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Students’ discipline is a major concern to many stakeholders globally. However, despite commitment of the government of Kenya to uphold both international and local trends of recognizing the rights of the child, the management of students’ discipline by use of alternative disciplinary methods in schools still remains largely unexplored. This study sought to investigate the effects of principals’ alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County, Kenya. The study objectives sought to establish the effect of principals’ use of peer counselling; suspension of indiscipline students; students’ expulsion and use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making on students’ discipline. The study was based on the Systems theory. Ex post facto research design was adopted. The target population for the study was 333 public secondary schools consisting of 333 Principals, 333 Deputy principals,1665 HoDs Guidance and Counselling, Board of Management (BoM) chairpersons, the County Director of Education and Kitui law courts Resident Magistrate. The sample size was obtained by stratified proportionate sampling procedure, purposive sampling and simple random sampling. The study sample size consisted of 101 public secondary schools consisting of Principals, Deputy Principals, HoDs Guidance and Counselling, 15 Board of Management members, Kitui County Director of Education and Kitui Law Courts Resident Magistrate. Purposive sampling was used to select some schools, HoDs guidance and Counselling, Kitui County Director of Education and Kitui Law Courts Resident Magistrate because of their number and because they had useful information in relation to this study. The total respondents for the study were 320. A test-re-test technique was used to test reliability. Data collection tools included questionnaires and interview guides. Data was analysed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze, tabulate and present data. Results of data gathered from closed ended and open ended items were reported in frequency tables, cross tabulation tables and explanation of the findings were made based on themes. The Chi-square($x^2$) test was used to determine the strength of association between alternative disciplinary methods and students’ discipline and to test whether the observed relationship is significant or not. The significance level was set at alpha = 0.05. The study established that peer counselling had the highest p-value 0.518. Students’ expulsion was rated second with p-value 0.491. Holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making was rated third with a p-value 0.373 while suspension of indiscipline students was rated fourth with a p-value 0.351. It was concluded that principals’ use of alternative disciplinary methods had no significant effect on students’ discipline. However, the study has revealed that Peer counselling has the strongest association with students discipline with a p-value 0.518 whereas suspension has the weakest relationship with students’ discipline with p-value of 0.351. The study recommends: review of disciplinary methods in schools and provision of policy guidelines on the best alternative disciplinary methods; strengthening the use of alternative disciplinary methods in management of students’ discipline. The study suggested a comparative study on perception of teachers and parents on corporal punishment and alternative disciplinary methods in the management of students’ discipline. This study could be significant in that it could provide an insight on the best practices and choices of appropriate alternative disciplinary methods to be used on students’ discipline in schools.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Students’ discipline is a major concern in many parts of the world (Cotton, 1990; Blandford, 1998; Stewart, 2004; Kindiki, 2009; Kiprop, 2012; Simatwa 2012; Maphosa & Shumba, 2010; Nene, 2013). According to Blandford (1998), there is a perceptible breakdown of school discipline worldwide. However, according to Reynolds (1989), the quality of students’ discipline is an important factor in determining the intellectual outcome of students and schools. This implies that school discipline is a key determiner of achievement of organizational goals.

Stewart (2004) notes that students’ discipline problems in Australia do manifest themselves in form of bullying, failure to pay attention in class, disrespect for other learners and staff or their property, fragrant breaching of school rules and regulations like inappropriate clothing. This is in conformity with Nene (2013) who said that learners are becoming more unruly and less respectful than they used to be in the past. Learner discipline problem has been characterised as serious and pervasive, negatively affecting student learning (Kasiem, Du Plessis & Loock, 2007; Leigh, Chenhall & Saunders, 2009; Tozer, 2010 & Rizzolo, 2004). This problem manifests itself in a variety of ways which include vandalism, truancy, smoking, disobedience, intimidation, delinquency, murder, assault, rape, theft and general violence (De Wet, 2003). This is consistent with Blandford (1998) who argued that indiscipline in schools could be caused by factors such as drug abuse, child abuse and neglect, community and media related violence all of which reverberate in many classrooms worldwide.
According to Cotton (1990), lack of discipline in public secondary schools in the United States of America (USA) has been identified as the most serious problem facing the nation’s educational system. The School discipline problems present themselves in form of drug usage, cheating, insubordination, truancy, intimidation which results into countless classroom disruptions. Cotton (1990) also argues that such discipline problems are responsible for a significant portion of loss of instructional time in USA for half of the classroom time is taken up by activities other than instruction. This implies that students spend much of their time servicing punishment hence compromising academic achievement.

Naong (2007) described indiscipline problems in South African schools as disproportionate and an intractable part of every teacher's experience of teaching. Marais and Meier (2010) reported that teachers in South Africa are becoming increasingly distressed about disciplinary problems in schools. It has been suggested that teachers link the growing problem of indiscipline in schools to the banning of corporal punishment in schools brought about by legislation, such as (The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 & The South African Schools Act, 1996).

According to the South African Schools Act (1996), corporal punishment was banned in South Africa since 1996. Despite its ban, recent studies in South Africa reveal that majority of learners still receive corporal punishment 14 years later after the ban of corporal punishment (Olivier, 2010). Kubeka (2004); Maphosa and Shumba (2010) argue that in the absence of corporal punishment, educators generally feel disempowered in their ability to maintain discipline in schools. This is consistent with Kivulu and Wandai (2009) noted that there is a growing concern that some teachers
are preoccupied and even obsessed with corporal punishment. Kilimci (2009) observes that teachers who use corporal punishment argue that the power to control learners is taken away from parents and teachers and this has also contributed to the high failure rate as there is a link between discipline and learner achievement. The teachers feeling of disempowerment after the ban of corporal punishment is an indicator of overreliance on corporal punishment in the management of school discipline in schools. This implies that the chances of reverting back to use of corporal punishment in order to manage students’ discipline are very high. However, in schools where there are no provisions for alternative disciplinary methods, the educators ought to explore other alternative disciplinary methods that could be deemed fit in the management of students discipline in schools in the absence of corporal punishment.

Corporal punishment was replaced by a discipline strategy called Alternatives to Corporal Punishment (ATCP) (Tungata, 2006). Alternatives like in-school suspension, more counsellors, psychologists, support groups and parental involvement were preferred by teachers as alternative discipline procedures (Cicognani, 2004). Tungata (2006) adds that teachers preferred positive alternatives to corporal punishment like parental involvement, manual work, application of school rules, enforcement of school code of conduct and educational counselling. Despite the introduction of ATCP research has shown that indiscipline in schools has continued to grow (Maphosa & Shumba, 2010). This implies that the ban of corporal punishment did not improve the state of school discipline nor the introduction of alternatives to corporal punishment.
Cicognani (2004) conducted a study which sought to explore teachers’ attitudes towards the ban of corporal punishment as well as the alternate discipline strategies teachers are using to discipline their learners in South Africa. The study indicated that although ATCP had been introduced, teachers were however not in favour of alternatives that needed to be supervised by them. The teachers were however concerned about their personal safety and felt that administering corporal punishment would ensure their safety. This implies lack of support for ACTP hence persistent use of corporal punishment in South Africa schools. This also means that teachers did not embrace the use of alternatives to corporal punishment hence an indicator of teachers’ resistance to change from use of corporal punishment.

Khewu (2012) conducted a study that sought to interrogate the consistency that prevails between disciplinary practices and principles of alternatives to corporal punishment and the implications of this for school leadership. The study found that principals’ roles in instilling discipline were focused mainly on reactive administrative and management functions rather than on giving leadership designed to inspire alternative ways of behaving. The principals and teachers’ belief in the use of alternatives to corporal punishment revealed ambivalence and lack of understanding. Disciplinary measures to instil discipline, even though they were said to be based on alternatives to corporal punishment, placed heavy emphasis on inflicting pain and relied on extrinsic control. This implies that although ATCP was introduced in schools, the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment encountered challenges such as resistance to change especially from teachers who were not willing to change and adapt to new practices. Another underlying reason could be lack of
adequate information as apertains to the implications of use of corporal punishment and the significance of using ACTP.

The abolition of corporal punishment in California, a state in Australia was replaced by suspension and expulsion (Brister, 1996). It is reported that between 1972 and 1973, one out of 13 students in United States had faced suspension (Harris & Benett, 1982). However, in some jurisdictions, corporal punishment is still used in Australia (Stewart, 2004). For instance, in the USA, there are still 30 states where corporal punishment is used (Brister, 1996). According to Nene (2013), alternative measures to corporal punishment were not very effective in curbing learner discipline in schools for it is difficult to choose and implement the correct alternatives to corporal punishment. This indicates that even after many years since the ban of corporal punishment in many states, use of alternative disciplinary procedures has not been fully embraced to manage students’ discipline in schools.

Corporal punishment is prohibited by International Instruments of which Kenya is a signatory. These include the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACRWC) of 1990 and the United Nations convention on the Rights of the child (UNCRC) of 1979. It is also prohibited by the local laws on Children’s Rights, and Basic Education Act ((Republic of Kenya, 2001 and Republic of Kenya, 2013). This implies that as a member, Kenya has to keep with international trends of recognising the rights of the child and the Kenyan laws on rights of the child. Therefore, the ban of corporal punishment implied an automatic switch to use of alternative disciplinary methods in the management of students discipline in secondary schools.
Ajowi and Simatwa (2010) in a study that sought to establish the role of Guidance and Counselling in promoting students discipline in secondary schools in Kenya noted a lack of teacher knowledge on alternative methods of maintaining discipline in schools. Kimani, Kara and Ogetange (2013) in a study that sought to investigate teachers’ views on persistent use of corporal punishment in managing discipline in primary schools in Starehe division Kenya which observed that corporal punishment was a regular school experience for the pupils. The study by Kimani, Kara and Ogetange (2013) also concurred with Ajowi and Simatwa (2010) that administrators and teachers are not thoroughly prepared to deal with indiscipline in the absence of corporal punishment. However, Kimani, Kara and Ogetange (2013) suggested that teachers should be trained on alternative strategies to deal with discipline problems other than use of corporal punishment. This implies that corporal punishment is still used as a disciplinary method to deal with learner discipline in Kenya, 13 years since its ban.

Simatwa (2012) did a study on management of students’ discipline in secondary schools in Bungoma County which observed that headteachers used a wide range of methods managing student discipline in schools. These included expulsion, suspension, caning, physical punishment, detention, and reprimanding, kneeling, guidance and counselling, fining, rewards, wearing school uniform at all times, self-commitment in writing to maintain good conduct, pinching, slapping and smacking. It was concluded that methods of establishing and maintaining student discipline in schools could not be applied wholesale, but they were contingent upon the environment and the effectiveness of each method depended on the traditions ethos of
schools and their environments. Implying that the judgement on the type of disciplinary method to be used to handle students’ discipline depended on individual schools.

A study by Busienei (2012) was conducted to investigate the alternative methods which teachers use instead of corporal punishment and the efficacy of these methods on student behaviour management in Eldoret Municipality of Rift Valley province. The study observed that cases of indiscipline have not reduced in schools with the use of alternative methods to corporal punishment with 71 percent of the respondents agreeing that the use of other alternative methods to corporal punishment have not reduced indiscipline in schools. Research findings by (Tungata, 2006; Ajowi & Simatwa, 2010; Olivier, 2010; Simatwa, 2010; Busienei, 2012; Khewu, 2012; Simatwa, 2012; Kimani, Kara & Ogetange, 2013) have therefore revealed a knowledge gap on effects of principals’ use of alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County, Kenya. However, investigations in this study were based on effects of independent variables such as principals’ use of peer counselling, suspension of indiscipline students, students’ expulsion and use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making on students’ discipline.

The ban of corporal punishment in Kenya has never improved the state of students’ discipline in secondary schools either. Students’ indiscipline in Kenya has escalated since the ban of corporal punishment in 2001. Kindiki (2009) observed that the level of discipline in secondary schools in Kenya is very low. Between 2000 and 2001, at least 250 schools had experienced unrests of students. In 2001, 68 students were burnt
to death at Kyanguli secondary school, Machakos District (Republic of Kenya, 2001). Between June and July in 2008, violent strikes affected more than 300 secondary schools in the country (Opondo, 2008). According to Kiumi, Bosire and Sang (2009), the conditions of students discipline in secondary schools in Kenya are disheartening as violent behaviour incidences are wide spread and frequent. Medlen (2012) adds that the issues that confront educational institutions are different, sophisticated, frequent and complex. This implies that corporal punishment was only among the disciplinary methods that were used to manage students’ discipline in the past and was banned by the government in order to comply with the requirements of human rights. This implied an automatic switch to use of alternative disciplinary methods in managing students’ discipline in schools.

Kitui County is one of the 47 Counties in Kenya. It is in the former Eastern Province of Kenya. The county has an area of 24,385.1 km². It consists of 16 Sub-Counties and 333 public secondary schools. Since the devolution of governance to the Counties in 2012, public secondary schools in Kitui County have been experiencing students’ discipline problems of various forms (Kitui County Education Office, 2013). Kitui County was chosen for this study, owing too its cases of students indiscipline in public secondary schools which are characterized by destruction and attempted arsons, unrests, burning of school structures, refusal to take exams and walkout to Sub-County Education offices (Kitui County Director of Education(CDE), 2013).

According to Kalanza (2010) and Musyoka (2011), public secondary schools in Kitui Central Sub-County experience students’ discipline problems of various magnitudes. However, those indiscipline cases have been replicated in other Sub-Counties in
Kitui County. Kitui County Director of Education (2013) reported that three public secondary schools from three Sub-Counties in 2012 respectively experienced attempted destruction of school structures through students’ unrests and fires during the second term. The indiscipline cases increased in 2013 in that 7 out of 16 Sub-Counties in Kitui County experienced students’ unrests of various forms in which 15 public secondary schools were affected (Kitui County Director of Education, 2013). The indiscipline cases included attempts to burn school structures like school stores and administration block, destruction due to fire where students personal effects were burnt, walking out of school to Sub-County Education office, students’ refusal to take exams, stealing school property and stoning buildings.

Although some of the indiscipline cases according to Kitui CDE (2013) were handled depending on the magnitude of the offences committed by the students, some of the culprits were suspendend in order to meet with BOMs, others students were talked to with a hope that they would reform and others were arraigned in court. However, some of the cases involving students are still pending in court meaning that they have not been concluded. According to Kitui Law Courts Resident Magistrate (2013), students who involve themselves in indiscipline issues such as burning of schools or attempts to burn school structures or destruction of school property are taken to court by some secondary schools and face charges of conflict with law or are charged for criminal offences. Consequently, some students are either counselled or disciplined by use of Community Service Order (CSO) or by asking the parents to reconcile with the school. The details of destruction or attempted arson in public secondary schools in Kitui County are a shown in table 1.1.
Table 1.1 Details of destruction /attempted arson in secondary schools in Kitui County in 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of schools that experienced destruction/ars on</th>
<th>Gravity / type of offense</th>
<th>Disciplinary action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matinyani</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attempted dormitory arson; Attempt to burn a school store</td>
<td>Suspension of two boys Fire put off immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katulani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dormitory razed down Dormitory put on fire, students personal effects burnt</td>
<td>Two boys suspended Suspect send for parent but never came back, investigation in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitui central</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dormitory burnt down. Destruction of personal property. Students went on rampage, stoned buildings, vandalised and store school machines.</td>
<td>Implicated students advised to look for alternative school. Others given manual punishment Impsition of a fine. School closure. Suspects arrested and arraigned in court. Investigations still on. Watchman and a student implicated. Suspension and appearance before the BOM Students transferred to another school Students Persuaded to go back to school Implicated boy suspended Suspension Suspended students were suspects. All were picked and arraigned in court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutomo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dormitory burnt down Students refused to sit for an exam and walked out to Deos office</td>
<td>Students suspended. Others transferred to another school Students Persuaded to go back to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower yatta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laboratory set on fire Boy c ott of exams Dormitory lazed down</td>
<td>Implicated boy suspended Suspension Suspended students were suspects. All were picked and arraigned in court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisasi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dormitory destroyed by fire</td>
<td>Implicated students suspended Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migwani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dormitory on fire put off immediately</td>
<td>Suspension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 15

Source: Kitui County Education office (2013).
However, this study sought to establish the effect of alternative disciplinary methods such as peer counselling, suspension of indiscipline students, students’ expulsion and use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui county.

Peer counselling is one of the alternative disciplinary methods that could be used to manage students’ discipline in learning institutions in Kenya. According to Ndichu (2005) the modern society has changed very much. The social safety nets that existed in the traditional societies and ensured somewhat stable environment for children to grow up in have all but gone. Students express many difficulties through withdrawal, unhappiness, annoyance, anger, and inability to meet needs, lack of knowledge, anxiety and hyperactivity. This implies that such difficulties could easily be portrayed in form of indiscipline among students hence peer counselling could be used to manage such students’ problems.

According to Wango (2006), most of the school activities concentrated on guidance rather than counselling. There was more career guidance rather than counselling. Guidance and counselling programme content was not generally coordinated. Teacher counsellors and schools seemed to have their own programmes rather than there being a coordinated national programme on guidance and counselling and progression was not monitored. In addition, schools did not appear to have built on peer counselling. Slightly over a half of the students (52.7%) appeared to understand who is a peer counsellor or even think it is simply a peer or age mate (29.2%). However, most of the students had an
idea of who is a peer counselor. Schools did not appear to have built on peer counselling foundation and this was evident in that majority of students did not seem to seek help from peer counselors. The study recommended that schools could build on this knowledge and ensure that peer counsellors are trained to assist students. This implies that although peer counselling was among the guidance and counselling programmes in schools, it was not used to manage discipline of students.

According to Kindiki (2009), peer counselling is a component of guidance and counselling. Peer counselling is achieved in America through coaching and training students who are trained in basic listening and helping skills of problem solving and decision making (Borders & Drury, 1992). Lines (2006) observed that the best alternatives for addressing adolescent needs are peer counselling. In peer counselling students identify with their peers and address problems at home and at school which may include substance abuse and career planning. Mutie and Ndambuki (2004) observed that peers in the African communities had control over each other’s behaviour through open disapproval of an unacceptable behaviour, continuous rebukes till unacceptable behaviour ceased.

Peer counselling in Botswana is based on the understanding that students tend to relate more to those with whom they are comfortable with (UNESCO, 2002). The peer counsellors assist in identifying students with problems and making referrals to the school counsellors (Chireshe, 2006). Peer counselling in Uganda enables students to discuss freely and express personal problems about parents, the authority and themselves in a free frank manner. Peer educators provide information that the adults would normally not be prepared to discuss (Rutondoki, 2000). According to Hendrix
(1986) teacher counsellors act as peer coordinators by providing supervision for peer group members. The teacher counsellors also act as mediators within the group when problems arise and deal with difficult issues within the group. This implies that the peers played a supervisory role in shaping each others’ behaviour.

Peer education concept in Kenyan schools is a recent phenomenon that is rapidly gaining momentum (KIE, 2004; Were, 2003). It was also recommended by the Kenya development plan (1997-2000) to be enhanced in learning institutions. As a result, peer education and counselling clubs have been established in school and training colleges (KIE, 2004). Republic of Kenya (2001) in a report of the task force on students’ discipline and unrest in secondary schools in Kenya recommended the inauguration of peer counselling groups in every school and training of peer counsellors to enable them acquire skills and knowledge that would empower them to perform their roles of managing discipline issues in schools.

Chireshe (2013) conducted a study that study sought to establish the status of peer counselling in Zimbabwean secondary schools as perceived by school teachers. The study used 26 teachers who participated in the study. The results revealed that most of the secondary schools from which the respondents came from, did not have peer counsellors. The peer counsellors were involved in HIV and AIDS and related issues such as unwanted pregnancy, sexual abuse, drug abuse, problem solving and overcoming peer pressure. The peer counsellors were reported to be lacking in peer helping training. The peer counsellors faced challenges such as: peer counselling underrating; resistance and discouragement from other students. This implies that peer counseling was not used to deal with learner discipline but it was used to handle other
aspects hence a knowledge gap on effects of use of peer counselling on students' discipline in public secondary schools.

Wango (2006) observed that despite the emphasis on guidance and counselling in schools, the provision of guidance and counselling services is highly variable and somewhat fragmented in scope and largely depending on individual schools. Schools that had peer counsellors had trained and oriented them into counselling while others had not. This study has left out a gap on effects of use of peer counselling on students’ discipline in this study.

Bett (2013) noted that peer counselling is an interactive relationship within age groups aimed at influencing positive behaviour change. The peers discuss their problems amicably without getting involved in bad behaviour and consequently improve their academic performance. From the information discussed in this paper, it was hoped that the school management, among other stakeholders, could see the need of promoting effective implementation of peer counselling programmes in order to reduce vandalism, truancy and school drop-outs among students in secondary schools. Although the discussion in this paper was basically theoretical it deemed it fit to use of peer counselling to manage some students' indiscipline issues hence a knowledge gap on effects of use of peer counselling on students’ discipline in this study.

The second alternative disciplinary method that could be used in the management of students’ discipline is suspension. Stewart (2004) noted that suspension is a temporary exclusion of a student from school. Suspension in USA is a popular tool for administrators because it takes less time than other alternatives and school
officials feel that it is effective. Harris and Bennet (1982) observed that Suspension rarely encourages control of students to control of students’ behaviour. Stewart (2004) argues that out of school suspension is used in United States of America (USA) for serious misconducts such as drug possession, the carrying of illegal weapons, poor attendance and truancy. However, Suspension of misbehaving learners should be treated with caution for they might not reflect accepted international principles and practices and should only be exercised in the most extreme circumstances.

According to Mutua (2004); Kindiki (2009) and Simatwa (2012) suspension was commonly used as a discipline method by headteachers. Mugo (2006) adds that suspension of indiscipline students was used in extreme cases and for habitual offenders. Kindiki (2009) in a study on effectiveness of communication on students discipline in in public secondary schools in Kenya observed that suspension was the most common discipline technique used to deal with students’ discipline. However, suspended students rarely change their behaviour but would continue with the same delinquent behaviour even after suspension. Republic of Kenya (1980) stipulates that a pupil may be suspended from attendance at a school if his language or behaviour is habitually or continuously endangers the maintenance of proper standards of moral and social conduct in the school or if any single act or series of acts subversive of discipline is committed. A suspended student shall not be allowed to attend classes and shall be required to be physically away from the school precincts until he/she is informed of the outcome of the case to the parent or legal guardian through a letter.

According to Okumbe (1998) suspension helps the educational management to gain enough time for thorough investigations. According to Kitui County Director of
Education (2013) when students are suspended from school, some parent side with their children claiming that their children are innocent.

According to Smit (2010) suspension pushes students out of school and may only contribute to the broader problem of violence. Harris and Bennet (1982); Smit (2010) and Kindiki (2009) also found that suspended students rarely changed their behaviour but would most likely carry on with the same delinquent behaviour after suspension. This is inconsistent with Nyang’au (2013) who noted that suspension from school was effective in improving student behaviour. Liu (2013) argued that lengthy and repeated suspensions results in lost learning; it also contributes to students’ feelings of alienation from school and perhaps most importantly does little or nothing to address the root cause of the behaviour. This study identified a knowledge gap on effects of suspension of indiscipline students on students’ discipline hence a research gap that the study sought to fill.

Students’ expulsion as an alternative disciplinary method of managing students’ discipline according to Brister (1996) and Oosthuizen (2003) is the permanent removal of a learner from a school or hostel where the child is enrolled. Expulsion of a student is pegged on recommendation to the Board of Education to uphold or reject recommendation to expel a student. According to Harris and Bennet (1982) grounds for expulsion of students included wilful defiance, vandalism, drugs, stealing, truancy, violence, force, repeated violation of school rules. Expulsion of learners in South Africa is done to a learner by permanently refusing admission to the school where the learner is enrolled. Learners can only be expelled in cases of serious misconduct by the head of Department after a fair hearing and not by the principal or the school (The South African Schools’ Act, 1996).
Smit (2010) in a study that focused on the role of discipline in the establishment and maintenance of a safe school environment for learners and educators in the East London Region of the Eastern Cape Province observed that expulsion may have an effect of pushing students out of school or fostering school drop outs and by doing so only contributes to the broader problem of violence and warns that expulsion as a method of instilling discipline on students should be used with caution.

Students’ expulsion in Kenya is done as a last resort after a school has tried other disciplinary procedures like suspension in extreme indiscipline cases (Republic of Kenya, 1980). According to the Republic of Kenya (2003) the Cabinet Secretary may make regulations to prescribe expulsion or the discipline of a delinquent pupil for whom all other corrective measures have been exhausted and only after such a child and parent or guardian have been afforded an opportunity of being heard provided that such a pupil shall be admitted to an Institution that focuses on correction in the context of Education.

Simatwa (2012) in a study on management of students’ discipline in Bungoma County noted that many infractions were experienced in secondary schools and headteachers used a wide range of methods to manage students’ discipline. Expulsion was one among the many methods that were used by headteachers to manage infractions but the effectiveness of expulsion depended on traditions, ethos, and schools and their environment. This study has identified a knowledge gap on effects of students’ expulsion on students’ discipline in public secondary schools hence a knowledge gap that the study sought to fill.
Principals’ use of class meetings for collaborative decision making is the fourth alternative disciplinary method that could be used to manage discipline of students in schools. The need for students’ involvement in secondary school administration began in 1960s in the United States of America (Powers & Powers, 1984). According to Lethoko, Heystek and Maree (2001) lack of dialogue between the administration and students has been identified as a factor leading to indiscipline in secondary schools in Kenya. Wekesa (2005) noted that learners do not use dialogue when they are aggrieved. In most cases they resort to strikes when they assume that no one is listening to their grievances.

Republic of Kenya (2001) stipulated that schools should plan and involve students in planning, implementation and evaluation of appropriate governance activities in schools. This is consistent with the Republic of Kenya (2013) which stated that BOM could encourage a culture of dialogue and participatory democratic governance at the learning institutions. This practice is inconsistent with a study by Muchelle (1996) which sought to investigate attitudes of secondary schools towards the involvement of students in school administration found that the amount of participation in school administration allowed in the school was not sufficient to give students a chance to practice democratic skills.

In addition, headteachers had a negative attitude towards involvement of students in school administration due to fear of uncertainties. The headteachers also lacked commitment towards participatory administration which was manifest through double standards. This concurs with Muchiri (1998) and Waweru (2008) who found that Students’ involvement was only minimal. Students’ involvement in school
governance through prefects was quite inadequate and was visibly below average. This implies that since students are key stakeholders in schools, their participation in decision making is would nurture decision making capabilities among students hence promotion of critical thinking skills in collaborative decision making practices hence improved discipline in schools.

According to the Republic of Kenya (2013), students are important stakeholders in the education sector and they could effectively contribute positively to decision making activities on very key issues in schools. This could be effectively implemented during class meetings with students for collaborative decision making. However, Republic of Kenya (2001) and Kindiki (2009) found that there were poor channels of communication used by school administrators.

Undemocratic school administration did not consider meetings as important channels of communication. This concurs with Kiprop (2012) who established that principals adopt master/servant superior/inferior attitude in dealing with students. They rarely listened to students’ grievances because they believe that they have nothing to offer. This creates a lot of tension, stress and misunderstanding and eventually leads to frustrations and violence as manifested in strikes. This is inconsistent with Kibet, Kindiki, Sang and Kitilit (2012) found that principals frequently or sometimes involve, students in their schools, they communicate clearly to students but frequently retained the final authority over most issues. The study found the existence of a significant relationship between leadership approach and student discipline. However this study has identified a research gap on effects of principals’ use of class meetings with students and students’ discipline in public secondary schools.
This study sought to establish the effects of principals’ use of alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County, Kenya. In this study, the independent variables under investigation included principals’ use of peer counselling, suspension of indiscipline, students’ expulsion and principals’ use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making. These independent variables were the indicators that captured the measures on effects of students’ discipline and to determine the significance levels and strengths of relationships. This was used to determine the number of students who underwent peer counselling, number of indisciplinind students who were suspended, number of students’ expulsion cases and number of class meetings held for the last two terms in a school and vice versa.

On the other hand, students’ disciplines formed the dependent variables in this study. Studies available on students’ discipline have revealed a knowledge gap on effects of principals’ use of alternative disciplinary methods such as peer counselling, suspension of indiscipline students, students’ expulsion and use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County (Muchelle, 1996; Muchiri, 1998; Wango, 2006; Waweru, 2008; Kindiki, 2009; Kibet, Kindiki, Sang & Kitilit, 2012; Smit, 2010; Bett, 2013; Chireshe, 2013; Simatwa, 2012). This is because none of the cited studies was undertaken on effects of principals’ alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County. This justifies the need for the study hence a knowledge gap which the study sought to fill.
1.2 Statement of the problem

This study chose Kitui County because public secondary schools in Kitui County experience students’ discipline problems of various forms. Kitui County Director of Education (CDE, 2013) reported that in 2012, three secondary schools from three districts respectively experienced destruction and attempted arson. Such cases increased in 2013 whereby 15 public secondary schools from 7 districts respectively experienced destruction and attempted arson in Kitui County. According to Kitui CDE (2013) students’ indiscipline problems in public secondary schools in Kitui County manifest themselves in form of truancy, incitement by students from other schools, defiance to school authority, rudeness, use of hard drugs, attempts to burn schools for flimsy excuses, burning of schools and destruction of school structures and stealing of school property.

Research findings by Musyoka (2011) on effects of secondary school prefects’ involvement in management of students discipline in kitui Central established that all public secondary schools in Kitui Central District (Sub-County) experience students’ discipline problems of varying magnitudes. Kalanza (2010) on factors influencing principals in the administration of public secondary schools in kitui (Sub-County) District noted that much of the challenges faced by principals in Kitui Central District included poor time management by students, strike incidences and sneaking out of school. The two studies by Musyoka (2011) and Kalanza (2010) have left out a gap on effects of principals’ alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County. This is because findings by Kalanza (2010) and musyoka (2011) on students’ indiscipline issues were replicated in 7 sub-counties out of 16 sub-counties in Kitui County. The studies were conducted in only one Sub-County (district) whose sample size is limited. In this study, investigations on effects
of principals’ alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline were conducted in 16 Sub-Counties) Districts in Kitui County. This justified the selection of Kitui County for my study. This study sought to establish the effects of principals’ alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools such as peer counselling, suspension of indiscipline students, students’ expulsion and principals’ use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making in public secondary schools.

1.3 Purpose of the study
This study sought to investigate the effect of principals’ alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County, Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the study
The following were the objectives of the study

i. To establish the extent to which principals’ use of peer counselling influences students’ discipline in public secondary schools.

ii. To determine the effect of suspension of indisciplined students on students’ discipline in public secondary schools.

iii. To establish the effect of students’ expulsion on students’ discipline in public secondary schools.

iv. To determine the extent to which principals’ use of class meetings for collaborative decision making with students influences students’ discipline in public secondary schools.
1.5 Research questions

This study sought to answer the following research questions

i. To what extent does the principals’ use of peer counselling affect students’ discipline in public secondary schools?

ii. What is the effect of suspension of in disciplined students on students’ discipline in public secondary schools?

iii. What effect does students’ expulsion have on students’ discipline in public secondary schools?

iv. To what extent does the principals’ use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making influences students’ discipline in public secondary schools?

1.6 Significance of the study

It was hoped that the findings of this study could benefit different stakeholders like BoMs, principals, teachers, parents who could be sensitized with new information on alternative disciplinary methods to be used on students’ discipline in schools. The researcher could also be assisted to make recommendations which could perhaps help policy makers at national level to come up with a new policy on use of alternative disciplinary methods. The study findings could add to the existing knowledge on effects of alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in schools. It may also serve as a basis from which other researchers could carry out further research. The study could be significant on the practical, methodological and theoretical value of the concept of alternative disciplinary methods and could provide an insight on the best practices and choice of appropriate alternative disciplinary methods to be used on students’ discipline in schools.
1.7 Limitations of the study

The concept of alternative disciplinary methods is relatively a new concept in the management of students’ discipline. It has gained momentum after the ban of corporal punishment in 2001. However the literature available on alternative disciplinary methods in the management of students’ discipline was insufficient for a comprehensive literature review.

1.8 Delimitations of the study

This study was confined to 16 Sub-Counties in Kitui County. It was also confined to 333 public secondary schools in Kitui County. Public secondary schools outside Kitui County were not investigated. The study location was Kitui County. The study included all types of public secondary schools in Kitui County. The study respondents included Principals, Deputy Principals, HoDs Guidance and Counselling, Board of Management chairpersons, Kitui County Director of Education and Kitui Law Courts Resident Magistrate. Private secondary schools and other learning institutions were left out.

The study was restricted to the factors under investigation which included peer counselling, suspension of indisciplined students, students’ expulsion and principals’ use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making. This was done in order to control other factors which were beyond the researcher’s control and could have brought about inaccurate results hence influencing the quality of the study. These factors included: students’ exposure to media facilities; students’ characteristics; students’ interaction with members of the community; use of other disciplinary methods by teachers to instil discipline on students.
1.9 Basic assumptions of the study

The study held the following basic assumptions:

- All secondary school principals were sufficiently informed about effects of various alternative disciplinary methods and could therefore respond adequately to the items in the questionnaire.
- All secondary schools used alternative disciplinary methods in addressing students’ discipline.
- All secondary schools had a code of discipline to be adhered to by all students.
- Principals involved all stakeholders in management of students’ discipline in secondary schools.
- Alternative disciplinary procedures such as peer counselling, suspension of indiscipline students, students’ expulsion and principals’ use of class meetings had a significant effect on students’ discipline.

1.10 Definition of significant terms

A child refers to a person who has not attained the age of 18 years.

An alternative disciplinary methods refers to other discipline procedures that are used on students’ discipline in secondary schools apart from corporal punishment that was banned in 2001.

Basic Education refers to the educational programmes offered and imparted to a person in an institution of basic education and includes education offered in pre-primary educational institutions and centres and post primary institutions.
Collaborative decision-making (Group decision-making) refers to a situation whereby individuals such as teachers and students collectively make a choice from the alternatives before them. The decision made for purposes of this study is no longer attributable to any single individual who is a member of the school community.

Collaboration refers to involvement of students by teachers in decision making to achieve discipline related goals in public secondary schools.

Corporal punishment refers to a form of physical punishment that involved the deliberate infliction of pain as retribution for an offence or for purposes of disciplining or reforming a wrongdoer, or to deter attitudes or behaviour deemed unacceptable in secondary schools.

Expulsion of students refers to permanent exclusion of a student from a secondary school following the order of the Director of Education.

Children’s right refers to legal, social or ethical principles of freedom or entitlement of children in a secondary school.

Community refers to persons residing in the neighbourhood of a secondary school in this study.

Learner refers to individuals undergoing a course of study and instruction in a secondary school in Kenya leading to the attainment of a Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE). It has been used interchangeably with the word student in this study.

Parent refers to a mother, father or guardian of a child and includes any person who is responsible under the law to maintain a child or is entitled to a child’s custody.

Peer counselling refers to a student to student talk as an alternative disciplinary method in secondary schools.
Peer refers to a person, who is equal to another in terms of age, education and abilities and they include students in a school.

Punishment refers to the authoritative imposition of a penalty on a student for an offence or fault committed in a secondary school.

School discipline refers to the system of rules, punishments and behavioural strategies appropriate to the regulation and maintenance of order in schools. Its aim is to control the students’ actions and behaviour.

Stakeholder refers to a person, a public or private institution or organization involved in an education institution and with vested interests for the benefit of such an institution.

Suspension of students refers to a temporary exclusion of a student from attendance at school by the principal for two 14 days (two weeks).

Unit of analysis refers to the major entity that is being investigated in the study.

1.11 Organization of the study

This study was organized into five chapters. Chapter one consisted of introduction, background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations of the study, delimitations of the study, basic assumptions of the study, definition of significant terms and organization of the study. Chapter two dealt with literature review of aspects explored under the effects of use of peer counselling, suspension, expulsion and use of class meetings for collaborative decision making on students’ discipline, Summary of literature review, theoretical framework and a conceptual framework.
Chapter three consisted of the research methodology that was used in conducting the research study. It specifically dealt with research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, instrument validity, instrument reliability, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques. Chapter four consisted of data interpretation, analysis techniques and discussion of research findings. Finally, Chapter five consisted of the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter comprised of literature review of aspects explored under the effects of alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools under the following: principals’ use of peer counselling; suspension of indisciplined students; students’ expulsion; holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making; summary of related literature review; theoretical framework and conceptual framework.

2.2 An overview of school discipline

Discipline refers to educating someone to acquire desired behaviour for both remediation and prevention purposes (Cotton, 2005). The quality of students’ discipline in schools is an important factor in determining the intellectual outcome of students and schools (Reynolds, 1989). According to Rogers (2001), discipline has to do with guidance and instruction to teach and enhance a social order where rights and responsibilities are balanced. Discipline is about positive behaviour change (squelch, 2000). Rossouw (2003) observes that when educators discipline learners, they are making disciples or disciplined persons. In this sense, discipline is regarded as training that develops self-control.

According to Oosthuizen (1998), discipline must always be prospective and directed at the development of the adult of the future. Discipline is the action by management to enforce organizational standards. In an educational organization, there are many set standards or codes of behaviour to which learners must adhere or uphold in order to
successfully achieve the objectives of the school (Okumbe, 1998). Any serious learner misconduct involving violent or criminal behaviour defeats achievement of educational goals (Gaustad, 2005).

According to Nyongesa (2007), discipline is a learning process and entails a willingness to put forth all the effort that is required to achieve a chosen objective. It is a system of guiding the individual to make reasonable decisions. It is also a mode of behaviour that ensures the smooth running of an organization. Chiuri and Kiumi (2005) allude that discipline plays the vital role of influencing and furthering learning goals in a school. Rogers (2002) also states that discipline enables individuals to take ownership of and be accountable for their behaviour to enable learners to develop self-discipline in school as well as building a workable relationship between teachers and learners. The aim of school discipline is to create an environment conducive for learning (Gaustad, 2005). This means that discipline is prerequisite to effective teaching and learning in schools and should mainly aim at controlling students’ actions and behaviour.

The management of school discipline is however a corporate responsibility between the principal, the teachers and parents. School heads should therefore create a democratic managerial environment in schools so as to enhance teachers and parents’ capacity to play their role expectation of shaping the behaviour of learners in the desired direction (Bosire, Sang, Kiumi & Mungai, 2009). This view is consistent with Sheldon and Epstein (2002) who maintained that an active partnership between parents and schools has great benefits and parents can have a powerful effect on children behaviour. Huczynski and Buchanaan (2001) noted that managing students’
behaviour requires a concerted effort of the parents, teachers and school principals as the key players. This means that there are many key players in shaping the discipline of students in schools. If effective learning is to be realized in use of alternative disciplinary methods in schools, all stakeholders who include MOE officials, parents, teachers, BoM members and the students themselves ought to participate in shaping the desired school discipline hence realization of organizational goals.

According to Kivulu and Wandai (2009); Okumbe (1998), there are two types/approaches to discipline which include methods that have a potential to cause pain or discomfort punitive/deterrent and methods that do not cause physical discomfort normative/preventive. Preventive type of discipline focuses on establishing a set of standards of behaviour, that is, norms, values and beliefs that are looking at relationship-building, self-determination, self-regulation, intrinsic control and commitment to morals and ethics whereas the punitive approach is mainly characterized by rules, extrinsic control, inspection and policing and is intended to punish to discourage further infringement of a rule (Okumbe, 1998; Longman, 2003 & Mkhatshwa, 2000).

Presently a range of measures exists from preventive action by individual teachers to punitive measures such as suspension and expulsion (Stewart, 2004). In this study, preventive discipline methods consisted of peer counselling and principals’ use of class meetings for collaborative decision making whereas corrective alternative disciplinary methods consisted of suspension of indiscipline students and students’ expulsion.
Although secondary school principals play a very important role in the management of school discipline in all learning institutions in Kenya Odundo (1990) observes that schools are expanding especially in developing countries and teachers are becoming more qualified professionally. Therefore according to Rarieya (2007), appointment to school leadership in Kenya is currently based on merit where one has to be interviewed before appointment by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC). This implies that despite the challenging role played by principals in management of students discipline by use of alternative disciplinary methods, they must be professionally qualified whether male or female for them to occupy such leadership positions.

The responsibility to implement school discipline policies in learning institutions is vested on principals and this justifies the critical role played by the principals in management of school discipline. Kiprop (2012) underscores the importance of the role played by principals in maintaining discipline in schools which they achieve by setting the tone and morale of the school through their remarkable influence over the teachers and students. Bosire, Sang, Kiumi and Mungai (2009) however underscores the need for school heads to create democratic managerial environments so as to enhance teachers and parents’ capacity to play their role expectation of shaping the behaviour of learners in the desired direction.

However, this view is consistent with Sheldon and Epstein (2002) who maintain that an active partnership between parents and schools has great benefits and parents can have a powerful effect on children behaviour. Bosire, Sang, Kiumi and Mungai (2009) support this by noting that the management of school discipline is a corporate
responsibility between the principal, the teachers and parents. This view is consistent with Huczynski and Buchanaan (2001) ; Kiprop 2012) who note that managing students’ behaviour requires a concerted effort of the parents, teachers and school principals as the key players for effective management of school discipline. This implies that the principal is a very crucial figure in the management of school discipline and appropriate efforts should be made to bring on-board all the other stakeholders and ensure that they are properly equipped with relevant information pertaining the use of alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in schools.

This could however be achieved by ensuring that principals posses basic qualifications for appointment as school heads. According to Kart (1995) administrators require technical skills, human skills and conceptual skills to perform their duties effectively and efficiently. Eshiwani (1993) adds that training provides knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for effective performance of one’s roles and responsibilities to accomplish tasks. Research findings by Joubert and Serakwa (2009) indicate that most educators have not received formal training with regard to discipline strategies and their applications. Cicognani (2004) agrees by reporting that the training that is provided at colleges and universities is inadequate and could not enable teachers meet their needs in the classroom situation.

2.3 Peer counselling and students’ discipline

Peer counselling can be used as an alternative disciplinary method of instilling discipline on students in public secondary schools. It is a component of guidance and counselling. Guidance and counselling traces its roots to the development of psychology in the USA. It came about as a reaction to change in the industrialised
society. In 1911, Goodwin organised a wide range of programmes in guidance and counselling in high schools in America (Were, 2003). Guidance and counselling in Kenya was formally introduced under the Ministry of education in 1967 and was coordinated from the head office. In 1971, the guidance and counselling unit was moved to the inspectorate.

Peer counselling in America is achieved through coaching and training students who are trained in basic listening and helping skills of problem solving and decision making (Borders & Drury, 1992). Corey (1991) maintains that effective peer counselling is characterized by quality leadership, excellence in training and consistent supervision. Peer counsellors assist school counsellors in showing new students around the school, listening to peers who have concerns and providing outreach activities (Chireshe, 2006). Davidoff (1997); Perold (2000); Steynand Van Wyk (1999) allude that due to a long history of oppression and struggle, teachers also lacked the necessary motivation and were not easily motivated to participate in new projects that would expect more effort from them. Despite the underlying challenges in the implementation of peer counselling programmes, this implies that if peer counsellors are properly equipped with training they could carry out their responsibility very well if proper supervision is undertaken by school counsellors.

Peer counselling in Botswana is based on the premise that students tend to relate more to those with whom they are comfortable with (UNESCO, 2002). The peer counsellors assist in identifying students with problems and making referrals to the school counsellors (Chireshe, 2006). Peer counselling in Uganda enables students to discuss freely and express personal problems about parents, the authority and
themselves in a free frank manner. Peer educators provide information that the adults would normally not be prepared to discuss (Rutondoki, 2000). Mutie and Ndambuki (2004) aver that peers in the African communities had control over each other’s behaviour through open disapproval of an unacceptable behaviour, continuous rebukes till unacceptable behaviour ceased. This implies that the peers played a supervisory role in shaping each other’s behaviour.

Guidance and counselling movement was started in the United States of America (USA) as a reaction to changes in the industrial society due to humanitarian concern to improve the rights of those people who were adversely affected by the industrial revolution of the mid to late 1800s. It aimed at offering occupational guidance to workers in order to cope up with challenges in life (Gladding, 1988). Literature on formal guidance and counselling in African countries traces the guidance and counselling movement in Africa in the fifties in Nigeria and sixties in Botswana, Nigeria, Tanzania, Zambia and Switzerland (Biswalo, 1969). Peer counselling as an alternative disciplinary method is embraced globally to manage discipline in learning institutions.

Peer counselling is achieved in America through coaching and training students who are trained in basic listening and helping skills of problem solving and decision making (Borders & Drury, 1992). Corey (1991) maintains that effective peer counselling is characterized by quality leadership, excellence in training and consistent supervision. Peer counsellors assist school counsellors in showing new students around the school, listening to peers who have concerns and providing outreach activities (Chireshe, 2006). Peer counselling in Botswana is based on the
premise that students tend to relate more to those with whom they are comfortable with (UNESCO, 2002).

The peer counsellors assist in identifying students with problems and making referrals to the school counsellors (Chireshe, 2006). Peer counselling in Uganda enables students to discuss freely and express personal problems about parents, the authority and themselves in a free frank manner. Peer educators provide information that the adults would normally not be prepared to discuss (Rutondoki, 2000). Mutie and Ndambuki (2004) aver that peers in the African communities had control over each other’s behaviour through open disapproval of an unacceptable behaviour, continuous rebukes till unacceptable behaviour ceased. This means that various countries have embraced peer counselling for it is characterized by students ability to interact freely hence the supervisory role played by peers in shaping each other’s behaviour.

Guidance and counselling was formerly introduced in Kenyan institutions of learning in 1971 (Mutie & Ndambuki, 2004). The MoE through a report of the presidential working party in Education and Manpower Training for the next decade and beyond Republic of Kenya (1988) and the Commission of inquiry into the Education system of Kenya Republic of Kenya (1999) recommended the establishment of peer counselling services in all educational institutions to motivate the youth to express their desire to protect themselves against HIV/AIDS and other social and psychological problems. Peer counselling was therefore integrated into the guidance and counselling program as a remedy for clients whose struggle revolve around problems in coping with demands of life and learning.
Were (2003) and KIE (2004) stated that peer education concept in Kenyan schools is a recent phenomenon that is rapidly gaining momentum. Wango and Mungai (2007) says that it is among the wide diversity of changing counselling practices that the educational system has adapted to with an aim to develop individual’s intellectual, social, physical and spiritual capabilities. Peer counselling is one of the strategies that have been adopted to help students who are in need of counselling. It was also recommended by the Kenya development plan (1997-2000) to be enhanced in learning institutions. As a result, peer education and counselling clubs have been established in school and training colleges (KIE, 2004).

Republic of Kenya (2001) in a report of the task force on students’ discipline and unrest in secondary schools in Kenya solicited for information from various stakeholders through written memorandum, oral presentations, previous reports, News papers and data collection which covered the period between 2000 to 2001. The report pointed out the importance of inauguration of peer counselling groups in every school and training of peer counsellors to enable them acquire skills and knowledge that would empower them to perform their roles. However, as an alternative disciplinary method, secondary school principals are expected to implement peer counselling programmes as a policy requirement by the government hence this study seeks to establish the effects of peer counselling on students’ discipline in public secondary schools. Despite the methods and procedures used in the report, this study has identified a research gap on effects of principals’ use of peer counselling on students’ discipline in Kitui County.
Chireshe (2013) did a study that sought to establish the status of peer counselling in Zimbabwean secondary schools as perceived by school teachers. The study used qualitative design. 26 secondary school teachers participated in the study. An open-ended questionnaire was used in the study as a tool for data collection. Data was thematically analysed. The results revealed that most of the secondary schools from which the respondents came from, did not have peer counsellors. Some participants mentioned peer counsellors in the form of peer educators from HIV and AIDS related organizations or Non-Governmental Organizations who sometimes visited secondary schools. The few teachers whose schools had peer counsellors revealed that the peer counsellors were selected on the basis of their good characters.

The peer counsellors were involved in HIV and AIDS and related issues such as unwanted pregnancy, sexual abuse, drug abuse, problem solving and overcoming peer pressure. They entertained other students through dramas, poems and presentations. Although the peer counsellors had some HIV and AIDS training, they were reported to be lacking in peer helping training. The peer counsellors faced challenges including peer counselling underrating, resistance and discouragement from other students, lack of faith by other students and shortage of time. The teachers wished the peer counsellors could receive training in managing depression, study and listening skills, ethical issues and managing disputes among students. This implies that that many challenges were encountered in peer counselling and this could affect its effectiveness negatively. Despite the research methodology used, it had limited sample size, data analysis techniques, data collection tools and in terms of locale of the study compared to my study hence a knowledge gap on effects of principlas alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.
Kindiki (2009) conducted a study on effectiveness of communication on students’ discipline in secondary schools in Naivasha District, Kenya. The study utilized qualitative approach. Questionnaires, interviews and documentation were used as instruments for collecting data. Purposive sampling was used to identify Naivasha district as the location of the study. Stratified and simple random sampling was used to identify 8 secondary schools and 200 respondents from these schools. Twenty (20) students and 4 teachers in each sampled school were given the self administered questionnaires while all the 8 head teachers were interviewed. The data collected was analyzed descriptively.

The study found that most schools with guidance and counselling programmes have reduced indiscipline cases compared with schools without. Guidance and counselling programme was seen to be an effective way of communication to assist students change their behaviour. The study recommended the utilization of guidance and counselling in handling low levels of discipline in secondary schools which was rated the best method of approach. Despite the appropriateness of the research methodology, the study used a smaller sample size compared to my study and it was also limited in terms of data analysis techniques used. However, the study has left out a gap of effects of principals’ use of peer counselling and students discipline in the management of students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

Busienei (2012) conducted a study that sought to investigate the alternative methods which teachers use instead of corporal punishment and the efficacy of these methods on student behaviour management. The study was conducted in Eldoret Municipality
of Rift Valley province. The study population comprised of secondary school teachers in Eldoret Municipality. Proportionate sampling technique was used to select 161 teachers from the 10 public secondary schools representing all the 3 strata of secondary schools in the Municipality. The respondents included 10 head teachers, 10 deputies, 10 guidance and counselling masters/mistresses, 40 class teachers and 91 classroom teachers. Data was collected using a closed-ended questionnaire. Data collected was analyzed using frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation. It was found that, although teachers use alternative methods to corporal punishment, they believe that they are less effective compared to corporal punishment. Guidance and counseling and positive reinforcement were suggested as alternative methods to corporal punishment. In view of the findings, the study recommended urgent need to create awareness on alternative methods to corporal punishment and also on the overall effects of corporal punishment on the child. Despite the effectiveness of the research methodology, this study has identified a gap on effects of principals’ use of peer counselling on students discipline in Kitui County.

Visser (2005) conducted a study on the implementation of a peer support programme in 13 secondary schools in Tshwane. The programme was aimed at establishing support for learners with psychosocial problems in order to prevent and reduce high-risk behaviour related to HIV/AIDS, substance abuse, and various forms of crime. The study used action research. Data was analysed descriptively. In a situation analysis done before the intervention programme, a questionnaire was used to obtain data about high-risk behaviour from a stratified sample of 873 secondary school learners (13–19 years) who represented the population composition in the area. The following forms of high-risk behavior were identified: Peer supporters were identified, trained
and supported to implement the programme in their schools with the assistance of a teacher and student facilitators. Peer supporters identified learners with problems, supported them or referred them to helping agencies. They also started awareness and information activities to prevent and reduce high-risk behaviour. Through the evaluation of the implementation process, crucial challenges were identified that needed to be addressed for the programme to function optimally and to enhance its sustainability. It was however found that learners did not trust these teachers enough to talk to them about their personal problems, as the teachers occupied an authoritarian position (Visser, 2001).

Likewise, many of the teachers felt that they were not properly equipped to deal with the emotional problems of the learners. They also carried a heavy burden in the schools and experienced high levels of stress (Davidoff, 1997; Jeevanantham, 1999; Mabeba & Prinsloo, 2000; Steyn, 1999; Steyn & Van Wyk, 1999; Vorster & Sutcliffe, 2000). They simply did not see counselling as part of their job description (Visser, Schoeman, & Perold, 2004). The study recommended that much more attention should therefore be focused on the involvement of teachers who are willing to assist the peer supporters. However, despite the research methodology used in the study, the study has left out a gap on effects of principles use of peer counselling on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

Chireshe (2006) conducted a study that attempted to assess the effectiveness of the Zimbabwean secondary school guidance and counselling services from school counsellors’ and students’ perspective. The survey method was used in the empirical study. A questionnaire was used to collect data. The respondents for the study
included 314 school counsellors and 636 students. Chi-square($\chi^2$) tests were also calculated. The study revealed that there were differences between the level of the school guidance and counselling services in Zimbabwean secondary schools and the international arena. The Zimbabwean school guidance and counselling services were not always planned for at the beginning of each year. Students and parents were not frequently involved in needs assessment while the services were not frequently evaluated in comparison with those in the international arena. The study also revealed that some biographical variables significantly influenced the way the respondents responded to given items while others did not.

The study revealed that the majority of both school counsellors and students viewed the school guidance and counselling services as beneficial and school counsellors as effectively playing their role. The study further revealed that the effectiveness of the Zimbabwean secondary school guidance and counselling services was negatively affected by lack of resources and training in guidance and counselling and non-counselling duties performed by school counsellors. Despite the importance of guidance and counselling programme, it is faced with challenges which need to be addressed hence a research gap of effects of peer counselling on students discipline. However, although the study used a very large sample size compared to my study the study has left out a gap on effects of principals’ use of peer counselling on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

Mbugua (2006) did a study that investigated the attitudes of teachers and students to student-peer counselling in Starehe Division Nairobi Province. Research methodology involved the use of ex-post design. Stratified and cluster sampling was used to obtain
a sample of seven second secondary schools and 20 teacher counsellors who participated in the study. The study used a questionnaire as the main research instrument. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse data and conclusions were drawn based on the findings. The findings indicated that students experienced a myriad of problems while in school. They were more comfortable opening up their concerns to peer counsellors than to teacher counsellors. Peer counsellors existed in only 56% of the schools but were largely dormant. Schools that had peer counsellors 51% of them were untrained. This could perhaps explain why the guidance and counselling departments in secondary schools is not effective in handling students’ counselling needs. The study recommended the need to identify and train peer counsellors who would be equipped with helping skills enabling them to reach out to their fellow students. Although the research methodology is similar to that of my study, the study by Mbugua (2006) has a limited sample size compared to my study. However, the study has left out a gap on effects of principals used of peer counselling on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

Wango (2006) conducted a study which sought to explore the Policy and Practice in Guidance and counselling in secondary schools in Kenya. The study used qualitative and quantitative approach. Questionnaires and systematic observations were used to collect data. The study was conducted in three stages with an initial survey at stage one in 43 schools, case studies at stage two in three schools and at third stage, discussions were held with various stakeholders including focus group discussions with students. The study observed that despite emphasis on guidance and counselling in schools, the provision of guidance and counselling services is highly variable and somewhat fragmented in scope and largely dependent on individual schools. Out
of the sampled schools, 32 (74%) had peer counsellors and 10 schools had trained or oriented peer counsellors into counselling while others did not have. Although there were peer counsellors in some schools, the mode of selection was a matter of concern for the peer counsellors were selected by the school administration and teachers. Lack of commitment among teachers who were expected to help the teacher counsellor was also noted for they were never there. Some students did not seek peer counselling. This could be explained by the fact that not all schools had peer counsellors or they were not active. Others said that they could not go to persons of the same age for they had nothing to tell them. Others said that they went for peer counselling because they could discuss issues that could not be discussed with teachers or parents.

The study however recommended the need for a more comprehensive guidance and counselling policy in education which are related to appointment of counsellors, professional issues like code of conduct for counsellors and the need for more comprehensive programme that is learner friendly. Although the selection of peer counsellors relied heavily on the school fraternity, this could explain the reason why peer counsellors encountered some challenges with other students. Despite the methodology used and the challenges encountered by peer counsellors the study has however left out a gap on effects of use of peer counselling on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

A study by Ajowi and Simatwa (2010) sought to examine the role of guidance and counselling in promoting students’ discipline in secondary schools was in Kisumu district Kenya. The study population comprised of 4,570 students, 65 head teachers, 65 deputy head teachers, and 65 heads of Guidance and Counseling Department from
all the 65 secondary schools in the District. Out of this, a sample of 22 head teachers, 22 deputy head teachers, 22 heads of Guidance and Counseling and 916 students from 22 secondary schools was selected through the simple random sampling technique. Two instruments were used to collect data for the study. These were interview schedule and a questionnaire. The data collected through questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics in form of frequencies and percentages. While data collected using interview schedule were audio taped and transcribed into themes, categories and sub-categories as they emerged from the data. They were analyzed using summary Tables for the purpose of data presentation and interpretation. The findings showed that guidance and counseling was minimally used to promote students’ discipline in secondary schools in Kisumu District.

Punishments especially corporal punishment was widely used to solve disciplinary cases in all schools. It was however; found that there were no policy guidelines from the Ministry of Education on how the schools could use guidance and counseling to manage the student disciplinary cases. Based on the findings, it was recommended that the Ministry of Education should provide policy guidelines on the use of guidance and counseling for the management of discipline in secondary schools. It is however noted that these findings are inconsistence with the ban on corporal punishment through legal Notice No. 56/2001. Corporal punishment is against the provisions provided for in international instruments on child protection to which Kenya is a signatory. The two instruments are in agreement with child protection and welfare provision as contained in the Children Act No. 8 of 2001. This implies that every secondary school principal must obey the law and any contravention of the Act (Legal Notice No. 52/2001) may result to prosecution. Although the study was
conducted 9 years after the ban of corporal punishment, the study revealed that corporal punishment is illegally practiced in schools to deal with learner indiscipline. However, despite the research methodology used, the study did not use inferential statistics to establish relationships between observed variables and the sample size was also limited since it was conducted in only one district whereas investigations for my study were conducted in 16 Districts in Kitui County. However, the study has left out a gap on effects of principals’ alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

Marangu, Bururia and Njonge (2012) did a study that sought to find out challenges faced by peer counsellors in their effort to effect behaviour change in secondary schools in Maara District, Kenya. The study used descriptive survey research design. The target and accessible population was 27 guidance and counselling heads of departments and 1700 form three students in 27 secondary schools. It was important in mentoring other students as they addressed issues related to the youth in secondary school in Maara district. Out of these, 7 girls’ school with 583 students, 4 boys’ schools with 434 students and 16 mixed secondary schools, with 683 students formed the study. Questionnaires were used as tools for data collection. The methodology was effective. The study established that peer counselling had been accepted as an important contributor to behaviour change among learners in learning institutions. Most peer counsellors were academically above average making them academic tutors.

Despite the important role played by peer counselling in behaviour change, it may be particularly important for principals in public secondary schools to ensure that peer counsellors are properly guided on use of peer counselling as alternative disciplinary
method hence achievement of school objectives in management of students’ discipline. The findings by Marangu, Bururia and Njonge (2012) also indicated that peer counsellors are established in many schools giving them the opportunity to model good behaviour. The study recommended that peer counsellors require adequate orientation on their roles like basic counselling skills. The MOE to ensure that peer counselling programme is established in all secondary schools. It should also develop a peer counselling curriculum that would be used to train the peer counsellors. The study further recommended that the appointed guidance and counselling teachers should be friendly and interacts well with the other students. The guidance and counselling teacher should appoint peer counsellors who are academically above average and who are respected by other students.

Peer counsellors should be shown their responsibilities. Students need to be sensitized on the roles and responsibilities of peer counsellors and proper recording system should be developed so that work done by peer counsellors can be recorded. This implies that appointment of competent peer counsellors would make them focused on issues that could shape the behaviour of other students positively. It is however noted that this study was conducted in only one district whose sample size is limited. Despite the effectiveness of the research methodology for the study, the research design is different from that used in my study and the study was limited in sample size since it was conducted in only one disctict while my study was done in 16 districts in Kitui County. However, this study has left out a gap on effects principals’ use of peer counselling on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.
Mbabazi and Bagaya (2013) conducted a study which sought to demonstrate that guidance and counselling strategies play a central role in school efforts to improve learners’ levels of conformity with the code of conduct in Gulu Municipality in Uganda. A cross sectional parallel sample survey design was used with a total of 366 respondents who comprised of 226 teachers and 140 prefects, in secondary schools who were selected through simple random sampling. Questionnaires were used as data collection tool. Three hypotheses were formulated to guide the study and were tested using descriptive statistics and Chi square tests.

The study revealed that individual guidance and counselling strategy was commonly used and that learners’ level of conformity with the code of conduct is moderate. The results further revealed that learners’ level of conformity with the code of conduct does not significantly depend on the guidance and counselling strategy. The study also found that there were other methods which were used to ensure learner conformity with the school code of conduct apart from guidance and counselling. Based on these findings, the researchers recommend that school administrators should adopt the use of both individual and group counselling strategies and the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) should conduct in-service training for all teachers on techniques of guidance and counselling. The study proposes areas for further research including investigating the effectiveness of guidance and counselling. Despite the effectiveness of the research methodology used, the study has left out a gap on effects of peer counselling on students discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

Bett (2013) undertook a review of issues that have been raised on the importance of promoting effective peer education and counselling in secondary schools with a view
to sensitizing the teachers, head teachers and other education stakeholders on the role of Peer Educators (PEs) and Peer Counsellors (PCs) in students’ lives in secondary schools. The methodology adopted was theoretical. The paper engaged in discussing the importance of promoting the value and the role of peer counselling among students. It was noted that peer group interactions enabled both peer educators and students experience increased self-esteem and greater ability to deal with adolescence related problems.

Effective peer counselling in schools supplements the provision of guidance and counselling services hence promoting positive behaviour change and improvement among students in academic performance. The discussions however recommended that schools should be more involved in conducting students’ needs assessments and developing comprehensive guidance and counselling services. This means that if peer counselling is properly managed, as an alternative disciplinary method, it could enhance students’ discipline in schools. However, despite the methodology used, this study has left out a gap on effects of principals’ use of peer counselling on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

Ngotho and Zani (2014) conducted a study that sought to establish the influence of different counseling methods in promoting indiscipline in district public secondary schools in Kikuyu District, Central Kenya. The study was guided by four objectives. A simple random sampling procedure was used to identify four secondary schools in the four educational zones in the study area. The study sample consisted of 132 form four students, four head teachers and four heads of guidance and counseling masters from four schools. The research compared several counseling methods.
The study by Ngotho and Zani (2014) established that group counseling was the most acceptable compared with individual counseling and peer counseling. The study also found that the promotion of school discipline was hampered by lack of parent participation in their children’s discipline. The head teachers and counselors complained of limited resources and poor ministerial support in the implementation of successful and effective school guidance and counseling programs. The study recommended proper communication between all education stakeholders in order to develop a sound school guidance and counseling program. The study also recommended a continuous teacher training program for teacher counselors. Despite the research methodology used in this study, the study was limited in sample size for it was conducted in only one district compared to my study which was conducted in 16 districts in Kitui County. However, the study has left out a gap on effects of principals’ use of peer counselling on students discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

From the findings (Kindiki, 2009) noted that most schools with guidance and counselling programmes have reduced indiscipline cases compared with schools without. This is in agreement with Wango (2006) who observed that the provision of guidance and counselling services is highly variable and somewhat fragmented in scope and largely dependent on individual schools in that Schools which had peer counsellors had trained and oriented them into counselling. This is consistent with Mbugua (2006) who observed that those schools that had peer counsellors, 51% of them were untrained. Marangu, Bururia and Njonge (2012) noted that effective peer counselling in schools supplements the provision of guidance and counselling...
services. Peer counselling is important in mentoring other students as they addressed issues related to the youth. This could be achieved through coaching and training students in basic listening and helping skills of problem solving and decision making (Borders & Drury, 1992).

Mbugua (2006) argued that students went for peer counselling because they could discuss issues that could not be discussed with teachers or parents. This is consistent with (Mbugua, 2006; Marangu, Bururia & Njonge, 2012). It is argued that effective peer counselling is characterized by quality leadership, excellence in training and consistent supervision (Corey, 1991). However, Ngotho and Zani (2014) established that group counseling was the most acceptable compared with individual counseling and peer counseling. According to (Chireshe, 2006) the challenges encountered by peer counsellors included lack of resources and training in guidance and counselling and non-counselling duties performed by school counsellors which negatively affected the effectiveness of the guidance and counselling services. Peer counselling was negatively affected by peer underrating; resistance and discouragement from other students; lack of faith by other students and shortage of time (Wango, 2006; Chireshe, 2013). Visser (2005) concurs by noting that some teachers simply did not regard care for the emotional well-being of learners as part of their duty as teachers. Wango (2006) adds that students did not seek peer counselling and others said that they could not go to persons of the same age for they had nothing to tell them. Reviewed literature has identified a gap on effects of use of peer counselling as an alternative disciplinary method for none of the conducted studies investigated the effects of peer counselling on students’ discipline in public secondary schools hence the need to fill the knowledge gap.
2.4 Suspension and students’ discipline

Suspension can be used as an alternative disciplinary method on students’ discipline in public secondary schools. Suspension is popular as a tool for administrators in United States because it takes less time than other alternatives and school officials feel that it is effective. In 1971, the Ohio law allowed a principal to suspend students for up to ten days from school for misconduct. Notification had to be made to parents within 24 hours of the suspension stating the reason for the action (Harris & Bennet, 1982).

According to Stewart (2004), out of school suspension is used in United States of America (USA) for serious misconducts such as drug possession, the carrying of illegal weapons, poor attendance and truancy. Suspension of students from schools involves temporary exclusion of a student from school. However there is considerable debate over just how effective excluding a learner from the school setting really is (Dettman, 1972; Cahoon, 1989; Pyke, 1993 & Slee, 1995). Stewart (2004) argues that measures such as the exclusion of misbehaving learners should be treated with caution for they might not reflect accepted international principles and practices and should only be exercised in the most extreme circumstances.

Stewart (2004) observed that in Australia, a range of measures which teachers use to ensure appropriate standards of learner behaviour presently range from preventive action by individual teachers to punitive measures such as suspension. Most Australian education authorities have passed regulations providing principals with the power to exclude misbehaving learners from their school and this power includes suspension. Suspension from school has commonly had the major objective of
removing an offending learner from the classroom and thus allowing the teacher to get on with the lesson in hand. It also provides an opportunity to require parents to be involved in any review of a learner’s behaviour problems and it can be used as a mechanism for punishing unacceptable behaviour. It can be argued, that the major consequence for some learners is that any suspension becomes a reward and thus it serves to reinforce the form of behaviour the teacher or school was trying to eliminate. Moreover, there is also evidence that suspended learners receive support from many of their classmates (Slee, 1995). This implies that as an alternative punitive disciplinary method, suspension has no effect on learner behaviour. This means that use of suspension to manage students’ discipline may not change the behaviour of learners.

Nyang’au (2013) did a study that sought to study the effects of disciplinary strategies on students’ behaviour in public secondary schools in Matungulu District, Machakos County. The study sample size consisted of 9 schools with a total population of 3433 and a proportionate total sample population of 1043 was selected representing 30% to ensure selection of a statistically significant sample. Systematic sampling was used to select the schools and simple random sampling was used to select teachers and students. Key informant respondents like the Deputy Head Teachers and Heads of Department Guidance and Counselling were included in the study due to the key role they play in maintaining appropriate student behaviour as well as being custodians of student behaviour records. Data was collected using questionnaires, interview of key informant respondents and document review. Data collected was analysed using descriptive statistics through the determination of measures of central tendency to
Data was also analysed through content analysis. Quantitative data was presented using percentages and frequency tables with explanations while qualitative data was presented in thematic narratives. The study established that 58.6% of the respondents were of the view that suspension from school was effective in improving student behaviour. The study recommended that schools should incorporate parents and guardians in tackling student behaviour problems and all teachers should receive training in guidance and counselling. Thus according to the study, suspension was an effective discipline strategy on students’ behaviour. This means that its use could be enhanced by incorporation of other stakeholders and training of those charged with its use could guarantee them of appropriate competencies on use of suspension as an alternative disciplinary method. Despite the effectiveness of the research methodology used in this study, this is limited in sample size since it was only conducted in a single district while my study was conducted in 16 districts. However, this study identified a knowledge gap on effects of suspension of indiscipline students on students’ discipline in public secondarschools in Kitui County.

Guidelines on the suspension of in disciplined students in Kenya are contained in the Education Act Cap 211 on school discipline regulations. Republic of Kenya (1980) stipulates that suspended students shall not be allowed to attend classes and shall be required to be physically away from the school precincts until he/she is informed of the outcome of the case to the parent or legal guardian through a letter. When a headteacher finds it necessary to suspend a student from school, the headteacher
should inform the student’s parents or guardian of the suspension, the length of the suspension and the specific reasons for it by formal notification. Particulars for the formal notification should include sufficient reason for suspension and relevant circumstances which should be fully understood by the students, parents and guardians. The headteacher should inform the BoM members of the punishment at once and convene a meeting within 14 days to discuss the discipline issues. Although suspension of indiscipline students consumes time, these legal provisions entails good legislative practices in administering suspension as an alternative disciplinary method and procedures to be followed in dealing with students’ discipline.

A study by Harris and Bennet (1982) on Student Discipline: Legal, Empirical and Educational Perspectives found that those students who are repeatedly suspended sometimes make the discipline problem appear greater than it is. Suspension rarely encourages students to control their behaviour although it gets the parent into the school. The study recommended that school officials should make every effort to help students learn to control their own behaviour and designing and utilization of disciplinary approaches that could directly address the discipline problems.

Mutua (2004) did a study that sought to investigate alternative strategies of discipline in the absence of Corporal punishment in public secondary schools in Matungulu Division, Machakos District Kenya. The instruments for data collection were questionnaires and an interview schedule and an observation schedule. The study used survey method and random sampling to get a sample of four headteachers and 60 classroom teachers. Data was analysed by descriptive statistics where means, percentages and frequencies were used. Chi-square($\chi^2$) was used to measure the
relationship between alternative strategies that teachers preferred to use and the independent variables.

The findings by Mutua (2004) indicated that teachers had a range of alternatives that they used. These include guidance and counselling, manual work, extra class work, having a set of school rules, withdrawal of privileges, kneeling down, dialogue and suspension was used at times. The study recommended that teachers should use alternative methods of behaviour modification which have a positive impact on students’ behaviour instead of using punishment which only suppressed behaviour. From the findings, suspension as an alternative strategy had not been given prominence as the chi square value is 0.17 meaning that the method is not statistically significant for it was rarely used. This was also confirmed by the other range of alternatives which were used to modify learner behaviour. Despite the appropriateness of the research methodology, this study has however identified a research gap on effects of suspension of indiscipline students on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

Mugo (2006) did a study on participatory processes used by headteachers in enhancing students discipline in public secondary schools in Kiambu Division, Kiambu District. Questionnaires were used as tools for data collection. The study used ex post facto design. The target population was five headteachers, 25 teachers and 150 students. The study found that suspension of indiscipline students was used in extreme cases and for habitual offenders. Guidance and counselling were identified coupled with punishment as leading methods of enhancing discipline in secondary schools. The study recommended development and implementation of proper
guidance and counselling programmes in all schools by school management and parents should be informed of proper parenting and the relevance it has to school discipline in our contemporary society. This implies that suspension was used subjectively based on students’ indiscipline cases. The study has however identified a knowledge gap on effects of suspension of indiscipline students on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui county Kenya.

Smit (2010) did a study on the role of school Discipline in combating violence in schools in East London region. The study sample was composed of four primary schools and five high schools. The respondents to the study included principals or senior members of staff and 330 learners. Data was collected by use of a questionnaire and an interview guide. The findings indicated that suspension pushes students out of school and may only contribute to the broader problem of violence. The study recommended addressing alternatives to suspension in order to find ways of helping children who have shown signs of misbehaviour problems. Counselling and focusing on problem solving relating to behaviour issue and community services could achieve more effective discipline. These results imply that suspension of students is counterproductive in dealing with indiscipline of students for it does not bring positive results. This study has however identified a research gap on effects of suspension of indiscipline students on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui county Kenya.

A study done by Kindiki (2009) on effectiveness of communication on students’ discipline in secondary schools in Kenya was conducted in Naivasha District. The study utilized qualitative approach with questionnaires, interviews and documentation
as instruments of collecting data. Purposive sampling was used to identify Naivasha
district as the location of the study. Stratified and simple random sampling was used
to identify 8 secondary schools and 200 respondents from these schools. 20 students
and 4 teachers in each sampled school were given the self administered questionnaires
while all the 8 head teachers were interviewed.

The data collected by Kindiki (2009) was analyzed descriptively. The study revealed
that suspension was considered the most common technique used to deal with
indiscipline in secondary schools. The study further revealed that suspended students
rarely changed their behaviour and will most likely carry on with the same delinquent
behaviour after suspension. The study recommended effective guidance and
counselling for students would realize their mistakes and initiate behaviour change
aimed at being better disciplined. Guidance of students on proper use of information
Communication Technology (ICT) would also minimize antisocial behaviour among
students. This implies that the executors of suspension get a little relieve for a while
as the student services the suspension period but the student may come back with
worse indiscipline issues than they left the schools. Although the research
methodology used in the study was appropriate for the study, this study has identified
a knowledge gap on effects of suspension of indiscipline students on students’
discipline in public secondary

A study by Simatwa (2012) on management of students discipline in secondary
schools in Kenya which was carried out in Bungoma County used questionnaires and
an interview schedule and document analysis to collect data. The study population
consisted of 125 headteachers, 125 deputy headteachers, 1575 teachers and 2075
prefects managing 20107 students in 125 secondary schools. Descriptive statistics was used to analyse data. The findings revealed that many infractions were experienced in public secondary schools and headteachers used a wide range of methods managing students discipline in schools including suspension. The study indicated that Headteachers had powers to suspend students for fourteen days and no absolute powers to suspend students for a period exceeding fourteen days. It was further revealed that most students and the society in general were against the use of suspension as a sanction. The affected students could come back to school determined to revenge.

The study by Simatwa (2012) concluded that suspension as a sanction should be used sparingly. The recommended way forward for using these sanctions included prompt resolutions on suspensions whereby students were to be kept out of schools as little as possible since the use of these sanctions had drastic consequences and suspension was only used as the last resort in which case the school administrators first considered use of alternative sanctions. This means that suspension was not an effective sanction of dealing with students’ discipline issues. From these findings, this study has identified a research gap on effects of suspension of indiscipline students on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

Ouma, Simatwa and Serem (2014) conducted a study on Management of pupil discipline in Kenya: A Case Study of Kisumu Municipality. Descriptive survey research design was adopted for this study. The study population consisted of 115 head teachers, 115 deputy head teachers, and 460 class teachers of standard seven and eight, 2530 prefects and one Municipal Quality Assurance and Standards Officer.
Simple random sampling technique was used to select a study sample that consisted of 37 head teachers, 37 deputy head teachers, 152 class teachers of standard seven and eight and 370 prefects. Saturated sampling technique was used to select one Municipal Quality Assurance and Standards Officer. In-depth interview schedules, questionnaire and document analysis guide were used for data collection. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics in form of means, percentages and frequency counts. Qualitative data collected from open-ended items in the questionnaire and in-depth interviews were analyzed and organized into themes and sub-themes as they emerged.

The study by Ouma, Simatwa and Serem (2014) revealed that Pupil discipline problems experienced in primary schools included; noise making which was rated 3.7, failure to complete assignment 3.8, truancy 4.0, lateness 4.0, theft 3.5, and sneaking 3.5. However, the study established that effective methods of dealing with indiscipline were; Involving parents who was rated 4.2, Guidance and counselling 4.2, manual work 4.0, caning 3.3 suspensions 2.5 and reprimanding 2.4. The study recommended that appropriate pupil discipline management methods be used in schools to create peace and harmony. Despite the appropriateness of the research methodology used in the study, this study has identified a research gap on effects of suspension of indiscipline students on students discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

From the findings Stewart (2004) observed that suspension is a punitive measure used as a mechanism for punishing unacceptable behaviour. Kindiki (2009) says that suspension was the most common technique used to deal with indiscipline in
secondary schools. Any suspension becomes a reward and reinforces the form of behaviour the teacher or school was trying to eliminate. Simatwa (2012) observed that suspension was among a wide range of methods used to deal with the many infractions that were experienced in public secondary schools by headteachers.

In conclusion on suspension of indisciplined students and students’ discipline, Mugo (2006) observed that suspension of indiscipline students was used in extreme cases and for habitual offenders. This is consistent with Mutua (2004) who found that suspension was used at times as an alternative strategy meaning that it had not been given a lot of prominence. Smit (2010) argues that suspension pushes students out of school and may only contribute to the broader problem of violence. Kindiki (2009) agrees in that suspended students rarely changed their behaviour and will most likely carry on with the same delinquent behaviour after suspension. This is not consistent with Nyang’au (2013) who established that 58.6% of the respondents were of the view that suspension from school was effective in improving student behaviour. The revealed literature has identified a gap of effects of suspension as an alternative disciplinary method on students’ discipline hence a research gap that this study sought to fill.

2.4 Students’ expulsion and students’ discipline

Expulsion can be used on students as an alternative disciplinary method in public secondary schools. In the United States of America, the law allowed an expelled pupil the right to a hearing before the Board of Education (Harris and Bennet, 1982). Brister (1996) noted that teachers in Victoria, a state in Australia felt that corporal punishment had been replaced by expulsion in schools. Expulsion of learners in South
Africa is done to a learner by permanently refusing admission to the school where the learner is enrolled. Learners can only be expelled in cases of serious misconduct by the head of Department after a fair hearing and not by the principal or the school (The South African Schools’ Act, 1996). This means that principals could not expel a student from school. This implies that grounds for expulsion could be instituted after a thorough investigation to establish a student’s misconduct beyond any reasonable doubt.

A study by Bennet and Harris (1982) on Students’ Discipline, Legal, Empirical and Educational perspectives in Indiana University found that during the 1979-80 school years, high school students had been expelled for wilful defiance and vandalism. Grounds for expulsion of students included drugs, stealing, truancy, violence, force, repeated violation of school rules. Expulsion of a student is pegged on recommendation to the Board of Education to uphold or reject recommendation to expel a student. However, this practice is almost similar to what happens in Kenya in that expulsion of students in Kenya is usually done as a last resort after a school has tried other disciplinary procedures like suspension in extreme indiscipline cases. The director of education may order the expulsion of the pupil in which case the pupil shall not be readmitted to a maintained or assisted school without the special sanction of the Director of Education (Republic of Kenya, 1980). This means that principals are not allowed to expel students from school unless they are authorised by higher authorities.

Smit (2010) did a study that focused on the role of discipline in the establishment and maintenance of a safe school environment for learners and educators in schools in
East London. Qualitative and survey methods were used in the study. Data was collected by use of interviews and questionnaires. Three hundred and thirty questionnaires were completed by learners from the selected schools. Nine interviews were conducted with either the principal or a member of the senior Management team of each school. The researcher also conducted further in-depth interviews with twenty learners from four schools (two primary and two high schools). Data was analyzed qualitatively in accordance with accepted procedures for qualitative data processing. The findings revealed that expulsion is a punitive measure used in schools. It may have an effect of pushing students out of school or fostering school dropouts and this may only contribute to broader problem of violence in their country. The study made recommendations for a fair hearing to a learner before a learner is expelled from a public school and that the Department of Education should support cases where expulsion is required for the sake of learner safety. This means that an expelled student may not be given another chance by the school. This may deny the student a chance to access education hence denial of a basic human right to the student. This implies that the behaviour of an expelled student may worsen due to desperation and hopelessness as a result of expulsion from school.

Simatwa (2012) did a study on management of students discipline in secondary schools in Kenya which was carried out in Bungoma County. The study population consisted of 125 headteachers, 125 deputy headteachers, 1575 teachers and 2075 prefects managing 20107 students in 125 secondary schools. Data collection instruments included questionnaires, an interview schedule and document analysis. Descriptive statistics was used to analyse data. The study revealed that had no absolute powers to use expulsion as a sanction in schools without consulting Boards
of Governors, Provincial Director of Education, Director of Higher Education and the Education secretary. Expulsion was one among the many methods that were used by headteachers to manage infractions that were experienced in public secondary schools. The effectiveness of expulsion depended on traditions, ethos, and schools and their environment. This implies that the choice to use expulsion as a disciplinary method depended on individual school judgement. Despite the methodology used in this study, the study did not explore the effects of each method in managing students hence a research gap on effects of students’ expulsion on students’ discipline in Kitui County.

The literature review has established that expulsion is done to a learner by permanently refusing admission to the school where the learner is enrolled (Brister, 1996). Learners can only be expelled in cases of serious misconduct by the head of Department after a fair hearing and not by the principal or the school (The South African Schools’ Act, 1996). This is consistent with Kenyan practice in that expulsion of a learner is usually done as a last resort after a school has tried other disciplinary procedures like suspension in extreme indiscipline cases. It is done upon recommendation by a full BoM meeting to the director of education. The director of education may order the expulsion of the pupil in which case the pupil shall not be readmitted to a maintained or assisted school without the special sanction of the Director of Education (Republic of Kenya, 1980) and (Republic of Kenya, 2013). Grounds for expulsion of students included drugs, stealing, truancy, violence, force, repeated violation of school rules (Harris & Bennet, 1982).
Nthiga (2014) conducted a study that sought to establish the strategies adopted in enhancing learners retention in public secondary schools, in Embakasi district Kenya. The study purposed to determine how parental involvement and learners sponsorship in education has been in enhancing learners” retention in secondary schools. The study adopted both quantitative and qualitative design. The research instruments used were questionnaires. The target population was 1 DEO and 148 public secondary school teachers in Embakasi District, Nairobi County. Sample size was selected randomly. One DEO and 75 teachers were used in the study.

The data collected by Nthiga (2014) was analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively by use of descriptive statistics such as, mean, mode, median and standard deviation. The study found that there was positive support from parents to the school administration, parental support to school disciplinary measures, parents come to school when required, parents contribution to learners activities and parents support of academic needs. Learners are retained in school throughout, learners’ access to education, students non- expulsion due to school fees, learners’ ability to meet their educational needs and learner”s expectations for a bright future. In regard to discipline influence on learners’ retention, the study found that behaviour problems led to expulsion, parents did not notify the school administration on learners absenteeism, inconsistent allocation of bursary funds disrupts leaning, and parents support discipline given by school administration and stakeholders’ ignorance of bursary allocations information. The study conducted multiple regression analysis which showed that learner sponsorship was a significant factor followed by discipline and the least influencing factor to learner retention was parental involvement.
The study by Nthiga (2014) recommended adoption of information and communication techniques in schools and communities in order to foster participation of all stakeholders. These measures include strengthening the Parent teacher Association incorporating formal and informal interaction between the parties. The study recommends reinforcement of guidance and counseling services in secondary school as per the Ministry of education recommendations. These will assist in dealing with discipline issues by adopting proactive approaches such as peer counsellin and mentorship. Despite the effectiveness of the research methodology that was used, this study identified a research gap on effects of students’ expulsion on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

In conclusion on students’ expulsion and students’ discipline, the findings from Smit, (2010) revealed that expulsion may have an effect of pushing students out of school or fostering school dropouts and this may only contribute to broader problem of violence in their country. According to Simatwa (2012) the effectiveness of expulsion depended on traditions, ethos, and schools and their environment. On the hand, Nthiga (2014) indicated that behaviour problems led to expulsion of indisciplined students. Reviewed literature has identified a knowledge gap from these studies of effects of students’ expulsions as an alternative disciplinary method on students’ discipline in public secondary schools as none of the studies investigated the effects of students’ expulsion on students’ discipline hence a research gap that the study sought to fill.

2.5 Collaborative decision making and students’ discipline

Class meetings for collaborative decision making can be used as an alternative disciplinary method on students’ discipline in public secondary schools. The need for
students’ involvement in secondary school administration began in 1960s in the United States of America (Powers & Powers, 1984). Gathenya (1992) argues that secondary school students are looked at as people who are mature enough to take responsibility of any administrative task assigned to them by the school administration. According to The Education Review office (2003) the government of New Zealand allows learners to exercise some decision making over how they learn within the limits set by the Government and individual schools. Thus, allowing students’ participation in decision making could enhance ownership of decisions made and could also help students in the development of decision making skills hence promotion of critical thinking skills.

Muchelle (1996) conducted a study that sought to investigate the attitudes of secondary school headteachers towards the involvement of students in school administration in Vihiga District, Kenya. The study used ex post - facto design and consisted of a sample of 72 headteachers in Vihiga District. The study used a questionnaires and an observation checklist as instruments for data collection. Data was analysed using one-way analysis of variance and the t-test and frequencies and percentages were also used.

The findings of the study indicated that: the amount of participation allowed in the school was not sufficient to give students a chance to practice democratic skills; headteachers had a negative attitude towards involvement of students in the areas of school curriculum, electoral processes due to fear of uncertainties; there was lack of commitment among the headteachers towards participatory administration which was manifest through double standards the headteachers had for those headteachers with
suggestion boxes felt that criticism deemed harsh to the school administration should be punished. Based on the findings, the study recommended the following: attempts should be made towards the establishment of elaborate students’ participation policies, regulations and procedures; students’ participation in school administration should be made an important component in teacher training and in-servicing of teachers and the need to elaborate institutional devices through which students can be incorporated in school administration procedures. This implies that the there was fear of unknown aspects by headteachers as a result of their negative attitude and this could have been caused by lack of prior information on the importance of students’ participation in school administration. This implies that students were not given a chance to participate in decision making activities yet they were expected to adhere to school rules and regulations which they never participated in making. Failure to involve students in school administration procedures as an alternative disciplinary method could make the students remain as strangers to school matters hence compromising the school discipline. Despite the effectiveness of the research methodology, this study has identified a research gap on effects of principals’ use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making in Kitui County.

Muchiri (1998) conducted a study that sought to examine participatory processes used by headteachers to enhance students discipline in public secondary schools in Nairobi Province, Kenya. The study was ex-post facto in design. The target population consisted of secondary school headteachers and teachers. Random sampling was used to obtain a sample size of 360 respondents. The study used a questionnaire as a tool for data collection. Two - tailed t-test and one- way analysis of variance were used to test the hypothesis.
The findings by Muchiri (1998) indicated that the most frequently occurring discipline problem among students was drug abuse and addiction. The most frequently applied method of dealing with indiscipline was punishment which was interspersed with guidance and counselling and parental involvement. About 97.1% of the headteachers involved other members of their schools in solving discipline problems. Disciplinary methods applied in secondary schools were seen to have various shortcomings of which the major ones were excessive use of punishment coupled with leniency and laxity in handling students’ discipline. Students’ involvement was only minimal. The most frequently suggested methods of enhancing discipline were guidance and counselling, dialogue, and parental involvement.

The study by Muchiri (1998) recommended that: headteachers should be encouraged to use alternative methods of behaviour modification such as dialogue with students, parental involvement and student involvement in the administration of the school which have a positive impact on student behaviour instead of using punishment. It also recommended that headteachers should increase involvement of other members of the community and increase their participatory ideals in school administration. Thus, the high frequency of occurrence of discipline problems is signified by use of punishment to correct infractions. This could have been instigated by minimal students’ involvement to enhance students’ discipline hence students’ involvement could have helped students to reflect on their beliefs by enlightening them about the right things to do hence cultivating a sense of responsibility among students hence improved management of students discipline. However, this study has identified a
research gap on effects of principals’ use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making.

A study done by Kindiki (2009) on effectiveness of communication on students’ discipline in secondary schools in Kenya was conducted in Naivasha District. The study utilized qualitative approach with questionnaires, interviews and documentation as instruments of collecting data. Purposive sampling was used to identify Naivasha district as the location of the study. Stratified and simple random sampling was used to identify 8 secondary schools and 200 respondents from these schools. 20 students and 4 teachers in each sampled school were given the self administered questionnaires while all the 8 head teachers were interviewed. The data collected was analyzed descriptively.

The study by Kindiki (2009) found that there were poor channels of communication used by school administrators and undemocratic school administration did not consider meetings as important channels of communication. The study advocated for use of meetings and assemblies as main channels of communication because they improved the interaction and relationship between the administration and the students hence leading to unity and peace in the school. This implies that stepping up effective communication by use of class meetings for collaborative decision making could improve on students’ discipline in secondary schools for important ideas could be discussed effectively through communicating to the students. However, despite the effectiveness of the research methodology used, this study has identified a research gap on effects of principals’ use for class meetings with students for collaborative decision making on students’ discipline in Kitui County.
According to Republic of Kenya (2001) in a report of the taskforce on students’ discipline and unrests in secondary schools, there was lack of clear channels of communication in a school and where the freedom to express opinions was curtailed, mistrust between students and administration is created. It breeds a situation where students have no way of expressing their grievances leading to frustrations and resulting into disruptive behaviours. The task force recommended that where there is need for any change in school policy for example changes affecting uniforms; charges and diet, the principals should make adequate consultations and record the same in the school logbook. The principals should also cultivate a democratic and participatory environment in the school and encourage as regular ‘’barazas’’where teachers and students are encouraged to express their views, suggestions and grievances and where the school administration can get an opportunity to expound on policies. The task force further recommended that the principals should not use students to spy on teachers or other students, but instead should make use of “barazas” and the suggestion boxes. This implies that students could vent off their frustrations and express their concerns instead of misbehaving as a way of expressing their anger.

According to Kiprop (2012) in a paper on discussion of the role of various stakeholders in the management of discipline in schools in Kenya observed that most principals adopt master or servant superior or inferior attitude in dealing with students. They rarely listened to students’ grievances because they believe that they have nothing to offer. This creates a lot of tension, stress and misunderstanding and eventually leads to frustrations and violence as manifested in strikes. The study
recommended a creation of opportunities to enable teachers, students and administrators to sit down and discuss issues affecting their school freely without inhibition, intimidation or victimization. Hence, for effective management of school discipline the cooperation between the principal, staff, students, parents and the community is a prerequisite. Thus, where students are denied a chance to express their views and vent out frustrations, it breeds a situation where students have no way of expressing their grievances leading to frustrations and resulting into disruptive behaviours and such incidences could be prevented by involvement of students for collaborative decision making during class meetings. This study has however identified a research gap on effects of principals’ use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making in Kitui County.

Kibet, Kindiki, Sang and Kitilit (2012) conducted a study to establish the relationship between leadership approach and students’ discipline in secondary schools in Koibatek district, Kenya. The study used descriptive survey design. The study was carried out in 40 secondary schools with a population of about 8492 students. The breakdown of the 40 schools is as follows; 4 boys’, 7 girls’ and 29 mixed schools. The target population consisted of principals, teachers and students in the schools in Koibatek. Data was presented by descriptive statistical techniques. The study found that principals frequently or sometimes involve other stakeholders, particularly teachers, students and to some extent parents, in the management of their schools. They communicate clearly to students but frequently retain the final authority over most issues. The study found the existence of a significant relationship between leadership approach and student discipline. It is recommended that principals embrace democratic leadership in their capacities as school leaders by involving teachers,
students and other stakeholders in decision making processes. Although headteachers involved other stakeholders in the management of their schools, the findings imply that headteachers used their veto power to determine the final direction of decisions made in their schools. Despite the effectiveness of the research methodology, this study has identified a research gap on effects of principals’ use of class meetings with students’ for collaborative decision making.

Republic of Kenya (2001) observed a lack of clear channels of communication in schools and where the freedom to express opinions was curtailed, mistrust between students and administration was created. Muchelle (1996) concurs in that the amount of participation allowed in the school was not sufficient to give students a chance to practice democratic skills. A negative attitude towards involvement of students by headteachers was noted. Headteachers lacked commitment towards participatory administration. This was manifested through double standards by the headteachers who had suggestion boxes for they felt that criticism deemed harsh to the school administration should be punished. This is consistent with Muchiri (1998) who found that Students’ involvement was only minimal and the most frequently suggested methods of enhancing discipline were guidance and counselling, dialogue, and parental involvement. This concurs with Kindiki (2009) who found that there were poor channels of communication used by school administrators and undemocratic school administration did not consider meetings as important channels of communication. This concurs with Kiprop (2012) who noted that most principals adopt master/servant superior/inferior attitude in dealing with students. They rarely listened to students’ grievances because they believe that they have nothing to offer. This creates a lot of tension, stress and misunderstanding and eventually leads to
frustrations and violence as manifested in strikes. This is inconsistent with Kibet, Kindiki, Sang and Kitilit (2012) who found that principals frequently or sometimes involve other stakeholders, particularly teachers, students and to some extent parents, in the management of their schools. They communicate clearly to students but frequently retain the final authority over most issues. Literature review has revealed that although the above studies used a variety of research methodologies, none of the studies investigated the effects of principals’ use of class meetings for collaborative decision making on students discipline as an alternative disciplinary method hence a knowledge gap that this study sought to fill.

2.6 Summary of related literature review

The first alternative disciplinary method discussed under literature review is Peer counselling as a component of guidance and counselling. Kindiki (2009) found that most schools with guidance and counselling programmes have reduced indiscipline cases compared with schools without. According to Wango (2006) the provision of guidance and counselling dependent largely on individual schools. Some schools had peer counsellors, had trained and oriented them into counselling while others had not. This is consistent with Mbugua (2006) who said that schools that had peer counsellors, 51% of them were untrained. According to Mbabazi and Bagaya (2013) effective peer counselling in schools supplements the provision of guidance and counselling services and promotes positive behaviour change hence improvement among students in academic performance.

Marangu, Bururia and Njonge (2012) note that peer counselling is important in mentoring other students as they addressed issues related to the youth. Mbugua
(2006); Marangu, Bururia and Njonge (2012) noted that students went for Peer counselling because they could discuss issues that could not be discussed with teachers or parents. Effective peer counselling could be achieved through coaching and training students in basic listening and helping skills of problem solving and decision making (Borders & Drury, 1992). Challenges that could negatively affect peer counselling include lack of resources and training in guidance and counselling; peer underrating; resistance and discouragement from other students; lack of faith by other students and shortage of time (Chireshe, 2006; Wango, 2006; Chireshe, 2013). Other challenges include: lack of peer counsellors in some schools; lack of active peer counsellors in schools that had peer counsellors and lack of commitment among teachers who were expected to help the teacher counsellors for they were never there (Visser, 2005; Mbugua, 2006; Marangu, Bururia & Njonge, 2012).

Reviewed literature on suspension as the second alternative disciplinary method on students’ discipline indicates that Suspension for some learners becomes a reward and thus it serves to reinforce the form of behaviour the teacher or school was trying to eliminate (Stewart, 2004). Suspended learners receive support from many of their classmates (Slee, 1995). This is consistent with Kindiki (2009) who said that suspended students rarely changed their behaviour and will most likely carry on with the same delinquent behaviour after suspension. Simatwa (2012) observed that the effectiveness of suspension as a method depended on traditions, ethos, and schools and their environment but as a sanction, it should be used sparingly. This concurs with Mugo (2006) who found that suspension of indisciplined students was used in extreme cases and for habitual offenders. Mutua (2004) concurs in that suspension was used at times as an alternative strategy meaning that it was not prominently used.
Literature review on students’ expulsion as the third alternative disciplinary method indicates that expulsion is done to a learner by permanently refusing admission to the school where the learner is enrolled (Brister, 1996). Grounds for students’ expulsion included wilful defiance and vandalism (Harris & Bennet, 1982). Expulsion of students is usually done as a last resort after a school has tried other disciplinary procedures like suspension in extreme indiscipline cases (Republic of Kenya, 1980); (Republic of Kenya, 2013). Smit (2010) observed that expulsion may have an effect of pushing students out of school or fostering school dropouts and this may only contribute to broader problem of violence in their country. Simatwa (2012) revealed that the effectiveness of expulsion depended on traditions, ethos, and schools and their environment and concluded that that expulsions as sanctions in schools were to be used sparingly.

Reviewed literature on principals’ use of class meetings for collaborative decision making on students, discipline as the fourth alternative disciplinary methods shows that there is lack of clear channels of communication in schools. Most principals rarely listened to students’ grievances because they believed that students have nothing to offer. This creates a lot of tension, stress and misunderstanding and eventually leads to frustrations and violence as manifested in strikes (Republic of Kenya, 2001; Kindiki, 2009; Kiprop, 2012). Muchelle (1996); Muchiri (1998) concur by noting that the amount of participation in school administration allowed in the schools was not sufficient to give students a chance to practice democratic skills. Headteachers lacked commitment towards participatory administration. This is inconsistent with Kibet, Kindiki, Sang and Kitilit (2012) who found that principals
frequently or sometimes involve other stakeholders, particularly teachers, students and to some extent parents, in the management of their schools. They communicate clearly to students but frequently retain the final authority over most issues.

Reviewed literature on the four independent variables which include: peer counselling; suspension of indiscipline students; students’ expulsion and principals’ use of class meetings for collaborative decision making has identified a research gap on the effects of principals’ use of the above variables as alternative disciplinary methods on students discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County and this justified the need for the study in order to fill the knowledge gap.

2.7 Theoretical framework

This study was based on the systems theory. The Systems theory is an approach to organizations which likens an organization to an organism with interdependent parts, each with its own specific function and interrelated responsibilities. Systems theory was first introduced by Von Bertalanffy (1968). Systems can be closed or open. Closed systems do not interact with the environment. All parts of the organization are interconnected and interdependent. If one part of the system is affected, all parts are. The school as an organization is an open system, which interacts with the environment and is continually adapting and improving.

Real systems are open to, and interact with, their environments, and it is possible to acquire new properties through emergence, resulting in continual evolution. Core (1996) and Scott (2008) aver that open systems have the following characteristics: they receive inputs from the environment, they transform these inputs into outputs and they discharge their outputs into their environment and receive feedback from the
environment. This theory is beneficial in that open systems are interrelated and interdependent. A disturbance in one part of the organization affects other parts of the organization hence the whole organization. Continuous feedback and responses result in better understanding by leadership and management of the organizations structure within the environment. However, the theory fails to specify the nature of relationship and interdependence between organizations and its environment. The theory is applicable in a school setup as an organization in that the school as an open system receives inputs from the environment (Okumbe, 2001). Thus, the inputs include students from the external diverse environment. This implies that students from the larger societal environment go to school with a host of their own believes, goals and hopes but become changed individuals as a result of educational experiences in school which are acquired through interaction with the school administration, teachers and students which also include monitoring and correcting learner discipline issues.

The interaction between teachers’ and students and other stakeholders also incorporates monitoring of students’ behaviour and appropriate correction of any discipline problems that may be noted among the students. This transforms them to educated citizens capable of contributing towards societal development. This means that if the school as an organization is to be effective in the management of school discipline, it must pay attention to changes in the external environment and take steps to adjust itself to accommodate the changes in order to remain relevant. Some of these changes may include policy changes, policy requirements and legislative requirements that may require principals’ appropriate response or implementation of external demands or influences which could affect students’ discipline either positively or negatively. These may include the ban of corporal punishment in Kenya in 2001,

For instance, media influence, easy availability and easy accessibility to internet materials, interaction of students with members of the community, technological advancement and receiving information from students who have been suspended or expelled may also affect students’ discipline. In order to realize educational goals, the school transforms students’ discipline through the use of alternative methods of instilling discipline on students which include peer counselling, suspension of indiscipline students, students’ expulsion and use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making. This means that the organization influences and is influenced by the environment in which it operates. This depends on the nature and quality of students’ discipline produced as a result of use of alternative disciplinary methods used in schools hence the suitability of the theory in the study.
2.8 Conceptual framework

Figure 2.1 Alternative disciplinary methods and students’ discipline

The following conceptual framework was used to show the interaction of variables.

The independent variables included peer counselling which consisted of aspects such as training, induction and democratic election of peer counselors; suspension of indisciplined student which included incorporation of parents in handling students discipline issues, review of students’ discipline and thorough investigation of indiscipline cases; students’ expulsion which included thorough investigation of
indiscipline cases, fair hearing and judgment by BoM members and Ministry of Education officials and holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making which included students’ participation in decision making activities, collective ownership of decisions made, prompt implementation of decisions made and continuous feedback. The intervening variable was formed by principals’ practices such as: selection or choice of various alternative disciplinary methods, appropriate disciplinary procedures, adherence to legislative and policy requirements. This determined the number of students who underwent peer counselling, number of indiscipline students who were suspended, number of students expelled and the number of class meetings held in a school per term. The expected students’ discipline outcome included: an improvement in students discipline or lack of it, decrease or increase of students’ unrests; enhanced problem solving abilities or lack of it, socially adjusted students or social misfits, high or low dropout rates and reduction of conflicts between teachers and students.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter dealt with research methodology that was used in conducting the research study. It specifically dealt with the research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, instrument validity, instrument reliability, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research design
The study adopted the ex-post-facto (after-the-fact) research design. Best and Kahn (2000) define ex-post-facto design as descriptive in nature where variables that exist have already occurred with non-intervention of the researcher. In this design, the researcher examined naturally existing relationships in which treatment is done through natural selection rather than by manipulation (Oso & Onen, 2005). The design attempted to determine the cause or consequences of differences that already exist between alternative disciplinary methods and students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County. Since Kitui County is composed of many schools, the research design was used to establish the situation of students’ discipline at the ground. The design was appropriate in this study since it was used to establish the effect of alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

3.3 Target population
The total population that the researcher specifies in research is referred to as the target population (Mugenda, 2011). During the time of the study, Kitui County comprised of
16 Districts with a total of 333 public secondary schools. Among the secondary schools included were 242 mixed day; 33 Girls’ boarding; 16 mixed boarding; 18 boys’ boarding; 16 mixed day and boarding; two girls’ day; two girls’ day and boarding; two boys’ day; two boys day and boarding (Kitui County Education office, Education Management Information System (EMIS) June, 2013). The target population for this study was 333 public secondary schools in Kitui County. The study therefore targeted 333 principals, 333 deputy head teachers, 1665 heads of departments (HoDS) and 333 Board of Management (BoM) chairpersons as units of analysis in public secondary schools in Kitui County.

3.4 Sample size and sampling procedure
A sample is a small proportion of a population selected for observation and analysis (Best and Kahn, 2000). A sample of 30 or more is to be considered a large sample (Best & Kahn, 2011) and large enough to detect a significant effect (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). The sample size for this study was obtained by a stratified proportionate sampling procedure and purposive sampling. Stratified proportionate sampling involves sub-division of the population into smaller homogenous groups or strata when the population is composed of dissimilar groups (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000; Kothari, 2011) in order to get more accurate representation (Mugenda, 2011). The sample size was however made up of nine categories of schools which was drawn from 242 mixed day secondary schools; 33 girls’ boarding secondary schools; 16 mixed boarding secondary schools; 18 boys’ boarding secondary schools; 16 mixed day and boarding secondary school; 2 girls’ day secondary school s; 2 girls’ day and boarding secondary schools; 2 boys day and Boarding secondary schools and 2 boys day secondary schools. Thus to obtain the sample size per stratum, if $p_i$ represents the
proportion of population included in stratum $i$ and $n$ represents the total sample size, the number of elements selected from stratum $i$ is $n \cdot p_i$ (Kothari, 2011). When a sample of 101 is to be drawn from a population size $N= 333$ which is divided into nine strata of school types $N_1= 242$ Mixed Day; $N_2= 33$ Girls’ Boarding secondary schools ; $N_3= 16$ Mixed Boarding secondary schools ; $N_4= 18$ Boys’ Boarding secondary schools ; $N_5=16$ Mixed day and Boarding secondary schools ; $N_6= 2$ Girls’ Day secondary schools ; $N_7= 2$ Girls’ Day and Boarding secondary schools , $N_8$ 2 Boys day and Boarding secondary schools and $N_9= 2$ Boys Day secondary schools.

Proportional allocation of the strata was adopted in order to get a sample size of 101 public secondary schools which were drawn from a population size of 333 public secondary schools. It was divided into nine strata based on school types to ensure equal representation of all school types and the sample size was as under; $p_1 = 30(242/333) = 72$ mixed day schools ; $p_2 = 30(33/333) = 10$ girls’ boarding secondary schools; $p_3 = 30(16/333) = 5$ mixed boarding secondary schools; $p_4 = 30(18/333) = 5$ mixed day and boarding secondary schools; $p_5 = 30(18/333)$ = 5 boys’ boarding secondary schools; $p_6 = 30(2/333) = 1$ boys day and boarding secondary schools; $p_7 = 30(2/333)$= 1 Girl’s day secondary schools; $p_8 = 30(2/333)$ =1 Girls’ day and boarding secondary schools and $p_9 = 30(2/333)$=1 Boys’ day.

In order to get the schools that participated in the study, a list of public secondary schools in Kitui County was obtained from the County Education office to enable the researcher get the number of schools from the county. The school names were written according to types of schools. To give every school type a chance to participate in the study, simple random sampling procedure with or without replacement was used to
select the sample size. The respondents for the study included 101 principals, 101 deputy principals and 101 HoDS guidance and counselling. The Hods guidance and counselling were purposively selected. It was not possible to use stratified proportionate sampling for boys’ day secondary schools and boarding, girls’ day secondary schools, pure boys’ day and girls’ day and boarding because of their number. Thus, purposive sampling was used to pick one boys’ day school, one boys’ day and boarding, one girls’ day and boarding and a girls’ day schools because (Mugenda, 2011) avers that they have the required information with respect to the objectives of the study. At least 15 BoM chairpersons were interviewed. One County Director of Education and one Kitui Law Courts Residnts Magistrate were also purposively sampled. The total respondents for the study were 320 respondents.

### Table 3.1 Details of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy principals</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD Guidance and Counselling</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOM</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitui Law Courts resident magistrate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Research instruments

The purpose of a tool or instrument in research is to measure the variables of the study (Mugenda, 2011). This study used questionnaires and an interview guide as tools for data collection. It administered three sets of questionnaires and three sets of interview guides. Appendix II consisted of a questionnaire for principals, Appendix III had a questionnaire for deputy principals, Appendix IV had a questionnaire for HoDs guidance and counselling, Appendix V had an interview schedule for Board of management (BoM) chairpersons Appendix VI had an interview guide for Kitui County Director of Education, and Appendix VII had an interview guide for Kitui Law Courts Resident Magistrate. The questionnaires were divided into sections. Section A contained items on personal characteristics, Section B, contained items on school characteristics, Section C contained items on peer counselling, Section D contained items on suspension, Section E contained items on expulsion and Section F contained items on class meetings for collaborative decision making. The questionnaires contained both open and closed ended items. Closed ended questions were used because they deal with facts and are less time consuming. Open ended questions were used in order to give detailed information on effects of various alternative disciplinary methods used on students’ discipline in public secondary schools. The interview guides had open ended items on alternative disciplinary methods. This allowed respondents to express their views freely and allow the researcher an in-depth understanding of the responses obtained.

3.6 Instrument validity

Validity is the degree to which results obtained and data analyzed represent the phenomenon under investigation (Orodho, 2009). Validity refers to whether an instrument provides adequate coverage of a topic. Content validity of the research
instruments could be enhanced through expert judgment (Best & Kahn, 2011). The researcher prepared the instruments in close consultation with the supervisors in order to ensure that the items in the questionnaires covered all the areas under investigation. Expert judgement enabled the researcher to identify weaknesses of the instruments and make appropriate adjustments. Instrument validity was established by pre-testing of data collection tools by a pilot study. The instruments were administered to three types of respondents from nine types of public secondary schools that did not participate in the main study giving a total of 27 respondents. The instruments were modified as follows: in appendix II items 8-15; 23-30; 39-44 and 52-56 which were initially in a Likert scale had five options whose responses included strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly agree and not at all. Those responses with “strongly agree” and “agree” were categorized under Yes responses and those items which had “disagree” and “strongly disagree” responses were put under No responses on a cross tabulation table and this enhanced the determination of the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable.

3.7 Instrument Reliability

Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Reliability of a research instrument is its level of internal consistency or stability over time (Borg & Gall, 1989). A measuring instrument is reliable if it provides consistent results (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Kerlinger & Lee, 2000; Kothari, 2011) and whether the process is reasonably stable overtime (Miles & Huberman, 1994). According to Roscoe (1969), a pilot study is useful in testing research instrument reliability in one way by helping to establish possible causes of error variance which could occur as a result of wording of the instrument, respondents’ mood during instrument administration, ordering of
the instrument items or may be because of the content of the instruments. Instrument reliability was established by a pilot study which was carried out in 9 types of public secondary schools in Kitui County that did not participate in the main study. These included one mixed day secondary school; one girl’s boarding secondary school; one mixed boarding secondary school; one mixed day and boarding secondary school; one boys’ boarding secondary school; one boy’s day and boarding secondary school; one Girl’s day secondary school; one Girls’ day and boarding secondary school and one Boys’ day secondary school. From each school 3 respondents were purposively selected that is, the principal, deputy principal and the HoD G&C. Purposive sampling was done in schools because the respondents had relevant information in relation to the study. The actual test was done on 27 respondents.

Instrument reliability was determined by a test-re-test technique. The questionnaires were administered to three respondents from the piloted schools. The same three respondents per school were allowed a time lapse of two weeks between the first and the second test. The Pearson’s Product-Moment correlation (r) formula was used to correlate the pre-test and post-test results in order to determine the coefficient of reliability or stability based on the formula below according to (Best & Kahn, 2011).

\[
r = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2} \sqrt{N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2}}
\]

Where;

\(\sum X =\) sum of X scores

\(\sum Y =\) sum of Y scores

\(\sum X^2 =\) sum of the squared X scores

\(\sum Y^2 =\) sum of the squared Y scores
\[ \sum XY = \text{sum of the products of paired X and Y scores} \]

N = number of paired score.

If the coefficient of 0.7 is obtained, for closed ended questions, it implied that there is a high degree of reliability of data (Best & Kahn, 2011; Mugenda, 2011) and the instrument has high test-re-test reliability. The reliability test results are as shown in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2**

**Reliability results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy principals</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD guidance and counselling</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This implied that the instruments were reliable.

### 3.8 Data collection procedures

Permission and authority to conduct the study was sought from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation, Kitui County Director of Education and Kitui County commissioner were respectively contacted and all principals from the sampled schools were contacted by paying a courtesy call to their schools. The researcher personally visited the sampled schools and gave the respondents the questionnaires to fill within the agreed schedule. Those respondents who did not complete the questionnaires in time were allowed more time to complete the questionnaires.
3.9 Data analysis techniques

Data analysis is the process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the mass of collected information (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Once data was collected, it was post-coded and analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Quantitative data gathered from closed ended questions were first post-coded and organized into similar themes as per the research questions. It was analysed, tabulated and presented by using descriptive statistics. To integrate qualitative data gathered from open ended questions into inferential data, it was post coded and tallying of similar responses of each item was done. Frequency counts were made of all responses making similar responses. Results of data gathered from closed ended and open items were reported in frequency tables, cross tabulation tables and explanation of the findings were made based on themes.

The Chi-square ($\chi^2$) test was used in this study to establish the strength of association between the independent variables and the dependent variables. It was also used to test whether the observed and expected frequencies is significant or not. The test thus determined the degree of association between principal’s alternative disciplinary methods and students’ discipline. The significance level was set at alpha = 0.05. This was used to determine the significance of peer counselling, suspension of indiscipline students, students’ expulsion and principals’ use of class meetings for collaborative decision making on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County.
3.10 Ethical considerations

According to Mugenda (2011), ethics in research focus on the application of ethical standards in the planning of the study, data analysis, dissemination and use of the results. This means that the study addresses logistical, ethical and human relations issues to ensure successful completion of a research project (Orodho, 2009). To ensure that there was informed consent and voluntary participation of the respondents who participated in the study, permission to conduct the research from respondents who participated in the study was sought from the secondary school principals. Each respondent was served with a copy of the introduction letter informing them about the nature, purpose and importance of the research. The respondents were further assured of treatment of their identities with utmost confidentiality and privacy. This was enhanced by asking them not to write their names on the data collection tools.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter consists of data presentation, interpretation and discussion of research findings. The study sought to investigate the effects of alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline by head teachers in public secondary schools in Kitui County, Kenya. The study utilised both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. The analysis was based on findings from four research objectives which sought to establish: the extent to which principals’ use of peer counselling influences students’ discipline; the effect of suspension of indisciplined students on students’ discipline; the effect of students’ expulsion on students’ discipline and the extent to which principals’ use of class meetings for collaborative decision making with students affects students’ discipline in public secondary schools.

4.2. Questionnaire return rate
Questionnaire return rate refers to the number of respondents who returned usable instruments for the study out of the total number contacted for the study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The questionnaires were administered on principals, deputy principals and Heads of departments (HoDs) guidance and counselling. The interview guides were administered on 15 Board of Management (BoM) chairpersons, one County Director of Education (Kitui County Education Office) and one Resident Magistrate (Kitui Law Courts). Analysis of data was on the basis of these questionnaires and interview guides. The results of questionnaire return rate are as shown in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1
Questionnaire return rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD G &amp; C</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>303</strong></td>
<td><strong>303</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.1, all the principals, deputy principals, HoDS guidance and counselling returned the questionnaires. The total respondents in the study were 318 (100) percent return rate. The return rate became possible because the researcher personally took the questionnaires to the sampled public secondary schools in Kitui County and a time limit of two weeks was given to the respondents. A total of fifteen 15 (100.0 percent) BoM participated by responding to an interview guide. After two weeks, the researcher personally went round the schools collecting the questionnaires and extra time was given to those found not to have completed them. This went on until all questionnaires were completed as some schools had to be visited several times. Data analysis and interpretation was based on these returns. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) observed that a 50 percent response rate is adequate for analysis and reporting. A response rate of 60 percent is good and a response rate of 70 percent and over is very good. Since the response rate was 100 percent, it was considered very good (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). This would provide the required information for purposes of data analysis hence this could enhance sample representation and meaningful generalization for the response rate implies a very good representation.
4.3 Demographic characteristics

The principals, deputy principals and HoDs guidance and counselling were asked to indicate their gender, age, highest academic qualifications, number of years served as a principal both within and without the current station, and number of years served in the current station. The inclusion of these variables in the study is important because it enabled a clear understanding of the background characteristics of the respondents. Some characteristics like gender provides a bearing on the way teachers handle disciplinary issues. Work experience is also likely to determine the principal’s exposure to disciplinary issues.

4.3.1 Principals’ and deputy principals’ demographic data

The principals’ gender is important since it would show the proportion of the respondents per gender and whether the leadership positions were all dominated by male or there were female too. Gender is also understood as a variable that has a bearing on the way teachers handle disciplinary issues. In a study by Khewu (2012) most participants who are school principals were male. According to Bosire, Sang, Kiumi and Mungai (2009), female principals were more likely to be inclusive by involving teachers and parents in managing students’ discipline matters. This implies that since the ban of corporal punishment in 2001 in Kenya, principals and teachers who have worked for at least 15 years may have been acquainted with use of alternative disciplinary methods due to their involvement in the transition between corporal punishment and implementation of alternative disciplinary methods in schools. However, the Principals and the Deputy Principals were asked to indicate their gender. The results are as shown in table 4.2.
Table 4.2

Distribution of principals and deputy principals by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Deputy principals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.2, there is no gender parity since there are more male principals than their female counterparts. This is also observed in the gender of deputy principals. This could therefore explain the nature of schools that were headed by male teachers which seemed to be more than those headed by female teachers. These results agree with Buckland and Thurlow (1996); Bush and Heystek (2006); (Khewu) 2012; Onderi and Makori (2013) who report that there is considerable evidence that women are greatly under-represented in management positions. This is consistent with Ikoya (2009) who noted a clear disparity between male and female principals as the application of preventive discipline was very low. Most of the male sampled principals used corrective approach to the management of school discipline whereas more female principals used the preventive approach when compared with their male counterparts. According to Jackline (2009) male teachers are mostly in headship positions than female.

The findings are inconsistent with Kenya National Policy on Gender and Development (NPGD) (2000) spells out a policy approach of gender mainstreaming.
and empowerment of women. It clearly states that it is the right of women, men, girls and boys to participate in and benefit equally from the development process where men and women enjoy equal rights, opportunities and a high quality of life. Although there were many public secondary schools in Kitui County which could be headed by both male and female principals including mixed gender public secondary schools like mixed day, mixed boarding and mixed day and boarding secondary schools this study has revealed underrepresentation of female principals in headship positions hence a reflection of disparities in the management of school discipline by use of alternative disciplinary methods between the male principals who are the majority and female principals who are the minority.

4.3.2 Distribution of respondents by age

The age category could be a pointer to the competency level, skill and physical maturity rate of a teacher. The principals and the deputy principals were asked to indicate their age and the results are shown in table 4.3.

Table 4.3

Distribution of principals and deputy principals by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Deputy Principal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 30 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From table 4.3, majority of the principals were aged between 40-49 years while on the other hand slightly below half of the deputy principals lies between the age 40-49 years and some below 30 years of age. On the other hand, a few of the principals and the deputy principals are above 50 years of age. This is an indication of a mixture of experience and skill in administrative duties held by both principals and deputy principals. This implies that as people advance in age they are given leadership positions owing to experience gained as they advance in age hence the principals and the deputy principals had the experience to concentrate on administrative functioning hence prioritising students’ discipline. Professional qualification of teachers could also determine how students discipline is managed in schools which the study also sought to establish.

4.3.3 Professional qualification of principals

Professional qualification of principals is very important for it determines the professional development of a teacher. Odundo (1990) alludes that teachers are becoming more qualified professionally. In addition, Rarieya (2007) says that appointment to school leadership in Kenya has undergone several phases. Initially, principals were appointed on recommendations by the stakeholders. Later it was based on seniority and currently it is based on merit where they have to be interviewed before they are appointed by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in leadership positions. This implies that head teachers are not just handpicked to head secondary schools, but there is more emphasis on the professional qualification of teachers in such appointments to a reasonable level.
This study sought to know the highest professional qualifications of the principals and deputy principals. The results are as shown in Table 4.4

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prinicipals and deputy principals by their highest professional qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Sc with PGDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A with PGDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA- Strategic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Sc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.4 although B.Ed was the major qualification for both the principals and the deputy principals, a number of principals had attained a M.Ed degree. This shows that there was a deliberate attempt by some principals and deputy principals to pursue further studies. This confirms arguments by Odundo (1990) who observed that teachers are becoming more qualified professionally. The findings also indicated that a number of deputy principals had a diploma in education. This implies both the Principals and Deputy Principals had basic professional qualifications which were considered when they were promoted. This implies that professional qualifications were considered when both the principal and the deputy principals were promoted.

Research findings by Imonje (2011), established that the quality of teaching does not
only depend on the academic background but also on professional development of a teacher. The professional status of the teacher is revealed through the duration, content covered during pre-service and in-service training. These results agree with Kart (1995) in that school administrators require technical skills, human skills and conceptual skills to perform their duties effectively and efficiently. Although about 15 years have lapsed since the ban of corporal punishment, it is expected that both pre-service and in-service training that is offered to teachers should prepare teachers adequately by offering courses which may enable practicing teachers to use alternative disciplinary methods while dealing with students discipline in schools. This in turn should enhance effective and efficient use of alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools.

4.3.4 Teaching experience of respondents and students’ discipline

The work experience of a teacher is usually determined by the number of years worked. Imonje (2011) observed that teaching experience is considered in terms of enhancing the mastery and application of pedagogical skills. Khewu (2012) also noted that the work experience of school managers determines their exposure to learner disciplinary issues and their familiarity with different disciplinary approaches. Principals who have worked between six years and more than 10 years of managerial experience is an indication that the principals have been exposed to both disciplinary approaches. Likewise, principals with more than 10 years’ experience were part of managing transition from corporal punishment. The principals and the deputy principals were asked to indicate the number of years they had served as principals in their career. The teaching experience of a principal and the deputy principal is very important in his/her career. This study sought to determine whether the principals and their deputies had enough teaching experience. The results are as shown in Table 4.5.
Table 4.5
Distribution of principals and deputy principals by teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Deputy principal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.5, it is clear that both the principals and the deputy principals had served as teachers for a long period. Majority of the headteachers had served as teachers for over 15 years. This has enabled them to gain a lot of experience in dealing with students’ discipline in schools because this period is an indication that they were still serving as teachers when corporal punishment was being banned and could effectively implement alternative disciplinary methods to handle students’ discipline in schools. Such length of service also meant that they could also effectively induct young teachers on handling of students discipline in schools. The findings concur with Onderi and Makori (2013) who noted that a significant number of principals had substantial experience to deal with issues arising among students. However, teaching experience could be a very valuable asset to a teacher. It helps one to become knowledgeable of issues surrounding them. It also enables a teacher to acquire certain commendable characteristics which include promptness, adaptability and efficiency.
arousing and maintaining interest of the subject. They are able to handle different issues including discipline of students diligently. This implies that such teaching experience would expose them to adapt and implement alternative disciplinary procedures in the management of students’ discipline in public secondary schools. According to Bosire, Sang, Kiumi and Mungai (2009), headship experience has a bearing on the extent to which a principal will involve teachers and parents in the management of students’ behaviour. Principals who had more years of headship experience were more likely to be inclusive by involving teachers and parents in managing students’ discipline matters. However, the level of teachers and parental input and the level of student discipline were comparatively higher in more experienced principals for they applied inclusive management approach compared to the less experienced principals. This implies that principals and teachers who have worked for at least 15 years may have been acquainted with use of alternative disciplinary methods due to their involvement in the transition between corporal punishment and implementation of alternative disciplinary methods in schools.

4.3.5 Principals’ and deputy principals’ length of service in a school

The number of years that a principal and a deputy principal have served in a current station is a measure of how much influence on the station could be attributed to him/her in the management of school discipline. On the other hand, overstaying in one station is also likely to make one dormant by as a result of one’s failure to manage school discipline. The principals and their deputies were asked to give the number of years they had served in their current stations. The results are as shown in Table 4.6.
Table 4.6

Distribution of principals’ by length of service in a school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Deputy principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.6 majority of the principals and their deputies had served for 1-5 years. This implies that they had not overstayed in their current stations hence they had much to offer to the school and the students. It also implies that they might have been newly posted in their current stations. This could also imply that majority of the principals were in the upcoming day schools and were probably implementing new rules and regulations, learning or building a new culture in their schools and also acquainting themselves with the parents, teachers and the rest of the school. This would enable them make the best choice in cases of indiscipline hence implement the best alternative disciplinary methods that they could use in their schools.

Peer counselling is one of the variables under investigation in this study which the study sought to establish the extent to which it influenced students’ discipline in public secondary schools.
4.4 Principals’ use of peer counselling as an alternative disciplinary method and students’ discipline

Peer counselling is an alternative disciplinary method that is embraced globally to manage discipline in learning institutions. This study sought to establish the extent to which principals’ use of peer counselling as an alternative disciplinary method influences students’ discipline. The results of cross tabulation are as indicated in table 4.7 on principals’ response on use of peer counselling in their schools.
Table 4.7 Principals’ responses on use of peer counselling and students’ discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students attended peer counselling</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes Frequency</td>
<td>No Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer counselling should be embraced in management of school discipline</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational guidance and counselling department in school</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counselling teacher had been trained to carry out the job</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counselling teacher is not conversant with peer counselling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full implementation of peer counselling in a school</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer counsellors trained to carry out their responsibility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counselling teacher is not conversant with peer counselling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer counselling enhances a workable relationship between learners</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counselling teacher is not conversant with peer counselling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students feel free to seek peer counselling services from their peers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer counselling enhances a sense of belonging</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study has established two sets of attributes which included both practical and attitude attributes that the principals had towards effects of peer counselling on students’ discipline. The practical attributes included: full implementation of peer counselling in school; operational guidance and counselling department in a school; training of both the peer counsellors and teachers to carry out the responsibility. The
attitude attributes included embracing peer counselling in the management of school discipline, guidance and counselling teacher is not conversant with peer counselling; peer counselling enhances a sense of belonging; students feel free to seek peer counselling and peer counselling enhances a workable relationship.

About 67.4 percent of the principals stated that there were operational guidance and counselling departments in their schools. On the other hand the principals recommended that peer counselling could be embraced in the management of school discipline. These results concur with Kindiki (2009); Ajowi & Simatwa (2010) who emphasized on use of guidance and counselling in management of minor discipline issues. The study revealed that 67.3 percent of the principals had implemented peer counselling in their schools. This agrees with Mbugua (2006) who emphasized on use of peer counsellors in schools to provide counselling to their fellow students. The findings concur with Wango (2006); Chireshe (2013); Marangu, Bururia and Njonge (2012) and Bett (2013) who noted the importance of peer counselling as an important contributor to behaviour change although not all schools had established peer counselling programs.

The study also revealed that 72.7 percent of the guidance and counselling teachers had been trained to carry out the job. This implies that they had the knowledge of handling students’ issues and could effectively train the peer counsellors. On the hand, the findings established that 70.8 percent of the principals stated that guidance and counselling teacher were not conversant with peer counselling. This implies that peer counsellors may not have received the required training from the guidance and counselling teachers. These findings agree with Wango (2006) who observed that
guidance and counselling programs were planned to enhance academic results. Some schools had peer counsellors, had trained and oriented them into counselling while others did not have. Where there were peer counsellors, the mode of selection was a matter of concern for the peer counsellors were selected by the school administration and teachers. Lack of commitment among teachers who were expected to help the teacher counsellor was also noted for they were never there.

The findings indicated that 67.4 percent of the schools had implemented peer counselling programmes while others had not. The principals also said that peer counsellors had been trained to carry out their responsibility. This implies that the implementation of peer counselling could have been effective in the presence of trained peer counsellors in schools. However, students felt free to seek peer counselling services from their peers. This could have resulted in the realization that peer counselling enhanced a sense of belonging which could have led to the assumption that peer counselling enhanced a workable relationship between learners. This agrees with Mbugua (2006) who found that students were more comfortable opening up their concerns to peer counsellors than teacher counsellors. This implies that in schools where peer counselling was effective, the principals would have embraced it to curb indiscipline cases among the students.

These results from the principals agree with those of Marangu, Bururia and Njoge (2012) who established that peer counselling had been accepted as an important contributor to behaviour change among learners in learning institutions. It was important in mentoring other students as they addressed issues related to the youth. This is not consisted with Wango (2006) who found that students did not seek peer
counselling and others said that they could not go to persons of the same age for they had nothing to tell them. On the other hand, although guidance and counselling teachers had been trained to carry out the job and peer counsellors had been trained to carry out their responsibility, this had resulted into positive impact on students discipline especially in institutions where the same was practiced. The results of the principals agree with those of the deputy principals, teacher counsellors and the BoMs.

The deputy principals were also asked to rate how peer counselling took place in their schools. All the deputy principals (101 respondents) agreed with the principals when they said that peer counselling was being embraced in management of school discipline. They also noted that peer counselling enhanced a sense of belonging which led to a workable relationship between the school management and students where peer counselling services were offered. Hence since the deputy principal is the discipline master, they are able to tell whether the programme has been effective in managing discipline of students or not especially where the programme had been implemented. This study then contradicts the results of Bett and Sigilai (2013) who noted that principals and teacher counsellors had a negative perception on the effectiveness of peer counselling among students. Since the principals, deputy principals, teacher counsellors and BoM chairpersons had reported that it had an effect on students discipline in their schools.

A Chi-square test is an important test among the several tests of significance developed by statisticians. It can be used to test the significance of association between two attributes (Kothari, 2011). A Chi-square test was undertaken to establish
the significance of association between peer counselling and students’ discipline in schools. The results are as shown in table 4.8.

**Table 4.8**  
**Chi-square test on peer counselling and students’ discipline**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counselling teacher had been trained to carry out the job</td>
<td>1.601</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer counsellors trained to carry out their responsibility</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counselling teacher is not conversant with peer counselling</td>
<td>2.196</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer counselling enhances a sense of belonging</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full implementation of peer counselling in a school</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer counselling should be embraced in management of school discipline</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational guidance and counselling department in school</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students feel free to seek peer counselling services from their peers</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer counselling enhances a workable relationship between learners</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the chi-square table, the p-value 0.206, 0.232, 0.333, 0.346, 0.349, 0.594, 0.758, 0.893 and 0.947>0.05 giving an average p-value of 0.518. This means that there is no significant difference between the principals who used peer counselling and those
who did not use peer counselling in their schools. This is because the two variables are different, that is principals who used peer counselling felt an effect on students’ discipline while those who did not use it felt no effect.

Although this study indicated that there is no significant difference between peer counselling and students’ discipline, the study has established that the attribute under peer counselling that states that Peer counselling enhances a workable relationship between learners with a p-value of 0.947 has the strongest relationship with students discipline whereas the attribute that states that guidance and counselling teacher had been trained to carry out the job with a p-value of 0.206 has the weakest relationship with students’ discipline. Although guidance and counselling teachers had been trained to carry out the job and peer counsellors had been trained to carry out their responsibility, this had resulted into positive impact on students discipline especially in institutions where the same was practiced.

4.4.2 Circumstances under which students sought peer counselling
The principals and the deputy principals were asked to indicate circumstances under which students sought peer counselling. Both the principals and the deputy principals indicated that students sought peer counselling due to family problems, adolescent challenges, when students did not want to confide to teachers, minor issues arising in classroom, and in the dormitory, absenteeism conflicts, relationships, spiritual issues, indiscipline and academic issues.

4.4.3 Principals’ response on peer counselling effects on students’ discipline
The respondents were asked to indicate the effect of peer counselling on students discipline in schools. The results are as shown in Table 4.9
Table 4.9
Principals’ response on effects of peer counselling on students’ discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves discipline of students</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps in mentorship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes open communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves academic performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to realize their mistake and reform</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes students have a sense of belonging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instils confidence and positive self-esteem among students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 73.3 percent of the principals said that peercounselling had an effect of improving students’ discipline while five percent of the principals said that it promotes open qualifications. This implies that the principals whose students went for peer counselling services had improved in discipline. On the other hand, one percent of the principals said that peer counselling helps in mentorship and makes students have a sense of belonging respectively. The results agrees with Wango (2006); Chireshe (2013); Marangu, Bururia and Njonge (2012) and Bett (2013) who noted the importance of peer counselling as an important contributor to behaviour change although not all schools had established peer counselling programs.
The results of the principals agree with those of the deputy principals, the BoM and the teacher counsellors who noted that it promotes open communication, it instills confidence, and positive self-esteem among students hence resulting to improved academic performance among students and it has also helped the students to have a sense of belonging. Peer educators provide information that the adults would normally not be prepared to discuss. Mutie and Ndambuki (1999) also observe that peers in the African communities had control over each other’s behaviour through open disapproval of an unacceptable behaviour. Bett (2013) found that peer group interactions enabled both peer educators and students experience increased self-esteem and greater ability to deal with adolescence related problems. Effective peer counselling in schools supplements the provision of guidance and counselling services hence promoting positive.

4.5 Effect of suspension of indisciplined students on students’ discipline

Suspension is a punitive measure used as a mechanism for punishing unacceptable behaviour (Stewart, 2004). Suspension was the most common technique used to deal with indiscipline in secondary schools (Kindiki, 2009). Suspension was among a wide range of methods used to deal with the many infractions that were experienced in public secondary schools by headteachers (Simatwa, 2012). Mugo (2006) argues that suspension of indisciplined students was used in extreme cases and for habitual offenders. This is consistent with Mutua (2004) who found that suspension was used at times as an alternative strategy. Suspension helps the educational management to gain enough time for thorough investigations (Okumbe, 1998). This study sought to establish the effect of suspension of indiscipline students as an alternative disciplinary method on students’ discipline. The results are shown in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10

Principals’ responses on suspension and discipline of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspension related for the last two terms</th>
<th>There is suspension</th>
<th>No suspension</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school readsmit students back to school</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents should accompany suspended students back to school</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school encounters discipline problems that require suspension</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has a readmission criteria for suspended students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPENSION RELATED FOR THE LAST TWO TERMS</td>
<td>There is suspension</td>
<td>No suspension</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some parents opt to take their children to other schools once suspended</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension gives the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension does not effectively control students discipline</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of suspended students don’t own up suspension of their children</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results it’s clear that principals who subscribed to suspension noted that the school readmitted the students back to school after suspension. This implies that although a student was liable to suspension as a punishment, the school was required to readmit them back to school after the expiry of the stipulated period of time as per the Kenya Education Act Cap 211 on school discipline regulations. Republic of
Kenya (1980) stipulates that suspended students shall not be allowed to attend classes and shall be required to be physically away from the school precincts until he/she is informed of the outcome of the case to the parent or legal guardian through a letter. The suspension shall be reported to the Board of Governors within 14 days and after consideration report to the director of Education who may terminate the suspension or confirm the suspension and determine the conditions on which the pupil may be readmitted to the same school or to any other school. This implies that suspension takes a better part of students’ time which could translate to loss of learning time hence a decline in academic performance.

About 68.1 percent of the principals also reported that parents should accompany suspended students back to school. The findings are consistent with Sheldon and Epstein (2002) who maintained that an active partnership between parents and schools has great benefits and parents can have a powerful effect on children behaviour. Bosire, Sang, Kiumi and Mungai (2009) support this by noting that the management of school discipline is a corporate responsibility between the principal, the teachers and parents. Huczynski and Buchanaan (2001) and Kiprop (2012) concur by noting that managing students’ behaviour requires a concerted effort of the parents, teachers and school principals as the key players for effective management of school discipline. Although the principal should make some effort to bring all the other stakeholders on board in the management of school discipline he/she should ensure that they are properly equipped with relevant information pertaining the use of alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in schools. This implies that parents take responsibility of their children misconduct hence it could have some cost implications in many aspects.
The principals further agreed that their schools encountered discipline problems that required suspension although the schools had readmission criterion for suspended students. This implies that schools suspended students and readmitted them at will after the time of suspension had erupted. On the other hand, the principals disagreed that suspension gives the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct. This is consistent with Nyang’au (2013) who established that suspension from school was effective in improving student behaviour. This implies that the principals had developed a positive attitude towards suspension since they felt that it did not give indiscipline student a chance for further misconduct. This may have resulted where it was practiced for students may have changed because after suspension they came to a realization that they would not have too much time in the same school since if the misconduct continued then they could be expelled from school. This is inconsistent with Smit (2010) who argues that suspension pushes students out of school and may only contribute to the broader problem of violence. Kindiki (2009) agrees in that suspended students rarely changed their behaviour and will most likely carry on with the same delinquent behaviour after suspension.

Majority of the deputy principals (78.2%) also agreed that the school encountered discipline problems that required suspension with 53.6 percent of them citing that some parents opt to take their children to other schools once suspended, 40.6 percent of them noted that parents of suspended students don’t own up suspension of their children with another 32.7 percent. This concurs with Kitui CDE (2013) who reported that the parents side with their children and deny that their children could have ever done anything wrong at school. Others said that suspension does not effectively
control students discipline in school and 32.7 percent indicating that suspension gives the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct. This contradicted the findings of the principals. However, the 60.2 percent of guidance and counselling teachers corresponded with the deputy principals views that the school experienced discipline problems that required suspension, 48.2 said that some parents opt to take their children to others schools once suspended, 32.6 percent noting that parents of suspended students did not own up suspension of their children and 30.0 percent noted that suspension of indisciplined students gave the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct and suspension did not effectively control students’ discipline in schools.

All the BoM members also agreed that the schools encountered students’ discipline problems that require suspension. This implies since the principal, deputy principal, teacher counsellors and the BoM were in agreement on issues within the school that required suspension, they also noted that suspension did not aver avenues for students to become more indiscipline. Although this would still cause other issues such as drop out cases. Liu (2013) disagrees by noting that lengthy and repeated suspensions for disruptive behaviour such as speaking disrespectfully to a teacher or fellow student results in lost learning, it also contributes to students’ feelings of alienation from school and perhaps most importantly do little or nothing to address the root cause of the behaviour. Dropping out of school is associated with life-long negative impact to the individual and at societal levels. Hence this means that the school had to introduce intervention programme after suspension to help the student cope with their new behaviour and also to encourage them to maintain their new adopted behaviours.
if they had to attend other interventions which may have included psychological counselling.

A chi-square test was done to determine the significance of association between peer counselling and students’ discipline in schools. The results are as shown in table 4.11

**Table 4.11**

**Chi-Square test on suspension of indisciplined students and students’ discipline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My school encounters discipline problems that require suspension</td>
<td>2.297</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of suspended students don’t own up suspension of their children</td>
<td>3.971</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension gives the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct</td>
<td>3.689</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school readmits students back to school after suspension</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents should accompany suspended students back to school</td>
<td>2.089</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension does not effectively control students discipline</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has a readmission criteria for suspended students</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some parents opt to take their children to other schools once suspended</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Chi-square table, the p-value 0.130, 0.137, 0.158, 0.218, 0.352, 0.409, 0.625 and 0.778>0.5. The average p-value for all attributes is 0.351. This indicates that there is no significant difference between suspension of indiscipline students and students’ discipline. The highest attribute under suspension is that some parents opt to
take their children to other school with a p-value of 0.778 which is not significant while the lowest attribute is that my school encounters students’ indiscipline problems that require suspension with a p-value 0.13 which is not significant. This implies that even if the principals used suspension as an alternative disciplinary method, it may have some weak impact on students’ discipline since the findings have revealed that the parents of the suspended students did not own up suspension of their children, suspension did not give the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct and suspension did not effectively control students’ discipline.

4.5.2 School intervention programmes after students’ suspension

Intervention measures are very important after students have been readmitted in school. School suspension alienates a student and re-orientation would be necessary. The researcher sought to know from the respondents the intervention programmes used by the school after readmission of suspended students to ensure that they settle down in school. The results are as shown in Table 4.12.
Table 4.12
Principals’ responses on intervention programmes used by school after readmission of suspended students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention measures</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counselling</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemption for manual duties to cover up lost time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to the deputy principal everyday</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue with the student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on student conduct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology letter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.12 majority of the principals agreed that they had put guidance and counselling in place to help the student change. On the other hand they noted that the students were supposed to be punished, there was follow up on student’s conduct, exemption from manual duties to cover up lost time, and dialogue with the students was given a chance. The results implies that the principals may have in several times used guidance and counselling in their schools and had probably found that it works well in managing discipline of students. Hence they still felt that it would work well as intervention program for the suspended students. The results concurred with Kindiki (2009) who recommended that guidance and counselling for students would help them realize their mistakes and initiate behaviour change aimed at being better disciplined. The results also agreed with those of the deputy principals who noted that
the students were referred for guidance and counselling and follow up programs were instituted although Ajowi and Simatwa (2010) found that guidance and counselling was minimally used to promote students’ discipline.

The deputies also noted that the students were also asked to write an apology letter after which they could do a punishment. There was also close supervision by the class teachers and a rewarding program for disciplined students was put in place. The teacher counsellors also agreed with the principals and the deputy principals by indicating that students were referred for guidance and counselling to help them change. The students were rewarded for good behaviour, they could also be asked to write an apology letter. The students could also be asked to meet with the discipline committee and the parents are involved in disciplining their children and follow up programme was also in place.

4.5.3 Challenges faced by principals in suspension of indisciplined students

The principals may encounter several challenges while instilling discipline on students in schools. This study sought to know from the principals whether they encountered some challenges while using suspension method in instilling discipline on students in a school. The results are as shown in Table 4. 13.
Table 4.13
Principals’ responses on challenges facing them in using suspension as a disciplinary method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative parents</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time wasting</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal of students to tell parents the truth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some students don’t change but like it that way</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students inciting others and refusal to go home</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional rights of a child</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of legal implications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instead of bringing parents/ guardians some hire parents or bring in siblings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 101

Majority of the principals indicated that the parents were uncooperative for they requested for reduction of suspension period, the parents also sided with the students and parents failed to report back to school on the given date. This implies that parents were not willing to admit that their children could make mistakes instead they supported the students’ misconduct. The results concurs with Kitui CDE (2013) who noted that some parents feel embarrassed while others deny whether their children could do anything wrong in school. This means that the parents sided with their problematic children and the suspended students also deny having done anything wrong completely.

Another factor that featured well was time wastage for the student, time taken by BoM to make decisions on the discipline case, time taken by the discipline committee and time taken on settling discipline issues. This concurs with Liu (2013) who noted that lengthy and repeated suspensions for disruptive behaviour results in lost
learning, it also contributes to students’ feelings of alienation from school and perhaps most importantly do little or nothing to address the root cause of the behaviour. Dropping out of school is associated with life-long negative impact to the individual and at societal levels. Suspension rarely encouraged students to control their behaviour although it gets the parent to school.

Kindiki (2009) also agrees by saying that suspended students rarely changed their behaviour and will most likely carry on with the same delinquent behaviour after suspension. This concurs with Smit (2010) who said that suspension pushes students out of school and may only contribute to the broader problem of violence. The study recommended addressing alternatives to suspension in order to find ways of helping children who have shown signs of misbehaviour problems. Schools should make every effort to help students learn to control their own behaviour. They should also design and utilize disciplinary approaches that could directly address the discipline problems. Counselling and focusing on problem solving relating to behaviour issue and community services could achieve more effective discipline.

Other challenges encountered included the constitutional rights of the child, fear of legal implications and some students instead of bringing parents /guardians hire parents or bring in siblings. This prompted the researcher to ask the respondents whether there were other alternative discipline methods considered to be effective for instilling discipline on students. The responses included instant punishment, manual work such as cutting firewood, digging holes, joint counselling between the school and parents, guidance and counselling combined with peer counselling, withdrawal of privileges, calling parents to school, giving a lot of assignments and giving a time
limit, detention of students and canning. An explanation for the following responses was that once punished the students will avoid misconduct; the parents involvement will encourage the child to correct their mistakes; manual work is constructive and discourages misconduct; parents gets to understand their children better; guidance and counselling helps the students realize their mistakes and many students don’t like being seen by their colleagues getting punished. This concurs with Cicognani (2004) and Tungata (2006) who noted that alternatives like in-school suspension, more counsellors, psychologists, support groups and parental involvement were preferred by teachers as alternative discipline procedures, application of school rules, enforcement of school code of conduct and educational counselling.

Cicognani (2004) observed that teachers were not in favour of alternatives that needed to be supervised by them but were concerned about their personal safety and felt that administering corporal punishment would ensure their safety (Cicognani, 2004). Simatwa (2012) revealed that headteachers used a wide range of methods managing student discipline in schools which included expulsion, suspension, caning, physical punishment, detention, reprimanding, kneeling, guidance and counselling, fining, rewards, wearing school uniform at all times, self-commitment in writing to maintain good conduct, pinching, slapping and smacking. This concurs with Kimani, Kara, Ogetange (2012) who found that corporal punishment was a regular school experience for the pupils and was administered by everyone in authority at school including prefects.

The most prevalent forms of corporal punishment used among pupils at school were canning, slapping, kneeling down, pinching, pulling hair/ears and forced manual
work. The study concluded that school administrators and teachers in Kenya are not thoroughly prepared to deal with indiscipline in the absence of corporal punishment. Ajowi and Simatwa (2010) concur by decrying a lack of teacher knowledge on alternative methods of maintaining discipline in schools. Kimani, Kars and Ogetange (2013) lament that administrators and teachers are not thoroughly prepared to deal with indiscipline in the absence of corporal punishment and are of the opinion that teachers should be trained on alternative strategies to deal with discipline problems other than use of corporal punishment. This implies that the future of school discipline could be at stake if teachers as policy implementers are not properly prepared through training to handle emerging pedagogical issues in the society. Therefore proper training on all educators could effectively and efficiently initiate implementation of alternative disciplinary methods in all learning institutions in Kenya.

4.5.4 Respondents’ recommendations on use of suspension in schools

The principals, deputy principals and the teacher counsellors were asked to make recommendations on how suspension could enhance management of students discipline as an alternative discipline method. The results are as shown in Table 4.14.
### Table 4.14

**Principals’ suggestions on use of suspension as an alternative disciplinary method**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be used when other methods have failed</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be scrapped</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful to involve parents in disciplining of their children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance guidance and counselling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reframe regulations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It contravenes children’s act</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to seek alternative schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch awareness campaign for parents and guardians on suspension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inculcate moral values on students to help manage their discipline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensify manual work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 101

Although 56.4 percent of the principals indicated that suspension could be used when other methods have failed, eight point nine (8.9) percent of the principals said that it should be scrapped while seven point nine (7.9) percent said that it should be scrapped and it is useful to involve parents in disciplining their children respectively. This implies that before a student is sent home; all the other alternative methods of disciplining students should have been used and proved to have failed. This is despite
the fact that some principals used guidance and counselling. Hence the study shows that majority of the principals were ready to use suspension as an end results after all the other available methods had failed. These recommendations concur with Kindiki (2009) who observed that suspension was considered the most common technique used to deal with indiscipline in secondary schools. Mugo (2006) concurs in that suspension of indiscipline students was used in extreme cases and for habitual offenders. Although the study recommended effective guidance and counselling, students would realize their mistakes and initiate behaviour change aimed at being better disciplined.

4.6 Students’ expulsion as an alternative disciplinary method and students’ discipline

Students’ expulsion as an alternative disciplinary method is also used in schools to curb indiscipline cases among the learners. Smit (2010) notes that expulsion as a method of instilling discipline on students may have an effect of pushing students out of school or fostering school drop outs and by doing so only contributes to the broader problem of violence. This study sought to identify the effects of students’ expulsion as an alternative disciplinary method. The results are as presented in table 4.15.
Table 4.15
Principals’ responses on expulsion of indisciplined students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expelled</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My school faces students that require expulsion</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelling an indiscipline student from school takes a long process</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MOE insists on retention of students in school</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of indiscipline students denies them access to basic education</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Frequency%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After crossing tabulation of principles practices and attitudes with the cases of indiscipline that the school had dealt with in the last two terms, it was noted that there were more principals who were against expulsion. Majority of the principals felt that there were other effective methods of instilling discipline on students. This implies that other disciplinary methods were readily available before expelling such as students. The principals also felt that expulsion of indiscipline students denied them access to basic education and expelling students from their school took a long process. This implied that they realised expulsion had a negative impact on the students access to basic education and also the process was long. These results agree with those of Oosthuizen (2003) who felt that expulsion is the permanent removal of a
learner from a school or hostel. It is a form of punitive measure aimed at correction and not at retribution as in the case of corporal punishment. Smit (2010) notes that expulsion as a method of instilling discipline on students may have an effect of pushing students out of school or fostering school drop outs and by doing so only contributes to the broader problem of violence. This implies that it may not solve the intended problem but may only aggravate the indiscipline problem.

Another factor that was discussed was the attitude of principals towards expulsion of indiscipline students as it was thought to bring about animosity in school. This implied that the principals’ assumption was not based on facts for majority of them felt that expulsion did not bring animosity in school. Hence this may imply that the students had come to a realization that once caught up as an individual in indiscipline cases; one had to carry their own cross. In a broader perspective, the principals were divided about the idea that their schools had indiscipline cases that required expulsion. This implied that expulsion came in as the last option. The results agrees with the Republic of Kenya (1980) which stipulates that expulsion of students in Kenya is usually done as a last resort after a school has tried other disciplinary procedures like suspension in extreme indiscipline cases. The director of education may order the expulsion of the pupil in which case the pupil shall not be readmitted to a maintained or assisted school without the special sanction of the Director of Education.

The findings of the principal agreed with those of the deputy principals, with all them indicating that there were other effective methods of instilling discipline on students while 95 percent of them also said that expelling an indiscipline student from school
takes a long process since the MoE insists on retention of indiscipline students in schools. Expulsion of indiscipline students from school was considered to deny students access to basic education. Another factor was that expulsion of indiscipline students brings about animosity in schools. However, a small percentage felt that the school faced students’ indiscipline cases that required expulsion compared with students who had been expelled for the last two terms.

The responses of teacher counsellors also corresponds with these findings that there are other effective methods of instilling discipline on students while 82.6 percent said that expelling an indiscipline student from school takes a long process and 82.5 percent of them noting that the MoE insists on retention of indiscipline students in school. This implies that the teacher counsellors were in agreement with the MoE directives. They also felt that there were other ways of instilling discipline other than expelling the students. About 75.7 percent of them noted that expulsion of indiscipline students from school denies them access to basic education, 54.0 percent of them also felt that expulsion of indiscipline students brings about animosity and 52.5 percent said that the school faced students’ indiscipline cases that required expulsion.

The researcher also asked the BoM whether their school faced students’ indiscipline cases that required expulsion with 40 percent of them saying that they required expulsion of some students. The researcher noted that all the respondents agreed that there were other effective methods of instilling discipline on students other than expulsion. These results agree with the Republic of Kenya (1980) which states that expulsion of students in Kenya is usually done as a last resort after a school has tried other disciplinary procedures like suspension in extreme indiscipline cases. Simatwa
(2012) concluded that expulsions as sanctions in schools were to be used sparingly.

This implies that expulsion as a punitive method could be avoided under all circumstances in order to enhance access and retention of students in schools by ensuring that if it has to be used, all other disciplinary methods have been tried and have been proved ineffective in dealing with learner indiscipline.

A chi-square test was done to determine the significance of association between students’ expulsion and students’ discipline in schools. The results are as shown in table 4.16.

**Table 4.16**

**Chi-Square test on students’ expulsion and students’ discipline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The MoE insists on retention of students in school</td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of indiscipline students denies them access to basic</td>
<td>2.337</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school faces students indiscipline cases that require</td>
<td>3.610</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expulsion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other effective methods of instilling discipline on</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of indiscipline students brings about animosity</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelling an indiscipline student from school takes a long</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the Chi-square table, the p-value 0.252, 0.311, 0.550, 0.550, 0.616 and 0.650 > 0.05 gives an average p-value of 0.491 indicating there is no significant difference or effect between students’ expulsion and students’ discipline in schools. The attribute with the highest p-value under expulsion is that expelling an indiscipline student from school takes a long process with a p-value of 0.665. The attribute with the lowest p-value (0.252) MoE insists on retention of students in school. This implies that even if the principals used expulsion as an alternative disciplinary method, it may have a weak impact on students’ discipline.

4.6.1 Circumstances leading to expulsion of indisciplined students

The principals, deputy principals, guidance and counselling teachers and BoM were asked to indicate the circumstances for expulsion of indiscipline students in their schools. The results for the principals are as shown in Table 4.17.

**Table 4.17**

**Distribution of the Principals’ responses on circumstances for expulsion of indiscipline students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstances</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When other options fails</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic indiscipline issues</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation by BoM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy and stealing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incitement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence attack</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and substance abuse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=101
The circumstances which led to expulsion according to a number of principals (22.8%) included when all the other options had failed. This implies that when expelling a student from schools all the other options should have been found to have failed to change learner behaviour. Another reason for expulsion also included students with chronic indiscipline issues. These results concurred with deputy principals and the guidance and counselling teachers who noted that students were expelled when a student had been suspended for more than two suspensions with no change. Other reasons included: incitement for the school students to go on strike; chronic stealing; fighting with teachers and attempts of school arson. The BoM members noted circumstances such as arson in the school, pregnant students, and chronic indiscipline cases and upon recommendation by BoM to the director of education. Others said that they had not expelled any students in their schools because their schools were still young and had not experienced indiscipline problems of high magnitude. The findings agree with those of Bennet and Harris (1982) who found that during the 1979-80 school years, high school students had been expelled for wilful defiance and vandalism. Grounds for expulsion of students included drugs, stealing, truancy, violence and force, repeated violation of school rules. Expulsion of a student is pegged on recommendation to the Board of Education to uphold or reject recommendation to expel a student.

4.6.2 Proportion of students expelled in the last two terms.

This prompted the researcher to request the respondents to indicate the number of students expelled for the last two terms for those schools that had expelled. The results are as shown in Table 4.18.
Table 4.18

Principals’ response on the proportion of students expelled in the last two terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large number of the principals (79.2%) had not expelled any student in the last two terms. This implies that although expelling was an option as an alternative disciplinary method, it was not commonly used. School expulsion though less widely studied, appears to be used relatively infrequently in relation to other disciplinary techniques (Heaviside, Rowand, Williams and Farris (1998). This agreed with the deputy principals, guidance and counselling teachers and the BoM members. This implies that expulsion is not commonly used since only a few schools had expelled students from their schools in the study.

The researcher then asked the effect of expulsion as an alternative disciplinary method of instilling discipline on students in schools. These results agreed with the deputy principals and guidance and counselling teachers who noted that it instilled discipline among students for fear of expulsion. Others indicated that it had a positive effect of improving discipline of students while others stated that it was not effective for it had a negative effect. Other respondents said that it led to destruction of the image of the
school due to suspicion and hardened indiscipline students as well as denying students access to education and refrains students from breaking school rules and regulations.

4.6.3 Challenges encountered due to expulsion of indisciplined students

There are different challenges encountered by principals and the schools at large because of expulsion. This study wished to identify the challenges encountered by principals due to use of expulsion as an alternative disciplinary method of instilling discipline on students in schools. The results are as shown in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19

Principals’ responses on challenges faced inexpulsion of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic process which wastes learning</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance from MoE officials and parents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces school enrolment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No access to basic education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its legal implications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigate an unrest in school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s against TSC Act</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of bright students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animosity from the community around the school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of the principals (18.8%) said that bureaucratic process for expulsion wasted learning time as one of the challenges they encountered. Another challenge encountered was the resistance from MoE officials and parents and reduction of
school enrolment. This implies that the school enrolment was at stake because of the expulsion of students. Slightly above half of the deputy principal (55.4%) noted that expulsion lacked support from the BoM, parents, politicians and MoE officials hence the parents were hostile and needed explanations for expulsion of their children. There was also resistance from parents and the community around the school with about seven point nine (7.9) percent noting that it was time consuming as time was wasted listening to students cases and five (5.0) percent of them noting that expulsion had not been used in their schools. The guidance and counselling teachers concurred with the deputy principals. The BoM chairmen also noted that expulsion was time wasting and had a negative effect on students’ performance, there was political interference, human rights, defiant parents and the process was long and tedious. These findings agree with Kitui CDE (2013) who alludes that the BoMS make recommendations for expulsion of indiscipline students from school, but laments that even when such recommendations are made, the MoE insists on retention of students in school. This means that very little may be done on the indiscipline students and is likely to promote further misconduct in school.

Smit (2010) notes that expulsion is a punitive measure used in schools and it may have an effect of pushing students out of school or fostering school dropouts and this may only contribute to broader problem of violence in their country. This implies that if students could be given a fair hearing by school BoM many school dropouts could be minimised hence a reduction of possibilities of creating more violence problems which may emanate from frustrated school dropouts.
The researcher sought to know other methods used by schools to instil discipline on students and were also considered effective. Slightly below half of the principals (47.5%) indicated that guidance and counselling was used to rehabilitate students, while 38.6 percent of the deputy principals concurred on the same. For suspension 15.8 percent of the principals and 15.6 percent of the deputy principals suggested its use. Another factor that was used was manual work with 27.8 percent of the principals and five (5.0) percent of the deputy principals. About five point nine (5.9) percent noted parental involvement and five (5.0) percent of the principals supported this. Other methods used included canning, mentorship programmes, peer counselling, advising parents to change the environment, taking problematic students to a court of law and involving the provincial administration to discipline the students. These results concurred with those of the guidance and counselling teachers who noted that guidance and counselling was used, the school also used manual work punishment, suspension and peer counselling were used.

4.6.4 Principals’ suggestions on how to use of expulsion as an alternative disciplinary method

The study also sought to know from the principals, deputy principals, guidance and counselling teachers and the BoM to make recommendation on use of expulsion to instil discipline on students in public secondary schools. The results from the principals are as shown in Table 4.20
Table 4.20
Principals’ recommendations on use of expulsion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used as a last option</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolish it</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restores school sanity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise guidance and counselling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoM mandated to expel problematic students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should discourage transfer from one school to another</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve stakeholders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 101

Slightly below half (48.5%) of the principals noted that expulsion should be used as a last option while 18.5 percent said that it should be abolished. This implies that none of the principals had expelled students for the sake of it but after trying all the other alternative methods of discipline and had failed. The principals also recommended that expulsion should be abolished and guidance and counselling should be maximized.

The deputy principals also noted that expulsion should be discouraged because it denies students access to basic education. Schools should explore the use of other alternatives and use expulsion sparingly hence this view agreed with that of the principals. Expulsion should be abolished and the students should be retained in school by being given a second chance and guidance and counselling should be enforced. This concurs with Muchiri (1998) who found that the most frequently
suggested methods of enhancing discipline of students were guidance and counselling, dialogue, and parental involvement. This study also recommends that students should be given manual punishment where necessary and the expulsion process should be reviewed and shortened. Some students who want to drop out of school take advantage of it and others recommended that it should be banned since it hardened the indiscipline students.

The guidance and counselling teachers recommended that expulsion should be done as the last resort after all other methods of instilling discipline on students have failed. Expulsion should be discouraged since it denies students access to basic education and denies them a chance to build their future hence leading to a waste and failure to develop potential human capital to full potential. Expulsion should be avoided and can work well with the involvement of parents. The BoM also agreed with the principals, deputy principals and the guidance and counselling teachers, in that expulsion should be used as a last resort. All stakeholders should be involved including the MoE before expulsion and parents should be involved and there should be an open discussion between the parents, teachers and students on school regulations. The researcher observes that all the respondents agreed that expulsion should be used as a last resort, and that all stakeholders should be involved including MoE. There should also be an agreement on the involvement of parents before any decision is made about their children.
4.7 Principals’ use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making and students’ discipline

Use of class meetings for collaborative decision making can be used as an alternative disciplinary method on students’ discipline in public secondary schools. Republic of Kenya (2001) observed a lack of clear channels of communication in schools and where the freedom to express opinions was curtailed, mistrust between students and administration was created. Waweru (2008) concurs in that students’ involvement in school governance was quite inadequate and was visibly below average except in co-curricular activities and maintenance of school plant. However, the study recommended a unique method of school governance during group meetings such as class meetings, club meetings and religious meetings. Hence this study sought to establish if principals’ use of class meetings for collaborative decision making with students as an alternative disciplinary method affects students’ discipline. The results are as shown in table 4.21.
From table 4.21 it is clear that all factors were highly rated with the principals factors all pointing out what is done within the school set up to enhance discipline. The principals reported that class meetings enhanced decision making and learners concerns were communicated during Class meetings. This implies that both the learners and the principals had an opportunity to converse together hence sharing
concerns that were affecting learners at that particular moment. These results are consistent with Kibet, Kindiki, Sang and Kitilit (2012) who found that principals frequently or sometimes involve other stakeholders, particularly teachers, students and to some extent parents, in the management of their schools. They communicate clearly to students but frequently retain the final authority over most issues. The results are however inconsistent with Muchelle (1996) who found that the amount of participation allowed in the school was not sufficient to give students a chance to practice democratic skills. Kindiki (2009) concurs by noting that there were poor channels of communication used by school administrators and undemocratic school administration did not consider meetings as important channels of communication. Kiprop (2012) also established that most principals rarely listened to students’ grievances because they believe that they have nothing to offer but adopted a master servant relationship which creates a lot of tension, stress and misunderstanding and eventually leads to frustrations and violence as manifested in strikes.

Kindiki (2009) advocated for use of meetings and assemblies as main channels of communication because they improved the interaction and relationship between the administration and the students hence leading to unity and peace in the school. This implies that during class meeting the school administrators had a close contact with the individual students hence this would enable a bonding that would help them to trust and open up on issues that were of concern to them. The class meeting also enable them to hold meetings with students for collaborative decision making. Hence this may enable the students to take responsibility of their actions. This is because during these class meetings students enhance dialogue with the school administration.
On the other hand class meetings helped the principal to communicate to the class on school discipline policies.

The deputy principals also strongly agreed and agreed that class meetings with students enhances dialogue with students and class meeting enhances students’ participation in decision making. Another 94.0 percent of the principals strongly agreed and agreed that school discipline policies are communicated during class meetings, 90.1 percent of them strongly agreeing and agreeing that learners’ concerns were communicated during class meetings and 89.1 percent strongly agreed and agreed that their schools held class meetings with students as a preventive discipline measure.

These results also agreed with those of all the guidance and counselling teachers who strongly agreed and agreed that learners’ concerns were communicated during class meetings, 95.2 percent of them strongly agreed and agreed that school discipline policies were communicated during class meetings, with 93.2 percent strongly agreeing and agreeing that class meetings with students enhances dialogue with students and class meetings enhance students’ participation in decision making and 90.1 percent strongly agreed and agreed that their school held class meetings with students as a preventive discipline measure. Majority of the BoM (93.4%) indicated that their schools held class meetings with students for collaborative decision making. The issues discussed during class meetings according to the BoM included strategies for enhancing good performance and general discipline of the students. The students were also able to raise their grievances during class meetings. The persons who attended such meetings according to the BoM include class teachers, BoM members,
PTA class representative, principal and deputy principal but in most cases according to the principals, deputy principals and the guidance and counselling teacher, the class teachers carried the day most of the times.

A chi-square test was done to determine the significance of association between principals’ use of class meetings for collaborative decision making and students’ discipline in schools. The results are as shown in table 4.22

**Table 4.22**

**Chi-square test on use of class meetings with students and students’ discipline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class meetings with students enhances decision making</td>
<td>1.792</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class meetings with students enhances dialogue</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School holds class meetings with students for collaborative decision making</td>
<td>5.175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners' concerns are communicated during class meetings/barazas</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School discipline policies are communicated during class meetings</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Chi-square table, the p-value 0.075, 0.209, 0.408, 0.520 and 0.653>0.5 has an average P-value of 0.373. This indicates that the relationship is not significant meaning that there is no significant difference between class meeting and students discipline. The lowest attribute is that class meetings with students enhances decision making with a p-value of 0.075 which is not significant while the attribute on school
discipline policies are communicated during class meetings has a p-value of 0.653 which is not significant.

4.7.2 Effects of holding class meetings on students’ discipline

The principals, deputy principals, teacher counsellors and the BoM were asked to indicate whether class meetings had any effect on students’ discipline. The results are indicated in Table 4.23

Table 4.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves discipline</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made are owned up</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances mutual understanding between students and teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are free to express their views</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instils a sense of responsibilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves academic performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly above half of the principals (53.5%) indicated that the effects of holding class meeting was improved discipline whereby on the other hand a handful of them felt that it helped the students to own up decisions made and it instilled a sense of responsibility. This implies that students had to take responsibilities for their own actions if they decided otherwise on issues discussed in class. The researcher
observes that when one participates in decision making, they are bound by it hence they have to take responsibilities of their actions.

The deputy principals also noted that the effect of holding class meetings with the students for collaborative decision making was to improve on discipline of students, make students feel part and parcel of decisions made, it reduces indiscipline cases, improves academic performance in school, solves minor issues before they spill over, leads to effective communication and understanding between teachers, students and the administration and the school administration becomes aware of the real challenges.

These findings were supported by the guidance and counselling teachers and BoM. This disagrees with Waweru (2008) who observed that students’ involvement in school governance was quite inadequate and was visibly below average except in co-curricular activities and maintenance of school plant. Kindiki (2009) concurred in that there were poor channels of communication used by school administrators and undemocratic school administration did not consider meetings as important channels of communication. The study advocated for use of meetings and assemblies as main channels of communication because they improved the interaction and relationship between the administration and the students hence leading to unity and peace in the school. This means that if effectively implemented, holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making as an alternative disciplinary method could enhance students’ discipline in schools.
4.7.3 Challenges faced by principals in use of class meetings with students’ for collaborative decision in public secondary schools

Some of the challenges of using class meetings with students for collaborative decision in public secondary schools in this study are as shown in Table 4.24.

**Table 4.24**

Principal responses on challenges faced in use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students come up with unrealistic demands that antagonize school</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some students shy away from stating their concerns/fears</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time consuming due to tight school schedule</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some teachers are uncooperative and fail to attend the class</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergent opinions and expectations which may not be to the</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some discussions may lose focus especially if an unpopular d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some teachers are embarrassed by some students' allegations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some students are just passive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has minimal effect and does not bring about instant change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some bad students may influence others to sabotage decision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism due to misconduct of indiscipline students and lack of fee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monotonous because the same teachers meet same group of study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All parties are supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover up of some mistakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor communication skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although several challenges were identified by the principals, about 20.8 percent of the principals noted that students come up with unrealistic demands that antagonize school administration, and that some students (19.8 %) shy away from stating their concerns/ fears. This implies that since the students are able to approach the school administration, the demands made do not have to be met there and then but the decisions have to be made by the principal in consultation with other stakeholders.

Most of the deputy principals (29.7%) felt that decision making takes long time to reach a consensus due to frequent meetings while 20.8 percent noted that some students declined speaking out of fear of being ridiculed by others, 16.8 percent said that students had too many unrealistic demands which are not easy to implement while eight point nine (8.9) percent of them noted that some students were not cooperative for they did not participate during class meeting and five (5.0) percent noted that some teachers did not take class meetings seriously and did not even attend them. Another challenge that was posed was of delays by the school administration to resolve some issues. Only issues affecting some classes are tackled while others are left out. The principal and the deputy principal may not get time to attend the meetings. They also noted that too many unrealistic demands that could not be easily implemented were mentioned and class teachers withheld some information that implicated them. The guidance and counselling teacher and the BoM also agreed with the said results.

Other types of meetings held in school in order to manage students discipline apart from class meetings with students for collaborative decision making as mentioned by the principals, deputy principals, guidance and counselling teacher and the BoM
included students’ “barazas” or open forums, guidance and counselling by motivational speakers, religious meetings, general assemblies, dormitory meetings, family meetings, Students council meetings, stakeholders meetings, and suggestion box was provided hence students would write and drop their grievances. This implies that schools had a wide range of methods that could be used to dialogue with students.

4.7.4 Respondents’ recommendations on use of class meetings with students’
to improve students’ discipline

The recommendations on how class meetings could be improved in the management of students’ discipline in public secondary schools by the principals are as shown in Table 4.25.

Table 4.25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal’s suggestions on use of class meeting as an alternative disciplinary method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be highly recommended in all schools and decision reached acted on</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be encouraged since it promotes democracy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances communication among teachers, students and administration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students ideas to be censored before implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large number of the principals highly recommended the use of class meetings in all schools and decisions reached to be acted on. This implies that holding class
meetings could enable principals to have a one on one conservation with the classes hence they would be able to know how to tackle challenges of each class since could have unique issues. On the other hand majority of the deputy principals and the guidance and counselling teachers also agreed with the principals that class meetings should be used in all schools and decisions reached acted on appropriately. Class meeting is an avenue where students can talk freely on issues affecting them and peers can effectively check on indiscipline student amongst themselves and it was seen as an important disciplinary tool. The BoM noted that students felt like part and parcel of the decision making process and the practice should be encouraged by holding class meetings regularly. Students should be encouraged to talk about issues affecting them since this would help the students to solve their issues and proper guidelines on the meetings should be provided.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the study and the conclusions drawn from the findings of the study. Finally, recommendations made from findings and suggestions for further research are presented.

5.2 Summary of the study

This study sought to investigate the effects of principals’ alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County, Kenya. The following were the objectives of the study: to establish the extent to which principals’ use of peer counselling affected students’ discipline; to determine the effect of suspension of indiscipline students on students’ discipline; to establish the effects of students’ expulsion on students’ discipline and to determine the extent to which principals’ use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making affects students’ discipline in public secondary schools.

Chapter two covered a literature review of aspects explored under alternative disciplinary methods. These included peer counselling and students’ discipline, suspension of indiscipline students and students’ discipline, expulsion and students’ discipline and collaborative decision making and students’ discipline. It also consisted of a summary of literature review, theoretical framework and a conceptual framework. Chapter three dealt with research methodology that was used in conducting the research study. It specifically dealt with the research design, target population, sample size and sampling techniques, research instruments that were
divided into sections, instrument validity, instrument reliability, data collection procedures data analysis techniques and ethical considerations.

The study adopted the *ex-post-facto* (after-the-fact) research design. The design attempted to determine the cause or consequences of differences that already exist between alternative disciplinary methods and students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County. Since public secondary schools in Kitui County experience students discipline problems of various forms, the research design was used to establish the state of students’ discipline at the ground. The study targeted 333 public secondary schools which included principals, Deputy Principals and Guidance and Counselling Heads of Departments (HoDS), Board of Management (BoM) chairpersons, Kitui CDE and Kitui Law Courts Resident Magistrate. Nine public secondary schools that represented various types of schools that participated in the main study were selected for a pilot study.

The sample size was obtained by a stratified proportionate sampling procedure and purposive sampling. A sample of 101 public secondary schools were selected which included principals, deputy principals, HoD's guidance and counselling and BoM chairpersons who participated in the study. The total respondents for the study were 320. The study used questionnaires and interview guides as tools for data collection. The questionnaires for the principals, deputy principals, HoD's guidance and counselling were all divided into sections. The pilot study was used to identify those items that could be misunderstood and such items were modified accordingly.

Once data was collected, it was post coded and analysed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze, tabulate and present data. Quantitative data gathered
from closed ended questions was first coded and organized into similar themes. To integrate qualitative data gathered from open ended questions into inferential data, it was post coded and tallying of similar responses per item was done after which frequency counts were made of all responses making similar responses. Results of data gathered from closed ended and open items were reported in frequency tables, cross tabulation tables and explanation of the findings were made based on themes. The Chi-square test was used to determine the strength of association between the independent variables and the dependent variable and to test whether the observed relationship is significant or not. The significance level was set at alpha = 0.05 which was used to determine the significance of alternative disciplinary methods and students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County. In chapter four, data was analysed, presented and interpretations were made based on four research questions. Chapter five dealt with a summary of the study, conclusions were drawn from the findings of the study, recommendations and suggestions for further research were also made.

5.3 Summary of findings

Effects of principals’ use of peer counselling as an alternative disciplinary method on students’ discipline

The results of students’ attendance to peer counselling and students’ discipline were generated from cross tabulation results. The study established that majority of schools (67.4 %) had operational guidance and counselling departments in secondary schools. The study also established that some schools had implemented peer counselling programmes in their schools while others had not. The findings also indicated that 67.3% of the principals felt that peer counselling should be embraced in the
management of school discipline. On the other hand, a high number of students according to the principals attended peer counselling in their schools while a few did not seek peer counselling.

The study also established that students sought peer counselling services due to family problems, adolescent challenges, when students did not want to confide to their teachers and minor issues arising from students in schools. The findings also indicated that not all schools had peer counsellors. Some of the schools that had peer counsellors had no active peer counsellors. However, some students’ outrightly refused to seek peer counselling services by saying that they could not go to persons of the same age because they had nothing to offer. On the other hand, the respondents stated that students sought for peer counselling services (67.9 %) because they could discuss issues that could not be discussed with their teachers. This was despite the fact that in some schools peer counsellors only existed and lacked or were largely dormant and untrained. The study recommended the need to identify and train peer counsellors who would be equipped with helping skills that could enable them to reach out to their fellow students. This implies that although peer counselling had been used in some schools, it was used for socially related aspects instead of using it as per the government policy on use of peer counselling to control students’ discipline in schools. The study also recommends that the MoE to review peer counselling practices in schools and reinforce full implementation of peer counselling programmes in all public schools.
A Chi-square ($\chi^2$) test was undertaken to establish the significance of association between peer counselling and students’ discipline in schools. The Chi square test gave an average p-value of 0.518. This means that there is no significant difference between the principals who used peer counselling and those who did not use peer counselling in their schools.

Although the study revealed that there is no significance difference between peer counselling and students’ discipline, the study established that a strong relationship exists between the attribute under peer counselling that states that Peer counselling enhances a workable relationship between learners which has a p-value of 0.947. On the other hand, the study has revealed that the attribute under peer counselling that states that guidance and counselling teacher had been trained to carry out the job with a p-value of 0.206 has the weakest relationship with students’ discipline.

However, the strong relationship could be attributed to the fact that peer counselling improved on students discipline with 73.3% of the principals noting that it promoted open communication, instilled confidence and a positive self esteem among learners. Students were free to seek peer counselling services from their peers hence this would encourage more students to seek the services from peer counsellors hence improving on academic performance. Therefore, effective peer counselling in schools promotes positive behaviour change among students hence an improvement among students in academic performance. The study however recommended that schools should be more involved in conducting students’ needs asseement and provide comprehensive guidance and counselling services.
Effects of Suspension of indisciplined students and students’ discipline in public secondary schools

The study has established that secondary schools encountered students’ discipline problems that required suspension. However, students were suspended upon recommendation to suspend a student by the school discipline committee, due to gross misconduct, after guidance and counselling had failed to work for a student, refusal to take punishment, fighting, abusing teachers and truancy criminal offences, sneaking in school with a mobile phone, drug and substance abuse, incitement, unrest and cheating in examinations, after warning a student several times and with no change and if a students’ indiscipline was beyond control, fighting and during school unrest. Although indiscipline students were expelled after trying other disciplinary methods, some principals disagreed that suspension gives the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct. This implies that the principals had developed a positive attitude towards suspension as an alternative disciplinary method. This may have resulted in schools where suspension of indiscipline students was practiced for students may have changed because after suspension, they came to realise that they would not have too much time in the school since if misconduct continued, they would be expelled from school.

The study also established from majority of the principals (60.4%) that the parents were uncooperative for they requested for reduction of suspension period. The parents also sided with the students and parents failed to report back to school on the given date. This means that the parents sided with their problematic children and the suspended students also denied having done anything wrong completely. This implies that although suspension got the parent to school, it rarely encouraged behaviour
change. The study recommended addressing alternatives to suspension in order to find ways of helping children who have shown signs of misbehaviour.

The study also revealed that public secondary schools had put in place readmission criteria for suspended students to ensure that they settled down in school. This included a wide range of intervention programmes that were used by public secondary schools after readmission of suspended students. The intervention methods as noted by majority of the principals (75.2%) included guidance and counselling which had been put in place to help the students change their behaviour. The study established that students were referred for guidance and counselling after which follow up programs were instituted. Students could also be asked to write an apology letter after which they could do a punishment. There was also close supervision by the class teacher and a rewarding program for disciplined students was put in place. This also included asking the indiscipline student to meet with the discipline committee. Parents were also involved in disciplining their children after which a follow up programme was instituted.

The study also established that there were other alternative disciplinary methods considered to be effective for instilling discipline on students as indicated by the respondents. These included: instant punishment; manual work such as cutting firewood, digging holes; joint counselling between the school and parents; guidance and counselling combined with peer counselling; withdrawal of privileges; calling parents to school; giving a lot of assignments and giving time limit; detention of students and canning. The respondents justified their responses by stating that once punished, the students could avoid misconduct, parental involvement could encourage the child to correct his/her mistakes, manual work is constructive and discourages
misconduct, parents get to understand their children better, guidance and counselling helps the students realize their mistakes and many students don’t like being seen by their colleagues getting punished and canning corrects the mistake instantly.

Although public secondary schools had a wide range of alternatives for dealing with learner indiscipline, corporal punishment in form of caning was also used in this study. This implies that despite its ban and the underlying legal implications to the users, corporal punishment is still used illegally in public secondary schools in Kenya. Therefore apart from suspension of indiscipline students, the study has established that there were sufficient disciplinary methods that could be combined to effectively instill discipline on indiscipline students including corporal punishment which was illegally practiced.

The results of chi-square($\chi^2$) test on effects of suspension of indisciplined students and students’ discipline had a p-value 0.351 indicating that there is no significant difference between suspension of indisciplined students and students’ discipline. Although the study revealed that there is no significant difference between suspension of indiscipline students and students’ discipline, the findings have established that there is a strong relationship on the highest attribute under suspension of indiscipline students which states that some parents opt to take their children to other schools once suspended which has a p-value of 0.778 which has the strongest relationship with students’ discipline. On the other hand, the lowest attribute under suspension of indiscipline students that states that my school encounters students’ discipline problems that require suspension with a p-value of 0.130 has the weakest relationship with students’ discipline. The weak relationship is attributed to the fact that the
parents of the suspended students did not own up suspension of their children, suspension did not give the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct and suspension did not effectively control students’ discipline.

**Expulsion and students’ discipline**

After crossing tabulation of principles practices and attitudes with the cases of indiscipline that the school had dealt with in the last two terms, it was noted that there were more principals who were against expulsion. The findings revealed that for the last two terms there are those schools that expelled students from school and others did not expel indiscipline students from their schools. However, majority of the principals (79.2%) had not expelled any student in the last two terms while 5.9 percent had expelled between 1-5 students.

The circumstances which leads to expulsion as indicated by 22.8 percent of the principals was when other options failed with 15.8 percent of the principals noting that it is due to chronic indiscipline issues. Other grounds for expulsion included drugs, stealing, truancy, violence and force, repeated violation of school rules and upon recommendations by the school BOM to uphold or reject recommendations to expel a student.

The study also established that although students’ expulsion refrains students who had been left behind from breaking school rules and regulations, students’ expulsion had its own underlying challenges. The challenges of expulsion were attributed by 18.8 percent of the principals to bureaucratic process which wasted learning time with 16.8 percent noting that principals encountered resistance from MoE officials and parents. It also left the school enrolment at stake especially where it was practiced and it
denied students access to basic education. This implies that very little may be done on the indiscipline students and is likely to promote further misconduct in school.

Although there were cases of indiscipline facing the schools that required students’ expulsion, the principals were divided on the idea that their schools encountered indiscipline cases that required expulsion. This is because majority of the principals felt that there were other effective methods of instilling discipline on students. This means that there were other disciplinary methods that were readily available for use before expelling an indiscipline student from school. However, the study has established that, expulsion of indiscipline students from school could be avoided under all circumstances for this could enhance access and retention of students in school. However, this could be enhanced by ensuring that all other disciplinary methods had been tried and had been proved ineffective in dealing with learner indiscipline before students’ expulsion is instituted.

The results of chi-square ($x^2$) test on effects of students’ expulsion and students’ discipline had an average p-value 0.491 indicating that there is no significant difference between students’ expulsion and students’ discipline. Although this study has established that there is no significant difference between students’ expulsion and students’ discipline, the study has found that there is a strong relationship between the highest attribute under students’ expulsion which states that expelling an indiscipline student from school takes a long process with a p-value of 0.665 which has the strongest relationship with students’ discipline. However, the lowest attribute under students’ expulsion that states the MoE insists on retention of students in school with a p-value (0.252) shows the weakest relationship with students’ discipline. This
implies that even if the principals used expulsion as an alternative disciplinary method, it may have a weak impact on students’ discipline.

**Collaborative decision making and students’ discipline**

The study has established that majority of the principals held class meetings with students for collaborative decision making. Although holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making encountered some challenges with about 20.8 percent of the principals stating that students come up with unrealistic demands that antagonized school administration, 19.8 percent stated that some students shy away from stating their concerns/ fears. However, wherever holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making was practiced, slightly above half of the principals (53.5 %) percent stated that it improved on school discipline whereby 20.7 percent of the principals felt that it helped the students to own up decisions made. In addition, holding class meetings with students enhanced dialogue with students. The study also found that students were able to open and inform both the class teacher and the principal of their impeding fears hence improving dialogue between them. This implies that there was participatory involvement of both students and the school administration in decision making practices hence enhanced implementation of decisions made because they were collectively owned by the students, teachers and the school administration.

The results of chi-square test on effects of holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making and students’ discipline had a p-value 0.373 indicating that there is no significant difference between holding class with students for collaborative decision making and students’ discipline. Although the study found that
there is no significant difference between holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making and students’ discipline, the study has established that there is a strong relationship on the highest attribute under principals’ use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making which states that school discipline policies are communicated during class meetings with a p-value of 0.653 which shows the strongest relationship with students’ discipline. However, the lowest attribute under use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making which states that class meetings with students enhances decision making with a p-value of 0.075 has the weakest relationship with students’ discipline.

Although some schools did not use class meetings with students for collaborative decision making, majority of the principals 71.3 percent highly recommended use of class meetings in all schools and decision reached to be acted upon.

5.4 Conclusions
The following conclusions were drawn from the study:
The study established that majority of the schools had operational guidance and counselling departments in their schools. Some schools had implemented peer counselling programmes in their schools while others had not. Although Peer counselling had been implemented in some schools, the programme had not picked up properly in public secondary schools for it was established that peer counselling was done for socially related aspects instead of using it to handle students’ indiscipline.

The study also established that majority of the principals were ready to use suspension as an end result after all other available disciplinary methods had failed. In addition,
schools had put in place intervention measures after suspension of indiscipline students to ensure that readmitted students settled down in school. However, apart from suspension of indiscipline students, the study established that there were sufficient disciplinary methods which were considered effective enough in instilling discipline on indiscipline students including corporal punishment which was illegally practiced. These could be combined together to manage students discipline in public secondary schools to ensure change of learner discipline hence positive improvement in academic performance. The Chi-square ($x^2$) results have indicated that suspension has no significant effect on students’ discipline with a p-value of 0.351.

The study established that students’ expulsion had an effect on students discipline by refraining those students who had been left behind from breaking school rules and regulations. Wherever practiced, students’ expulsion left the school enrolment at stake and denied students access to basic education. The study also established that apart from expulsion, there were other methods of instilling discipline on students such as guidance and counselling, giving manual work and more assignments, reporting to the deputy on weekly basis among others. This means that other disciplinary methods were readily available for use before expelling a student from school hence student’s expulsion came about as a final option for a school. Chi-square ($x^2$) test has indicated that there is no significant relationship between students’ expulsion and students’ discipline.

The study also found that although holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making was practiced in some schools, it enhances dialogue among the participants, it enhances class participation in decision making and learners
are able to communicate their concerns. However, holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making enhanced participatory involvement of students, teachers and school administration in decision making practices.

This study has established that peer counselling had the highest p-value 0.518 while students’ expulsion was rated second with a p-value 0.491. In addition, holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making was rated third with a p-value 0.373 while suspension of indiscipline students was rated fourth with a p-value 0.351. This indicates that there is no significant difference between alternative disciplinary methods and students’ discipline. This is consistent with Busienei (2012) who observed that the cases of indiscipline have not reduced in schools with the use of alternative methods of corporal punishment with 71% of the respondents agreed that the use of other alternative methods to corporal punishment have not reduced indiscipline in schools.

However, the study concluded that alternative disciplinary methods such as peer counselling, suspension of indiscipline students, students’ expulsion and principals’ use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making have no significant effect on students’ discipline. Although the study established that there was no significant difference between alternative disciplinary methods and students’ discipline, the study found that there was a strong association between peer counselling with p-value 0.518 and students’ discipline whereas suspension of indiscipline students with p-value 0.351 had the weakest relationship with students discipline in public secondary schools.
5.5 Recommendations of the study

The following were the recommendations of the study:

In terms of policy, the government should review the use of all disciplinary methods in public secondary schools and provide policy guidelines on the best alternative disciplinary methods to be used in the management of students’ discipline in all learning institutions.

In terms of practice, the government should strengthen the use of alternative disciplinary methods through sensitization of all stakeholders on the significance of each alternative disciplinary method in order to enhance ownership of decisions made at institutional levels by all stakeholders.

In terms of policy, the government should review reintroduction of corporal punishment but with more guidelines and consider its combination with other alternative disciplinary methods in the management of students’ discipline in public secondary schools.
5.6 Suggestions for further research

The following were the suggestions for further research.

A comparative study should be carried out in other counties on effects of alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline by principals in public secondary schools in Kenya so as to compare the results with those of Kitui County.

A study on effectiveness of other disciplinary methods that have not be researched on in this study to be carried out to determine their effects on students’ discipline in secondary schools in Kenya.

A comparative study on perception of teachers and parents on corporal punishment and alternative disciplinary methods in the management of students’ discipline in schools.

A study on students’ views on effectiveness of alternative disciplinary methods in the management of students’ discipline in secondary schools should be carried out.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

INTRODUCTION LETTER TO THE RESPONDENTS

University of Nairobi,
Department of Educational Administration and planning,
P O Box 30197-00100,
NAIROBI.

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH VISIT TO YOUR SCHOOL

I am a Post Graduate Student at University of Nairobi. I am conducting a study on the effects of principals’ alternative disciplinary methods on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kitui County, Kenya. The respondents for the study are headteachers, deputy headteachers, HoDss guidance and counselling and BoM chair persons in Kitui County.

The purpose of this letter is to seek your participation in the study. The information gathered from respondents will be used for purposes of this study only. To ensure confidentiality of your identity, please do not write your name on the questionnaires.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Yours Faithfully,

Janet K. Mulwa.
APPENDIX II
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEADTEACHERS

INSTRUCTIONS

You are kindly requested to complete this questionnaire honestly by inserting a tick (√) against your option in the appropriate box and offer explanations for the questions that require your answer through a word of explanation. For confidentiality purposes, you need not write your name on the questionnaires. Your cooperation and assistance will be highly appreciated.

SECTION A. Personal profile

a. Please indicate your gender:

Female [ ]  Male [ ]

2. Please tick the age category that applies to you:

Below 30 years [ ]  31-39 years [ ]  40-49 years [ ]

50-59 years [ ]  60 years and above [ ]

3. Please indicate your highest professional qualifications.

B.A [ ]  B.A with PGDE [ ]  B.Ed [ ]

M.A [ ]  M.SC [ ]  S.1 [ ]  M.Ed [ ]

Diploma in Education [ ]  B.SC with PGD [ ]

4. How many years have you served as a) A teacher...........................................

5. How long have you served in this school?..............................................................

SECTION B: School characteristics

6. Please indicate the type of your school.

Mixed day and boarding [ ];  Boys Boarding [ ]  Girls Boarding [ ];

Girls day [ ];  Boys day [ ]  Girls’ day and boarding [ ]

Mixed boarding [ ];  Boys’ day and Boarding [ ]  Mixed day [ ]

7. How many streams does your school have?.........................................................
SECTION C. Peer counselling and students’ discipline

Please tick the number that best describes your opinion about peer counselling in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8  The school has an operational guidance and counselling department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  The guidance and counselling teacher has been trained to carry out the responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Peer counselling programme has been fully implemented in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Peer counsellors have been trained to carry out their responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Students feel free to seek peer counselling services from their peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Peer counselling enhances a workable relationship between the learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Peer counselling enhances a sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Peer counselling should be embraced in management of school discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Do students seek peer counselling services in your school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

17. If your answer is Yes under what circumstances do students seek peer counselling services in your school?

18. How many students have undergone peer counselling in your school for the last two terms?

..........................................................
19. What effect does peer counselling have on students’ discipline in your school?  

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

20. What challenges does your school encounter in use of peer counsellors on students’ discipline?  

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

21. Apart from peer counselling, what other methods of preventing students’ indiscipline does your school use?  

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

22. What are your recommendations on how the use of peer counsellors in management of students discipline could be enhanced in secondary schools?  

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

SECTION E Suspension and students’ discipline

In a rating scale, please tick the number that best describes your opinion about suspension of indiscipline students in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 My school encounters students’ discipline problems that require</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suspension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 The school readmits students back to school after suspension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 The school has a readmission criteria of suspended students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Parents should accompany suspended students back to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Parents of suspended students don’t own up suspension of their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some parents opt to take their children to other schools once suspended.

Suspension gives the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct.

Suspension does not effectively control students’ discipline in public secondary schools.

31. Do you suspend indiscipline students from school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

32. If your answer is Yes under what circumstances does your school suspend problematic students?

…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………

33. How many students have you suspended for the last two terms?

…………………………………………………………………………………

34. How long does the suspension of indiscipline students in your school last?

…………………………………………………………………………………

Please explain the reason for your response

…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………

35. What intervention programmes does your school use after readmission of suspended students in school to ensure that they settle down in school?

…………………………………………………………………………………

36. What challenges does your school encounter when using suspension as a method of instilling discipline on students in your school?
37. Apart from suspension, what other effective methods of instilling discipline does your school use to correct students’ discipline?

Please explain your response

38. How best can suspension be used in public secondary schools to manage students’ discipline?

SECTION D. Expulsion and students’ discipline

In a rating scale, please tick the number that best describes your opinion about expulsion of indiscipline students in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My school faces students indiscipline cases that require expulsion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelling an indiscipline student from school takes a long process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MOE insists on retention of indiscipline students in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of indiscipline students from school denies them access to basic education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other effective methods of instilling discipline on students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
44. Expulsion of indiscipline students brings about animosity

45. Does your school expel indiscipline students from school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

46. If your answer is Yes, under what circumstances do you expel students from school?
   ........................................................................................................................................

47. How many expulsion cases have you had for the last two terms?
   ........................................................................................................................................

48. What effect does use of expulsion as an alternative method of instilling discipline have on students’ discipline in your school?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

49. What challenges do you encounter in use of expulsion as an alternative method of instilling discipline on students in your school?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

50. Apart from expulsion, what other effective methods of instilling discipline on students does your school use on problematic students?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

51. What are your recommendations on expulsion as an alternative method of instilling discipline on students in public secondary schools in order to enhance the management of students’ discipline in schools?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
**SECTION F: Class meetings and students’ discipline**

In a rating scale, please tick the number that best describes your opinion about class meetings in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 My school usually holds class meetings with students as a preventive discipline measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Class meetings with students enhances dialogue with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Class meetings enhances students’ participation in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 School discipline policies are communicated during class meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Learners’ concerns are communicated during class meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. Do you hold class meetings with students for collaborative decision making in your school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

58. If your answer is Yes, how often do you hold class meetings in your school?

..........................................................................................................................................................

59. Who usually attends the class meetings?

..........................................................................................................................................................

60. What effect does holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making have on students discipline in your school?

..........................................................................................................................................................
61. What challenges does your school encounter in use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making in your school?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

62. Apart from holding class meetings with students, what other types of meetings does your school hold with students in order to manage students’ discipline?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

63. What are your recommendations on use of class meetings to enhance the management students’ discipline in schools?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Thank you for your cooperation
APENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE DEPUTY HEADTEACHER

INSTRUCTIONS

You are kindly requested to complete this questionnaire honestly by inserting a tick (√) against your option in the appropriate box and offer explanations for the questions that require your answer through a word of explanation. For confidentiality purposes, you need not write your name on the questionnaires. Your cooperation and assistance will be highly appreciated.

SECTION A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Please indicate your gender:
   - Female [ ]
   - Male [ ]

2. Please tick the age category that applies to you:
   - Below 30 years [ ]
   - 31-39 years [ ]
   - 40-49 years [ ]
   - 50-59 years [ ]
   - 60 years and above [ ]

3. Please indicate your highest professional qualifications.
   - B.A [ ]
   - B.A with PGDE [ ]
   - B.Ed [ ]
   - M.A [ ]
   - M.SC [ ]
   - S.I [ ]
   - M.Ed [ ]
   - Diploma in Education [ ]
   - B.SC with PGDE [ ]

4. What is your teaching experience as a teacher?.................................

5. How long have you served in this school?...........................................

SECTION B: School characteristics

6. Please indicate the type of your school.
   - Mixed day and boarding [ ]
   - Boys Boarding [ ]
   - Girls Boarding [ ]
   - Boys day [ ]
   - Girls’ day and boarding [ ]
   - Mixed boarding [ ]
   - Boys’ day and Boarding [ ]
   - Mixed Day [ ]
7. How many streams does your school have?

SECTION C. Peer counselling and students’ discipline

Please tick the number that best describes your opinion about peer counselling as an alternative method of instilling discipline on students in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8  The school has an operational guidance and counselling department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  The guidance and counselling teacher has been trained to carry out the responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Peer counselling programme has been fully implemented in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Peer counsellors have been trained to carry out their responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Students feel free to seek peer counselling services from their peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Peer counselling enhances a workable relationship between the learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Peer counselling enhances a sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Peer counselling should be embraced in management of school discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Do students seek peer counselling services in your school? Yes [ ] No [ ]
17. If your answer is Yes, under what circumstances do students seek peer counselling services in your school?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

18. How many students have undergone peer counselling in your school for the last two terms?
........................................................................................................................................

19. What effect does peer counselling have on students’ discipline in your school?
........................................................................................................................................

20. What challenges does your school encounter in use of peer counsellors on students’ discipline?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

21. Apart from peer counselling, what other methods of preventing students’ indiscipline does your school use?
........................................................................................................................................

22. What are your recommendations on use of peer counselling in management of students’ discipline in secondary schools?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

SECTION E: Suspension and students’ discipline

In a rating scale, please tick the number that best describes your opinion about suspension of indiscipline students in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 My school encounters discipline problems that require suspension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Parents should accompany suspended students back to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Parents of suspended students don’t own up suspension of their children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Some parents opt to take their children to other schools once suspended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Suspension gives the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Suspension does not effectively control students’ discipline in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Do you suspend indiscipline students from school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

30. If your answer is Yes, under what circumstances does your school suspend problematic students?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

31. How many students have been suspended from your school for the last two terms?

........................................................................................................................................

32. How long does the suspension of indiscipline students in your school last?

........................................................................................................................................
Please explain the reason for your response

..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

33. What intervention programmes does your school use after readmission of suspended students in school to ensure that they settle down in school?
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

34. What challenges does your school encounter in use of suspension as a method of instilling discipline on students in your school?
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

35. Apart from suspension, what other effective methods of instilling discipline does your school use to correct students’ discipline?
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

Please explain your response
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

36. How best can suspension be enhanced in public secondary schools to manage students’ discipline?
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
**SECTION D: Expulsion and students’ discipline**

In a rating scale, please tick the number that best describes your opinion about expulsion of indiscipline students in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My school faces students indiscipline cases that require expulsion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelling an indiscipline student from school takes a long process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MOE insists on retention of indiscipline students in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of indiscipline students from school denies them access to basic education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other effective methods of instilling discipline on students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of indiscipline students brings about animosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Does your school expel indiscipline students from school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

43. If your answer is Yes, under what circumstances do you expel students from school? ...........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

How many students have been expelled from your school for the last two terms?
...........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
51. What effect does expulsion of indiscipline students have on students’ discipline in your school?
...........................................................................................................................................

52. What challenges do you encounter in use of expulsion as an alternative method of instilling on students in your school?
...........................................................................................................................................

53. Apart from expulsion, what other effective methods of instilling discipline on students does your school use on problematic students?
...........................................................................................................................................

54. What are your recommendations on how expulsion as an alternative method of instilling discipline on students in schools could be enhanced to manage students’ discipline in public secondary schools?
...........................................................................................................................................

SECTION F: Class meetings and students’ discipline

In a rating scale, please tick the number that best describes your opinion about class meetings in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49 My school holds class meetings with students as a preventive discipline measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Class meetings with students enhances dialogue with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Class meetings enhances students’ participation in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 School discipline policies are communicated during class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53. Learners’ concerns are usually communicated during class meetings.

54. Do you hold class meetings with students for collaborative decision making in your school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

55. If your answer is Yes, how often do you hold class meetings?
   ............................................................................................................................

56. Who usually attends the class meetings?
   ............................................................................................................................

55. What effect does holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making have on students discipline in your school?
   ............................................................................................................................

56. What challenges does your school encounter in use of class meetings with students for collaborative decision making in your school?
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................

57. Apart from holding class meetings with students, what other types of meetings does your school hold with students in order to manage students’ discipline?
   ............................................................................................................................

60. What are your recommendations on use of class meetings to enhance the management of students’ discipline in schools?
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
APPENDIX IV

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HOD GUIDANCE AND COUNSELLING

INSTRUCTIONS

You are kindly requested to complete this questionnaire honestly by inserting a tick (√) against your option in the appropriate box and offer explanations for the questions that require your answer through a word of explanation. For confidentiality purposes, you need not write your name on the questionnaires. Your cooperation and assistance will be highly appreciated.

SECTION A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Please indicate your gender: Female [ ] Male [ ]

2. Please tick the age category that applies to you:
   - Below 30 years [ ] 31-39 years [ ] 40-
   - 49years [ ] 50-59years [ ] 60 years and above [ ]

3. Please indicate your highest professional qualifications.
   - S.I [ ] M.Ed [ ] Diploma in Education [ ] B.SC with PGDE [ ]

4. What is your teaching experience as a teacher?..................................................

5. How long have you served in this school?............................................................... What post do you hold in this school?..........................................................
   Apart from teaching, what other duties do you carry out in this school?..............

SECTION B: School characteristics

6. Please indicate the type of your school.
   - Mixed day and boarding [ ]: Boys Boarding [ ]
   - Girls Boarding [ ]: Girls day [ ]: Boys day [ ]
   - Girls’ day and boarding [ ] Mixed boarding [ ]
   - Boys’ day and Boarding [ ] Mixed day [ ]
7. How many streams does your school have?.................................

SECTION C. Peer counselling and students' discipline

Please tick the number that best describes your opinion about peer counselling as an alternative method of instilling discipline on students in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 The school has an operational guidance and counselling department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 As a guidance and counselling teacher I have been trained to carry out the responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 As a guidance and counselling teacher, I am not conversant with peer counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Peer counselling programme has been fully implemented in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Peer counsellors have been trained to carry out their responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Students feel free to seek peer counselling services from their peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Peer counselling enhances a workable relationship between the learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Peer counselling enhances a sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Peer counselling should be embraced in management of school discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Do students seek peer counselling services in your school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

18. If your answer is Yes, under what circumstances do students seek peer counselling services in your school?..........................................................................................................................
19. How many students have undergone peer counselling in your school for the last two terms? ........................................................................................................................................

20. What effect does peer counselling have on students’ discipline in your school? ........................................................................................................................................

21. What challenges does your school encounter in use of peer counsellors on students’ discipline? ........................................................................................................................................

22. Apart from peer counselling, what other programmes does your school use under guidance and counselling department to manage students’ discipline in your school? ........................................................................................................................................

23. What are your recommendations on how peer counselling should be enhanced in management of students’ discipline in public secondary schools? ........................................................................................................................................

24. My school encounters discipline problems that require suspension ............................
25. Parents of suspended students should accompany them back to school

SECTION E: Suspension and students’ discipline

In a rating scale, please tick the number that best describes your opinion about suspension of indiscipline students in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 My school encounters discipline problems that require suspension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Parents of suspended students should accompany them back to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

199
Parents of suspended students don’t own up suspension of their children

Some parents opt to take their children to other schools once suspended

Suspension gives the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct

Suspension does not effectively control students’ discipline in public secondary schools

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Parents of suspended students don’t own up suspension of their children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Some parents opt to take their children to other schools once suspended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Suspension gives the indiscipline students a chance for further misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Suspension does not effectively control students’ discipline in public secondary schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Does your school suspend problematic students from school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

31. If your answer is Yes, under what circumstances does your school suspend problematic students?

..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................

32. How many students have been suspended from your school for the last two terms?

..................................................................................................................................................

33. How long does the suspension of indiscipline students in your school last?

..................................................................................................................................................

Please explain the reason for your response

..................................................................................................................................................

34. What intervention programmes does your school use after readmission of suspended students’ in school to ensure that they settle down in school?

..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
35. What challenges does your school encounter in use of suspension as an alternative method of instilling discipline on students in your school?

.................................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................................

36. Apart from suspension, what other alternative disciplinary methods does your school consider effective for instilling discipline on students and are instead used on students who would otherwise deserved a suspension?

.................................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................................

Please explain your response..............................................................................................

37. What are your recommendations on use of suspension as an alternative disciplinary method of instilling discipline on students in public secondary schools?

........................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................

SECTION D. Expulsion and students’ discipline

In a rating scale, please tick the number that best describes your opinion about expulsion of indiscipline students in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 My school faces students' indiscipline cases that require expulsion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Expelling an indiscipline student from school takes a long process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40. The MOE insists on retention of indiscipline students in school

41. Expulsion of indiscipline students from school denies them access to basic education

42. There are other effective methods of instilling discipline on students

43. Expulsion of indiscipline students brings about animosity

44. Does your school expel problematic students from school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

45. If your answer is Yes, under what circumstances are students expelled from your school?

.................................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................................

46. How many students have been expelled from your school for the last two terms?

.................................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................................

47. What effect does expulsion of indiscipline students have on students’ discipline in your school?

.................................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................................

48. What challenges does your school encounter in use of expulsion as an alternative method of instilling on students in your school?

...........................................................................................................................................
49. Apart from expulsion, what other disciplinary methods does your school consider effective for instilling discipline on students and are used on problematic students?

............................................................................................................................
............................................................................................................................

50. What are your recommendations how use of expulsion as an alternative disciplinary method in public secondary schools could be enhanced in the management of students’ discipline?

............................................................................................................................
............................................................................................................................

SECTION F: Class meetings and students’ discipline

In a rating scale, please tick the number that best describes your opinion about class meetings in your school. The numbers represent the following responses strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Disagree (3); Strongly Disagree (2); not at all (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51 My school holds class meetings with students as a preventive discipline measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Class meetings with students enhances dialogue with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Class meetings enhances students’ participation in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 School discipline policies are communicated during class meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Learners’ concerns are usually communicated during class meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
56. Does your school hold class meetings with students for collaborative decision making?  Yes [ ] No [ ]

57. If your answer is yes, how often do you hold class meetings?  ........................................

58. Who usually attends the class meetings?
...............................................................................................................................................

59. What effect does holding class meetings with students for collaborative decision making have on students’ discipline in your school?
...............................................................................................................................................

60. What challenges does your school encounter while using class meetings with students for collaborative decision making in your school?
...............................................................................................................................................

61. Apart from holding class meetings with students, what other types of meetings does your school hold with students in order to manage students’ discipline?
...............................................................................................................................................
...............................................................................................................................................

62. What are your recommendations on how use of class meetings for collaborative decision making could be enhanced in the management students’ discipline in public secondary schools?
...............................................................................................................................................

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
APPENDIX V

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR BOARD OF MANAGEMENT CHAIRMAN

1. What is your highest academic qualification?.................................................................

2. What type of school are you a BOM chairman?.............................................................

3. Does your school encounter students’ indiscipline problems that require suspension of students yes [ ] No [ ]

4. How do you manage indiscipline of students who have been suspended from school?
   .................................................................................................................................

5. What effect does suspension have on students’ discipline?...........................................

6. What challenges does the BOM face in handling indiscipline of suspended students?
   ...........................................................................................................................................

7. What are your recommendations on how to enhance suspension as an alternative disciplinary method in management of students discipline?........................................

8. Does your school encounter students’ indiscipline that requires expulsion?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

9. If your answer is Yes, under what circumstances does the BOM/BOG expel students?
   .............................................................................................................................................

10. How do you go about the expulsion of indiscipline students?.................................

11. What effect does expulsion have on students’ discipline?...........................................

12. What challenges do you encounter in expulsion of indiscipline students?
   .............................................................................................................................................
13. What are your recommendations on how to enhance use of expulsion as an alternative disciplinary method to enhance management of students’ discipline?

14. Does your school use peer counselling as an alternative disciplinary method?

15. Under what circumstances is it used?

16. What effect does peer counselling have on students’ discipline?

17. What challenges does the school encounter in use of peer counselling to manage students’ discipline?

18. What are your recommendations on how to enhance peer counselling to manage students’ discipline?

19. Does your school hold class meetings with students for collaborative decision making? Yes [ ] No [ ]

20. If your answer is Yes, what challenges does the school face in use of class meetings for collaborative decision making to manage students discipline?

21. What effect does use of class meetings for collaborative decision making have on students’ discipline?

22. What are your recommendations on how to enhance use of class meetings for collaborative decision making?

23. What other alternative disciplinary methods does the school use to discipline students?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
APPENDIX VI

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR COUNTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

Date: 9th July 2013

Name of researcher: Janet K. Mulwa

1. What kind of indiscipline problems do public secondary schools in Kitui County encounter?

2. What are your opinions on the following disciplinary methods.
   
   (a). Peer counselling
   
   (b). Suspension of indisciplined students
   
   (c). Students expulsion
   
   (d). Use of Class meetings for collaborative decision making

3. What are the parents reactions towards
   
   a) Suspension of indisciplined students
   
   b) Students expulsion

4. What is the stand of the Ministry of education on
   
   a) Suspension of indisciplined students
   
   b) Students expulsion

5. What complains are presented to your office by parents pertaining their children indiscipline cases?
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INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR KITUI LAW COURTS RESIDENCE MAGISTRATE

1. What kind of students’ indiscipline problems do public secondary schools bring to court?

2. How does the court handle students’ indiscipline problems that are presented to the courts by the schools?

3. What role do parents play when their children are brought to court?

4. How do the schools react to the judgement passed by the court pertaining indisciplined students?
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SECONDARY SCHOOLS WHICH PARTICIPATED IN THE STUDY

1. A.I.C Miambani sec.
2. Engineer ngilu sec. School
3. Gai secondary school
4. Ilako mututa sec.school
5. Ilalambyu secondary school
6. Ilika secondary school
7. Ithiani secondary school
8. Itiva nzou sec. School
9. Kaai girls sec. Sch
10. Kairungu secondary school
11. Kakeani secondary school
12. Kakongo secondary school
13. Kakululo secondary school
14. Kalisasi secondary school
15. Kalatine sec. Sch
16. Kamandio sec. School
17. Kamuwongo sec. school
18. Kandwia secondary school
19. Kangalu secondary school
22. Kaningo secondary school
23. Kanyuuni sec.school
24. Kasavani secondary school
25. Kasevi girls sec. School
26. Kasue secondary school
27. Kasyalani sec. School
28. Kathungi secondary school
29. Katalwa secondary school
30. Kaundu secondary school
31. Kauwi secondary school
32. Kavaini secondary school
33. Kea secondary school
34. Kilonzo secondary school
35. Kimangao girls sec. sch
36. Kisovo secondary school
37. Kithumula sec. school
38. Kitui school
39. Kivou sec. Sch
41. Kitulani secondary school
42. Kikiini secondary school
43. Kiomo secondary school
44. Kyanika secondary school
45. Kyuso girls sec.sch.
46. Kyaani girls sec. School
47. Kyangunga sec. school
48. Kyamani secondary school
49. Kyatune girls sec. sch.
50. Kyethani secondary school
51. Kyome boys sec school
52. Kyome girls sec. sch.
53. Kyondoni girls sec. sch.
54. Kyondoni mixed
55. Kyulongwa secondary
56. Masavi boys sec. school
57. Matinyani boys sec.
58. Matinyani Mixed sec.
59. Mbitini sec. school
60. Mbondoni sec. school
61. Muangeni secondary sch.
62. Mumbuni sec. school
63. Munyuni secondary school
64. Musengo sec. school
65. Muslim secondary school
66. Musuani secondary school
67. Mutanda secondary school
68. Mutendea secondary
69. Muthale girls sec. sch.
70. Muthale mixed sec. school
71. Muthamo secondary school
72. Mutonguni boys sec. sch.
73. Mutitu girls sec. sch.
74. Mutukya secondary school
75. Muunguu secondary school
76. Mutwangombe secondary
77. Mwambiu sec. school
78. Mwingi boys sec. school
79. Ndaluni secondary school
80. Ngutani sec. sch.
81. Nzalae secondary school
82. Nzamani sec. Sch ool
83. Nzatani secondary school
84. Nzauni secondary school
85. Nzeluni boys’ sec.
86. Nzeluni girls’ sec.
87. Nzuli secondary school
88. Precious blood nthangani
89. Precious blood tyaa
90. St. Charles lwanga
91. St. Pauls kasyala sec. Sch
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>St. Patrick Ithimani sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Syomikuku sec.school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Syungii secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Thokoa secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Tyaa kamuthale sec. school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Yakalia secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Waita secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Yenzuva secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yumbe secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Yumbisye secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

The National Council for Science and Technology is committed to the promotion of Science and Technology for National Development.
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RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION COUNTY COMMISSIONER

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION & INTERNAL SECURITY

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION,
JANET KAVULA MULWA

The above named is a student of University of Nairobi.

She is authorized to carry out a research on “The effect of alternative methods of instilling discipline by head teachers on students’ discipline in secondary schools in Kitui County, Kenya” for a period ending 30th September, 2013.

Any assistance accorded to her in data collection will be highly appreciated.

E.N. MWACHIRO,
FOR: DEPUTY COUNTY COMMISSIONER
KITUI CENTRAL

11th June, 2013
APPENDIX XI

RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION COUNTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Telephone: Kitui :22759
e-Mail : cde.kitui@gmail.com

When replying please quote:
Ref. No: KTIC/ED/RES/228

Janet Kavula Mulwa
Yambyu Secondary School
Mwingi Central District

DATE: 14th June, 2013

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

The letter from the National Council for Science and Technology Ref. NCST/RCD/14/013/881 dated 30th May, 2013 refers.

This office has no objection and therefore you are authorized to undertake your research in Secondary Schools in Kitui County.

P. M. MAKITE
DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
KITUI COUNTY

Ce:

1. The County Commissioner - Kitui
2. The TSC Director – Kitui
3. The KSSHA Chairperson - Kitui
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RESEARCH PERMIT

CONDITIONS

1. You must report to the District Commissioner and the District Education Officer of the area before embarking on your research. Failure to do that may lead to the cancellation of your permit.
2. Government Officers will not be interviewed without prior appointments.
3. No questionnaires will be used unless it has been approved.
4. Excretion, filming and collection of biological specimens are subject to further permission from the relevant Government Ministries.
5. You are required to submit at least two (2) copies bound copies of your final report for Kenyans and non-Kenyans respectively.
6. The Government of Kenya reserves the right to rigidify the conditions of this permit including its cancellation without notice.

Republic of Kenya
RESEARCH CLEARANCE PERMIT

This is to certify that:
Prof./Dr./Mr./Mrs./Miss Institution
Janet Kevuwa Muviwa
of (Address) University of Nairobi
P.O Box 92-0002, Kikuyu.
has been permitted to conduct research in

Location
District
County

on the topic: Effects of alternative methods of instilling discipline by headteachers on students' discipline in secondary schools in Kitui County, Kenya.

for a period ending: 30th September, 2013.

Applicant’s Signature

For Secretary
National Commission for Science & Technology

Research Permit No. NCST/RCD/14/013/881
Date of issue
30th May, 2013
Fee received
KSH 2000