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ABSTRACT
The purpose of this study was to investigate the school strategies influencing students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District, Kenya. It was guided by four objectives which included: To establish how the Principals’ use of democratic leadership influences students’ discipline in public secondary schools, to determine the extent to which the Principals’ means of communication influence students’ discipline in public secondary schools, to examine how the involvement of prefects’ body in decision making process affects students’ discipline in public secondary schools. The study is based on the collegial theory which attempts to explain all those theories that emphasized that power and decision making should be shared among some members of the organization. The researcher applied descriptive survey research design. This is because the design is useful since it would collect data from members of the population in order to determine the current status without manipulating the variables. The target population consisted of all 52 public secondary schools in Kisii Central District, 52 Principals and 1,560 teachers in the administration of the school affairs. Simple random sampling was used in selecting teachers at school level from the 16 Principals and 30 teachers per school who participated. Data was gathered by use of questionnaires and analyzed using quantitative method in frequency distribution tables, percentages and bar graphs. The validity of the questionnaires was checked by my supervisors, pilot testing in two schools and checked against the research objectives. Reliability was established through computation of Cronbach’s alpha coefficient formula. The research findings on the Principals’ strategies influence on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District, the process was carried out jointly by both Principals and teachers. The main criterion used was very frequent, frequent, often, rarely and never. Based on the findings, the study recommended that: The Principals of secondary schools should be democratic in the administration of school affairs; the Principals should establish students’ councils through which the students can participate in leadership matters of the school and other affairs; there is also need for the Principals to be clearer when communicating rules and regulations to students to avoid misinterpretation; the stakeholders in education should provide appropriate resources for guidance and counseling such as special rooms. Based on suggestions for further research, the study recommended that: a similar study should be carried out in other districts for comparison purposes; The same research should be carried out to identify other more strategies the Principals use to influence students discipline; A similar study on the head teachers’ strategies influencing pupils’ discipline in public primary schools in Kenya and Since the study only focused on public secondary schools, a similar study should be carried out in private secondary school for comparison purposes.

1.1 Background to the Study
Worldwide every government is concerned about its development. The fundamental purpose of education is to gain knowledge, inculcate forms of proper conduct and acquire technical competency (Oak, 2008). Education is therefore, fundamental to the success of any country’s overall development strategy and a corner stone of economic and social development (Republic of Kenya, 2005).

Huczynski (2001) says that the success of an organization depends on the quality of its leadership. He observed that the school Principal is the most influential individual in an education institution and that good leadership is the key in holding efficient administration together. Chapman (2003) explains that the school Principal is viewed as the primary decision maker, facilitator, problem solver and social change agents.

In democratic leadership, the reader consults, encourages participation and uses ‘power with’ rather than ‘power over’ students. Principals of best performing schools tend to be democratic (Maicibi, 2005). Students’ discipline problems are experienced world wide. In united states of America (USA), Gottfredson (1989) calculated that in six middle schools in Charles town south Carolina, students lost 7,932 instructional days because of school suspensions in a single academic year due to misconduct in schools. Weeramunda (2008) also did a study in Sri Lanka on discipline in s schools and noted that violence and students’ misbehavior is on the increase. Several unrest were reported in 1990, 1996 and 2004. (Garagae, 2007) did a study in Botsawana, discipline problems in schools manifests themselves in various ways such as bullying, vandalism, alcohol and substance abuse, truancy and unwillingness to do homework.
In Kenya, discipline in schools is equally a problem. Ngotho (2011) did a study and found that discipline problems are manifested in form of: drug and substance abuse, truancy, bullying, cheating in examinations, school riots among other ways. A report written in the Daily Nation on 9th November 2011 (p.18) indicated that impersonation and use of mobile phone to cheat during year 2011 Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) examination was detected in several parts of the country which lead to cancelling of results for 2,927 students (the Daily Nation 1 March 2012 (p.2).

Recent inspection report from D.E.O’s office in Kisii Central District, cases of indiscipline in schools were noted such as; Kisii High School, where a total of 25 students were held at the local police station rioting because of Principal being authoritarian, corrupt and have no time for parents, workers and fellow teachers. Cardinal Otunga High school students went on strike demanding the transfer of the Principal accusing him, being authoritarian in his leadership.

Communication is very important in school administration and everything a Principal does involves communication (Robbins, 2002). According to Saakshi (2005) asserts that communication contributes greatly to effective administration as many institutions have failed because of poor communication, misunderstood massages and unclear instructions. It is important that Principals communicate frequently with staff member and students (Mbiti, 2007).

Globally communication has been used to transmit information such as policies and rules, changes and developments from the Principal to staff members and students and also used to give feedback to the departments, teachers and students on their performance (Saakshi, 2005). According to Gottsfredson (1989) established that students disruptive behavior in South Carolina was associated with unclear school rules and regulations. Rules were perceived as unfairly enforced. Balyejusa (1982) in Ogunsaju (1983) established that good student behavior in Nigeria was fostered through proper communication means implemented by the Principal. Moral laxity was in Nigeria where means of communication could not be used to maintain students discipline. In Kenya education sector has experienced frequent administration problems that many people link to communication (Asugo, 2002). According to the statistics by Republic of Kenya (2008) an estimated 290 schools in the secondary education sector went on strike in year 2004.

The need for involvement of secondary school students in school administration started in the 1960s in the United States of America. This was later to spread to other parts of the world in the two decades that follows this period (Powers and Powers (1984). In Muchelle (1996) he noted that this desire for student participation in school administration has been supported by a variety of propositions by the proponents of the practice.

In Africa, the case has not been different. In Senegal, a primary strike following allegations of embezzlement of school funds turned violent when secondary school students and university students joined the pupils in a show of solidarity (Amoth, 1998). In Mali ten secondary school students were wounded by police while demonstrating, protesting against the banning of their Union. (Amoth, 1998). In Kenya from the beginning of the 1990s, there has been an increase of strikes in secondary schools. This indicates that student problems will be solved not by use of dialogue but by imposition of authority (Otieno, 2001). According to Koli (2005) observed that the prefectoral system is one of the most effective ways of involving students directly in the administration of the school, where students are delegated certain duties connected with day to day life of the school.

Guidance and counseling encompasses two related concepts. Such as; advice and information giving (guidance) and personnel help in a formal setting (counseling) (Makinde, 1993). The guidance movement started in the USA with an emphasis on vocational information, planning and guidance (Makinde, 1993). The 21st century has been the awakening of various Associations to deal with problems facing the youth in America, Europe and across the globe for example in Chile and India (Riley, 2004).

In African countries, started taking root in nineteen fifties with Nigeria taking the lead followed by South America and Uganda (Bernald, 2002). In Kenya formal guidance and counseling can be traced back a few years before independence. After independence in 1963, the Kenyan government took charge of all its affairs and this included the development, implementation and supervision of education programmes. Mbiti (2007) says that educational guidance and counseling has emerged as a discipline to provide help to students in schools, so that they are not overwhelmed by internal conflicts. The purpose for which guidance and counseling programmes has been set in schools does not seem to have been achieved, Indiscipline is high in our Kenya secondary school (Benard, 2002).
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Principals are viewed as central in the creation of effective school administration in which student discipline is motivated to strive for continuous improvement in the quality learning. Discipline is a rudimentary ingredient that plays a crucial role in school systems which insists on upholding the moral values of students. The culture of students’ indiscipline is rampant among secondary schools students not only in Kisii central district, Kenya, but also worldwide. This is in spite of government and schools efforts to curb it through instituting strategies such as: Principals’ democratic leadership, proper means of communication, involvement of prefects’ body in decision making process and strengthening of guidance and counseling department in schools.

Emerging students’ discipline issues within schools in Kisii Central District are of great concern. Several studies have been carried out to investigate discipline problems in secondary schools students in Kenya. However, there is paucity of research on Principals’s strategies and students’ discipline not only in Kenya but more so in Kisii Central District. Could the Principals’ strategies be associated with students’ discipline? It was on these basis that this study sought to establish the relationship between Principals’ strategies influencing students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the strategies used by the Principals and establish their influence on students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study sought to achieve the following objectives:

i. To establish how the Principals’ use of democratic leadership influences students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District.

ii. To determine the extent to which the principals’ means of communication influences students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District.

iii. To examine how the involvement of prefects’ body in decision making process affects students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District.

1.5 Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

i. To what extent do Principals’ democratic leadership influences students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District?

ii. To what extent do Principals’ means of communication influences students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District?

iii. To what respect do involvement of prefects’ body in decision making process affects students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District?
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2.3 Principals’ Use of Democratic Leadership on Students’ Discipline

In this leadership style the major point of focus is sharing. The Principal shares decision making with the subordinates. He /she seeks discussion and agreements with all the stakeholders before a decision is taken (Durbin, 1998). He also observed that effective democratic school administration affect the trust level of students, teachers and parents. David (2007) study focused on the survey of the effectiveness of democratic school administration and management in one school division in Philippines. The implication of the study is that just like in Philippines school heads in Kenya who favor the use of democratic leadership attach the same level of trust to their students, teachers and parents in the administration of schools.

Olembo (1986) says leadership of a principal should be democratic, combining self-confidence, friendless, firmness and tact. It should not merely consist of issuing orders. Also says that the head leads better if he consults his staff and students from time to time on what is going on in the school. Griffins (1994) says that the Principal should endow each student with habits, self-respect and proper pride in his integrity that he will observe the norms of good conduct when not under compulsion or supervision and will carry them eventually into adult life.
Linda (1998) says that Principals should not be too autocratic in their leadership. They should not use some techniques. For instance, saying “I’m the boss here”, using tense body language being rigid or clench hands, insulting, humiliating or embarrassing teachers, students, support staff and even parents among others which will lead to indiscipline of students. Okumbe 1998 says that Principals should encourage open door policy where student are free to see the head of the institution to explain their problems, should encourage students to bring new chamber as well as creative ideas, Accept that he/she is capable of making mistakes, allow students to question his/her views, show no favorites and treat all students equally , encouraging democratic form of school organization in which students elect their own leaders, provision of a suggestion box within the for students to give independent views about the school administration and even allowing students to have a say in determining the dress code of the school.

Consulting with students before changes are made to the diet provided by the school and setting aside specific day(s) in a week for meetings between the principals and students to discuss matters pertaining to the running and organization of the school.

2.4 Principals’ Means of Communication on Students’ Discipline
Robbin (2001) defines means of communication as the medium through which the message travels. Mbiti (2007) says that written communication conveys a lot of information not only from one person to another but also from generation to generation. In a school, official letters, circulars, memos, notices, suggestion boxes, minutes, reports, printouts, school magazines and handbooks are means of communication. He also points out that the written work is more permanent and less liable to misinterpretation.

Republic of Kenya (2008) indicated that the means of communication between Principal and students should be clear, unambiguous and continuous. Similarly Republic of Kenya (2001) also highlighted the importance of open communication means between the Principal and students as it fosters performance and discipline. Mukindi (1991) in his study examined the importance of communication when carrying out administrative tasks and recommended for interactive communication techniques such as dialogue between the Principal and students. For Principals to maintain students discipline, should always communicate in time. He/she can look for the best means to use to pass the information or the message depending the type and urgency of the message. For example, school rules and daily routine should be written down and pinned at notice-boards, classrooms and dining halls for students to access them face to face. School mission and vision should be well communicated through school boards and sign posts. Principal should ensure there is communication in three major communication networks namely; downward, upward and lateral (horizontal) communication (Barasa, 2007).

2.5 Involvement of Prefects’ Body in Decision Making Process and Effects on Students’ Discipline
American schools, like their English counterparts, seeks to maintain a social order, and to teach their students lessons about leadership, authority and responsibility (Koli, 2005). He also observed that there are some students in the American high schools who enjoy a more active influential role in the schools’ authority system than others. Student council in American high schools is generally an official sponsored agency in the high school which takes decisions and see that they are carried out.

Participatory decision making process is recommended because individuals who participate are usually more satisfied with the decision that they have collectively made and they would enthusiastically support it. It also satisfies and motivates key players in the decision making process (Barasa, 2007). Student involvement in decision making is a concept of participatory management which is a tenet of the Human Relation Theory of Management. The theory views members of the organization as worthy components without whose effort and input the objectives of the organization cannot be achieved effectively (Mondy, 1988).

A study carried by Kibaka (2005) found that, students should be allowed to participate in school administration such as; elect leaders (monitors and prefects), supervising manual work, taking roll calls in class/dorm, making announcements at assemblies, deciding school menu, code of dressing and counseling fellow students. Olembo (1992) says that, prefect committee can be allowed to formulate many of the school rules and should be open to question or change. The student-teacher relationship is improved and that schools should have student councils whereby the students, together with their teachers, discuss matters affecting the school.

2.6 Strengthening of Guidance and Counseling Department on Students’ Discipline
Mwaura (2006) explains that a teacher counsellor needs to establish a counseling department and a committee whose membership are the Principal. He/she needs to strengthen it by offering finance and moral support for an
effective implementation of counseling services. He/she needs to sponsor one teacher to be fully trained to make the department programmes function successfully. Principals together with teachers and guidance personnel have to inform students about the counseling services, its organization, the kind of problems with which it proposes to assist and its relation to other aspects of the total school programme. The facility should be in a convenient location, adequate space and sufficient privacy, comfortable surroundings (Nelson, 2000).

Nelson (2000) says that students should be guided through offering them with advice to show them the right direction. Setting limits and giving guidance are the main issues during this period to shape their behavior positively. Adolescents are confused and mixed up about who they are and what they want to do. Counseling should be done to offer the students with advice and cautioning them those who may have gone astray or out of control. A student should not be forced to obey, the alternative is to always encourage and influence him. Strengthening of guidance and counseling department in any school assists the errant students very much hence the best way of arresting unrest. Students should be encouraged to work through disagreements by not suppressing them, they should have freedom to seek assistance from teachers when faced with problems and after counseling students should have freedom to choice of next action not forced to (Mwaura, 2006).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
The study used descriptive survey design which according to Orodho (2003) is a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals. According to Orodho (2005), descriptive research design is used because accurate information can be obtained for larger number of people with a small sample. The information is collected at one point in time with intention of describing the nature of existing conditions. It is used to explore relationship that exist between variables and allows generalizations across populations. The design is suitable for this study because it is used to explore and evaluate in details the Principals strategies for maintaining student discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District.

Borg and Gall (1989) say a target population is defined as all the members of a real hypothetical set of people, events or objects to which a researcher wishes to generalize the results of the research study. There are fifty two (52) public secondary schools in Kisii Central District. The target population for this study was fifty two (52) Principals and one thousand, five hundred and sixty (1, 560) teachers of public secondary schools in Kisii Central District.

Neuman (2000) says that the sample size depends on what one wants to investigate the purpose of the inquiry, what is at stake, what will be useful, what can be done within the available time and resources. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a sample of 30% is appropriate in social science study therefore, out of 52 schools in the district, 16 schools was the sample size selected. Sixteen (16) principals and thirty (30) teachers per school participated. Simple random sampling was used in selecting teachers at school level from the sixteen schools selected. Names of all teachers from the sixteen schools were written on papers, rubbed then put in one container. After which the container was shook to mix them up before start picking the names of teachers to be sampled.

The research instruments for data collection in this study was questionnaires. Questionnaires are tools of data collection which provide comparable data from all subjects since the same questions must be asked. They are also easy and convenient to administer (Mbwesa 2006). Questionnaires helps the researcher to obtain quantitative data. It will provide triangulation of the data collected so as to reduce the chance of making biased deductions and thus ascertained credibility of data from the different sources. The Principals’ Questionnaire: This questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part one consisted of short answered questions on school and demographic data of the secondary school Principals. Part two of the questionnaire contained closed-ended questions which provided data that was easy to compute and analyze.

Second questionnaire was designed to collect data from the secondary school teachers. The Teachers’ Questionnaire: This questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part one consisted of short answered questions on the school and demographic data of the secondary school teachers. Part two of the questionnaire contained closed-ended questions which provided data that was easy to compute and analyze.

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) define validity as an accuracy and meaningfulness of inference, which are based on research results. It is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of data actually represent the phenomenon under study. These involved assessment of content validity which was ascertained through the results of pilot study to ensure that the instruments measured what they were supposed to measure. Validation
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entails collecting and analyzing data to assess the accuracy of an instrument, which involved pilot testing in two schools. Simple random sampling was used to choose the schools. The responses of the subjects was checked against the research objectives. This gives a reason as to why the content would have to be used (Muta 2000). For a research instrument to be considered valid, the content selected and included in questionnaire must be relevant to the variables being investigated.

Research instruments was piloted in two (2) schools among ten (10) teachers and two (2) Principals. These were excluded during the actual data collection.

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) define reliability as a measure of degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. Reliability was established through computation of Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951). Cronbach’s $\alpha$ is defined as:

$$\alpha = \frac{K}{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{K} \sigma Y^2_i}{\sigma X^2}\right)$$

Where $K$ is the number of components (K-items or test lets), $\sigma X^2$ the variance of the observed total test scores, and $\sigma Y^2_i$ the variance of component $i$ for the current sample of persons. The test-retest method was used to test stability of instrument. An instrument was given to the same individuals in two occasions within relatively short duration of time. A correlation coefficient was calculated to determine how closely the participants’ responses on the second occasion was matching their response on the first occasion. Reliability was determined by calculating the alpha coefficient. Hence if 0.80 onward is reliable but one can work with it as from 0.70 but below 0.70 is not very good to rely on.

**DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION**

4.13 Principal’s Use of Democratic Leadership on Students’ Discipline

Table 4.7: Principals’ Opinions on Principals’ Use of Democratic Leadership on Students’ Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>VF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage open door policy where students are free to see the head of the institution to explain their problems.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to bring new chamber as well as creative ideas.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept that you are capable of making mistakes.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with students before any changes are made to the diet provided by the school.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing students to have a say in determining the dress code of the school.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a suggestion box within the school for students to give independent views about the school administration.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting a side specific day(s) in a week for meetings between the principals and the students to discuss matters pertaining to the running and organization of the school.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.7 above, it is evident that Principals encourage open door policy where students are free to see the head of the institution to explain their problems. The responses showed that 3 (18.0 percent) very frequent, 8 (50.0 percent) frequent, 3 (18.8 percent) often, while only 2 (12.5 percent) rare and 0 (0.0 percent) never respectively. Principals encouraging students to bring new chamber as well as creative ideas has also rated as good. The responses showed that 4 (25.0 percent) very frequent, 7 (43.8 percent) frequent, 3 (18.8 percent) only 1 (6.2 percent) and 1 (6.2 percent) said rarely and never existed in their school.

Principals accepting that are capable of making mistakes, the responses showed that 6 (37.5 percent) very frequent, 6 (37.5 percent) frequent, 2 (12.5 percent) often, 2 (12.5 percent) rarely and none was for never. Consulting with students before any changes are made to the diet provided by the school, responses showed that 3 (18.8 percent) very frequent, 6 (37.5 percent) frequent, 3 (18.8 percent) often, 3 (18.8 percent) rarely and 1 (6.2 percent) never. To allow students to have a say in determining the dress code of the school, the responses showed that 2 (12.5 percent) very frequent, 7 (43.8 percent) frequent, 4 (25.0 percent) often, 1 (6.2 percent) rarely and 2 (12.5 percent) never. Provision of suggestion box within the school, responses showed that 8 (50.0 percent) very frequent, 6 (37.5 percent) frequent, 2 (12.5 percent) often while no response was for rarely and never. With specific day(s) set aside in a week for meetings between the principals and the students to discuss matters pertaining to the running and organization of the school the responses showed that 5 (31.3 percent) very frequent, 6 (37.5 percent) frequent, 3 (18.8 percent) often while 1 (6.2 percent) rarely and 1 (6.2 percent) never respectively. The overall indication showed that principals, use democratic leadership as a strategy to influence students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District.

Figure 4.10: Principals’ Responses on Principals’ Use of Democratic Leadership on Students’ Discipline

4.10 above, many Principals choose use of democratic leadership as a strategy on students’ discipline since from the responses, the majority gave their opinion very frequent, frequent and often. Very few were on the opinion of rarely and never.
Table 4.8: Teachers’ Opinions on Principals’ Use of Democratic Leadership on Students’ Discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>VF Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>O Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>R Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage open door policy where students are free to see the head of the institution to explain their problems.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to bring new chamber as well as creative ideas.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept that you are capable of making mistakes.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with students before any changes are made to the diet provided by the school.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing students to have a say in determining the dress code of the school.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a suggestion box within the school for students to give independent views about the school administration.</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting a side specific day(s) in a week for meetings between the principals and the students to discuss matters pertaining to the running and organization of the school.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.8 above, it is evident that teachers in their respective schools, those responded their principals encourage open door policy where students are free to see the head of the institution to explain their problems. The responses showed that 90 (20.0 percent) very frequent, 210 (46.7 percent) frequent, 80 (17.8 percent) often, while only 40 (8.9 percent) rare and 30 (6.7 percent) never respectively. Principals encouraging students to bring new chamber as well as creative ideas had also rated as good. The responses showed that 87 (19.3 percent) very frequent, 205 (45.6 percent) frequent, 94 (20.9 percent) only 51 (11.2 percent) and 13 (2.9 percent) said rarely and never existed in their schools.

Principals accepting that they are capable of making mistakes, the responses showed that 125 (27.8 percent) very frequent, 175 (38.9 percent) frequent, 73 (16.2 percent) often, 62 (13.8 percent) rarely and 15 (3.3 percent) never. Consulting with students before any changes are made to the diet provided by the school, responses showed that 111 (24.7 percent) very frequent, 196 (43.6 percent) frequent, 93 (20.7 percent) often, 30 (6.7 percent) rarely and 20 (4.4 percent) never. To allow students to have a say in determining the dress code of the school, the responses showed that 97 (21.6 percent) very frequent, 230 (51.1 percent) frequent, 85 (18.9 percent) often, 21 (4.7 percent) rarely and 17 (3.8 percent) never. Provision of suggestion box within the school, responses showed that 135 (30.0 percent) very frequent, 240 (53.3 percent) frequent, 60 (13.3 percent) often while 15 (3.3 percent) rarely and 0 (0.0 percent) never. With specific day(s) set aside in a week for meetings between the principals and the students to discuss matters pertaining to the running and organization of the school the responses showed that 95 (21.1 percent) very frequent, 196 (43.6 percent) frequent, 98 (21.8 percent)
often while 21 (4.7 percent) rarely and 40 (8.9 percent) never respectively. The majority showed that their Principals, to curb down indiscipline cases in their schools, they use democratic leadership as one of the strategies to influence students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District.

**Figure 4.11: Teachers’ Responses on Principals’ Use of Democratic Leadership on Students’ Discipline**

From Figure 4.11 above, it is evident that the majority of teachers (respondents) agree on the use of democratic leadership as one of the Principals’ strategies used to influence students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District.

**4.14 Principals’ Means of Communication on Students’ Discipline**

One of the objectives was to establish the level at which the Principals’ means of communication on students’ discipline as a strategy in secondary schools. Both the Principals and the teachers were asked about their opinions. The results are as shown in Table 4.9 below.

From Table 4.9 above, it is evident that Principals use well spelt written communication through official letters, circulars, memos, notices, suggestion boxes, minute reports, printouts, school magazines and handbooks in their school to communicate. The responses showed that 4 (25.0 percent) very frequent, 8 (50.0 percent) frequent, 4 (25.0 percent) often while no responses found rarely and never respectively. There are open communication means between Principals and students which is clear, unambiguous and continuous e.g. use of dialogue. The responses showed that 4 (25.0 percent) very frequent, 7 (43.8 percent) frequent, 3 (18.8 percent) often, only 1 (6.2 percent) and 1 (6.2 percent) were on opinion rarely and never respectively. Also Principals communicate in time always e.g. school rules and daily routine pinned at notice-boards, classrooms and dinning halls. The responses showed that 6 (37.5 percent) very frequent, 7 (43.8 percent) frequent, 3 (18.8 percent) often, no responses was rarely and never. School mission and vision are well communicated through school budes and signposts. The responses were; 10 (62.5 percent) very frequent, 6 (37.5 percent) frequent, no responses from often, rarely and never. There is an indication that there are three major communication networks in schools namely; downward, upward and lateral (horizontal) communication. The responses were 8 (50.0 percent) very frequent, 5 (31.3 percent) frequent, 2 (12.5 percent) often, no responses from rarely and never. From the overall
evident, majority agreed that they use means of communication as one of the strategies to influence students’
discipline in their respective public secondary schools.

Table 4.9: Teachers’ Opinions on Principals’ Use of Democratic Leadership on Students’ Discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>VF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are well spelt written communication through official letters, circulars, memos, notices, suggestion boxes, minutes, reports, printouts, school magazines and handbooks in the schools.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are open communication means between Principals and students which is clear, unambiguous and continuous e.g. use of dialogue.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals communicate in time always e.g. school rules and daily routine pinned at notice boards, classrooms and dining halls.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School mission and vision well communicated through school budges and sign posts.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are three major communication networks in school namely: downwards, upward and lateral (horizontal) communication.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                  32  | 100 | 33  | 100 | 12  | 100 | 1  | 100

Figure 4.12: Principals’ Responses on Principals’ Means of Communication on Students’ Discipline

Responses

From Figure 4.12 above, many principals use means of communication as one of the strategies to influence
students’ discipline. From the responses, the majority gave their opinions very frequent and frequent.
From Table 4.10 above, it is evident that teachers (respondents) in their respective schools, Principals use means of communication on influencing students’ discipline where, Principals use well spelt written communication through official letters, circulars, memos, notices, suggestion boxes, minutes, reports, printouts, school magazines and handbooks in their school to communicate. The responses showed that 95 (21.1 percent) very frequent, 175 (38.9 percent) frequent, 105 (23.3 percent) often while 50(11.1 percent) rarely and 25(5.6 percent) never respectively. There are open communication means between Principals and students which is clear, unambiguous and continuous e.g. use of dialogue. The responses showed that 85 (18.9 percent) very frequent, 205 (46.6 percent) frequent, 145 (32.2 percent) often, 10 (2.2 percent) rarely and 5 (1.1 percent) never respectively. Also Principals communicate in time always e.g. school rules and daily routine pinned at notice boards, classrooms and dining halls. The responses showed that 210 (46.7 percent) very frequent, 190 (42.2 percent) frequent, 40(8.9 percent) often, 10(2.2 percent) rarely and 0(0.0 percent) never. School mission and vision are well communicated through school budges and sign posts. The responses were; 240 (53.3 percent) very frequent, 210 (46.7 percent) frequent, no responses from often, rarely and never. There was an indication that there are three major communication networks in schools namely; downwards, upward and lateral (horizontal) communication. The responses were 135 (30.0 percent) very frequent, 230 (51.1 percent) frequent, 50 (11.1 percent) often, 20(4.4 percent) rarely and 15(3.3 percent) never. The indication from the majority showed that means of communication was one of the strategies their principals use to influence students’ discipline in their respective public secondary schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>VF</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are well spelt written communication through official letters,</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circulars, memos, notices, suggestion boxes, minutes, reports, printouts,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school magazines and handbooks in the schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are open communication means between Principals and students which</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is clear, unambiguous and continuous e.g. use of dialogue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals communicate in time always e.g. school rules and daily</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>routine pinned at notice boards, classrooms and dining halls.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School mission and vision well communicated through school budges and</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign posts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are three major communication networks in school namely;</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>downwards, upward and lateral (horizontal) communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.13: Teachers’ Responses on Principals’ Means of Communication on Students’ Discipline

From Figure 4.13 above, majority of teachers’ responses agreed that Principals’ communication strategies affect students’ discipline, because effective means of communication strategy promotes attitude change and enhances dialogue between the Principal and the students as they become more serious and focused.

4.15 Involvement of Prefects’ Body in Decision Making Process and Effects on Students’ Discipline

To establish the level at which the involvement of prefects’ body in decision making process affects students’ discipline in public secondary schools as a strategy was one of the objectives. The Principals and teachers were asked whether there were involvement of prefects’ body in decision making process. The results are as shown in Table 4.11 below.

Table 4.11: Principals’ Opinions on Involvement of Prefects’ Body in Decision Making Process and Effects on Students’ Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>VF</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefects’ body consulted when major school decisions e.g. diet, dressing code, cancellation of trips affecting them is made.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects’ body consulted when making school rules.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects’ body suggests possible ways of improving school.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects’ body attends disciplinary meetings.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects’ body involvement in supervising manuals, takes the roll call, punish those breaking rules and make announcements.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.11 above, it showed that most disciplined students are the ones with prefects’ body involved in major school decisions 3 (18.8 percent) very frequent, 7 (43.8 percent) frequent, 3 (18.8 percent) often, 2 (12.5 percent) rarely and 1 (6.2 percent) never. Consultation of prefects’ body when making school rules 3 (18.8 percent) very frequent, 8 (50 percent) frequent, 2 (12.5 percent) often, 2 (12.5 percent) rarely and 1 (6.2 percent) never. Prefects’ body suggests possible ways of improving school 4 (25 percent) very frequent, 6 (37.5 percent) frequent, 4 (25 percent) often, 2 (12.5 percent) rarely and none was for never. Prefects’ body attends disciplinary meeting 2 (12.5 percent) very frequent, 7 (43.8 percent) frequent, 4 (25 percent) often, 2 (12.5 percent) rarely and 1 (6.2 percent) never. With involvement in supervising manuals, takes the roll call, punish those breaking rules and making announcements 6 (37.5 percent) very frequent, 6 (37.5 percent) frequent, 4 (25 percent) often, no response was neither rarely nor never respectively. It was an indication that the majority responded positively for the strategy since the responses were very frequent, frequent and often most of them.

Figure 4.14 Principals’ Responses on Involvement of Prefects’ Body in Decision Making Process and Effects on Students’ Discipline

From figure 4.14 above, it is evident that prefects’ body was involved in different ways on behalf of all students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District

Table 4.12: Teachers’ Opinions on Involvement of Prefects’ Body in Decision Making Process and Effects on Students’ Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>VF</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefects’ body consulted when major school decisions e.g. ion diet, dressing code, cancellation of trips affecting them is made.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects’ body consulted when making school rules.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects’ body suggests possible ways of improving school.</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects’ body attends disciplinary meetings.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects’ body involvement in supervising manuals, takes the roll call, punish those breaking rules and make announcements.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.12 above, it is evident that teachers (respondents), in their respective schools prefects’ body was involved in decision making process and has effects on students’ discipline where prefects’ body consulted when major school decisions were made 85 (18.8 percent) very frequent, 199 (44.2 percent) frequent, 110 (24.4 percent) often, 32 (7.1 percent) rarely and 24 (5.3 percent) never. Consultation of prefects’ body when making school rules 80 (17.8 percent) very frequent, 220 (48.9 percent) frequent, 87 (19.3 percent) often, 43 (9.6 percent) rarely and 20 (4.4 percent) never. Prefects’ body suggests possible ways of improving school 130 (28.9 percent) very frequent, 190 (42.2 percent) frequent, 97 (21.6 percent) often, 25 (5.6 percent) rarely and 8 (1.8 percent) never. Prefects’ body attends disciplinary meeting 90 (20.0 percent) very frequent, 210 (46.7 percent) frequent, 100 (22.2 percent) often, 30 (6.7 percent) rarely and 20 (64.4 percent) never. With involvement in supervising manuals, takes the roll call, punish those breaking rules and making announcements 200 (44.4 percent) very frequent, 205 (46.6 percent) frequent, 45 (10.0 percent) often, no response was neither rarely nor never respectively. The indication from the majority showed that among the strategies their Principals use to influence students’ discipline, involvement of prefects’ body on behalf of all students in decision making process was one of the strategies.

**Figure 4.15: Teachers’ Responses on Involvement of Prefects’ Body in Decision Making Process and Effects on Students’ Discipline**

From Figure 4.15 above, it is evident that involvement of prefects’ body influence students’ discipline in public secondary schools in Kisii Central District and was one of the strategies most Principals use to curb down indiscipline cases in schools.

### 5.4 Recommendations

In view of the research findings, the researcher recommended the following:-

i) The Principals of secondary schools should be democratic in the administration of school affairs. This is because this type of leadership practice influence students’ discipline since it allows for open door policy for discussions between the students and administration.

ii) The Principals should establish students’ councils through which the students can participate in leadership matters of the school and other affairs. This will make them be empowered on school matters and they feel that they are part of decision making.

iii) Students should be taught ways of communicating with each other, their teachers and the authority.

iv) More open forums to be organized within the school level between the Principals, teacher-counsellor, other teachers and students prefects’ body.

v) The Ministry of Education (MoE) should come up with policies that enhance effective means of communication between the Principals and students and make a follow-up to that effect.

vi) The Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) should identify factors that hinder effective means of communication between the Principals and students and address them when offering in-service courses to educational administrators.
vii) The Board of Governors (BoG) should facilitate effective means of communication in schools by giving money for installation of notice boards in strategic points within school and by allowing students to come up with some of the school rules and regulations.

viii) There is also need for the Principals to be clearer when communicating rules and regulations to students to avoid misinterpretation.

ix) That, schools should have laid down policies on how prefects’ body ought to be involved in school administration.

x) All public secondary schools should select prefects democratically from the student, in fact elect there prefects and should be free and fair to avoid students feeling shortchanged.

xi) Schools should set aside enough time and resources to effectively and efficiently induct the prefects for them to be able to carry out their roles well.
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