesis is rejected.

**Conclusion:** Thus there is a significant difference in discipline strategies adopted by teachers when categorized according to school ownership.

**Conclusion:** Therefore, there is no significant difference in relationship between the teachers’ supportive strategies when categorized by school ownership.

### 4.6 Document Analysis

Documents received from various schools include school discipline policy documents, school rules and regulations/code of conduct. The researcher also checked out with schools about their Punishment and Reward Book generally referred to as the Black book. Table 4.24 indicates that majority of the schools 11(91.66%) keep track record of students’ punishment. The book has clear records of major and minor offences and the kind of punishment meted out on the individual student or group of students.
School discipline policy document was collected from 1(8%) schools. Many of the schools surveyed at the moment said that they are still drafting their school policy document and some said that they only have school rules and regulations. Out of the 12 schools visited 9(75%) gave their school rules and regulations. Others did not give because they were not permitted to release such information without the school board authority giving their consent.

**Punishment/Reward Book**

All the schools visited keep track record of minor, major and gross misconducts of students and the punishments given to them. Some minor misconduct that was recorded in the black book includes lateness to school, wearing non school items, noise making, and sluggishness. The major misconducts found in the books include disobedient, insolence, abusive behaviour and absenteeism, absconding from class and cheating in any test or exam. Gross misconducts include possession of dangerous weapons and drugs, vandalism, theft, fraudulent acts, assault and plagiarism.
Table 4.25

Summary of Black Book Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misconduct</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateness to school, wearing non school items, noise making, and sluggishness</td>
<td>Detention to do some duties, confiscation of banned items and giving the student more academic work to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobedient, insolence, abusive behaviour and absenteeism, absconding from class and cheating in any test or exam</td>
<td>Multiple detentions, loss of privileges and suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of dangerous weapons and drugs, vandalism, theft, fraudulent acts, assault and plagiarism.</td>
<td>Cleaning school hall, washing corridors, school dormitories and classrooms and expulsion or longer suspension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different forms of punishments were recorded for the different levels of misconducts. Punishments meted for minor misconducts include detention to do some duties, confiscation of banned items and giving the student more academic work to do. Major misconducts incurred multiple detentions, loss of privileges and suspension. While gross misconducts attracts serious action and heavy punishments such as cleaning school hall, washing corridors, school dormitories and classrooms and expulsion or longer suspension.

School Code of Conduct/Rules and Regulations

School rules and regulations and code of conduct were collected from nine schools. Majority of the school rules and regulations are written in negative clause using ‘should and should
only one school has its rules expressed in positive clauses such as ‘be safe, respectful and responsible’, ‘keep the school environment clean’ etc. The distribution of discipline strategies as found in different school rules and regulations are shown in Table 4.26.

Table 4.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punitive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strategy that dominated the school rules and regulation in most Langata schools is punitive strategy. This strategy involves in major cases suspension or expulsion, surcharge, and physical punishment. The only supportive strategy mentioned by one of the schools is bringing parents to school to discuss the discipline case. There is one cognitive strategy also mentioned by one of the schools on giving a student more academic work/literature.

School Discipline Policy and DECS Discipline Policy

The DECS (2007) policy on school discipline is stipulated in four major clauses. These clauses are as follows: schools are to focus on providing opportunities and support for students success, school are to help students develop acceptance of responsibility for their own behaviours, they are to involve staff, parents and caregivers in developing safe, caring, orderly and productive learning environment and each school should develop a behaviour code in partnership with all stakeholders. These clauses have many other points under it.
which helped the researcher to compare the individual school policy document with the Department of Education Children’ Services (DECS, 2007) school discipline policy. The similarities and differences from the two documents were drawn out as presented in table 4.27 as follows:

Table 4.27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools to create Safe learning environment</td>
<td>Consequences are mostly physical punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve families in discipline</td>
<td>School have no consequences for good behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have well defined rules and consequences for irresponsible behaviour</td>
<td>Involving all stakeholders especially students in formulating school rules and consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following due process in suspending or excluding students</td>
<td>Students to have access to services and agencies that will support them in developing responsible behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach students social skills and values of honesty, trust, respect and corporation across the curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DECS (2007) policy on school discipline states that schools are to create learning communities that are safe, inclusive, conducive to learning and free from harassment and bullying. This was captured in the individual school policy document. The involvement of the student and families when responding to inappropriate behaviour was also in line with number one clause, bullet five of DECS policy statement. Individual schools have well developed school codes and consequences for irresponsible behaviours but have no consequences for responsible behaviours. The need to follow due process was also there in the school policy document.
However, there are some differences found between the DECS policy statements and individual schools discipline policy. DECS stipulates that consequences must be non-violent and they described non-violent as responses to behaviour which do not involve any kind of physical punishment, emotional hurt or verbal harassment. Some of the consequences stipulated in schools policy documents have well planned physical punishments. There is no area in the individual school policy statement that has any supportive strategy in plan as is stipulated under DECS clause number 2 bullets 7. There are no cognitive strategies also in the individual school policy document which is well defined in clause two bullets 5 and 6.

From the findings in comparing the Kenyan government policy document as stipulated by the Department of education and children’s services 2007 and the individual school policy document it became evident that what is so prevalent in the individual policy document is punitive strategy and preventive strategy. Other important strategies such as cognitive and supportive strategy are not included in their discipline policy.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

5.0 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the findings and makes conclusions based on the research questions of the study. It also made recommendations based on the findings on the strategies teachers adopt in managing students’ behaviour and on their challenges in using alternative discipline approaches and teachers suggestions on how to improve discipline situations in their schools.

5.1 Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the strategies adopted by teachers to manage students’ behaviour in Langata district Secondary schools. The different strategies were categorized into five such as preventive/proactive strategy, punitive/reward strategy, corrective strategy, cognitive strategy and supportive strategy.

The study made use of mixed paradigm research using mostly survey research design and phenomenology. The target population was teachers, principals and deputy principals in Langata secondary schools. It sampled 92 teachers using stratified sampling technique and through automatic inclusion 11 principals and 10 discipline masters/mistresses who were the deputy principals were sampled as well. The private schools were sampled using stratified technique while the public schools were automatically included. Data were collected using three instruments- questionnaire, semi structured interview and document analysis.

Data collected were analyzed using descriptive method and thematic approach. The quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS for windows. The hypotheses were tested using Chi-square test for independence.
Six research questions were used in this study. The first question was on the strategies male and female teachers use in disciplining students in Langata District Secondary schools. The study revealed that teachers use all the five strategies in varying degrees. The most widely used strategy which was shown from further findings includes punitive strategies and supportive strategies.

The second question sought to explore the effectiveness of these strategies. The findings from teachers when ranked with highest number of respondents in each strategy shows that cognitive strategy came 1st followed by supportive strategy, 3rd was preventive strategy, 4th was reward strategy followed by corrective strategy and the last in effectiveness was punitive strategy. Moreover, the principals ranked reward 1st, followed by Supportive strategy as 2nd, then cognitive and corrective as 3rd in effectiveness then preventive and the last was punitive.

The third question intended to find out if schools discipline approaches are in resonance with what was prescribed in the Kenya school discipline policy document of the Department of Education and Children’s Services (DECS). The findings showed that majority of teachers and schools practice the discipline strategies outlined in the DECS policy document.

Fourth question explores the influence of teachers past and present experiences in their choice of discipline strategies. Majority of the teachers were disciplined using corporal punishment and many other physical punishments. Very negligible numbers were supported through guidance and counseling and through corrective measures. Results shows that most teachers use the same physical punishments that were used in disciplining them which they agreed were helpful in shaping their lives to discipline students except the use of corporal
punishment which was outlawed. Only few teachers do not like the strategies used by their teachers to discipline them which they said were cruel and oppressive.

The fifth question explored the challenges teachers are facing in disciplining students using other approaches to discipline since the ban of corporal punishment. The challenges includes: increase in students indiscipline, lack of support from parents, alternative approaches are found to be time consuming, demanding and less effective. Too much child right tend to tie teachers, too much administrative control, lack of an outline from the ministry of education on application of alternative approaches to discipline. They noted that there was lack of support from colleagues and prefect bodies. Teachers were also being threatened by parents and students. There are diverse students’ background and upbringing and different understanding of the right way to discipline. There is soar relationship between teachers and students, ambiguity in the role of teachers in the area of discipline. Some students enjoy the simple punishment and the others tend to abscond from school when asked to fetch their parents, the upsurge of technology, lack of teachers' skills in counseling and lack of proper knowledge of students background and health history. Physically challenged students take advantage of their situation and misbehave. There is an overload of guidance and counseling unit. Teachers lack of trust in the modern approaches.

The last question sought for suggestions on how to improve discipline in schools. The different suggestions when categorized under different strategies have supportive strategies such as employing professionals to give students individual guidance instead of group counseling, involving stakeholders especially parents in their students counseling, training and encouraging peer counseling and understanding students background, their health history and monitor their progress.
They also suggested the use of preventive strategies such as dialogue with all stakeholders and getting full support from them. Students are to be involved in setting school rules and consequences and in reviewing them over time to help students become part of the decision making and owners of the discipline system. Setting of discipline committees that are functional and setting high standards for students starting from day one of their inception into school. New students are to be vetted and all students should be closely monitored.

Punitive strategies that were suggested included reintroduction of corporal punishment and physical punishment with regulations, denying students of privileges and physiological needs such as food and use of suspension and expulsion.

Use of cognitive strategies was also suggested by some teachers like use of mentoring and exchange programs to build students social skills. They also suggested that students should be trained on self-awareness and leadership skills. Inviting very important persons or resource persons from the society to give students motivational talks was also suggested. Students should be given moral formation both at home and in school. Using academic work to discipline students and training students to help them become self-driven.

Two corrective strategies were suggested by teachers as well; that teachers should handle indiscipline cases in fairness and avoid compromising. Teachers to help students understand their misconduct and the reason they are being punished. They also suggested the use of reward as a discipline strategy.

Two hypotheses that were tested showed that there are no significant relationships between discipline strategies adopted by teachers when categorized by gender and school ownership.
5.2 Conclusions

From the investigations done it became evident that teachers in Langata schools use all the strategies in varying degrees but most prevalent method used was Punitive Strategy. This was so evident from their responses on other strategies which they use in disciplining students and from the documents analyzed.

In as much as punitive strategy was widely used in schools, most teachers and principals rated it as moderately effective and a good number of teachers also saw it as ineffective in combating indiscipline in schools. This could be attributed to what majority of the teachers and principals highlighted as their major challenges in disciplining students after the ban of corporal punishment. They saw students as not affected when punished because they are used to the small and minor physical punishments given to them.

Findings also shows that the schools discipline strategies which teachers are using in Langata are in resonance with what the DECS policy document on school discipline requires. Further exploration into how teachers’ experiences both past and present influence their strategy showed that most teachers who were disciplined using some physical punishments such as deprived privileges and food use the same strategy in disciplining student. They believed that they were formed and helped to become who they are today because of how they were disciplined. Some few teachers saw it as unhelpful because they were punished heavily which made them become more defiant and rebellious. Those teachers who were in favour of physical punishments are in favour of reintroduction of corporal punishment which should be monitored and regulated. Thus teachers experience of discipline as students affect their choice of strategy in disciplining students.
However, the major challenge that teachers are facing in using alternative approaches to discipline is that it is time consuming and slow in effectiveness. There is also lack of corporation from parents and guidance. Their differences in understanding of how to discipline students brings about strained relationships between teacher to teacher, to family, to students and to school administration.

Upon suggesting how discipline should be improved in schools. Majority suggested partnering with all stakeholders in formulating a system of discipline that will be of help to the entire school community. They also suggested that enough professionals be employed to carry out the guidance and counseling of students in schools.

5.3 Recommendations

From the results and findings of this study the researcher recommends the following:

• That each school without discipline policy should make an effort to produce a comprehensive policy document on student discipline for their individual schools as soon as possible. This was as a result that majority of sampled schools have no policy document on school discipline.

• A whole school community approach will help provide a school environment which is safe and conducive for learning. To provide a whole school community approach schools should make sure that all stakeholders such as teachers, students, parents, school management and school community representatives are involved in setting and reviewing the discipline policy, rule and code of conduct that are used in individual schools. Reviewing of the discipline documents should be once in every three years. This is in accordance with what is stipulated in DECS, 2007 policy document on school discipline. Partnering of all stakeholders is very important because it will help
each member to own what is in the policy since they were fully involved in formulating it.

- All school staffs especially the teachers and the administrators should be given more training and workshops annually on the modern discipline models that are very effective. This will help them to become better informed on the use of discipline approaches that work effectively. It will also help them to learn a better way of applying them in the classroom level and in school wide level.

- Schools should also organize training for students on social skills and self awareness annually to help them in becoming more responsible. Teachers also should continuously teach students core values of life by incorporating within their curriculum lessons that will aid students develop responsible behaviour. They also should serve as a model to the students.

- Ministry of Education should provide guidelines for teachers on proper discipline strategies to be used in schools and also facilitate teachers training on the use of the designed strategies to help them in implementation of it without much trouble.

- The Ministry of Education should call for a review of the various child rights which has put the teachers in an awkward situation and has tied them from exercising their right to discipline students. This should be done as soon as possible. This recommendation was due to one of the challenges mentioned by the teachers on too much child right and threat from parents and students to sue teachers.

- Schools should adopt Marvin Marshals’ discipline without stress, punishment or reward and Curwin and Mendler’s Discipline with Dignity which are mostly embedded on cognitive strategy and values. This recommendation was as a result of
the findings that most teachers rated the cognitive strategy 1st in effectiveness followed by supportive strategy. Also in their suggestions on how to improve discipline in schools cognitive strategy was suggested by many teachers as well.

5.4 Recommendations for Further Studies

The researcher based on the findings recommends that further studies be carried out on the following topics:

- Challenges faced by teachers in disciplining students in Langata Secondary school and its relationship on their level of training on the use of alternative approaches to discipline. This was as a result of one of the challenges teachers pointed out in this study which was that teachers lack the appropriate skills for alternative approaches such as guidance and counseling.

- Relationship between African cultures in social skills and teachers’ choice of discipline strategy in relation to alternative strategies. This came about from one of the challenges mentioned in the findings about cultural gap.

- Since this study dealt only with teachers view on effectiveness of different discipline strategies it became necessary that further studies should look at both the Students and teachers view on effectiveness of different strategies used in schools to discipline students.
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APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE LETTER

Post Graduate Studies in Education
Faculty of Education
Catholic University of Eastern Africa
Nairobi
17th May, 2013.

Dear Respondent,

I am a post graduate student of The Catholic University of Eastern Africa. I am carrying out a research on the topic “Strategies adopted by educators to maintain discipline in secondary schools at Langata district, Nairobi, Kenya”. Be assured that your responses will be treated confidentially.

Thanks for your anticipated cooperation.

Yours faithfully

Angela Igwe (MSHR)
APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

You are please requested to indicate your opinion on the appropriate spaces provided below.

Section A: Demographic Information

1. School: Private [ ] public [ ]
2. Students: Girls only [ ] Boys only [ ] Mixed [ ]
3. Gender: male [ ] female [ ]
4. Age: 25-30yrs [ ] 31-35yrs [ ] 36-40 [ ] 40-45yrs [ ] 46-50yrs [ ] 51-55yrs [ ] 56-60yrs [ ] 61 and above [ ]
5. Designation: Form mistress/master [ ] Teacher [ ] School discipline master/mistress [ ]
6. Qualification______________
7. No. of Years in teaching profession______________
8. Average No. of students taught in a class___________
9. No. of allotted periods per week______________

Section B: What Are Teachers’ Strategies To Discipline Students In Langata District?

Please tick (√) to indicate your honest opinion on the following discipline strategies in your school.

Do you use the following strategies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline strategies</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Make clear rules for the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Plan suitable and clear consequences for each rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teach students class rules and consequences and make sure they understand them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Consistently apply consequences with students who break the rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Punish students who misbehave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Reward students for good behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Involve students in making class rules and setting consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Send students out of class when they are in the habit of disrupting the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Students are sent on suspension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Send students to guidance and counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Guide students to make good behaviour choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Organize class meeting to discuss vital behaviour lessons with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Reprimand students in public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Let parents know the class rules and consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Listen to students to understand what make them behave the way they do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Maintain written records of specific events to assist you in tracking students’ behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Monitor students’ behaviour by checking their progress over time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. What other strategies do you use in disciplining students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C: How Effective are Teachers’ Strategies in Instilling Discipline in Schools

Please tick (√) to indicate your opinion on how effective the strategies below are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of strategies</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Moderately effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Rewarding students when they behave well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Correcting students by using positive interventions such as giving them more class work to do and helping them develop individual behaviour plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Creating rules and consequences for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Punishing students when they misbehave using physical punishments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Counseling students and giving them guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Supporting students to make positive changes by teaching them social skills and moral values for responsible behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. What other strategies do you think works very effectively for you aside those listed above?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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Section D: How are the Discipline Strategies Adopted in Langata Secondary Schools in Resonance with the Kenyan Government Policy on School Discipline?

Please tick (√) to indicate your opinion on the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question 3 DECS Policy and Strategy</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Explain your reasons in each case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. BOM, Teachers, Students are always involved in deciding the code of conducts for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Students are taught the skills to enable them take part in development, implementation and review of school’s behaviour codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Students are taught social responsibility across the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I teach students the values of honesty, trust, respect and cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Our school has consequences for both responsible and irresponsible behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Consequences are applied consistently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Our school has a well established expectations for the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Students with serious problem behaviour are given special support by Department of Education and Children’s services (DECS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section E: How Do Teachers’ Past and Present Lives Experiences Influence Their Strategy To Discipline In Langata Secondary Schools?

Please tick (✓) to show your agreement or disagreement to the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educators Experience</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. How I was groomed growing up helped me a lot and I like using the same method to discipline my students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I hate giving students physical punishment because it never helped me as a student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I decide on what kind of punishment or reward to give to a student as the incidence happen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I follow strictly the rules and stipulated consequences for each offence or good behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. Explain how you were disciplined as a student and indicate whether it was helpful or not helpful to you

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Section F: In What Ways Are Teachers Challenged In Practicing Alternative Discipline Approaches?

48. What challenges do you face in trying to discipline students using other approaches aside corporal punishment?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Section G: What are the Suggestions of Teachers for the Best Way to Instill Discipline?

49. Please give some suggestions on how to improve students discipline in your school

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX 3

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Section A: Demographic Information

1. School: Private [ ] public [ ]

2. Students: Girls only [ ] Boys only [ ] Mixed [ ]

3. Gender: male [ ] female [ ]

4. Age: 25-30yrs [ ] 31-35yrs [ ] 36-40 [ ] 40-45yrs [ ] 46-50yrs [ ] 51-55yrs [ ]
   56-60yrs [ ] 61 and above [ ]

5. Qualification_________________

6. Number of Years in teaching profession ______________________

7. Total Number of students in school_________________

SECTION B: What Discipline Strategies are adopted by Principals?

Please tick (√) to indicate your honest opinion on your use of the following discipline strategies in your school.

Do you use the following discipline strategies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline Strategies</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. There is a school wide code of conduct for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have a well planned reward and consequences for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I involve students in decision making when planning for students school code of conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I give students punishment when they are in the habit of being referred to my office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I expel students whose misconduct is grievous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I reward student’s when they behave well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I organize workshops to train teachers on alternative approaches to discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Parents, Teachers and BOM has each a copy of school discipline document and government policy on school discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>We have a functional guidance and counseling office and I send students with serious discipline problem to get special support services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>We communicate the school rules and regulation to teachers, students and parents through school assembly, School news letter and handbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. What other strategies do you use in disciplining students?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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### Section C: How Effective are Teachers’ Strategies in Instilling Discipline in Secondary Schools in Langata District?

Please tick (√) to indicate your opinion on how effective the strategies below are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of strategies</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Moderately effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Rewarding students when they behave well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Correcting students by using positive interventions such as giving them more class work to do and helping them develop individual behaviour plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Creating rules and consequences for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Punishing students when they misbehave using physical punishments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Counseling students and giving them guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Supporting students to make positive changes by teaching them social skills and moral values for responsible behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. What other strategies do you think works very effectively for you aside those listed above?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
## SECTION D: Department of Education and Children’s Services’ policy and Principals discipline strategy. Please tick (√) to indicate your opinion on the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECS Policy and Strategy</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Explain your reason in each case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Are Board of Managers, Teachers, and Students always involved in deciding the code of conducts for students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Are Students taught the skills to enable them take part in development, implementation and review of school’s behaviour codes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Are Students taught social responsibility across the curriculum?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Do you teach students the values of honesty, trust, respect and cooperation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Do you have general school consequences for both responsible and irresponsible behaviour?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Are those Consequences are applied consistently?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Does your school have well established expectations for students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Section E: Teachers Past and Present Experience. Please tick (√) to show your agreement or disagreement to the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educators experience</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. Did your teachers use cane and other physical punishment to discipline you when you were a student?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Did you like how you were disciplined growing up?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Do you like using the same method to discipline your students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I hate giving students physical punishment because it never helped me as a student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. I decide on what kind of punishment or reward to give to a student as the incident happen.

38. I follow strictly the rules and stipulated consequences for each offence or good behaviour

39. Explain how you were disciplined as a student and indicate whether it was helpful or not helpful to you

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

Section F: In What Ways Are Teachers Challenged In Practicing Alternative Discipline Approaches?

40. What challenges do you face in trying to discipline students using other approaches aside corporal punishment?

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________
Section G: What are the Suggestions of Teachers for the Best Way to Instill Discipline?

41. Please give some suggestions on how to improve discipline in your school

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX 4

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SCHOOL DISCIPLINE MASTER/MISTRESS

1. What strategies do you use in disciplining students?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2. Which of the strategies work best for you? Please give your reasons

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

DECS student discipline Policy and School Discipline strategy

3. Do you know about school discipline policy document provided by the Department of Education and Children’s services? If yes how do you implement it in your school? please give your reasons for each answer

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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Educators past and present experience

4. What were your experiences like in terms of how you were disciplined as a student?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

5. A. Do you like how you were disciplined as a student?
   Yes (   )                                    No (   )
   B. If No give reasons,
   Yes (   )                                    No (   )
   C. if yes, do you use similar strategy in disciplining your students’ today? Give reasons for your answer
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

Challenges teachers face in disciplining students.

6. What are the challenges you get in trying to discipline students after the ban of corporal punishment?
   I. From students
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
II. From teachers

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

III. From parents

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

IV. From Board of management

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

7. What suggestions can you give on how to improve school discipline?

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________
## APPENDIX 5

### Document Analysis Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Document to be analyzed</th>
<th>Analysis Detail</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Government policy document on school discipline</td>
<td>Check out the similarities and differences with schools policy on strategies to discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>School discipline policy</td>
<td>Check out the similarities and differences with government document on Strategies to discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>School rules and regulations/ code of conduct</td>
<td>Find out the Strategies to discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Punishment and Reward Book (Black Book)</td>
<td>To check if schools keep track of students behaviour as part of its discipline strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MAP OF KENYA REPUBLIC

Source: http://www.nationsonline.org/oneworld/map/kenya_map.htm
APPENDIX 7

MAP OF NAIROBI

The area marked out in black line is the Langata Division within Nairobi

Source: http://www.mapsofworld.com/kenya/cities/nairobi.html
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MAP OF LANGATA DIVISION

Source: http://www.flickr.com/photos/albertkenyaninima/6946038587/in/photostream/
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