

**SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND  
TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT  
DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS**

**A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE SCHOOL  
OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS  
IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION**

**BY  
TAYE AGA**

**JUNE 1997**

**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS'  
PRECEPTION OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY  
PROBLEMS**

**BY**

**TAYE AGA  
Faculty of Education**

**APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS**

**\*Ayalew Shibeshi**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Chairman, Department  
Graduate Committee**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature**

**Ayalew Shibeshi**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Advisor**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature**

**\*\*Tafesse Asfaw**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**External Examiner**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature**

**\*\*Yalew Ingidayehu (Ph.D)**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Internal Examiner**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature**

\* Assoc. Prof.

\*\* Assist. Prof.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am most grateful to my thesis advisor, Ato Ayalew Shibeshi, for the guidance and thought-provoking comments he gave me in due course of my research work. His tolerance for the repeated visits I made to his office and his unreserved entertainment of my questions is unforgettable.

---

Secondly, I would like to express my indebtedness to my wife Degnesh Damtew who has shouldered the great task of administering our family and numerous other familial affairs alone with patience, stamina and wisdom.

TAYE AGA

## ABSTRACT

*The purpose of the study was to make a survey of the general condition of the prevailing student disciplinary problems in senior secondary schools of Oromia Region.*

*The needed data was obtained by means of a self-completed questionnaire distributed to 80 administrators and 3000 teachers working in 20 senior secondary schools randomly selected from 5 study 'zones' of the region -East, West, North, South and Center.*

*The data was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Accordingly, the research revealed the following results.*

*1a) The following 15 behaviors were identified as student disciplinary problems prevailing in the studied schools.*

- Cheating during examinations and test.*
- Failing to do assignments.*
- Coming to school without bringing textbooks.*
- Late coming.*
- Absenteeism.*
- Fleeing from school jumping over fences or through forbidden exist.*
- Passive evasion of students during class hours.*
- Getting into class after the teacher arrived and leaving it immediately following the teacher's footsteps.*
- Teasing/Joking upon teachers.*
- Physical attacks/attempts of physical attacks on teachers.*
- disturbing and/or making noises while teacher teaches.*
- Defacing, damaging or destroying school property.*
- Stealing.*
- Engaging in undesirable habits (like smoking, chewing 'Chat', drunkenness) in school.*
- Bullying girl students for sexual purpose on their ways to and from school.*

*b) Of the previously identified 15 disciplinary problems the first eight (8) were indicated as a relatively more frequent ones than the latter seven (7) that occur only occasionally.*

2a) The study groups perceived a moderate relationship ( $r=.53$ ) between the overall student disciplinary problems and the degree of their disruption of the teaching-learning process. In other words, 27 percent of the disruption of the teaching-learning process was attributable to the student disciplinary problems. The result of the study also indicated that higher frequency of disciplinary problems does not necessarily imply higher degree of disruption.

b) In the study, both administrators and teachers showed much similar perception with regard to the frequency of the disciplinary problems and their disruption effect.

3. Loss of hope in education on the part of students was the most single cause of student disciplinary problem indicated by both administrators and teachers. Both groups equally rejected the hearsay that students tend to be disciplinary because of teacher insults and reprimands and corporal punishment.

4. With regard to coping strategies for dealing with student disciplinary problems, both administrators and teachers suggested those within the implementation capacity of schools, like the need for orienting students about school rules and regulations at the beginning of the academic year, the need for identifying the frequenting disciplinary problems, searching for their causes and devising short- and long-term solutions.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	i
ABSTRACT .....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
ABBREVIATIONS .....	xi
<hr/>	
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background to the Study .....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem .....	6
1.3 Delimitation of the Study.....	7
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	7
1.5 Definitions of Terms .....	8
1.6 Organization of the Study .....	10
CHAPTER TWO REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE.	12
2.1 Youth: as Age Category.....	12
2.1.1 Definition .....	12
2.1.2 Youth and Socio-economic Changes .....	12
2.1.3 Youth: Secondary School & Preparation for Adult Responsibility .....	16
2.2 Discipline .....	19
2.2.1 Discipline: Emergence and Development .....	19
2.2.2 Discipline in School Setting .....	20

	PAGE
2.3 Student Disciplinary Problems .....	22
2.3.1 Types of Disciplinary Problems .....	22
2.3.2 Causes of Disciplinary Problems .....	24
2.3.2.1 Teachers .....	25
2.3.2.2 School Administration .....	27
2.3.2.3 The Educational System in General .....	31
2.3.2.4 School Educational Facilities .....	34
2.3.3 Coping Strategies for Student Disciplinary Problems.	36
2.3.3.1 Rules and Regulations .....	37
2.3.3.2 Counseling .....	39
2.3.3.3 Punishments and Rewards .....	40
2.4 An Overview of Student Disciplinary Problems in Ethiopia..	45
<b>CHAPTER THREE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.</b>	<b>53</b>
3.1 The Sample and the Sampling Techniques .....	53
3.2 The Instrument and Procedures of Data Collection .....	55
3.2.1 Pilot Test of the Instrument .....	56
3.3 Methods of Data Analysis .....	57
<b>CHAPTER FOUR PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS ...</b>	<b>59</b>
Part One: Characteristics of the Study Populations .....	60
Part Two: Analysis of the Data of the Study .....	62
1A. Types of Student Disciplinary Problems.....	63
1B. Frequency of Occurrence of Student Disciplinary Problems..	66

	PAGE
2. The Degree by which Student Disciplinary Problems Disrupt the Teaching-Learning Process.....	79
3. Causes of Student Disciplinary Problems.....	85
4. Coping Strategies for Student Disciplinary Problems..	88
<b>CHAPTER FIVE SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	
5.1 Summary .....	91
5.2 Conclusions .....	96
5.3 Recommendations .....	98
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	
<b>APPENDICES</b>	

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Distribution of Sample Schools and Respondents.....	53
2. Respondents by Level of Education, Field of Specialization, Sex, Age and Year of Service .....	59
3. Percentages of Secondary School Administrators and Teachers Reporting Frequency of Types of Students Behaviours Perceived to Be Student Disciplinary Problems .....	62
4. Respondents' Views Concerning Student Cheatings during Examinations and Tests .....	65
5. Respondents' Views Concerning Student Failing to Do Assignments.....	66
6. Respondents' Views Regarding Student Coming to School without Bringing the Required Text books.....	67
7. Respondents' Views Concerning Students' Coming Late / Tardiness.....	67
8. Respondents' Views Regarding Student Absenteeism.....	68
9. Respondents' Perceptions of Students Fleeing from School Jumping over Fences and/or through Other Forbidden Exits ..	69
10. Respondents' Perceptions of Student Evasion (Hiding, Roaming) of Class Hours.....	70
11. Respondents' Perceptions of Student Getting into Classroom after the Teacher Arrived in and Leaving It Immediately Following the Teacher's Footsteps.....	71
12. Respondents' Views Regarding Student Teasing/Joking upon Teachers.....	71

	PAGE
13. Respondents' Views Regarding Physical Attacks/Attempts of Physical Attacks on Teachers.....	72
14. Respondents' Views Regarding Student Disturbing and/or Making Noises while the Teacher Teaches.....	73
15. Respondents' Perceptions of Student Defacing, Damaging or Destroying School Property.....	74
16. Respondents' Views Regarding Student Stealing .....	75
17. Respondents' Views Concerning Students Engaged in Undesirable Habits (like Smoking, Chewing 'Chat', Drunkenness) in School ...	76
18. Respondents' Views Concerning Student Bullying of Girl Students for Sexual purpose on Their Ways to and from School ..	77
19. The Frequency of the Overall Student Disciplinary Problems and the Degree of Their Disruption of the Teaching-Learning Process..	78
20. A Correlation Matrix showing Correlation Coefficient between the Frequency of Student Disciplinary Problems and the Degree of Their Disruption of the Teaching-Learning Process .....	79
21. Comparison of Level of Frequency and Degree of Disruption ....	81
22. A Paired t-test of the Mean Differences between Administrators and Teachers' Perceptions of the Disciplinary Problems (combined) Disrupting the Teaching-Learning Process .....	83
23. Respondents' Views Concerning Causes of Student Disciplinary Problems .....	84
24. Coefficients of Correlation between Administrators and Teachers' Rankings of the Causes of Student Disciplinary Problems.....	85
25. Respondents' Views Regarding Coping Strategies of Student Disciplinary Problems.....	87
26. Coefficients of Correlation between Administrators and Teachers' Rankings of Coping Strategies for Student Disciplinary Problems..	88

## ABBREVIATION

C.S.S	- Comprehensive Secondary School.
C.Y.A.O	- Children and Youth Affairs Organization.
C.Y.F.W.O	- Children, Youth and Family Welfare Organization.
E.C	- Ethiopian Calendar.
EMPDA	- Educational Materials Production & Distribution Agency.
ENA	- Ethiopian News Agency.
E.S.A. A	- Education Statistics Annual Abstract.
MOE	- Ministry of Education.
S.S.S	- Senior Secondary School.

# CHAPTER 1

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background to the Study

School is among the most important socializing institutions next to home. Societal values, skills and knowledge are transmitted to the youth in school. This educational task can properly be executed and the objectives be achieved provided there is an optimum disciplinary situation in school. Stoops et al (1981:95) stressed the important role of discipline in the accomplishment of goals as follows. "Disciplined schools, football teams and military units succeed. Undisciplined organizations fail."

For a long time in the past, discipline in school largely used to mean unquestioned, complete submission of students to the rules and regulations imposed upon them by school authorities and teachers. There was little provision made for students to air their views. Moreover, teachers' and school authorities' conception of discipline was rather traditional and religious. They 'preached' the importance of habits of doing desirable things and refraining from doing undesirable things. Their philosophy emphasized rules and regulations, mostly prohibitory (Pittenger, 1951:321-323).

As a consequence of advances in science progressive educational philosophies emerged and the concepts of older philosophy gradually declined. Education that was once understood as something static and a one-way communication happened to be understood as something developmental in principle, and as an interactive process between teachers and students in practice. As Pittenger (1951:322) views it, education is not primarily concerned with extreme quietness and obedience. Rather, order in school is

much activity, movement and much free exchange of ideas. For Pittenger, school activity becomes disorderly only when it seriously and unnecessarily interferes with desirable growth.

With a much similar view, Thompson (1976:20) argues that a very serious difference exists between those behaviours which are legitimate discipline problems (i.e. real) and those behaviours which are merely perceived by the teacher to be discipline problems. He contends that not only are many physiological and psychological problems of students incorrectly being dealt with as discipline problems, he even argues that too much discipline in the classroom is counterproductive. Thompson's thesis is that teachers should learn to differentiate between real and perceived discipline problems.

In spite of the importance of discipline in any work setting in general, and in school setting in particular, there hasn't been discovered so far any an all-time and place panacea for disciplinary ills. As Anderson and Van Dyke (1963:407) described it, discipline is not a problem for which there is a permanent solution. In connection with coping strategies of disciplinary problems, educationists and researcher agree that the identification of causes of the problems is of first-rate importance in the solution-seeking process. In support of this idea, Thompson (1976:23) writes "...remedial discipline should be related to its cause..." Stoops et al (1981:351) in the same vein state, "The cause should be treated rather than the misbehaviour which is the symptom."

Discipline problems are likely to differ in their causes. Since students are likely to have been to lots of influences before they come to school and

after, their behaviour must be examined in view of the possible factors. In relation to this, Shipman (1986:101) states:

The usual way of examining discipline in schools is to concentrate on individual children.... the pupil who is habitually disorderly in school and defies standard measures of correction is a child with an unsolved personal problem or problems. This is the psychological perspective. Here, discipline will be examined as a product of factors in the culture and social structure of the school. Individual problems will occur in every school, but within the context of these social factors.

When an educational system becomes more concerned with socialization and less with the personality development of the student, this itself may generate indisciplinarity. Dewey (in Dubey, 1980:15), for instance, points out that the absence of democratic atmosphere in school prepares ground for indiscipline because the ill-advised and ill-directed youth comes into conflict with it.

Despite the lots of influences the students had been exposed to prior to their coming to school, several studies indicate that schools can contribute much in positively shaping the behaviour of students. According to Charlton and David (1993:3), what schools offer, and how they offer it, helps to determine whether pupils respond in desirable or undesirable ways. Galloway and Goodwin (1987:109); Martimore et al. (1988:83) and Reynolds 1989 (in Charlton and David, 1993:54) showed in their respective studies that schools make difference to their pupils' behaviours for better or for worse. After making a survey of the characteristics of 500 schools with good discipline, Wayson et al and the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Discipline (1982:1)

also arrived at a similar conclusion saying, "... regardless of negative factors in the home, the school environment can have significant positive effects on children." Based on the result of its survey, the group further states, "We all know of schools where discipline does not seem to be a problem. The fact that such schools exist convinces us that solutions are possible." (Wayson et al. and Phi Delta Kappa Commission, 1982:2). Stoops et al (1981:96), on the other hand, released a shocking report about schools with student discipline problems from the same land, USA. In their report they made a decade ago, vandalism in American schools cost tax payers between \$600,000,000-1,000,000,000 annually, without expenditures for security guards, fire prevention devices and for similar others included. The same report also released a number of other cases involving loss of human lives and assaults. It was reported that more than 5,000 teachers were used to be attacked on school campuses each month and an estimate of one student death per week.

There is one crucial question to be asked in connection to the two contrasting disciplinary situations in the American schools. What caused the difference between the two kinds of schools with regard to student discipline? Based on their country-wide study of schools with good discipline, Wayson and others reply to the question.

We learned about schools from all over the country, serving children from a wide range of social backgrounds, that are orderly places where children are behaving in responsible ways. That such schools exist is evidence that discipline need not be a problem and that school practice can make a great deal of difference in student behaviour.

(Wayson et al. and Phi Delta Kappa Commission, 1982:2).

Although the features and their degrees of severity vary, school disciplinary problems are also emerging and developing in the less developed

countries like Ethiopia. Despite the fact that little has been known about the types and the causes of the problems, student discipline problems are manifesting themselves, particularly in secondary schools, in Ethiopia today. As a logical consequence of such unstudied problems, various misconceptions and wrong assumptions are being widespread about the problem. The misconceptions include exaggerating or undermining of the problem, assuming that students are always the cause of the problems, and consequently proposing unscientific solutions. It is, perhaps, appropriate to quote Ronald Davie (in Charlton and David, 1993:53-4) in relation to this age-old student-biased assumption. Davie asks, "Problem children or problem schools?" He further comments "... it may be thought that it is the child who is the focus of the assessment because in some sense he or she is where the problem behaviour lies. This is not necessarily the case and no such assumption should be made."

Davie's idea will hopefully compel those teachers and others to pause and question themselves about their stereotyped images of students. To this group of people, the student is the source of all disciplinary problems: Yet, such assumption is always harmful since wrong and unscientific assumptions often end up in wrong and unscientific measures. Moreover, it conceals facts. In order to arrive at a correct solution of any educational problem in general, and behavior problem in particular, the first thing to be done is to determine the cause of the problem by scientific method. The present study was, thus, planned in line with this farmework to make a preliminary investigation about some school-and teacher- related variables affecting student discipline.

## 1.2 Statement of the problem

Schools perform the teaching-learning task when and where the required disciplinary preconditions are fulfilled. Any infraction of this atmosphere calls for the attention of school administrators, teachers and other school personnel concerned. If and when such infractions occur, school administrators and others need to correctly and timely perceive the problem, study its nature, cause, and consequently design a suitable coping strategy before it reaches the level too difficult to reverse.

In spite of their sporadic nature, there were few reports of student disciplinary problems in Oromia secondary schools (Addis Zemen, Tikimt 1, 1985:11). Hence, the present study was conducted with the following four specific objectives. (1) identifying the types and nature of the existing student disciplinary problems, (2) identifying their causes, (3) determining the degree by which the disciplinary problems disrupt the teaching-learning process, (4) suggesting possible coping strategies on the basis of the experiences of practitioners and opinions of experts. In order to meet the objectives, the following research questions were formulated.

- 1a. What are the types of current disciplinary problems in secondary schools as perceived by administrators and teachers?
- b. How often do the student disciplinary problems occur?
- 2 To what degree do the identified disciplinary problems disrupt the teaching-learning process?
- 3 What are the causes of student disciplinary problems as perceived by administrators and teachers?
- 4 What are the possible coping strategies to keep the problem in an acceptable limit?

### **1.3 Delimitation of the Study**

There are three major categories of factors or variables that are causally related to inappropriate behaviour: school and teacher-related variables, home and social group variables, and student adjustment and personality variables (Cole and Chan, 1994:304). This study was delimited to the first of the three, namely, the school and teacher-related variables. The investigator delimited the study to the specified area for two practical reasons. Firstly and chiefly, the possible recommendations of the study are relatively more feasible at school level than those of the other variables which fall beyond the control and capacity of educators at school level. Secondly, the delimitation warrants a detailed and deeper investigation of the area than if it was otherwise.

As this study was carried out in Oromia region only, the conclusions were conventionally confined to the senior secondary schools operating in the region by the time the research was undertaken.

### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

A considerable period of time has now elapsed since student discipline problem has become a topic of concern to some parents, teachers, educational administrators, and even of politicians to a certain extent, particularly in the urban schools of Ethiopia (Region 14 Education Bureau, 1987 E.C.: 1). At times, the problem even has escalated to the extent of drawing the attention of public mass media (Addis Zemen, Meskerem 13, 1987:9).

Having the awareness of the problem is, of course, essential in the process of solving it. Like other problems, student discipline problems,

however, can be correctly solved if and when studied. The study of student disciplinary problems, thus, becomes significant for the following reasons:

- (a) the findings might identify the causes which in turn might help the schools (provided the research product is disseminated through channels like MOE's Journal of Education) concerned guard against the causes in future.
- (b) the findings might point out the kinds of corrective (remedial) disciplinary measures needed to be taken.
- (c) the findings might help in sifting out wrong views and assumptions from facts about the present student disciplinary situations in concrete terms.
- (d) it might serve as a stepping stone for others to study the problem from a wider perspective.

## **1.5 Definition of Terms**

The following are the contextual definitions of key terms used in the study.

**Adolescence:** a period in human development occurring between puberty and maturity and extending roughly from 13 to 14 years of age into the early 20's (Good, 1973:16)

**Cause:** the relatively approximate factors that are necessarily antecedent to the condition or existence of a given phenomenon (Hoult, 1997:54)

**Discipline:** the process of result or directing or subordinating immediate wishes, impulses, desires, or interests for the sake of an ideal or for the purpose of gaining more effective dependable action (Good, 1973: 185-6)

**Corrective discipline:** disciplinary principles and practices deliberately selected and applied as teaching devices or methods usually with an attitude of helpfulness, and usually based on comprehensive insight into normal human frailties and causes of misbehaviour (Good, 1973:186)

**Democratic discipline:** the procedure by which members in a group take responsibility for their behaviour by sharing in the determination of the controls which must apply within the group (Good, 1973:186)

---

**Punitive discipline:** the act of exercising control through punishment in a given school or the means by which that order is obtained, the maintenance of conditions conducive to the efficient achievement of the school's functions (Good, 1973:186)

**Preventive discipline:** a term applied to efforts to discourage disorder or misbehaviour before it actually occurs (Good, 1973: 186)

**Factor:** a cause or determiner, which may be unique to one variable or common to several variables, that may be used to account for the correlations among a set of variables (Good, 1973: 233)

**Misbehaviour:** nonconformity to rules and standards, such as antagonism, non participation, or overt rebellion (Hoult, 1977:369)

**Perception:** awareness of external objects, conditions, relationships, etc (Good, 1973: 413)

**Problem:** any significant, perplexing, and challenging situation, real or artificial, the solution of which requires reflective thinking (Good, 1973:438)

**Senior secondary school:** the upper part of a divided reorganized secondary school, comprising grades 9 to 12 (Good, 1973: 527)

**Survey research:** a systematic gathering of data relating to aspects of the life of human population or of a sample thereof, the data typically being obtained through the use of such tools as interviews and/or questionnaires (Hoult, 1977:325)

**Zone:** a part of land of the whole region arbitrarily divided by the investigator for the sake of convenience of the study.

## **1.6 Organization of the Study**

The study consists 5 chapters. Chapter 1 makes-up the introductory part whereby the background to the study, statement of the problem and significance of the study are briefly presented. Chapter 2 deals with the review of the related literature. In this part, theoretical constructs and previous research evidences (though the latter is very scanty) related to the problem of the study are reviewed. Chapter 3 of the study is concerned with the design of the study and the methodology employed. Based on the purpose of the study, the following three major components are considered in this chapter; namely, the sample and sampling techniques, the instrument and procedures of data collection, and methods of data analysis. In chapter 4, the data are presented, analyzed and the results interpreted. In the last chapter, i.e. chapter 5, the summary of the study and the conclusions reached on the basis of the findings are presented. Moreover, some recommendations are also forwarded with the objective of alleviating the existing situation with regard to the problem.

## CHAPTER TWO

### REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

As indicated previously in this paper in connection to the significance of the study, there is a growing concern on the parts of educators, parents and the government about student discipline. In spite of this, there is scanty research-based information regarding the problem. As a result the literature review is dominantly general principles and some external research findings.

#### 2.1 YOUTH: AS AGE CATEGORY

**2.1.1 Definition.** According to the definition of the United Nations, “Youth” constitute the population between 15-24 years of age (Eisenstadt in CYAO, 1995:3). The Ethiopian legal system considers all persons under the age of 18 as minors (Penal code, Article 52). Hence, by implication, those young people above 18 years old are non children. This group occupies somewhere between children and adults.

The UN’s definition of “youth” thus, incorporates the age group of secondary school students (i.e. 15-18 years), in Ethiopia which this study refers to. A young boy or a girl enters grade 1 at the age of 7 and reaches grade 9 (the first year of senior secondary school) when he/she is 15 years old. By inference, the Ethiopian senior secondary school student is, thus, youth. CYAO fully agrees with this view. According to this organization, youth is a transition period in life between dependent childhood and self-reliant adulthood, the range in which the majority of young people join the labour force (CYAO, 1993:3).

As cited by Erickson (in CYAO 1995:7), youth are the most affected section of a society by the impact of changes. In the face of such uninterrupted socio-economic and cultural transformations some societies are better prepared than others in socializing their youths.

**2.1.2 YOUTH AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHANGES:** In the pre-industrial society, the family, historically, had been one of the units of stability in the rearing of youth (Eichhorn, 1978:499). The youngsters used to learn at home what they needed to know in order to fulfil their adult roles in working life (Husein, 1979:132). For Adesina (1990:193), today in contrast to twenty or thirty years ago, the home is rapidly losing its influence on the growth and development of the child. As the number of working mothers continues to increase, the great task of child rearing is left in the hands of people who can never provide the type of parental attention, guidance and affection that are critical at this formative stage. Poole (in CYAO, 1995:5) states that the changes have, much more serious impacts, particularly, on the youths coming from the lowest socio-economic strata and for youths in developing countries. By describing this point further, Poole says that pathogenic societal influence like difficult social rules and experiences often lead to the development of maladaptive behaviours such as uncertainties, despair, demoralization and a sense of hopelessness. As a supplement to Poole's view, Adesina (1990:194) explains the situation by saying that the fundamental problem lies, more than anything else, in the fact that industrial technology and the race for wealthier or financial self-sufficiency, particularly in the metropolis, are keeping parents farther and farther away from the home, the first educator of the child.

World events of late 1960s and early 1970s also added to the transformed nature of youth. In Eichhorn's (1978:499) view, these periods were marked by a significant social upheaval. Its roots were deeply imbedded in an emerging opposition to the status quo. According to Eichhorn, youth protest reached a crescendo of such magnitude that the nature of existing youth cultures took a new form during these turbulent years.

The changes that underwent in the society in general, and in the home in particular, did occur in school, too. Today's schools are enormously large compared with what they used to be, and today's teachers have to cope with a large number of students. Besides this, the missionary zeal in teaching which gave the 'old' teacher all his credit is almost completely lost. In Adesina (1990:195), the author reminds us of those good school days as follows.

In the 1950s the teacher was rightly regarded as one in loco parentis and enjoyed considerable cooperation from the home. When a teacher took over a new classroom, that teacher quickly got to know intimately the problems and aspirations not only of his few children, but also of their parents, aunts, sisters and brothers.

This change in the teacher-student relation had a socio-economic reason. The increase in the student enrollment in the less developed countries in the 1960s and 1970s vis-avis the meagre economies of these countries resulted in a widened student-teacher ratio, classroom-student ratio, and teachers' low pay that consequently encroached the moral wealth of teachers. As the aftermath of these changes, teachers are caught up in the race for status and wealth just with the parents of the children they teach (Adesina, 1990:195).

Moreover, Eichhorn (1978:499) reports that youth-adult relationship also changed during this period. The so-called generation-gap marked a point of differentiation between youth and adults and developed new dimensions. The interaction between the two is further complicated by the phenomenon of earlier biological maturation. Tanner and others (in Eichhorn, 1978:501) cited that children are maturing biologically at an earlier age by some four months per decade since 1830s. Early maturation is even more today than it was in the nineteenth century. Husein (1979:130) reports that young people mature biologically one or two years earlier than did their counter parts some fifty years ago. By maturing earlier youth have an even longer period of social and economic dependence. Coupled with the need to acquire knowledge and skills needed to ensure career attainment, early maturation adds to the complexity of youth cultures (Eichhorn, 1978:501). In the face of such changes, teachers may not sufficiently accommodate to the real needs, intents and perceptions of modern students. Kindsvatter (1982:512) tells us that today's students are different from those of prior generations. They live in a society in which absolutes have given way to relativity; the family structures have been steadily weakened; the use of drugs is endemic, crime and vandalism abound, the government has suffered incredibility; and schools are frequently criticized.

Thus, almost all authors agree that the youth culture is undergoing transformation alongside the social, economic and cultural changes in the society. The youth is increasingly in demand for more and more freedom and independence. In due course, there are more collisions between these needs of the youth and that of the society. Except being heightened in this age of science and technological revolution, generation-gap does not seem to be a

new phenomenon. It seems to be something that has existed for a long time. Socrates (in Child, 1986:283) had to write the following in the year 329 B.C.

Our youth now loves luxury. It has bad manners, contempt for authority, disrespect for older people. Children nowadays are tyrants. They contradict their parents, chatter before company, gobble their food and tyrannise their teachers.

However, the existence of some misbehaviours in the past does not imply sameness in the types of problems and degree between the past and the present time.

Before concluding this part of the review, we may need to bring back the following salient points to the memory of the reader. The socio-economic changes that have occurred in the society have also effected a given degree of change in the mode of life, needs, and aspirations of youth. In the absence of sufficient resource for the fulfilment of its needs, the youth may go its own way in its endeavour to satisfy itself. This in turn, often results in undesirable social consequences that could cost the society.

### **2.1.3 YOUTH: SECONDARY SCHOOL AND PREPARATION**

**FOR ADULT RESPONSIBILITY:** Regardless of the level of development and the socio-political systems of their respective countries the present day secondary schools have the general function of preparing their students for adult responsibility. The schools enroll adolescents that require guidance for their heightened physical, psychological and emotional behaviours. The adolescents are naturally endowed with the need for more autonomy, freedom and independence. Secondary schools, thus, are

entrusted with guiding these potentials using their professionals like teachers, guidance workers, psychologists and other schools personnel. Other than the socialization task, secondary schools shoulder the responsibility of providing general and professional education that equip the students with work skills such that they become responsible and productive citizens in the world of work. The adequacy of secondary schools, thus, depends on how much they have succeeded in fulfilling these two tasks of socializing and preparing for life after school.

Despite the good intent, most research evidences show that secondary schools have failed to accomplish their mission. Among others, impotency of schools, paucity of student participation in school matters, irrelevant curriculum, long school duration are the major factors that different authorities assume for its failure. Husen (1979:131), for instance, argues that the school with its present institutional structures and resources has not been able to shoulder the socializing functions which previously were handled in adult settings, such as at work place, with prospects of success. As reported by Martin et al (in Husen, 1979:132) American secondary schools, as a result of their alienation from the rest of the society and lack of motivation to enter adult life, have succeeded in producing a youth society housed in overburdened institutions excessively isolated from the reality of the community and the adult world. The United States' Office of Education (USOE) (in Husen, 1979:132), also described the situation in striking metaphor as follows.

We have used our schools, inadvertently, as the social 'ageing vats' that have isolated adolescents and delayed their learning adult roles, work habits and skills.

Schools are also being criticized for their undemocratic actions. More often than not, they are centres of reaction. Silberman (in Husein, 1979:130) writes that secondary schools tend to transmit values of docility, pacificity, conformity and lack of trust. The essential draw back of the contemporary school, when it comes to socializing young people into adult responsibilities is that it makes the student altogether dependent.

Freire and Illich (in Fagen, Long and Stevens, 1975:17), on their part, criticize schools as inherently oppressive, in that educators are responsible for shoveling whatever is presently accepted as necessary by those in authority into passive "learners".

The negligence of student roles mostly emanate from traditional views held by school administrators and teachers. Such administrators and teachers consider students as objects that others manipulate in the way the latter wish the former to be. Such view focuses almost exclusively on the external "stuff" that is to be implanted in these (students) apparently inert organisms (Clinchy, 1995:383). In the opinion of this author, the pronouncement is an erroneous image of the learner as a passive receptacle, along with a discredited conception of pedagogy that the revolutionary educator Paulo Freire calls the "Banking model". Clinchy (1995:384) describes the model:

In the banking model the teacher deposits information in the students' (empty) heads; the students' tasks are to store the deposits and to prove that they have done so by retrieving them upon request. The emphasis is on an obsolete and simplistic conception of cognitive development as entirely a matter of "socialization" from the "outside in" a molding of the shapeless blob of the mind by outside agents, such as parents & teachers.

Under the “banking model” of teaching-learning process, the student is unlikely to develop his potential for critical thinking and problem solving. He is not encouraged to share what he potentially has with others. As a result we cannot expect young people who leave school to be capable of more responsibility than the school has allowed them to acquire (Husein, 1979:129).

## **2.2 Discipline**

### **2.2.1 Discipline: Emergence and Development**

Etmologically, the word “discipline” had its origin in Judaism and in the ecclesiastical history of Christianity. Rose (in Dubey, 1980:7) writes that Paul sat at the feet of Gamaliel (a categorical name given to the Palestinian Patriarchs of 1<sup>st</sup> - 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D) to receive the learning the latter teaches Paul about life, and hence, Rose refers to Paul as Gamaliel’s “disciple”. Werblowsky and Wigoder (1966:23) also refer to Paul as the “disciple” (pupil) of Gamaliel whom Paul had to obey and follow his teaching-order, faith, and standard of life. Thus, the importance of keeping up to a given norm or a set of standard was understood much earlier in the ecclesiastical life of man. A true Christian, for instance, had to conform to and remain faithful to the doctrines and practices of Christianity. Any breach of this religious norm by the individual shall subject him to a series of corrective measures ranging from teaching and counseling to ex-communicating him as a heretic.

Gradually, the material world borrowed the concept for its own service. Bender and Smith (1956:69) described “discipline” as the adoption and maintenance of the group of standards of faith and life which are practised by

the individual members. Good (1959:185), in his part, defined discipline as a process or result of directing or subordinating immediate wishes, impulses or desires or interests for the sake of an idea or for the purpose of gaining more effective, dependable action.

From what has been discussed so far, it may be concluded that a person or group of persons who ever wish to accomplish a given task must, first and foremost, be able to keep up to an established disciplinary requirement.

### **2.2.2 Discipline in School Setting**

Perceptions about discipline vary across time and place. In the past school discipline largely used to mean unquestioned, complete submission of students to the rules and regulations imposed upon them by school administrators and teachers. Less provision (if any) was given for the students to express their views. This conception of discipline was rather traditional and religion-oriented.

In opposition to this unscientific and uneducational view, Pittenger (1951:322) comments:

Education as a developmental activity involves more or less confusion and it is inconsistent with fixed positions and extreme quietness. Education, involving the interaction of teachers and pupils is not primarily concerned with obedience. Rather, order in schools is much activity, movement, much free exchange of ideas.

With the emergence and expansion of such progressive ideas, the old conception of religious authoritarianism as the basis for the right conduct, gradually declined.

Perceptions of discipline are also contextual. What one student does in the middle of the school week may be viewed differently from the same thing done at the end of the week. Or what one does outside the school gates may be perceived differently from the same action inside. In the same way, what a pupil may do in one school may be considered hazardous and completely unacceptable in another (Watkins and Wagner, 1987:9). Thus, whether a student's action is seen as a 'breach of discipline' will depend on who does it, where, when, why, to whom, in front of whom and so on (Watkins and Wagner, 1987:9).

Teachers' explanation of discipline reflect a number of influences. But an ever present influence on the explanation a teacher gives for any particular deviant behavior is the situation the teacher is at the time. This includes the 'frame' he is in, the situation he has just come from (especially if it was the pupil or pupils concerned), the audience he is talking to, the goals he may have in mind, and so on (Watkins and Wagner, 1985:12). What is misbehavior to some teachers is certainly not to others (Gnagey, 1968:5). Commenting on this problem of perception difference in what misbehavior is, Montgomery (1989:5) states that one of the main difficulties in defining behavior problems is the involvement of value judgement as a result of which one classifies a socially disapproved behavior as bad behavior when the other might not. The example given by Gnagey illustrates how much the meaning we attach to discipline is culture-bound and contextual. Gnagey compares the explanation given to the plant 'hybrid corn' in two different contexts with that of an action designated as disciplined or undisciplined. He argues, "If a weed is any plant that grows where it is not wanted, a hybrid corn plant is just as much a weed in a flower bed as a morning glory in the cornfield." Elaborating his idea, the author says that the classification of a plant as a

Perceptions of discipline are also contextual. What one student does in the middle of the school week may be viewed differently from the same thing done at the end of the week. Or what one does outside the school gates may be perceived differently from the same action inside. In the same way, what a pupil may do in one school may be considered hazardous and completely unacceptable in another (Watkins and Wagner, 1987:9). Thus, whether a student's action is seen as a 'breach of discipline' will depend on who does it, where, when, why, to whom, in front of whom and so on (Watkins and Wagner, 1987:9).

Teachers' explanation of discipline reflect a number of influences. But an ever present influence on the explanation a teacher gives for any particular deviant behavior is the situation the teacher is at the time. This includes the 'frame' he is in, the situation he has just come from (especially if it was the pupil or pupils concerned), the audience he is talking to, the goals he may have in mind, and so on (Watkins and Wagner, 1985:12). What is misbehavior to some teachers is certainly not to others (Gnagey, 1968:5). Commenting on this problem of perception difference in what misbehavior is, Montgomery (1989:5) states that one of the main difficulties in defining behavior problems is the involvement of value judgement as a result of which one classifies a socially disapproved behavior as bad behavior when the other might not. The example given by Gnagey illustrates how much the meaning we attach to discipline is culture-bound and contextual. Gnagey compares the explanation given to the plant 'hybrid corn' in two different contexts with that of an action designated as disciplined or undisciplined. He argues, "If a weed is any plant that grows where it is not wanted, a hybrid corn plant is just as much a weed in a flower bed as a morning glory in the cornfield." Elaborating his idea, the author says that the classification of a plant as a

weed is much more dependent upon the purposes of the gardener than upon any characteristic of the plant itself (Gnagey, 1968:5). By the same token, misbehavior is any action that is taken where it is not wanted, and the appropriateness of behavior is much more dependent upon the purpose of the teacher than upon any characteristic of the behavior itself (Gnagey, 1968:6).

The preceding discussion seems to be sufficiently convincing to believe that there is no universal parameter of disciplined and undisciplined behavior because “situational demands and the interpretation of failure will vary from school to school and from teacher to teacher.” (Leach and Raybould, 1977:1).

## **2.3 Student Disciplinary Problems**

### **2.3.1 Types of Disciplinary Problems**

Discipline problems are basically of two orders: real and perceived. A real disciplinary problem arises when an individual or a group or groups infringe on the freedom of the teacher to teach and/or the right of other students to learn. The perceived problem, on the other hand, is caused by the teacher perceiving a problem when there is none (Thompson, 1976:20). Since the making of these two orders of problem vivid has a practical contribution for the solution of discipline problems, we shall see them using examples. When teaching in a class, a teacher has a professional and legal right not to be unduely interrupted. The students, too, have the right to follow their lesson without interruption by any other student who himself might have disliked to pursue the lesson being taught by the teacher. Any infringement of the right of both the teacher and the students who like to follow their lesson is a real discipline problem. On the other hand, a student or a group of students may not be pursuing the lesson seriously but merely sit in the class without, in any way, infringing upon the right of the teacher to teach and that of other students to learn. Despite it being a problem of one kind on the part of those

students who lost the learning interest, it is by no means a problem in reality, but perceived (Thompson, 1976:20). The teacher has no justifiable reason to take disciplinary measure in such instance. He may, rather be needed to study the problem of those students who have developed disliking against the lesson.

Although types of disciplinary problems are not identical even among schools in adjacent geographical areas, the obtained results in some studies indicate similarities. As cited by Yusuf (1996:10), Shertzer and Stone listed school and college dropouts, unwanted pregnancies, youthful marriages and divorce, crime and delinquency, youth unemployment, alcohol and drug abuse, and venereal disease as problems peculiar to youth. Haregewoin and Yusuf (1994:9) documented various concerns that are unique to girls in Ethiopian schools as unwanted pregnancy, abortion, dropping out from school, problems of or addiction (drug, chat, alcohol), delinquency, menstrual problems, and lack of knowledge about contraceptives (Yusuf, 1996:10). Though there are no country-wide surveys made on smoking in Ethiopia, a 1978 study of high school students undertaken in Gondar revealed that among 12-23 year olds, the percentage who smoked was 3% for females and 28% for males (CYAO, 1995:26). Based on police reports CYAO (1995:28) cites that most of the drug abusers and traffickers in Ethiopia are youth between the ages of 15-25 years. One fact must be clear regarding reports given in the preceding lines about Ethiopia. The studies were limited to certain localities. As a result, the investigations are hardly representative to conclude for the whole country. A very recent study which has a particular relevance to this investigation is that conducted by Ayalew in 1996. In his study of School Discipline and Corporal Punishment in Ethiopian Schools, the investigator has identified the following 15 types of school disciplinary

problems as they frequent in the studied schools: not doing home assignments, cheating in examinations, tardiness/late coming, truancy/absence, jumping over the fence, lack of interest in education, poor classroom participation, telling lies, property damage or vandalism, fraud, fighting among students, bad habits (i.e. smoking, getting drunk), insulting/attacking teachers, profanity, theft (Ayalew, 1996:15). The results show that the most frequent disciplinary problems are trivial offences (Ayalew, 1996:20).

### **2.3.2 Causes of Disciplinary Problems.**

The complex nature of human being and the varying characteristics of the problems that encounter him pose an obstacle to his effort of giving solution to his problem of discipline. No specific formula is possible for solving disciplinary problem. Discipline is not a problem for which there is a permanent solution (Anderson and Van Dyke, 1963:407). The adequate preparation of teachers in this regard has been impeded by the lack of science of discipline in any strict sense (Clarizio, 1971:VII). In spite of the less encouraging achievements gained in searching out a permanent solution, studies have identified some causes of student misbehaviours. Knowing the cause of misbehavior (however deep in the pupil's sub-conscious) is the ideal resolution to a discipline situation in order to treat the cause adequately (Thompson, 1976:20). There is, however, rare single cause for human behavior. This further complicates the treatment of the problem. Thompson (1976:20) also has suggestion as to what teachers may do in such odd situations of inability of identifying a single cause of misbehavior. He suggests that the teacher who could not discover the cause of the misbehavior may use a set of hypotheses about the situation and according to the best one, can he formulate the solution.

problems as they frequent in the studied schools: not doing home assignments, cheating in examinations, tardiness/late coming, truancy/absence, jumping over the fence, lack of interest in education, poor classroom participation, telling lies, property damage or vandalism, fraud, fighting among students, bad habits (i.e. smoking, getting drunk), insulting/attacking teachers, profanity, theft (Ayalew, 1996:15). The results show that the most frequent disciplinary problems are trivial offences (Ayalew, 1996:20).

### **2.3.2 Causes of Disciplinary Problems.**

The complex nature of human being and the varying characteristics of the problems that encounter him pose an obstacle to his effort of giving solution to his problem of discipline. No specific formula is possible for solving disciplinary problem. Discipline is not a problem for which there is a permanent solution (Anderson and Van Dyke, 1963:407). The adequate preparation of teachers in this regard has been impeded by the lack of science of discipline in any strict sense (Clarizio, 1971:VII). In spite of the less encouraging achievements gained in searching out a permanent solution, studies have identified some causes of student misbehaviours. Knowing the cause of misbehavior (however deep in the pupil's sub-conscious) is the ideal resolution to a discipline situation in order to treat the cause adequately (Thompson, 1976:20). There is, however, rare single cause for human behavior. This further complicates the treatment of the problem. Thompson (1976:20) also has suggestion as to what teachers may do in such odd situations of inability of identifying a single cause of misbehavior. He suggests that the teacher who could not discover the cause of the misbehavior may use a set of hypotheses about the situation and according to the best one, can he formulate the solution.

In spite of the challenges, different researchers in the field of psychology, sociology and others have been able to identify some major causes of disciplinary problems or misbehaviors. Thompson (1976:21), for instance, identified two major causes; namely, aspects of adolescent development and institutionalization. As with the former cause, the author describes that adolescence is the developmental stage in which the individual strives toward adult independence in the process of which he/she encounters failures as well. He further states that it is this that count as misbehavior by the adult. In the belief of the author, the adolescent develops the necessary traits like autonomy and independence only by passing through this experience - "risk takings", that are unavoidable and are natural aspects of adolescence. The second cause, i.e., institutionalization refers to the maladaptive behavior occurring as a result of increased social pressures within an institution such as school (Thompson, 1976:22).

For the purpose of this investigation 'within' school factors that are considered major contributors to student disciplinary problems, are closely reviewed. These include teachers, school administration, the education system in general and educational facilities.

### 2.3.2.1 Teachers

Teachers do contribute much to the making of the total personality of students. This is with regard to both desirable and undesirable behavior. In conformity with this idea, Kindsvatter (1982:512) says that teachers' behaviors and beliefs contribute directly to student discipline problems. According to Guinott (1972:14), teachers' own behavior can be either most destructive or instructive when dealing with disciplinary problem. A teacher with a commendable personality uses his knowledge, skill and experience to

positively affect events. In connection to this, James (1960:246) mentioned some characteristics of teacher personality that seem essential for successful discipline of students. James advises that a teacher to be worthy of his name has to avoid false dignity, shame and unnatural imitation of others. Moreover, James warns a teacher to avoid sexual relationship and undue contact with his students.

Another undesirable character that a teacher must avoid is involvement in favouritism. Chauhan (1978:502) and Bellon et al (1992:13) comment that partiality or favouritism committed by some teachers serve as a cause of student discipline problem. The authorities argue that when teachers create some kind of close relationship with certain students and treat them unduely, other students will start being provoked by it. The condition becomes worse when such partiality is accompanied by the teachers' mistreatment of other students. In such instances the latter may be going to the extent of unifying themselves and go against the teachers concerned and their pets.

Poor teaching can also cause disruption (Charlton and David, 1993:154). Teachers with sufficient calibre, professional interest and skill motivate their students to learn. When students are engrossed in the learning process they don't have spare time for disruption. Experience has frequently shown us how one teacher, for example, can inject a 'breathe of life' into a lesson or subject, while another gives a similar lesson the 'kiss of death' (Charlton and David, 1993:223). Thus, teachers' skill in planning the lesson to be taught, and their presentation greatly assist in avoiding discipline problems. Kujoth (1970:30) by supplementing the foregoing idea of Charlton and David a little more, says that the teacher who gets into his classroom each teaching period with his lesson plan prepared in the manner to sustain the interest and

participation of his students, will have few problems to solve. Høghughi (1983:134), too, follows suit. He says that those teachers, who have the necessary presence and competence rarely have problems with any but the most extreme youngsters. Høghughi also commented about those incompetent teachers who can become sources of student misbehavior, and rather contribute to worsening the discipline situation. Here is what he says:

Although the school atmosphere appears to be the most important controlling factor in every school, there are a number of teachers who have difficulty in exercising control. Almost invariably such teachers resort to authoritarian measures of excessive, ridiculing...

(Høghughi, 1983:134).

### **2.3.2.2 School Administration**

The inclination of some principals and teachers to treat isolated discipline cases as a mechanism of alleviating disciplinary problems has been proved less effective (Galloway, 1987:33). He argues for the need for schools and teachers to overcome their preoccupation with the behavior of individual pupils and teachers and to recognize that school responses to disruptive behavior are likely to be more effective where they are organized at the institutional level, using a whole-school approach. According to this approach, a practical strategy for principals and teachers to understand and minimize indiscipline starts by focusing on the institutional with an awareness of the personal and cultural (Watkins and Wagner, 1987:34). Without this level of analysis, much of teachers' other efforts may be going to waste (Watkins and Wagner, 1987:37). Watkins and Wagner (1987:37) tell us that the whole-school approach gives attention to the so far less attended element of school organization - school climate. As reported by the authors, the significant differences observed in the publications of researches conducted on

twelve London secondary schools by Rutter and his colleagues was attributed to the different 'ethos' of the schools - the informal social relations of the schools (Watkins and Wagner, 1987:39). Nevertheless, there is no full consensus among the researchers as to what methods to use to assess these intangible feature. Watkins and Wagner (1987:39), however, do have a strong conviction that school climate influences school performance. This can be seen from what they say about it. "Whether school climate is or is not easily measured does not divert us from the fact that it is connected with the school's performance on many dimensions."

Informal school relationships such as interpersonal relationships between the school principal and teachers, among the teachers themselves, between the teachers and service personnel, between teachers and students can matter much more, at times, than rules and regulations do. When we consider processes of discipline in a school, the tendency to talk in formal terms about the organization can be distinctly productive. The tendency to call for routines to cope with situations can be an ineffective attempt at a short cut in problem solving (Watkins & Wagner, 1987:40). Thus, the overall climate of the school can facilitate or deter the effort the administration of the school makes to create desirable student behavior. Assessing the results of the few studies available on discipline and school climate, Watkins and Wagner (1987:40-41) inform us that the trends which seem to be developing confirm the importance of examining informal processes.

Another major aspect of school management that will have effect on student discipline is the way in which the responsibility of students is recognized and made use of through their participation in the management of the school. From the living experience, numerous schools do not attend to

this aspect. The source of this is the underlying attitude of the schools that takes students as mere recipients of processes applied to them by adults. Watkins and Wagner (1987:50) illustrate the situation with the following striking metaphor.

Unlike the inanimate production-line object, however, pupils may display marked alienation, in an active manner. Schools which engage their pupils, take their views seriously and consult them in decision making, and generally treat them more as clients than as products, may be doing much to foster a climate in which disaffection is reduced.

For better school results, those who are concerned must give due attention to student participation in decision making, and the overall administration of the school. Notifying school principals of their responsibility in this regard, Calkins (1974:15), says, "as a key person in the school, humanization of the school as a prerequisite to involving students in the decision making process begins with the principal." School administrators have to realize that students of today don't get satisfied with only what the adults willed to provide them. They have become more and more daring to demand their rights. Just as Stoops et.al (1981:350) rightly put, the present day students are not willing to accept adult-made rules and regulations. They want the right to help form rules of conduct. Hence, administrators and teachers must accept the fact that students have certain rights established by legal precedent in constitution. The authors also have forwarded justification for their support of student participation in decision making. They believe that students when given opportunity to develop their own standards of behavior have a better understanding of the reasons for establishing them and are more likely to assume personal responsibility for supporting them. They, however, warn the administrators to assure that the degree of student

this aspect. The source of this is the underlying attitude of the schools that takes students as mere recipients of processes applied to them by adults. Watkins and Wagner (1987:50) illustrate the situation with the following striking metaphor.

Unlike the inanimate production-line object, however, pupils may display marked alienation, in an active manner. Schools which engage their pupils, take their views seriously and consult them in decision making, and generally treat them more as clients than as products, may be doing much to foster a climate in which disaffection is reduced.

For better school results, those who are concerned must give due attention to student participation in decision making, and the overall administration of the school. Notifying school principals of their responsibility in this regard, Calkins (1974:15), says, "as a key person in the school, humanization of the school as a prerequisite to involving students in the decision making process begins with the principal." School administrators have to realize that students of today don't get satisfied with only what the adults willed to provide them. They have become more and more daring to demand their rights. Just as Stoops et.al (1981:350) rightly put, the present day students are not willing to accept adult-made rules and regulations. They want the right to help form rules of conduct. Hence, administrators and teachers must accept the fact that students have certain rights established by legal precedent in constitution. The authors also have forwarded justification for their support of student participation in decision making. They believe that students when given opportunity to develop their own standards of behavior have a better understanding of the reasons for establishing them and are more likely to assume personal responsibility for supporting them. They, however, warn the administrators to assure that the degree of student

participation should be relevant to the maturity level of the students. In a similar vein, in support of this idea Wayson et al (1982:42) also say that good schools attempt to involve most of their constituents in developing and implementing the rules. Educators in those schools know that those who are not involved in the process will have neither an understanding of the rules nor a commitment to obey them. Fagen, Long and Stevens (1972:5) also stress the need for participation of students in school affairs even when the latter is not ready for it. The authors call upon the school principal to provide the leadership for raising the students' level of consciousness to enable them realize the need for becoming involved. Calkins (1974:14) has even made qualification for the desired kind of student participation. He starts by posing questions to school principals:

What kind of voice do your students have in the real issues of your school? Who holds the power? Do students have thorough representation in some democratic structure, an equal voice in making the most significant decisions in your school. Unless positive answers can be given to these and similar questions, the students are not really involved in the decision making process in the school. What exists otherwise is phony.

The principal's idiosyncrasy with respect to student discipline and skill in the management of behavior problems count for the degree of effectiveness of his principalship. His managerial capacity, his relationship with the members of the school community and his communication channels have a much greater impact on student discipline.

Ignorance of school rules is certainly one of the reasons for a student becoming a deviant. Conflicting rules of the home or of the larger society and

of school and frustration are other sources of student deviance. According to Bellon et al (1992:139) student control methods have to be worked together with parents and teachers. In his opinion, effective communication net work is an important tool of the school principal. Such communication is required to be built with the school community. He also stresses the importance of discussing the methods of handling the frequently occurring student disciplinary problems with experienced teachers. Clarizio (1980:180) recommends the orienting of school community about policies and the type of behavior a school expects of its students as one of the strategies to be used in maintaining student discipline.

### **2.3.2.3 The Educational System in General.**

If the educational system is basically faulty and divorced from the realities of life with an emphasis on the memorization of facts and right answers, schools have failed to make learning relevant. This in turn may create in students a spirit of hopelessness and carelessness (Lehman, 1982:62). Coleman (in Husein, 1979:133) states that today's schools are divorced from the real-life situation. He explains it in a catch phrase: 'the school is information-rich but 'action-poor'. In his view, the weakness of the present educational system is its tendency to make the verbal abstract exercise an end in itself, something that is further strengthened by the ritualism of marks and examinations. The one who successfully masters the rituals is rewarded, while the one who is able to apply what he has learnt is not. With respect to defective curriculum and examination system Chauhan (1978:503) cites that an irrelevant curriculum and examination based on bookish knowledge is one cause of misbehavior. The overall pattern of teaching methods used in school also bears relation to the patterns of discipline (Watkins and Wagner, 1987:46)

Eventhough impulsive behavior arises from a multitude of factors, to Fagen, Long and Stevens (1975:7) the major problem of impulsive children derive from poor interpersonal teaching rather than from inherent causes. While other modes of intervention, such as counseling, parent case work or individual tutoring are not discounted, a specialized teaching curriculum has the best potential for getting to the core deficits. In other words, a child who struggles unsuccessfully to reduce anxiety and fear connected with felt weaknesses may be helped best by purposeful training to overcome those weaknesses (Fagen, Long and Stevens, 1975:7). Wayson et al (1982:48) state that curriculum and instruction are the central business of schools, and as a consequence students are in the school to learn. They further argue that if time is not spent learning, there seems little reason to be in school; therefore, students are likely to drop out or to protest the system. Such protests often appear as discipline problems because students feel they are not served by the system and cannot tolerate the insecurity that arises when the system is not doing what they expected it to do. The curriculum establishes the goals a school attempts to achieve. If those goals seem worthwhile and attainable, both staff and students will be committed to achieving them. But if they seem abstract, useless, or unattainable, the staff will have to exert a great deal more energy to persuade students to pursue the curriculum goals. Under such circumstances, the curriculum can actually become a cause of discipline problems.

The difficulty level of the lesson taught also has a bearing on the disciplinary behavior of students. With reference to this Wayson et al (1982:49) explain that if instructional practices are not related to curriculum goals or do not take into account what students already know and need to know in order to participate, some students will become alienated from

classroom activity, and proceed to seek other, perhaps disruptive ways to gain attention or to feel successful. According to the authors, discipline problems are bound to result if:

- . the curriculum goals are not shared and reinforced;
- . the curriculum is pursued without students really learning;
- . the curriculum provides no choices that recognize staff and student individual styles;
- . the curriculum does not relate to anything students or their families have experienced or value;
- . the curriculum content has no solid substance;
- . staff are not expected to teach every student;
- . instruction does not begin at the students' level of ability;
- . no one cares enough about what the student does to give constructive feedback;
- . the student cannot do the work, and no one helps;
- . the student continuously experiences failure in similar activities;
- . instructional methods are consistently dull & uninspiring;
- . staff feel the student cannot learn and the system provides excuses for failure to teach. (Wayson et al, 1982:49)

El-Abd (1973:81) also considers an irrelevant curriculum and wrong methodology experienced in primary schools can contribute to the problems of secondary schools. According to him, when the content of courses is generally over-academic, it lends itself to rote- learning and cramming. He believes that an irrelevant curriculum hardly stimulates the intrinsic interest in teachers to teach and students to learn. As viewed by El-Abd, bad student experiences in primary schools also are often a bad preparation for secondary education. "Spoonfeeding", "rote-learning", and repressive discipline at

primary level too often make it difficult for secondary students to develop sense of responsibility and ability to work unsupervised. Over-dependence on the teachers erode students potential for working independently toward a given goal.

#### **2.3.2.4 School Educational Facilities**

As suggested by Wayson et al (1982:59), anyone who wants to reduce discipline problems should take a close look at the physical facilities and the way the school is organized. Both the way the given space is used and the way schedules are made affect the way people work together. Wayson et al criticize educators for the latter sometimes act as if standardized organizational procedures cannot be changed. The authors, yet, inform us that, well disciplined schools reported numerous departures from standard operating procedures as ways to get better results. Bellon et al (1992:18) identify class size, recreational facilities, student-textbook ratio and other teaching materials as factors that influence student discipline. They believe that recreational facilities such as playground also occupy a significant place in both the teaching-learning program and students' overall character training. In the opinion of the authors where these facilities are absent, students spare their after school/class time in unwanted places and on undesirable engagements where they more likely acquire bad habits and custom. Pupils' learning is, in a large measure, a function of the quality and quantity of learning materials made available to them. In relation to shortage of books, Macober (1954:306) argues that vital educational problems of pupils grow out of the weakness of school to supply adequate textbooks. Consequently the students' desire for learning decreases. This is more often accompanied by frustration. Otto and Sanders (1964:199), on their part, pin pointed the role of library service in an educational program. They emphasized that library

service is another essential support input for the well functioning of the educational program. To the authors, lack of library service has a negative impact on the teaching-learning process, and can ultimately become a source of student disciplinary problems.

On the other hand, an education system rich in variety of both curricular and extra curricular activities is believed to have less discipline problems. Programs like games, drama, debate, scouting, excursion help students release from possible emotional stresses that happen to them as a result of persistent work.

Class size has a direct influence on student discipline. An optimum number of students per classroom is useful for both pedagogical and managerial reason. In classes where there are manageable number of students, the teacher can easily detect attendance, mark the work of students, and provide individual assistance to students. When class size increases, not only does the teacher become incapacitated to accomplish such professional commitments but lacks capacity even for mere classroom management. In general, an appropriate number of students per class, and in school as a whole, increases the effectiveness of maintaining good discipline (Bellon et al, 1992:19). On the whole, schools that have a balanced program for both curricular and extra curricular areas together with the necessary and sufficient educational facilities greatly increase students desire for learning and affection for school environment. The absence of this makes the school program boring and monotonous, which in turn, may become a source for differing disciplinary problems.

### 2.3.3 Coping Strategies for Disciplinary Problems

Next to parents, teachers and schools have, perhaps, the most significant impact on shaping the attitudes of children during the critical periods of childhood and adolescence. Stoops et al (1981:350) report that in the previous time, poor behavior was dealt with by harsh, immediate and authoritative means. The modern aim, as opposed to the old, is to have groups and individuals develop social control, self-control and self-direction. To achieve this aim, as Hoghughi (1983:286) viewed, the atmosphere of the school and the positive measures it takes to reduce disruption and delinquency through creating a pleasant and engaging approach is a critical element. Disgusted as they may seem with the aversive conditions of the education systems, Fagen, Long and Stevens (1975:16-17) commented that the prevailing educational systems show apparent reluctance to provide for the development and exercise of such self-control. In opposition to this thwarting role of the existing educational system, few educational revolutionaries like Freire and Illich argue that all formal schooling is inherently oppressive. Hoghughi (1983:286) warns that harsh and unsystematic treatment of students to solve disciplinary problems itself, can make the disrupted atmosphere rather more worse. Such style of management that does not consider the concrete condition and the maturity level of the students under treatment fails to handle the problem effectively. Stoops et al (1981:350) suggest the following as the procedure of solving any encountered disciplinary problem. They instructed that except when and where immediate control is necessary, it is better to first diagnose the problem, determine its cause and then plan a course of action.

Thompson (1976:21), on his part, warns behavior managers that any effort to correct misbehavior must weigh the disruptive elements of the

problem since disciplinary action can become productive only when the disruption of the problem is greater than that of the correction. According to him a mismanaged disciplinary action results in unintended negative consequences.

Another important element of greater consideration in the management of behavior is the need for positive approach to the problem. Thompson (1976:21) states that authoritative force tends only to develop negative attitudes, resistance and eventually rebellion. He suggests to make compromises with the adolescent students so that a workable behavior standards can be set commonly.

Having considered the basic principles of behavior management vis-avis the school setting in which this study is conducted, the following assumed solution mechanisms are considered worth discussing. They are rules and regulations, counseling, and punishments and rewards.

### **2.3.3.1 Rules and Regulations**

Rules and regulations help in minimizing student disciplinary problems. They are mechanisms of preventive and corrective measures. Good and Brophy (1987:229) explain rules not as ends in themselves but as means to warn the students against the breach of standards or as corrective means. The authors advise that rules should be stated explicitly and their rationale for existence also be explained. Gnagey (1968:9-11) suggest that rules be relevant, meaningful and positive as much as possible. Bellon et al (1992:133) supplement Gnagey's idea saying that rules must originate from the concrete condition of the school they are expected to serve. Bellon et al go a little further and recommend that rules and regulations be better introduced

to the school community at the beginning of the academic year and also posted as reminders for the rest of school days.

Another important element related to the issuing of rules and regulations is the question of who makes and implements them. This question is of particular importance in social settings like school where each piece of work is much more social requiring directly or indirectly the participation of all. In connection to this, Landers (in Zaudneh, 1987:193-4) noted that a good school administration involves representatives of students in the formulation of code of ethics or code of behavior of the entire student body in the school. Landers believes that such a body of representatives inculcates self-discipline and raises the moral of students. In support of participatory decision making approach, Straus and Sayles (in Zaudneh, 1987:115) state that people are often getting more and more eager in designing out a plan than they are for implementing plans that are simply announced from above. Risk (1958:497) was much more practical in suggesting the mechanism schools may adopt to realize participatory decision making. According to Risk a discipline committee formed with the representatives of school administration, teachers, parents, school psychologists or counselors and students can greatly assist in preventing and remedying student disciplinary problems. In his opinion, such a committee helps the school to attain good discipline by nurturing self-control and palatable attitudes toward desirable conduct and constituted authority. Furthermore, it can play the role of a mediator among the major components of a school system: the educational leaders, the students and the community.

Thus, in the face of the increasing complexity of school administration, school administrators cannot go on in administering school in the old way.

When the benefactors and the beneficiaries are not involved, neither will they have an understanding of the rules nor commitment to obey them. According to Wayson et al (1982:42), modern school administrators engage themselves in teaching the advantage of participatory planning and implementation in order to avoid discomfoting atmosphere in their schools. The administrators take time to make certain that everyone in the school knows the rules & regulations, procedures, and understands what is expected of him, and has some sense of how the rules benefit the school and the individual.

### **2.3.3.2 Counseling**

Chauhan (1978:503) reports that schools that do not provide personal and educational guidance for their students encounter higher percentage of delinquency. Kujoth (1970:46) also states that guidance and counseling service with a competent and committed staff is a source of information for students. It helps the students adjust themselves to the school situation. Moreover, it helps in studying and identifying potential sources of academic and other 'within school' student problems before they mature and become real discipline problems. Kujoth believes that guidance and counselors contribute much to the development of good school program. As a supplement to Kujoth's idea, Stone and Stertzler (1980:5) comment that guidance and counseling offered by qualified personnel to an individual of any age helps the latter to manage his own activities and carry his own burden.

In the light of related available data, guidance and counseling program is not satisfactorily implemented in Ethiopian secondary schools so far. For that matter, counseling is little known and neither its name nor its concept exist in Ethiopian educational literature (Yusuf, 1996:6). Despite the negligence on the part of those concerned, studies have been suggesting the need for offering

counseling services in the Ethiopian secondary schools for it can help in improving the quality of education and in minimizing the attrition rate and educational wastages (Yusuf, 1996:6). In reply to the question how or who can help youths resolve their plights, Esman (1986) Chauhan (1983) and Van Evra (1983) (in Yusuf, 1996:12) suggest that the rudimentary problems of youth can be resolved by the concerted understanding and help of parents, teachers and society whereas the severe situations can be handled only by people who can provide professional interventions.

### **2.3.3.3 Punishments and Rewards**

Punishments and rewards are the most commonly used methods of disciplining students. The use of punishment as a corrective technique is among the most controversial issues in behavior management. Despite the differences in views, there is a consensus that the positive contribution of punishment, if any, is only temporary and not long-lasting. To make a survey of some of these views, McGuinness (1993:41) states that a punished child is forced to pay attention while at the same time develops the attitude of regarding all human relations from the superior-inferior angle and trained in a basic neurotic attitude. Gordon (1974:16), on his part, comments that repressive, power-based methods usually provoke resistance, rebellion and retaliation. Redl and Sheviako (1956:1-2) describe punishment as the act of men who tend to looking for a less thought-requiring procedures but which are ineffective in the long run since they do not teach the students right ways of behaving when the coercion is removed. El-Abd (1973:87) also complains that corporal punishment is essentially negative, educationally and psychologically. Watkins and Wagner (1987:33) accuse schools of inclining often toward mere punishment without considering the cause of the misbehavior. According to these authorities, punishment serves mainly to

repress particular behavior rather than to educate new ones. Commonly, the process of punishment in schools is carried out with little reference to an understanding of the social context in which the disruptive behavior took place. Richmond (1968:123), on his part, views punishment as something incompatible with the modern democratic thought which only had served in the past to keep the students in subjugation. Ayalew (1996:22) remarks that corporal punishment besides the pain, subjects students to fear and insecurity with all its negative consequences.

In spite of the derogatory effect of punishment pronounced by several authorities, there are also others who positively view punishment. The position of this second group varies from those who recommend punishment as the sole effective corrective mechanism to those who argue for qualified punishment. Shipman (1968:117), for instance, tries to justify the need for punishment as follows:

Punishment, from a ticking off to the cane can serve several different ends. As retribution it is applied because the particular offence deserves a particular punishment. The punishment are made to fit the crimes so that any boy found cheating in external examinations is expelled. Punishment is also used to deter the offender or others from repeating the crime. To make deterrents effective, the teacher publicizes the punishments-he makes sure that everyone knows that detention has been given to the offence. Boys are sometimes caned for serious offences in front of the whole school.

Bunting (1976:118) is among those few who unreservedly support the use of punishment. To put it in his own words he says, "In my experience it (cane - citation mine) not only achieved positive results in many cases in

terms of improved conduct or effort, but it was an effective deterrent against bullying and other forms of anti social misconduct.” With some degree of deviation from those proponents of unqualified punishment, Wayson et al (1982:42), Good and Brophy (1987:270), Bellon et al (1992:167) and others, cautiously suggest punishment as a last resort. According to Good and Brophy, punishment should be used only as a last resort, when students repeatedly fail to respond to more positive treatment (Good and Brophy, 1987:270). Cooper (in Zaudneh, 1987:81), too, reminds us of occasions where punishment may be more contributing to organizational objectives than do rewards. The range of misbehavior in schools could be from verbal put downs to physical violence. Hence, the range of corrective measures should be wide enough from call for desisting to expulsion (Bellon et al, 1992:167).

Reward is a much more common reinforcement technique in the educators’ effort to build desirable student behaviors. As compared to negatively reinforcing of undesirable behaviors, positively reinforcing of desirable behaviors is more supported by several authorities. Reward, thus, is a positive reinforcer. It includes such reinforcers as grades, public recognition, symbolic reward, extra privileges, activity choices, or material reward (Good and Brophy, 1987:235).

Similar to differences in the use of ‘punishment’, there are also variations among authorities with respect to the use of ‘reward’. The difference ranges from a complete denial of such a need for reinforcement to the need for reinforcement only under limited conditions.

As reported by Good and Brophy (1987:237), educational theorists like Montessori (1964); Moore and Anderson (1969); Piaget (1952) virtually

1987:237). Eden (1975) in Good and Brophy reminds us of individual differences in the motivation system of students as one complicating factor. For a given person and situation, certain motives will be relevant and for others not. Hence successes of motivational effort will depend on how well it fits the person's present motives. According to Deci and Ryan (1980) and Kruglanski (1978) (in Good and Brophy, 1987:237), a decrease in the quality of performance and in intrinsic motivation most likely occur when the reinforcement has the following characteristics:

- (I) High salience (large or highly attractive rewards, or rewards presented in ways that call attention to them).
- (ii) Non contingency (rewards are given for mere participation in activities rather than being contingent on achievement of specific performance objectives).
- (iii) Unnatural/unusual (rewards are artificially tied to behaviors as control devices rather than being natural outcomes of the behavior)

Giving of rewards is one of the most valuable tools in establishing good discipline. It is a motivating factor that gives a better encouragement and recognition (Kujoth, 1970:39). Given this, school administrators and teachers must be careful in the employment of rewards. They must be able to select the appropriate kind of reward that fits the students' psychological, physical and emotional characteristics. For instance, elementary school children are more responsive to adult approval while secondary school students are more concerned with special privileges and independence (Clarizio, 1980:25). Using a reward that appeals to higher motives is the most effective tool in teaching self-discipline. The use of the various forms of reward such as praise, recognition of good performances and useful services of groups and

1987:237). Eden (1975) in Good and Brophy reminds us of individual differences in the motivation system of students as one complicating factor. For a given person and situation, certain motives will be relevant and for others not. Hence successes of motivational effort will depend on how well it fits the person's present motives. According to Deci and Ryan (1980) and Kruglanski (1978) (in Good and Brophy, 1987:237), a decrease in the quality of performance and in intrinsic motivation most likely occur when the reinforcement has the following characteristics:

- (I) High salience (large or highly attractive rewards, or rewards presented in ways that call attention to them).
- (ii) Non contingency (rewards are given for mere participation in activities rather than being contingent on achievement of specific performance objectives).
- (iii) Unnatural/unusual (rewards are artificially tied to behaviors as control devices rather than being natural outcomes of the behavior)

Giving of rewards is one of the most valuable tools in establishing good discipline. It is a motivating factor that gives a better encouragement and recognition (Kujoth, 1970:39). Given this, school administrators and teachers must be careful in the employment of rewards. They must be able to select the appropriate kind of reward that fits the students' psychological, physical and emotional characteristics. For instance, elementary school children are more responsive to adult approval while secondary school students are more concerned with special privileges and independence (Clarizio, 1980:25). Using a reward that appeals to higher motives is the most effective tool in teaching self-discipline. The use of the various forms of reward such as praise, recognition of good performances and useful services of groups and

individuals through feasible media of communication, approval and recognition from authority figures such as school authorities, teachers and parents reinforce students when properly applied. Material and symbolic rewards warrant and help in establishing and maintaining discipline (Kujoth, 1970:138).

Generally, the various studies suggest the combination of punishment and reward as a much more effective technique of handling disciplinary problems than using one alone. Because punishment reminds the misbehaving student what not to do while appropriate reward tells the student what he should do (Clarizio, 1980:133).

## 2.4 AN OVERVIEW OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS IN ETHIOPIA

Prior to the development of a nation-wide educational administrative structure in the 1950s, each school had its own rules and regulations given to it directly from the government. The following is a precept of the regulation given by government to the first modern school. Menelik II school.

ከተማ ሆኖ ውስጥ ከሰው የግደባ ሁከት ልጅ የተገኘ  
 እንደሆነ አባቱ ሆኖ 2 እና 3 ጊዜ ይመክራል :: ምን  
 ራቸውንም የግደባ የሆነ እንደሆነ በተምህርት ቤት  
 ደንብ ይቀጥታል :: ከቀጥተኛ በኋላ ሁከትን የግደባ  
 የሆነ እንደሆነ ዲራክትሪ ከተምህርት ቤት ሊያስጠቅም  
 ይችላል ::

(Mahteme Selassie W/Meskel, 1942 E.C.)

The preceding article gives priority for advice as a major mechanism for correcting misbehavior. It is if and only if the pupil fails to regain the desired behavior pattern that he is subjected to a prescribed penalty and finally to expulsion from school.

As cited by Ayalew (1996:3), the Regent to the throne, Ras Tafari Makonnen, issued regulations for the administration of Tafari Makonnen School in 1919 E.C. This issue was much more permissive and clear for implementation. It reads:

ተማሪ ያቸ ማንኛውንም ዓይነት ቁፋት ገዢ ለሰተማሪ ያቸቸው  
 ቁፍ፣ ተቁፍ፣ እድህን ዘርጋ፣ እድህን ሰብሰብ፣ ከሰው ሰትገ  
 ናገ ይህን ያህል ሰዓት በዘገ ቤት ተቁፍ እያሉ በቀላል ቅጣት  
 ይቀጥቻል እንዲ በአላንጋ፣ በቀፊ፣ በበተር፣ በክርን ይህን  
 በመሰለ በልጆቹ ላይ በሽታ በሚያመጣ በበተር ቅጣት እንዳይቀጡ  
 ተከልከለዋል :: ነገር ገን በተምህርት ቤት ገቢ ያታክልትና  
 ያበባ ሥራ በማሠራት ቢቀጥቸው አይከለከሉም ::

(Mahteme Selassie, 1942)

In recent years, more than ever before, the student discipline question has occupied a major place in Ethiopian school administration. The Ministry of Education with the objective of creating a viable teaching-learning environment, has instituted two basic documents entitled “Internal School Administration Guideline, I and II,” in 1980 E.C. The guideline was prepared as per the proclamation No.260/76 (MOE, Internal School Administration Handbook, 1980:52). Taking the guideline as a frame of reference and without violating the principles constituting it, schools are expected to develop their own rules and regulations in their own local context.

In volume I, the guideline announces the establishment of the “Committee for Administration and Discipline”. The members of the committee and their areas of representation, as well as, the job description and the duties and responsibilities of the committee are clearly defined in the same volume. The committee is accountable and advisor to the principal of the school. The fundamental principle guiding the student discipline is the employment of both preventive and curative measures as condition warrants.

In spite of the provision of rules and regulations, student discipline problems not only have continued to rise increasingly in Ethiopian schools but have also got diversified. Reports of harassments, bullyings, cheatings during exams, property damage, violence, etc., have become occasional news items even of public mass media. For instance, the 1985(E.C.) grade eight candidates of ALFA-school for the Deaf (located in Region 14) failed that year’s national examination because they blackened options of forged examination that the candidates secured for money some time earlier before the commencement of the official national examination (Addis Zemen, Meskerem 13, 1985:9).

Bullying and using of drugs was another student disciplinary problem reported in some schools. With regard to this, a meeting was once held in Gelawdeos Technical-Vocational School located in Nazareth, Eastern Shoa Administration. The meeting was attended by an official from Eastern Shoa Administration Council, representatives of government and public organizations, parents and teachers. The principal of the school reported to the meeting that some students driven by alcohol and drug had proved unruly by threatening & robbing money from their teachers and fellow students (Addis Zemen, Tikimt 1, 1985:11). At another instance, a conference was

convened by the Education Bureau of Region 14 to discuss the prevailing student discipline problems in the region. The participants were representatives of various organizations and sections of the society including invited scholars from Addis Ababa University, Heads of Zonal Education Offices of Region 14, Principals of high schools of Region 14, representatives of Urban Dwellers' Associations and religious leaders. The sole agenda of the meeting was "student disciplinary problem". On the meeting were discussed the following related issues.

- . The need to strengthen school-community relation and bilateral cooperation in search of solution for the prevalent disciplinary problems.
- . Improving the presentation of lesson to be taught, methodological quality and efficiency.
- . Strengthening of school administration.

On the whole, the meeting discussed the characteristic of the current student disciplinary problem and passed a resolution to form an adhoc committee that can prepare a region-wide guide line. Accordingly, the draft guideline consisted of the following main areas: definition of discipline, school discipline, the need for school discipline, rights and duties of students, responsibilities of parents, indiscipline and its causes, the typical disciplinary problems in Region 14, and mechanisms of implementation of the newly devised discipline rules and regulations.

Despite the prevalence of the disciplinary ailment in the Ethiopian educational system, it had not been given sufficient consideration by those concerned so far. To the knowledge of this investigator, there is hardly any

nation-wide study of student disciplinary problems. Few studies made in related areas, however, indicate that school and teacher factors greatly contribute to student disciplinary problems. One among these is the one done by Tekeste Negash in 1990. Tekeste in CYAO (1995:25) identified the following education related factors as sources of the multi-faceted problems of Ethiopian youth.

- . Over crowding, short school days and too many subjects;
- . The low level of relevance of education to the socio-economic and technical needs of the country;
- . Poor articulation between youth education and labour market demand for trained personnel;
- . The development of negative attitudes among youth toward education;
- . The laxity and breakdown of discipline in schools;
- . The increased participation of youth in unhealthy behavioral practices such as smoking, untimely and dangerous sexual practices, alcohol consumption, drug use and abuse;
- . Unavailability of school premises for extra curricular activities;
- . General disillusionment and exhibition of hopelessness about the future due to tight labor market conditions;
- . Increased incidence in truancy and delinquent behavior;
- . Deterioration in student- teacher relationship;

CYAO (1995:13) also believes that the increasing tendency to break school rules, dropout of schools and display truant behavior are vivid manifestations of youth's growing disenchantment with an educational system that neither enlightens nor prepares them for responsible adulthood.

A study made on the prevalence of cigarette smoking among high schoolers in Gondar city also substantiate the study by Tekeste. Ahmed Zein and Masresha Abahoy (in Yusuf, 1996:10) in their study of cigarette smokers in high schools in Gondar town reported that 3 percent of the females and 28 percent of the male students were smokers. At another instance, in an inquiry made to fifty young people in one higher urban dwellers' association of Region 14 in 1983 E.C., 62 percent of those smoking respondents were found to be students. (CYFWO, 1985:13).

On the other hand, states and governments at international, regional and national levels have shown cooperative efforts to respect the rights of children and youth. They have persistently advocated the rights of children and youth to education, health, and on the whole to their physical, social and emotional well-being. Among such efforts is the United Nations' Convention on the Rights of the Child. As cited (in Ayalew, 1996:8), Article 28(2) of the Convention demands of states parties to "ensure that school discipline is administered in a manner consistent with the child's human dignity and in conformity with the convention". Clarifying the application of Article 28(2) further, Article 37 of the Convention states that "No child shall be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

The Transitional Government of Ethiopia (TGE), too, has signed the Convention to abide by it. The Council of Peoples' Representatives of TGE accepted and endorsed the Convention on the Rights of the Child on Hidar 29, 1984 E.C. Article 19 of this Convention reads as follows:

States parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that school discipline is administered in a manner consistent with the child's human dignity and in conformity with the present convention.

(CYFWO, 1992:37).

The Convention also has an article for its objective of facilitating for the wholesome development of children. Pertaining to this Article 29(1) of the Convention states:

States parties agree that education of the child shall be directed to:

- (a) The development of the child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential;
- (b) The development of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and for the principles enshrined in the charter of the United Nations;
- (c) The preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin;

(CYFWO, 1992:47)

In the light of her signing of the Convention, Ethiopia thus, has voluntarily committed herself to protect children from being exposed to unlawful use of drugs and other similar harmful substances. Article 33 of the convention reads:

States Parties shall take all appropriate measures, including legislative, administrative, social and educational measures, to protect children from the illicit use of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances as defined in the international treaties to prevent the use of children in the illicit production and trafficking of such substances.

(CYFWO, 1992:47).

One other article of the Convention relevant to the rights of children and youth of Ethiopia is Article 34. The article demands of all States Parties to defend the rights of children against any kind of sexual abuse.

States Parties undertake to protect the child from all forms of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse. For these purposes, States Parties shall in particular take all appropriate national, bilateral and multilateral measures to prevent: (a) the inducement of coercion of a child to engage in any unlawful sexual activity;

(CYFWO, 1992:47-48).

In the review of the related literature attempts have been made to make clear the conceptual definition of 'discipline' in general, and of school setting in particular. Beyond this, types of student disciplinary problems, their causes and their assumed solutions also have been surveyed.

Despite lack of country-wide studies on student discipline in Ethiopia, results of some local investigations and sporadic reports have also been explored. On the whole, the limited information available regarding student discipline gives a warning signal to schools, parents and the society in general.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A design of a research study is based on the purpose of the study (Quirk, 1979:237). Since the purpose of this study was to know the existing condition of student disciplinary problems in senior secondary schools with the intent of suggesting ways of improving them, the descriptive survey research method was selected. The sample and the sampling techniques, the instrument and procedures of data collection and the methods of data analysis are briefly described.

#### **3.1 The Sample and the Sampling Techniques**

According to a statistical report of the Education Bureau of Oromia, there were 111 government senior secondary schools with a total of 4471 administrators and teachers in 1995/96 academic year (E.S.A.A, 1995/96:12).

In order to obtain a correct and representative sample from the population, the region was arbitrarily stratified into five zones, namely, East, West, North, South and Centre. This was done for the purpose of minimizing the effect of any socio-cultural differences that may exist in the different 'zones' of the region. Following this, four schools were randomly selected from among schools in each of the five zones, thus making the total sample of schools studied in the region twenty. Eventhough there wasn't any intention of the study to analyze the results in rural-urban terms, rural and urban place schools were nearly equally represented. Table 1 consists of names of the twenty sample schools, their 'zone' and the number of respondents.

**Table 1**  
**Distribution of Sample Schools and Respondents**

S. No.	Names of sample schools	Zone	Number of Respondents	
			Adm.	Teachers
1	Alamaya S.S.S	EAST	3	12
2	Gursum S.S.S		2	9
3	Badessa S.S.S		2	11
4	Asbe Teferi C.S.S		3	11
5	Adama S.S.S	CENTRE	3	10
6	Wonji C.S.S		2	12
7	Mojo S.S.S		3	13
8	Debre Zeit C.S.S	SOUTH	4	12
9	Bokoji S.S.S		3	13
10	Chilalo S.S.S.		3	11
11	Gedeb S.S.S		3	12
12	Dodola S.S.S		3	12
13	Fitche C.S.S	NORTH	3	12
14	Gebre Guracha S.S.S		3	11
15	Sheno S.S.S		2	10
16	Sendafa S.S.S		3	10
17	Agaro	WEST	3	10
18	Dembi S.S.S		2	11
19	Bedelle C.S.S		3	12
20	Metu C.S.S		4	13
<b>Total (distributed)</b>			<b>80</b>	<b>300</b>
<b>Total (returned)</b>			<b>57 = 77%</b>	<b>227 = 76%</b>

The study was planned to be conducted on a sample of 380 school personnel (i.e. 80 administrators and 300 teachers). For the purpose of this study alone, the administrators' group was made to include principals, assistant principals, unit leaders and guidance officers. The arbitrary categorization was done for the mere fact that these four group of people in one way or another are concerned with facilitating the school environment for the teaching-learning process itself. The principal, one assistant principal, one unit leader and the guidance officer of each school are purposefully included in the study. In the selection of sample teachers for the study, systematic

random sampling was employed to pick every third or fifth name from the teachers' register depending on the size of the teaching staff of the school studied. In doing so, the starting point was selected randomly. When the names of the required number of teachers for the study had been collected randomly, then, arrangements were made with the administration of the school for the purpose of administering the questionnaire. Accordingly 380 questionnaires were distributed from which a total of 284 (about 77 percent) usable questionnaires were returned. (For a detailed information, refer to Table 1).

### **3.2 The Instrument and Procedures of Data Collection**

A-97 item questionnaire with four sections was used for soliciting the required data for the study from both study groups, i.e., administrators and teachers. The first section consisted a list of 23 assumed student disciplinary problems and asked the respondents to indicate their option by choosing 'YES' if they believed it was a student disciplinary problem, and 'NO' if they believed it was not, in front of the respective disciplinary item. Finally, the response for the 'YES' category was scored and those disciplinary problems indicated by 30 percent and above of the total respondents were further included in the study as the types of student disciplinary problems currently existing in the studied schools. Part (b) of this section of the questionnaire was prepared in the form of Likert type attitude scale. The level of agreement was indicated on the five-point scale ranging progressively from 'never occurs' to 'occurs daily'. This was used to get information on the frequency of occurrence of the 15 type of disciplinary problems determined as per the data obtained on part (a) of this section of the questionnaire.

Section Two of the questionnaire was designed to obtain information on the degree of disruption of the teaching-learning process as caused by the student disciplinary problems.

Section Three of the questionnaire requested the respondents to rank order the assumed 16 causes of student disciplinary problems according to their level of seriousness with 1 representing “the most serious cause” and 16, “the least serious cause”. To this effect, the 16 item assumed causes of student disciplinary problems were listed for rank ordering.

The last part of the questionnaire, section Four, was designed to get information on the possible coping strategies for dealing with student disciplinary problems. The nature of the question and the procedure of acquiring the data was similar to what was done in section Three.

### **3.2.1 Pilot Test of the Instrument**

Any measure, but especially one we have just invented, must be queried as to its accuracy in terms of producing the same results on different occasions (Coolican, 1994:150). Guided by this principle, the draft questionnaire of this study had been subjected to a pilot test.

The draft was administered to 44 school personnel working in Holeta and Sabata Senior Secondary Schools both of which are located in the region the main study was conducted. During the administration of the questionnaire the respondents were instructed to identify ambiguities, double-barreled questions that may pose problem in responding to the items. More over some open-ended questions were also included in the draft to get local views regarding some items that were constructed in light of the related

literature. The feed back to the item regarding the determination of the prevailing disciplinary problems was found very much important for the construction of the questionnaire for the main study.

After the acquisition of the data, the split-half method was used for checking the reliability of the self-developed questionnaire because the reliability of Likert-type of attitude scale is computed by split-half method (Koul, 1984:167). Accordingly, the computed correlation coefficient of the two halves of the questionnaire was found to be 0.76 indicating high relationship in the respondents' scores of the two halves. From the reliability of the half-test, the reliability of the whole test was estimated using the Spearman-Brown Prophecy formula (Koul, 1984:127). Consequently, the reliability of the whole test was found to be as high as  $(r)=.82$ .

Thus, the questionnaire was accepted as a reliable data gathering tool for the main study.

### **3.3 Methods of Data Analysis**

Based on the nature of the research questions, and consequently on the type of measurement scales used in gathering the data, the following statistical techniques were deemed appropriate for analysis.

For the first basic question, i.e., for determining the type of student disciplinary problems and the frequency by which they occur, percentage and the chi-square test of difference was used.

The second basic question, i.e., the degree by which the identified student disciplinary problems disrupt the teaching-learning process was

measured using Correlation coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ). Part (b) of this same question that asks whether there is significant difference between the study groups in perceiving the degree of disruption was tested using t-test.

The third and the fourth basic questions were analyzed more or less in a similar way. The third basic question that requests for the rank ordering of the assumed causes of student disciplinary problems, and the fourth basic question that requests for the rank ordering of the coping strategies, were both analyzed using Spearman's rank order Correlation. Pearson's correlation was also used to see the strength of the relationship between the perceptions of administrators and teachers with respect to the assumed causes and the strategies to cope with the problems.

The differences and relationships in the findings of the study were all tested at 0.05 level of significance.

## CHAPTER 4

### PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS

This chapter is divided into two major parts. In part one, characteristics of the sample populations are analyzed in terms of level of education, field of specialization, sex, age, and years of service.

The second major part deals with the analysis of the data of the study. In this part, the data based on responses of the two study groups, namely, the administrators and the teachers, are analyzed and interpreted from the perspective of the following major variables.

1. Types of student disciplinary problems.
2. The degree by which the student disciplinary problems disrupt the teaching-learning process.
3. School and teacher variables perceived to be causes of student disciplinary problems.
4. Possible coping strategies.

**PART ONE. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY POPULATIONS**

**TABLE 2**

**Respondents by Level of Education, Field of Specialization, Sex, Age and Years of Service**

ITEM NO	ITEMS	ADMINISTRATORS		TEACHERS	
		No	%	No	%
<b>1</b>	<b>LEVEL OF EDUCATION</b>				
	≥ B.A / B.Sc	26	51.00	91	39.06
	12 + 3	1	2.00	4	1.72
	12 + 2 (Diploma)	20	39.20	112	48.07
	12 + 1	2	3.90	5	2.15
	12 and 12 + T.T.I.	2	3.90	21	9.00
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION</b>				
	Educational Administration	10	19.60	5	2.15
	Pedagogics	1	2.00	9	3.86
	Subject Area Specialization	30	58.80	159	68.24
	Vocational Education	2	3.90	56	24.03
	Others	8	15.70	4	1.72
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>SEX</b>				
	Male	51	100.00	220	94.42
	Female	-	-	13	5.58
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>AGE</b>				
	< 20 years	-	-	5	2.15
	21 - 30 years	18	35.29	112	48.07
	31 - 40 years	28	54.90	89	38.20
	≥ 41 years	5	9.80	27	11.59
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>YEARS OF SERVICE</b>				
	< 1 year	-	-	16	6.87
	1 - 5 years	28	54.90	50	21.46
	6 - 10 years	11	21.57	91	39.06
	11 - 15 years	8	15.69	54	23.18
	16 - 20 years	3	5.89	15	6.44
	≥ 21 years	1	1.96	7	3.00
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100.00</b>

92 percent of the administrators were reported to have qualification ranging from diploma (12 + 2) to bachelor degree or above. Among these, 51 percent were either bachelor degree holders or above. The case was similar among the teachers. 88.9 percent of the teachers had the qualification ranging from diploma (12 + 2) to either bachelor degree or above. Among them, 39.06 percent were either first degree holders or above. In both groups the number of persons whose level of education was below diploma (12 + 2) was as low as 7.80 percent and 11.5 percent for administrators and teachers respectively. The similarity in the level of education between the administrators and the teachers likely may contribute to a corresponding similarity of perception.

As depicted in the table, subject area specialists were the overwhelming majority in both administrators and teachers, comprising 58.80 percent and 68.24 percent respectively.

In terms of sex, the male-female ratio was strikingly unbalanced in favour of males over females. In the case of the administrators, there wasn't even a single female administrator reported. In the teachers' group, too, the situation was hardly any better. Of the 233 teacher respondents only 13 persons (about 6 percent) were found to be females. The disparity may possibly be explained by the under representation of females in the Ethiopian tertiary level education.

With respect to age, 90.19 percent of the administrators and 86.27 percent of the teachers were reported to be in the same age bracket of 21 to 40 years. Thus, the overwhelming majority of the administrators and teachers studied were believed to be in the most productive age category. Given

favourable condition, both administrators and teachers can maximize their efforts in creating a conducive teaching-learning environment. It is also likely that the generation-gap between secondary school students and such young administrators and teachers may not be so wide to become a source of conflict. The degree of difference of perception between the two may be reduced due to homogeneity of age.

Regarding years of service, 28 persons (54.90 percent) of the administrators were reported to have 1 to 5 years of service in their administrative positions. 22 persons (43.14 percent) reported to have served from 6 to 20 years. Only 1 person (1.96 percent) served for 21 years or more. On the part of the teachers, the majority (71.67 percent) had served for 6 years or more. The remaining 28.33 percent of the teachers had served only for 5 years or below. Despite some difference in tenure between the administrators and teachers, on the whole the duration of their service in the school system was hoped to be sufficient to enable them know student discipline-related problems.

## **PART TWO. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA OF THE STUDY**

In this part, respondents' perception of the types of student disciplinary problems, disciplinary problems disrupting the teaching-learning process, school and teacher factors causing disciplinary problems and coping strategies were analyzed in that order.

## 1A. TYPES OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS

**TABLE 3**  
**Percentages of Secondary School Administrators and Teachers**  
**Reporting Frequency of Types of Student Behaviours Perceived To**  
**Be Student Disciplinary Problems (Administrators (N) = 51**  
**(Teachers (N) = 233)**

TYPES OF STUDENT BEHAVIOURS (LISTED BY FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE)	REPORTED FREQUENCY WITH WHICH THEY ENCOUNTERED AROUND THE SCHOOL			
	Administrators		Teachers	
	%	Rank	%	Rank
Cheatings during examinations and tests.	92.75	1	98.25	1
Getting into classrooms after the teacher arrived and leaving it immediately following the teacher's footsteps.	87.75	2	84.00	4
Failing to do assignments.	86.75	3	93.00	2
Late coming.	85.25	4	83.50	5
Coming to school without bringing the required textbooks.	82.25	5	90.50	3
Absenteeism.	81.25	6	78.75	7
Fleeing from school jumping over fences and through other exits.	72.00	7	83.25	6
Defacing, damaging or destroying school property.	71.00	8	69.75	10
Testing / jocking upon teachers.	69.50	9	76.00	8
Passive evasion (roaming hiding) of students during class hours.	67.75	10	74.50	9
Engaging in undesirable habits (like smoking drunkenness) in school.	66.75	11	62.25	13
Bullying girl students for sexual purpose on their ways to and from school.	63.25	12	59.75	14
Physical attacks / attempts of physical attacks on teachers.	59.75	13	66.00	12
Disturbing and / or making noises while the teacher teaches.	56.25	14	67.00	11
Stealing	52.50	15	52.25	15
Sleeping in class.	27.60	16	31.40	17
Physical attacks / attempts of physical attacks on school administrators.	24.35	17	17.90	20
Use of obscene languages.	23.10	18	28.00	18
Raping / attempted raping.	19.00	19	12.85	22
Coming to school without exercise books.	16.00	20	33.60	16
Bringing weapons to school.	14.50	21	22.15	19
Stealing examinations.	13.00	22	13.00	21
Robbing others.	11.90	23	9.95	23

Table 3 displays a list of 23 student disciplinary problems (misbehaviours) that administrators and teachers reported they have encountered around their school. The list was made by frequency of occurrence from the highest to the lowest. As depicted in the table, the administrators' top ten list included cheating during examinations and tests, getting into classrooms after the teacher arrived, failing to do assignments, coming late, coming to school without bringing the required text books, absenteeism, fleeing from school by jumping over fences and through other forbidden exits, defacing, damaging, or destroying school property, teasing / jocking upon teachers & passive evasion of class hours. These are also in the top ten list of the teachers.

Moreover, the administrators and the teachers were also made to rank order the student misbehaviours (disciplinary problems). Despite some differences, the rankings showed a high relationship ( $r = 0.96$ ). A  $t$  - test was also run to see if the observed relationship was statistically significant. The obtained value was found to be 15.71. Hence,  $t$  - observed (15.71) is by far greater than the table value (2.080) at  $\alpha = .05$ . Therefore, one can say with confidence that there is a high and strong relationship between administrators and teachers with respect to their perception of the frequency of the types of student misbehaviours (disciplinary problems) they encountered around schools.

Another striking similarity of perception between the two study groups was the distribution of the rating scores for the identified disciplinary problems. A cut-off point is observed in the distributions after the 15th problems showing clearly that the problems 1 upto 15 as those rated by the majority of the groups while the remaining 8 disciplinary problems were those rated only by few members of the groups, precisely, by less than 40 percent of

each group. Since the last 8 disciplinary items were perceived as disciplinary problems only by a negligible number of respondents (Refer Table 3), the forth coming analysis was limited only to the first 15 problems; namely: 1. Cheating during examinations and tests, 2. Getting into classrooms after the teacher arrived and leaving it immediately following the teacher's foot steps, 3. Failing to do assignments, 4. Coming to school without bringing text books, 5. Late coming, 6. Absenteeism, 7. Fleeing from school jumping over fences or through other forbidden exits, 8. Passive evasion of students during class hours, 9. Teasing/Jocking upon teachers, 10. Physical attacks/attempts of physical attacks on teachers, 11. Disturbing and/or making noises while teacher teaches, 12. Defacing, damaging or destroying school property, 13. Stealing, 14. Engaging in undesirable habits (like smoking, chewing, 'chat', drunkenness) in schools, 15. Bullying girl students for sexual purpose on their ways to and from school.

The analysis and results of the data collected on the frequency of the identified 15 student disciplinary problems from the study groups follow. In all of the cases, the perceived differences, if and where any, were tested using a Chi Square ( $\chi^2$ ) for significance.

## 1.B. FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF STUDENT DICIPLINARY PROBLEMS

TABLE 4

Respondents' Views Concerning Students Cheatings during Examinations & Tests

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
6	Administrators	10	19.61	31	60.78	10	19.61	51	100.00	3.99
	Teachers	39	16.7	115	49.36	79	33.91	233	100.00	

Critical  $\chi^2(2) = 5.99$

Note:

$\chi^2(2)$  = Chi-square with 2 degrees of freedom (df)

Table 4 presents respondents' views regarding student cheatings during examinations and tests. As illustrated in the table, 80.39 percent administrators and 83.27 percent teachers reported student cheatings on exams and tests as a problem of average and above frequency.

On the other hand, 19.61 percent administrators and 16.74 percent teachers in their response expressed their perception as below average. Compared to those who viewed the frequency of student cheating on examination, and tests as average and above, those who viewed the frequency as below average comprised the minority.

Whether the apparent difference in proportions in the responses of administrators and teachers was statistically significant was analyzed using Chi-square. For these data  $\chi^2(2) = 3.99$ ,  $P > .05$ . since the obtained value was less than the critical value of  $\chi^2 = 5.99$ , there was no a statistically significant difference between administrators and teachers regarding student cheating.

**TABLE 5**  
**Respondents' View Concerning Students Failing to do Assignments**

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
7	Administrators	2	3.92	6	11.76	43	84.31	51	100.00	0.65
	Teachers	16	6.87	29	12.45	188	80.69	233	100.00	

Critical  $\chi^2$  (df = 2, N = 284) = 5.99

Table 5 reveals how often administrators and teachers observed students failing to do assignments. The great majority of both administrators and teachers, i.e., 84.31 percent and 80.69 percent respectively, perceived the frequency of the problem as above average. Only 3.92 percent administrators and 6.87 percent teachers rated the frequency of occurrence as below average.

A Chi square test was used to analyze the result as to whether there was a statistically significant difference between the proportions of administrators and teachers to determine their perceptions. Accordingly, a computed Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.65 value was obtained. There were 2 df for this analysis because  $(R-1)(C-1) = (2-1)(3-1) = 2$ . Thus, on 2 df at  $\alpha = .05$ , the critical value ( $\chi^2$ ) = 5.99. Since the obtained value of  $\chi^2$  (0.65), is less than the critical value = 5.99, it is evident that there was no significant difference between the proportions of the study groups.

Note: R = Row, C = Column.

**TABLE 6**  
**Respondents' View Regarding Student Coming to School**  
**Without the Required Textbooks**

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
8	Administrators	2	3.92	7	13.73	42	82.35	51	100.00	.64
	Teachers	12	5.15	37	15.88	184	78.97	233	100.00	

Critical  $\chi^2$  (df = 2, N = 284) = 5.99

As clearly indicated in Table 6, 82.35 percent administrators and 78.97 percent teachers were of the views that the problem of students coming to school without having the required textbooks occur at the frequency of above average. Those administrators & teachers who viewed the frequency of the problem as average and below were only 13.73 percent and 3.92 percent, and 15.88 percent and 5.15 percent respectively

The computed  $\chi^2 = 0.64$  which is less than the critical  $\chi^2 (2) = 5.99$  at  $\alpha = .05$  confirmed that there was no a statistically significant difference between the proportions of administrators and teachers.

**TABLE 7**  
**Respondents' Views Concerning Student coming Late/Tardiness**

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
9	Administrators	3	5.88	5	9.80	43	84.31	51	100.00	1.15
	Teachers	15	6.44	36	15.45	182	78.11	233	100.00	

Critical  $\chi^2$  (df = 2, N = 284) = 5.99

Table 7 depicts respondents' views of students coming late or students showing tardiness. As indicated, this problem was rated as above average by both administrators and teachers, i.e. by 84.31 percent administrators and 78.11 percent teachers.

Whether the difference in proportion of their responses was statistically significant was tested using the Chi-square test on proportions. The calculated  $\chi^2 = 1.15$  was far less than the critical  $\chi^2 (2) = 5.99$ , showing that there was no significant difference in their proportion that also implied that there was no difference of perception between administrators and teachers.

**TABLE 8**  
**Respondents' View Regarding Student Absenteeism**

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
10	Administrators	2	3.92	13	25.49	36	70.59	51	100.00	1.43
	Teachers	18	7.73	68	29.18	147	63.09	233	100.00	

Critical  $\chi^2 (df = 2, N = 284) = 5.99$

Table 8 presents the responses of the study groups on the frequency of student absenteeism. The frequency of this problem was also rated as above average by 70.59 percent administrators and 63.09 percent teachers. A considerable proportion of the study groups, i.e. 25.49 percent administrators and 29.18 percent teachers viewed the problem as average.

A Chi-square test was applied to analyze the result. For these data  $\chi^2(2) = 1.43, p > .05$ . Examination of the results indicated that there was no significant difference between the perceptions of administrators and teachers regarding the disciplinary problem under question.

**TABLE 9**  
**Respondents' Perceptions of Students fleeing from School jumping over Fence and/or through other forbidden Exits**

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
11	Administrators	5	9.80	8	15.69	38	74.51	51	100.00	0.68
	Teachers	29	12.45	44	18.88	160	68.67	233	100.00	

Critical  $\chi^2(df = 2, N = 284) = 5.99$

74.51 percent administrators and 68.67 percent teachers regarded the students' problem of fleeing from school as a problem occurring at above average frequency.

Whether the observed difference in the respective data collected from the study groups implied statistical difference was also tested at  $\alpha = .05$ . The calculated value  $\chi^2 = 0.68$  vis-avis the tabled value = 5.99 confirmed that there was no significant difference between the perceptions of the study groups, i.e administrators and teachers.

**TABLE 10**  
**Respondents' Perceptions of Student Evasion (hiding, roaming)**  
**of Class Hours**

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
12	Administrators	7	13.73	9	17.65	35	68.63	51	100.00	0.98
	Teachers	28	12.02	56	24.03	149	63.95	233	100.00	

Critical  $\chi^2$  (df - 2, N = 284) = 5.99

Just like the previous disciplinary problems discussed in this paper, student deliberate evasion of class hours was also perceived by both administrators and teachers as a recurrent problem. Accordingly, 68.63 percent administrators and 63.95 percent teachers categorized the frequency of its occurrence at above average. Those who rated it as average and below were 17.65 and 7 percent and 24.03 percent and 12.02 percent for administrators and teachers respectively, the proportion not high enough to matter in relation to the question at hand.

A Chi-square ran to check if there was a statistically valid difference between the perceptions of the administrators and the teachers also confirmed that there was no significant difference (i.e  $\chi^2$  (2) = 0.98 < critical  $\chi^2$  = 5.99).

TABLE 11

**Respondents' Perceptions of Students Entering Classroom After the Teacher Arrived and Leaving it Following Teacher's Footsteps**

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
13	Administrators	9	17.65	5	9.80	37	72.55	51	100.00	2.19
	Teachers	25	10.73	19	8.15	189	81.12	233	100.00	

Critical  $\chi^2$  (df = 2, N = 284) = 5.99

As portrayed in Table 11, the disciplinary problem of students tending to enter classrooms after the arrival of the teacher seems to be amongst the frequently occurring problems. The fact that 72.55 percent administrators and 81.12 percent teachers rated the frequency by which it occurs as 'above average' seems to confirm this statement.

A Chi-square test was also run to see if the difference in the proportion of the data of the study groups imply a statistically significant difference of perception. The Chi-square calculated confirmed that there was no a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of administrators and teachers with respect to this problem (Calculated  $\chi^2 = 2.9$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

TABLE 12

**Respondents' Views Regarding Student Teasing/Jocking upon Teachers**

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
14	Administrators	20	39.22	14	27.45	17	33.33	51	100.00	3.57
	Teachers	65	27.90	59	25.32	109	46.78	233	100.00	

Critical  $\chi^2$  (df = 2, N = 284) = 5.99

Table 12 illustrates administrators and teachers' views on the disciplinary problem - student teasing or jocking upon teachers. An inspection of the data indicates that neither of the cells could capture the views of the majority of the study groups. The configuration of the distribution of the data might mean some difference in the perceptions of the frequency of the problem amongst the study groups.

These seemingly existing difference of proportion of the data collected was subjected to a Chi-square test for significance. Since the observed value of  $\chi^2 = 3.57$  is less than the table value of  $\chi^2 = 5.99$ , it was proved that there was no a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of administrators and teachers with respect to student teasing or jocking upon teachers.

**TABLE 13**

**Respondents' Views Regarding Attacks/Attempts of Physical Attacks upon Teachers**

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
15	Administrators	32	62.75	10	19.61	9	17.65	51	100.00	1.30
	Teachers	155	66.52	47	20.17	31	13.30	233	100.00	

critical  $\chi^2$  (df = 2, N = 284) = 5.99

Table 13 shows responses offered by administrators and teachers to the questionnaire item requesting observed frequency of student physical attacks or attempts of physical attacks on teachers. As can be seen in the table, 62.75 percent administrators and 66.52 percent teachers rated the frequency of the problem as below average. Those who categorized the frequency of the problem as 'average' and 'above average' counted no more than 40 percent

(precisely, somewhat less than) for both groups. It may, thus, possibly be generalized that physical attacks or attempts of physical attacks by students on teachers is a less frequent discipline problem.

The calculated  $\chi^2 = 1.30$  which is less than the tabled  $\chi^2 = 5.99$ , shows there was no significant difference between the perceptions of the study groups.

**TABLE 14**

**Respondents' Views Regarding Student Disturbing and/or  
making Noises while the Teacher Teaches**

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
16	Administrators	12	23.53	17	33.33	22	43.14	51	100.00	2.10
	Teachers	64	27.47	57	24.46	112	48.07	233	100.00	

Critical  $\chi^2(df = 2, N = 284) = 5.99$

As seen in Table 14, in none of the three frequency categories did the respondents outbalance one another with respect to the question. This, perhaps, indicates that this problem in the secondary schools studied was not as frequent as some others.

Similar to the previously discussed disciplinary problems, the respondents showed no significant difference in their perceptions of the frequency of the problem.

**TABLE 15**  
**Respondents' Perceptions of Student Defacing, Damaging**  
**or Destroying School Property**

ITEM	RESPONDENTS	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
17	Administrators	21	41.18	9	17.65	21	41.18	51	100.00	7.96
	Teachers	115	49.36	64	27.47	54	23.18	233	100.00	

Critical  $\chi^2(df = 2, N = 284) = 5.99$

Table 15 depicts the data gathered from administrators and teachers regarding the disciplinary problem of student defacing, damaging or destroying school property.

In relation to this problem, administrators and teachers reflected a considerable degree of difference in their responses, particularly, in their rating of the problem as 'above average' and 'average'. 41.18 percent administrators rated the frequency of the problem as 'above average' while the corresponding figure for teachers was only 23.18 percent. Similarly, 17.65 percent administrators categorized the frequency of the problem as 'average' while a relatively higher proportion, i.e 27.47 percent teachers categorized the frequency of the problem as 'average'. About half of the teachers included in the study, i.e. 49.36 percent rated the frequency of the problem as 'below average'. The interesting aspect of the data lies in the variation the two groups showed in rating the problem as 'below average' and 'above average'. While 41.18 percent administrators categorized the problem as 'above average', 49.36 percent teachers categorized it as 'below average'.

From the data available, it is quite difficult to determine precisely the frequency of the problem. The tendency of the variation and dispersion of the study groups in their responses, however, seems to indicate that the problem is not common or the respondents are not equally exposed to the information of such disciplinary problems.

The data in Table 15 resulted in a relatively larger observed Chi-square value ( $\chi^2 = 7.96$ ) than the critical value ( $\chi^2 = 5.99$ ) required to reject the claim of non study groups difference. Hence, administrators and teachers showed a statistically significant difference with respect to student defacing, damaging or destroying school property. One possible explanation for this difference may be the fact that teachers are mostly limited to such problems if and when they occur in classrooms they teach while the administrators likely know what takes place in this regard in the whole school.

**TABLE 16**  
**Respondents' Views regarding Student Stealing**

ITEM	RESPONDENT	BELOW AVERAGE		AVERAGE		ABOVE AVERAGE		TOTAL		$\chi^2$
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
18	Administrators	40	78.43	7	13.73	4	7.84	51	100.00	1.16
	Teachers	176	75.54	38	16.31	19	8.15	233	200.00	

Critical  $\chi^2$  (df = 2, N = 284) = 5.99

As can distinctly be learned from Table 16, the vast majority of both administrators (i.e., 78.43 percent) and teachers (i.e., 75.54 percent) rated the frequency of observation of 'student stealing' as 'below average'.

## 2. THE DEGREE BY WHICH THE DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS DISRUPT THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS

TABLE 19

The Frequency of the Overall Student Disciplinary Problems and the degree of their Disruption of the Teaching-Learning Process

Group	Administrators	Teachers	r <sup>2</sup>	%
Adm	1.00	0.52*	.27	27
Teachers	0.52*	1.00		

\* p<.05

The data in Table 19 indicate the existence of a moderate correlation ( $r=.52$ ) between the frequency of student disciplinary problems and the degree of their disruption of the teaching-learning process. Whether the relationship between the two was statistically significant was determined by running a t-test.

According to the result, the t-observed (2.19) exceeds the t-critical (2.16) showing the existence of a statistically significant relationship between the frequency of the overall student disciplinary problems and the degree of their disruption of the teaching-learning process.

Table 20

A correlation matrix showing correlation coefficients between the frequency of student disciplinary problems and the degree of their disruption of the teaching - learning process

VARIABLES	Y <sub>21</sub>	Y <sub>22</sub>	Y <sub>23</sub>	Y <sub>24</sub>	Y <sub>25</sub>	Y <sub>26</sub>	Y <sub>27</sub>	Y <sub>28</sub>	Y <sub>29</sub>	Y <sub>30</sub>	Y <sub>31</sub>	Y <sub>32</sub>	Y <sub>33</sub>	Y <sub>34</sub>	Y <sub>35</sub>	r <sup>2</sup>
X <sub>6</sub>	.1598*	.1094	.0673	.0459	.0424	.1409*	.1196	.0586	.1013	.1021	.1048	.0918	-.0286	-.0101	.0343	3%
X <sub>7</sub>	.0895	.3317**	.2998**	.2442**	.2553**	.1686**	.1199	.1994**	.1704**	.0050	.0951	.1432*	.0143	-.0027	-.0314	11%
X <sub>8</sub>	.1069	.2950**	.4191**	.2473**	.2704**	.2603**	.2069**	.2414**	.2439**	.1146	.2479**	.2030*	.0707	.0311	.1106	18%
X <sub>9</sub>	.1123	.1680*	.0813	.3052**	.2609**	.2710**	.2332**	.2324**	.2752**	.0876	.1310	.1237	.0639	.0873	.1043	9%
X <sub>10</sub>	.0235	.0955	.0886	.2354**	.3008**	.2978**	.2294**	.3078**	.2657**	.1209	.1986**	.1522*	.0932	.1832**	.1434*	9%
X <sub>11</sub>	-.0042	.1506*	.1478*	.2328**	.2547**	.3592**	.2970**	.2940**	.2692**	.1329	.1521*	.2256**	.1098	.1117	.1215	13%
X <sub>12</sub>	.1556*	.1651*	.1456*	.2670**	.2965**	.3050**	.5292**	.3191*	.2992	.1578*	.2168**	.1463	.0562	.1113	.0572	28%
X <sub>13</sub>	.1390*	.1560*	.1095	.2188**	.2360**	.2076**	.2289**	.3713**	.1767*	.1644*	.1146	.1420	-.0262	.0372	-.0364	14%
X <sub>14</sub>	.0886	.1355	.1322	.2162**	.2292**	.2333**	.3304**	.3056**	.4559**	.2307**	.3205**	.1619*	.0696	.0462	.0576	21%
X <sub>15</sub>	-.0452	-.0542	-.0361	.0241	.1192	.1592*	.1686*	.1163	.2689**	.2536**	.2025**	.1096	.0753	.0817	.1191	6%
X <sub>16</sub>	.1234	.1554*	.1910**	.2162**	.2346**	.2253**	.2960**	.2100**	.3258**	.2291**	.4427**	.2598**	.1351	.1265	.1958**	20%
X <sub>17</sub>	.0134	.0499	.0694	.1035	.1022	.1934**	.2311**	.1817*	.2138**	.0751	.2016**	.4556**	.1159	.0622	.2526**	21%
X <sub>18</sub>	-.0566	-.0139	-.0345	.0354	.0274	.0821	.0977	-.0265	.1061	.0270	.0726	.0564	.2328**	.0919	.1641*	5%
X <sub>19</sub>	-.1047	-.0702	-.0253	.1114	.1110	.1892**	.1512*	.1613*	.1908**	.0407	.1220	.1646*	.1510*	.4176**	.1657*	17%
X <sub>20</sub>	.0600	-.0002	.1132	.1021	.1705*	.1570*	.2174**	.1122	.2279**	.1410*	.3358**	.3684**	.3357**	.2768**	.6054**	37%

Note: \* p < . 01  
 \*\* p < .001

x<sub>6</sub> - x<sub>20</sub> = Frequency of the 15 student disciplinary problems  
 y<sub>21</sub> - y<sub>35</sub> = Degree by which the 15 student disciplinary problems each disrupts the teaching - learning process

Table 20 displays the relationship between the frequency of the 15 student disciplinary problems and the degree by which supposedly they disrupt the teaching-learning process. In order to determine the relationship between the two major variables (i.e., the frequency of each problem and the degree by which it disrupts), Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was employed. As depicted by the table, there is some degree of relationship between each of the 15 disciplinary problems and the degree of disruption ratings. In fact, most of these relationships are significant even at .01 and .001 level. The following few intercorrelation coefficients are examples of such problems with much closer coefficients:  $r_{x_7 y_{24}}$  and  $r_{x_8 y_{24}} = .2442$  and  $.2473$  respectively,  $r_{x_{11} y_{27}}$  and  $r_{x_{16} y_{27}} = .2970$  and  $.2960$  respectively,  $r_{x_{10} y_{29}}$  and  $r_{x_{11} y_{29}} = .2657$  and  $.2692$  respectively. These similarity of coefficients between different problems suggest that there is much overlapping in what  $x_7$ ,  $x_8$ ,  $x_{10}$  and  $x_{11}$  measure. As the main purpose of this particular item is to determine the contribution of each problem to the disruption effect, only the coefficients of  $r_{x_6 y_{21}}$ ,  $r_{x_7 y_{22}}$ ,  $r_{x_8 y_{23}}$ , ...  $r_{x_{20} y_{35}}$  were considered and squared. Hence, the coefficients of determination ( $r^2$ ) found at the right extreme of the table show the percentage share of each of the disciplinary problems.

TABLE 21

## Comparison of Level of Frequency and Degree of Disruption

TYPES OF DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS	LEVEL OF FREQUENCY	DISRUPTION
Cheating during examinations and tests.	81.83	3%
Failing to do assignments.	94.61	11%
Coming to school without bringing the required textbooks.	95.47	18%
Coming late.	93.84	9%
Absenteeism.	94.18	9%
Fleeing from school jumping over fences and through other forbidden exits.	88.88	13%
Passive evasion (hiding, roaming) of students during class hours.	87.13	28%
Getting into classroom after the teacher arrived and leaving it following the teacher's footsteps.	85.81	14%
Teasing/jocking upon teachers.	66.44	21%
Physical attacks/attempts of physical attacks on teachers.	35.34	6%
Disturbing and/or making noises while the teacher teaches.	74.50	20%
Defacing, damaging or destroying school property.	54.73	21%
Stealing.	23.02	5%
Engaging in undesirable habits (like smoking, chewing 'chat', drunkenness) in schools	42.05	17%
Bullying girl students for sexual purpose on their ways to and from school.	42.05	37%

Table 21 presents the level of frequency of each of the 15 types of student disciplinary problems and the corresponding percentage of disruption attributable to the respective problem. According to the data, higher frequency does not necessarily imply higher degree of disruption because there are data cases in this table where some surprisingly high frequencies are only associated with moderate disruption (for example, frequency = 94.18 with disruption = 9%), and an awfully low frequencies associated with high 'disruption', (for example, frequency = 42.05 with 37% 'disruption').

In this table the mean scores of the 'average' and 'above average' were considered as frequencies for the study groups against each of the problems in order to inspect the foregoing idea of relationship.

Table 21 lists that the most frequently observed disciplinary problems were - coming to school without having the required textbooks, failing to do assignments, absenteeism, late coming, fleeing from school ..., and others. The apparent implication of the list is that the study groups perceive the most frequently occurring disciplinary problems to be those dealing, in general, with passive rather than active offences and imply lack of motivation on the part of the students rather than destructiveness and aggressiveness. Related to this is what the finding revealed regarding level of frequency and the corresponding degree of disruption. The most frequent disciplinary problems were mild and less disruptive. Example could be 'late coming' and 'absenteeism' which explain only 9% each of the factors that contribute to the disruption of the teaching - learning process. On the otherhand, the relatively less frequent but of active offence nature - bullying of girl students, account for 37% of the factors that contribute to the disruption of the teaching-learning process.

TABLE 22

**A Paired t-test of the Mean Differences Between Administrators and Teachers' Perception of the Disciplinary Problems(Combined) Disrupting the Teaching-Learning Process (N=284)**

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t-value
Administrators	51	43.922	11.624	0.835
Teachers	233	45.489	12.242	

$p > .05$

As can be seen from Table 22, the average scores earned by administrators was found to be 43.922 while that of teachers was 45.489 with a mean difference of 1.567. To examine whether this mean difference between the two groups is significant or not, a paired t-test was run at .05 level of significance. Consequently, and as may have been expected, a calculated t-value = 0.835 was obtained. Since the value of t-critical (.05,282) =  $\pm 1.96$ , is greater than the value of t-calculated (.835), there was no statistically significant difference between administrators and teachers in their perception of the overall disciplinary problems disrupting the teaching-learning process.

### 3. CAUSES OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS

TABLE 23

Respondents' Views concerning Causes of Student  
Disciplinary Problems  
(N = 16)

ITEM NOs	ASSUMED CAUSES	ADMINISTRATORS		TEACHERS	
		Average Rankings	Rank Orders	Average Rankings	Rank Orders
36	Lack of cooperation between teachers & students.	8.12	8	8.54	7.5
37	Inadequate Lesson preparation & methods of teaching.	8.71	10	10.03	11
38	Indulgence of some teachers in favouritism.	10.33	12	11.10	15
39	Idle or under engaged students.	6.39	5	6.50	3
40	Absence of esprit de corps among teachers.	10.84	13	10.25	12
41	Students' Lack of knowledge of school rules and regulations.	6.65	6	6.75	6
42	Students denied school administrative participation.	11.47	14	10.28	13
43	Loss of hope in education as a result of seeing those grade 12 completers who are neither employed nor got chance for higher education.	5.02	1	4.08	1
44	A demonstrated failure on the part of school to take a commensurate corrective measure in case of violation of school rules and regulations	5.98	3	4.91	2
45	When the lesson taught is deemed difficult.	5.39	2	6.67	4
46	Physical/corporal punishment	13.12	16	12.04	16
47	Repeated insults and reprimands	11.69	15	10.61	14
48	Over crowded classrooms	6.12	4	6.70	5
49	Lack of well furnished libraries, laboratories & shops.	7.78	7	8.54	7.5
50	Lack or shortage of textbooks	8.35	9	9.31	9
51	Absence and/or inadequate guidance and counselling service.	9.57	11	9.64	10

The average ranking for administrators and teachers was computed and compared, using the Spearman rank correlation. The result appears in the following table.

**TABLE 24**  
**COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN**  
**ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS' RANKINGS OF THE**  
**CAUSES OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS**  
(N = 16)

Group	Administrators	Teachers
Administrators	1.00	0.96*
Teachers	0.96*	1.00

\*  $p < .05$

In this study, causal items with values of higher average ratings in the table (5.02 and 4.08 for administrators and teachers respectively), for example, were taken for the most serious causes as opposed to items with values of lower average ratings, for instance, 13.12 for administrators and 12.04 for teachers, which were taken for the least serious causes. (Higher numbers in the average rankings represent lower mean values).

How close the administrators and the teachers in their perception of the causes of student disciplinary problems was determined by the attained coefficient of correlation. The coefficient of correlation of the rank order of administrators and teachers was found to be 0.96 (Refer Table 24). The (r) statistic confirmed the existence of high, strong positive relationship in the perception of the two study groups.

Several factors may explain the strong relationship observed between administrators and teachers in ranking the causes of student disciplinary problems. One explanation could be the existence and operation of the “Administration and Discipline Committee” and a centralized work guideline in the government schools of the country. The director of the school or his assistant being the chair person, the committee is formed by unit leaders, guidance officer, teachers, ancillary staff and students. One major duty of the committee is investigating the causes of the frequenting disciplinary problems and devising long-and short-term solutions. In the process of their duty, the members of the committee endeavour to identify the causes, discuss the severity and arrive at joint decisions. The decision(s) via the school director, is brought to the general staff meeting and get ratification (MOE, Internal School Administration Handbook, I, p.132, 1980). This type of participatory decision making and execution might have contributed to the narrowing of perception difference in identifying the causes of student disciplinary problems.

#### 4. COPING STRATEGIES OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS

TABLE 25

Respondents' Views regarding possible Coping Strategies of Student Disciplinary Problems ( $N=7$ )

ITEM NOs	ASSUMED STRATEGIES	ADMINISTRATORS		TEACHERS	
		Average Ranking	Rank Orders	Average Ranking	Rank Orders
52	Improving the preparation of lesson and methods of teaching.	4.90	7	5.01	7
53	Giving due consideration for courses like adolescent psychology, educational psychology, classroom management in the teacher education curriculum.	3.78	3	4.39	5
54	Identifying the frequenting discipline problems of greater disruptive role, searching for their causes, and devising short-and long-term coping strategies.	3.37	2	3.24	2
55	Orienting students about the rules and regulations of their respective schools at the beginning of the school year and facilitating for 'reminders' of such rules.	3.29	1	3.00	1
56	Taking a fair and a commensurate corrective measure immediately in case of the violation of such rules & regulations.	3.98	4	3.47	3
57	Providing a student guidance and counseling service.	4.29	5	4.58	6
58	Devising a mechanism of orientating disciplinary measures toward developing self-control.	4.45	6	4.22	4

The average ranking for administrators and teachers was computed and compared, using the Spearman rank correlation. The result appears in the following Table 26.

**TABLE 26**  
**COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN**  
**ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS' RANKINGS OF**  
**THE POSSIBLE COPING STRATEGIES FOR STUDENT**  
**DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS.**  
**(N = 7)**

GROUP	ADMINISTRATORS	TEACHERS
Administrators	1.00	0.82*
Teachers	0.82*	1.00

\*  $p < .05$

Similar to the procedure followed for the foregoing variable (i.e. rankings of the causes of student disciplinary problems), the coping strategy items with values of higher average ratings in the table (3.29 and 3.00 for administrators and teachers respectively), for example, were taken for the best possible coping strategies as opposed to items with values of lower average ratings, for instance, 4.90 for administrators and 5.01 for teachers, which were taken as the least preferred strategies. (Higher numbers in the average rankings represent lower mean values).

As can be seen in Table 26 above, the coefficient of correlation of administrators and teachers' perception in prioritizing the coping strategies was 0.82. The statistic indicated a high, strong positive relationship between the two professional study groups.

One possible explanation for this similar point of view between the two groups is not different from that given to the highly close perception they demonstrated in rank ordering the causes of disciplinary problems.

In general, the fact that the studied groups cooperate closely in their attempt to understand and solve student problems could have contributed to the creation of this similarity.

To get relevant information on the current status of the problem and eventually offer answers to the research basic questions raised, two groups of school personnel, namely, administrators and teachers were selected as subjects of study. To make the study representative the region was arbitrarily stratified into 5 'zones' of study, i.e. eastern, central, southern, northern and western. From each of the five zones of study, 4 senior secondary schools were randomly selected making up a total of 20 schools to be included in the study. From each school, then, the principal, the assistant principal, one unit leader and a guidance officer were purposefully included. These four comprise the administrators' group of the study. The teachers' group, which is the second study group, was selected by systematic random sampling technique from among teachers working in the 20 sample schools. Thus, the study was planned to be conducted on 80 administrators and 300 teachers, altogether on 380 school personnel.

As a means of soliciting the required data from the two study groups, a 97- item self-report questionnaire was first prepared in English and then translated into Amharic to facilitate easier communication.

With the objective of making the data gathering instrument reliable, a pilot test of the drafted questionnaire was administered to 44 administrators and teachers in two senior secondary schools and obtained dependable result. After having made some modifications and incorporated some feed back points into the draft questionnaire, the final questionnaire format was prepared & distributed to the targeted study groups from which a usable return of 77 percent for administrators and 76 percent for teachers was made ready for processing.

The data so secured was, then tabulated and analyzed by using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS). The findings were tested for their significance using percentage, Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ), t-test, Spearman Brown's rank order correlation and Pearson's correlation.

The following were the findings of the study.

#### **PART ONE: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND BIO-DATA OF THE STUDY POPULATIONS**

- . 92.2 percent of the administrators and 89.9 percent of the teachers had the qualification level ranging from college diploma (12+2) to first degree and above.
- . 58.8 percent of the administrators and 68.2 percent of the teachers studied subject areas as their field of specialization.
- . While female teachers comprised only 5.58 percent of the studied teachers, there was no single female administrator.
- . 90.19 percent of the administrators and 86.27 percent of the teachers were found to be in the same age range of 21 to 40 years.
- . 54.90 percent of the administrators served from 1 to 5 years. 43.15 percent of the administrators served from 6 to 20 years. Only one person (1.96 percent) served for 21 years or more. Regarding the teachers, 21.46 percent served from 1 to 5 years. 68.68 percent served from 6 to 20 years. Only seven persons (3 percent) served for 21 or more years.

## PART TWO: RESULTS OF THE STUDY

1a) The following 15 types of disciplinary problems were identified by the majority (about 70 percent) of the two study groups as the really existing student disciplinary problems in secondary schools.

- . Cheatings during examinations and tests.
- . Failing to do assignments.
- . Coming to school without bringing textbooks.
- . Late coming.
- . Absenteeism.
- . Fleeing from school by jumping over fences or through other forbidden exits.
- . Passive evasion of students during class hours.
- . Getting into class after the teacher arrived and leaving it immediately following the teacher's foot steps.
- . Teasing/joking upon teachers.
- . Physical attacks/attempts of physical attacks on teachers.
- . Disturbing and/or making noises while teacher teaches.
- . Defacing, damaging or destroying school property.
- . Stealing.
- . Engaging in undesirable habits (like smoking, chewing 'Chat', drunkenness) in school.
- . Bullying girl students for sexual purpose on their ways to and from school.

b) Of the mentioned problems only eight (8), namely, cheating during examinations and tests, failing to do assignments, coming to school without bringing text books, late coming, fleeing from school, passive evasion of class hours, getting into classroom after the teacher arrived,

were indicated as the most frequently occurring disciplinary problems. The remaining seven (7) problems, namely, teasing/joking upon teachers, physical attacks/attempts of physical attacks on teachers, disturbing and/or making noises while the teacher teaches, defacing, damaging or destroying school property, stealing, engaging in undesirable habits, bullying girl students were only occasional (non frequent) problems.

- c) Administrators and teachers demonstrated much more similarity of perception in the frequency of disciplinary problems.
- 
- 2a. There is a moderate link between frequency of disciplinary problems and the degree of their disruption of the teaching-learning process ( $r = .53$ ). Accordingly, the study indicated that 27% of the disruptions inflicted on the teaching-learning process are attributable to student disciplinary problems. The finding of the study also indicated that higher frequency does not necessarily imply higher degree of disruption.
  - b. Similar to their perception of the frequency of the disciplinary problems, the study groups also showed nonsignificant difference in their perception of the degree by which the disciplinary problems disrupt the teaching-learning process. (calculated  $t = .835$ , tabled  $t = \pm 1.96$ ,  $p > .05$ ).
  - 3a. Both administrators and teachers cited student loss of hope in education (as a result of the latter's experience in observing the former grade 12 completers who neither were employed nor continued higher education) as the most single cause of student disciplinary problems. It is interesting to see their indication of the second cause which seems to reflect their expected complaints against each other. While administrators viewed 'difficult lesson', teachers, on their parts, indicated 'failure of school administration to take measure when rules and regulations are violated', as the second cause. Both groups equally rejected the hearsay that students incline to indiscipline because of

insults and reprimands and corporal punishments of school authorities and teachers by rating them as 15th and 16th respectively.

- b. A very high correlation ( $r = .96$ ) was also observed between administrators and teachers in perceiving school and teacher factors as causes of student disciplinary problems.
- 4a. The study also had to suggest possible coping strategies for dealing with the student disciplinary problems. In their suggestions, the respondents gave priority to those types of coping strategies that schools themselves can adopt and implement. The need for acquainting students with school rules and regulations at the beginning of the school year was suggested by both study groups as number one coping strategy. Next, both groups proposed the need to identify the frequenting disciplinary problems, search for their causes and devise short-and long-term solutions. Both administrators and teachers gave the least consideration for the role 'improving the preparation of lesson and methods of teaching' can play as a coping strategy.

## 5.2 CONCLUSIONS

There is hardly any comprehensive, country-wide research-based information available to help identify which student disciplinary problems are actually being faced and in what frequencies, by those concerned. Without this information it is improbable that teachers, administrators, program developers and teacher-trainers can effectively work in their respective capacities toward the improvement of the status of student discipline.

As perceived by administrators and teachers, those student disciplinary problems which occur most frequently tend to be fairly passive in nature. As

a result, the problems teachers and administrators mostly encounter are not of the most grave nature.

The comparison between the level of frequency of the disciplinary problems and the degree of their disruption of the teaching-learning process indicate that the problems with the highest frequency are not of necessity problems with the highest degree of disruption.

The findings of the study seem to confirm that usually too much emphasis is given to the rarer indiscipline events than to the most relevant, milder ones. This tendency of exaggerating the situation is in fact more dangerous to teacher morale than to the physical well-being of persons or property.

Despite the fact that teachers mainly are concerned with the classroom work of students, and administrators with the problems of school at large, the findings of the study showed much higher similarity of perception with regard to student disciplinary problems.

Grade 12 completers who got neither employed nor continued higher education serve as a symbol of disappointment and lack of achievement motivation for those who are in the pipeline and in turn as the most single cause of student disciplinary problems.

a result, the problems teachers and administrators mostly encounter are not of the most grave nature.

The comparison between the level of frequency of the disciplinary problems and the degree of their disruption of the teaching-learning process indicate that the problems with the highest frequency are not of necessity problems with the highest degree of disruption.

---

The findings of the study seem to confirm that usually too much emphasis is given to the rarer indiscipline events than to the most relevant, milder ones. This tendency of exaggerating the situation is in fact more dangerous to teacher morale than to the physical well-being of persons or property.

Despite the fact that teachers mainly are concerned with the classroom work of students, and administrators with the problems of school at large, the findings of the study showed much higher similarity of perception with regard to student disciplinary problems.

Grade 12 completers who got neither employed nor continued higher education serve as a symbol of disappointment and lack of achievement motivation for those who are in the pipeline and in turn as the most single cause of student disciplinary problems.

### 5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and the conclusions drawn, the following measures were suggested to be taken by schools, teachers, other relevant organizations and individuals to promote good discipline in schools.

#### 1. SHORT-TERM STRATEGIES

1.1 Based on central guideline for student discipline set by the Ministry of Education, each school must develop its own rules and regulations/code of conduct that reflect local conditions with the participation of school administrators, teachers, students and parents.

1.2 Schools must orient students and the whole school community about the rules and regulations/code of conduct of the school at the beginning of the school year, and fix 'reminders' in proper places.

1.3 In the course of the application of the rules and regulations, a school needs to:

1.3.1 ensure the rules and regulations are applied judiciously and consistently by all concerned.

1.3.2 take a fair and a commensurate corrective measure immediately in case of violation.

1.3.3 avoid both the injudicious use of group punishment where the innocent as well as the guilty are punished.

1.3.4 discourage public punishment which humiliates individuals.

1.3.5 communicate the rules and regulations to parents fully early and clearly, and make effective induction arrangements for parents of new students.

1.4 Lesson preparation and methods of teaching should be related to curriculum goals and take into account what students already know and need to know.

1.5 Schools and teachers should give students every opportunity to take responsibilities and make a full contribution to improving behaviour in schools.

1.6 Schools and teachers should recognize the importance of students' view; and organize systems for doing so and for taking information gathered into account in the management of school.

1.7 Teachers should learn to differentiate between real and perceived discipline problems and to raise their level of tolerance for trivial things .

## 2. LONG TERM STRATEGIES

2.1 The role of initial and in-service training of teachers is crucial in the effort to promote good behaviour in the classroom and in school as a whole. Hence, teacher education institutions:

2.1.1 should include practical training in ways of motivating and managing groups of students during the initial training of teachers.

2.1.2 must provide in-service training for those already in the job either during long vacation or through school-based programs or both.

2.1.3 should introduce all their students to basic counseling skills.

2.2 The 1994 Education and Training Policy to revise the content of the education system and to reorient it in the direction of imparting employable skills must be facilitated in practical and concrete terms. Students must also accept and develop the ideas of self-employment in schools.

2.3 In the light of the increased cost of education increased financial provision is a mandatory. This comes partly into the category of factors beyond the control of school; nevertheless, causes of student disciplinary

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. Books

- Adesina, S. (1990). Educational Management. Enugu, Nigeria: Fourth dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Anderson, L. W. and Lauren A. V. D. (1963). Secondary School Administration, Boston: Houghton and Mifflin Company.
- Bellon, J. et al. (1992). Teaching from a Research Knowledge Base. New York: Merrill Company.
- Bunting, J.R. (1976). To Light a Candle: Educational Problems and Opportunities in Developing Common Wealth and Britain. London: Evan Brothers Ltd.
- Charlton, T. and Kenneth D. eds. (1993). Manging Misbehaviour in Schools. Second Edition. London: Routledge, 11 New Fetter Lane.
- Chauhan, S.S. (1978). Advanced Educational Psychology. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House PVT Ltd.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1982). Principles and Techniques of Guidance. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing PVT Ltd.
- Child, D. (1986). Psychology and the Teacher. Fourth Edition. Great Britain: Cassell Educational Ltd.
- Charizio, H. F. (1980). Toward Postitive Classroom Discipline. Third Edition. New York: John Wiley & sons.
- Cole, P. G. and Lorna K.S. C. (1994). Teaching Principles and Practice. Second Edition. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Coolican, H. (1994). Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology. Second Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Dubey, R.K. (1980). Toward Democracy in Education. Allahabad, India: Chugh Publications.
- El-Abd, H. A. (1973). Educational Psychology: Research and the African Teacher. Cairo: Dar El-Hana Printing House.

- Fagen, S.A., Nicholas J. L. and Donald J. S. (1975). Teaching Children Self-Control. Preventing Emotional and Learning Problems in the Elementary School. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Galloway, D. and Goodwin C. (1987). The Education of Disturbing Children. London: Longman.
- Ginott, H. (1972). Teacher and Child. New York: MacMillan company.
- Gnagey, W. J. (1968). The Psychology of Discipline in the Classroom. London: The MacMillan Company.
- Good, C. V. ed. (1973). Dictionary of Education. New York: MC Graw-Hill Book Company.
- Good, T. L. and Jere E. B. (1987). Looking in Classrooms. Fourth Edition. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Gordon, T. (1974). Teacher Effectiveness Training. New York: Peter H. Wyden/Publisher.
- Hoghugh, M. (1983). The Delinquent: Directions for Social Control. London: Burnett Books Ltd.
- Hoult, T. F. (1977). Dictionary of Modern Sociology. Totowa, New Jersey: Little Field, Adams and Co.
- Howell, D. C. (1995). Fundamental Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Third Edition. Belmont, California: Duxbury Press.
- Hurlock, E. B. (1973). Developmental Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Husen, T. (1979). The School in Question: A Comparative Study of the School and Its Future in Western Society. New York: Oxford University Press.
- James, B. (1960). Student Teaching in the Elementary School. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

- Koul, L. (1988). Methodology of Educational Research. Second Revised Edition. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House PVT LTD.
- Kujoth, J. S. ed. (1970). The Teacher and School Discipline. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scare Crow Press, Inc.
- Lehman, J.D. (1982). The Three Approaches to Classroom Management. New York: University Press of America.
- Leach, D. J. and E. C. Raybould. (1977). Learning and Behaviour Difficulties in School. Great Britain: A. Wheaton and Co. Ltd.
- Macober, L. R. (1954). Principles of Teaching in the Elementary School. New York: American Book Company.
- McGuinness, J. (1993). Teachers, Pupils and Behaviour: A Managerial Approach. Great Britain: Biddles Ltd. Guildford and King's Lynn.
- Montgomery, D. (1989). Managing Behaviour Problems. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Otto, H.J. and Sanders D.C. (1964). Elementary School Organization and Administration. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
- Pittenger, B. F. (1951). Local Public School Administration. First Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Quirk, T. J. (1979). Psychological Research: How to Do It. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Publishers.
- Redl, F. and George V. S. (1956). Discipline for Today's Children and Youth. New York: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Richmond, W. K. (1968). Readings in Education. London: Metuchen & Co. Ltd.
- Risk, T.M. (1958). Principles and Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School. New York: American Book Company.

- Fagen, S.A., Nicholas J. L. and Donald J. S. (1975). Teaching Children Self-Control. Preventing Emotional and Learning Problems in the Elementary School. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Galloway, D. and Goodwin C. (1987). The Education of Disturbing Children. London: Longman.
- Ginott, H. (1972). Teacher and Child. New York: MacMillan company.
- Gnagey, W. J. (1968). The Psychology of Discipline in the Classroom. London: The MacMillan Company.
- Good, C. V. ed. (1973). Dictionary of Education. New York: MC Graw-Hill Book Company.
- Good, T. L. and Jere E. B. (1987). Looking in Classrooms. Fourth Edition. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Gordon, T. (1974). Teacher Effectiveness Training. New York: Peter H. Wyden/Publisher.
- Hoghugh, M. (1983). The Delinquent: Directions for Social Control. London: Burnett Books Ltd.
- Hoult, T. F. (1977). Dictionary of Modern Sociology. Totowa, New Jersey: Little Field, Adams and Co.
- Howell, D. C. (1995). Fundamental Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Third Edition. Belmont, California: Duxbury Press.
- Hurlock, E. B. (1973). Developmental Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Husen, T. (1979). The School in Question: A Comparative Study of the School and Its Future in Western Society. New York: Oxford University Press.
- James, B. (1960). Student Teaching in the Elementary School. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

- Koul, L. (1988). Methodology of Educational Research. Second Revised Edition. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House PVT LTD.
- Kujoth, J. S. ed. (1970). The Teacher and School Discipline. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scare Crow Press, Inc.
- Lehman, J.D. (1982). The Three Approaches to Classroom Management. New York: University Press of America.
- Leach, D. J. and E. C. Raybould. (1977). Learning and Behaviour Difficulties in School. Great Britain: A. Wheaton and Co. Ltd.
- Macober, L. R. (1954). Principles of Teaching in the Elementary School. New York: American Book Company.
- McGuinness, J. (1993). Teachers, Pupils and Behaviour: A Managerial Approach. Great Britain: Biddles Ltd. Guildford and King's Lynn.
- Montgomery, D. (1989). Managing Behaviour Problems. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Otto, H.J. and Sanders D.C. (1964). Elementary School Organization and Administration. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
- Pittenger, B. F. (1951). Local Public School Administration. First Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Quirk, T. J. (1979). Psychological Research: How to Do It. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Publishers.
- Redl, F. and George V. S. (1956). Discipline for Today's Children and Youth. New York: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Richmond, W. K. (1968). Readings in Education. London: Metuchen & Co. Ltd.
- Risk, T.M. (1958). Principles and Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School. New York: American Book Company.

Shipman, MD. (1968). Sociology of the School. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd.

Stone, S.C. and B. Shertzer. (1980). Fundamentals of Counseling. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Stoops et al. (1981). Handbook of Educational Administration : A Guide for the Practitioner. Second Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Tekeste Negash. (1990). The crisis of the Ethiopian Education. Upsala: Upsala University.

Watkins, C. and Patsy W. (1987). School Discipline: A Whole-School Practical Approach. England: Basil Black well Ltd.

Wayson, W. W. et al. (1982). Handbook for Developing Schools with Good Discipline. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa.

Werblowsky, R.J. Z. and Geoffrey W. eds. (1966). The Encyclopedia of the Jewish Religion. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

## II. JOURNALS

Calkins, J. E. (1974). "Are your students involved in Deciding crucial Issues?" Education Digest. Vol. 40. No. 4.

Clinchy, B. Mc V. (1995). "Goals 2000:the Student as Objects," Phi Delta Kappa. Vol. 76 No. 5.

Eichhorn, D. H. (1978). "Youth Cultures: What can we Learn," Educational Leadership. Vol. 35. No.7.

Kindsvatter, R. (1982). "The Dilemmas of Discipline," Educational Leadership. Vol. 39. No.7.

Thompson, G. H. (1976). " Discipline and the High School Teacher," Education Digest. Vol. 42. No. 3.

### III. MISCELLANEOUS

- Ayalew Shibeshi, (1996). School Discipline and Corporal Punishment in Ethiopian Schools. Addis Ababa University. (A paper presented at the National Conference on the Situation of Children and Adolescents in Ethiopia).
- Children, Youth and Family Welfare Organization (1985 E.C.). Evaluative Report on Studies Conducted about Youth. Addis Ababa (Mimeograph, Amharic version).
- CYAO (1995). Ethiopian Youth - Basic Challenges and Prospects. Addis Ababa: Berhanena Selam Printing Press.
- ENA (1985 E.C.). "Students Failed for Working on Forged Examination Questions," Addis Zemen, 50<sup>th</sup> year, No 416.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Cooperation was Demanded in the Effort to Improve the Status of Student Discipline," Addis Zemen, 52<sup>nd</sup> year No 432.
- Haregewoin, C. and Yosuf, O.A. (1994). Gender Sensitive Counseling Services for High School Female Students: Trainees' Manual. Addis Ababa (unpublished).
- Mahteme Selassie W.M. (1942 E.C.). "Regulations of Tafari Mekonnen School," Zikre Neger. Addis Ababa: Netsanet Printing Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Regulations of Menelik II School," Zikre Neger. Addis Ababa: Netsanet Printing Press.
- Ministry of Education & Fine Arts (1958 E.C.). General Regulations of School Administration. Addis Ababa.
- Ministry of Education (1980 E.C.). Guideline for Internal School Administration and Management, I & II. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- Oromia Education Bureau (1995/96). Education Statistics Annual Abstract. Addis Ababa: Bole Printing Enterprise.
- Penal Code of the Empire of Ethiopia (1957). Proclamation No. 158. Addis Ababa: Berhanena Selam Printing Press.

Region 14 Education Bureau (1987 E.C.). Guideline for Student Discipline. Addis Ababa (Mimeograph).

Yusuf, O.A. (1996). Does Psychotherapy Benefit Youth Counselees? A Study on the Efficacy of Counseling Intervention at Two Centres in Addis Ababa. Department of Psychology. Addis Ababa University (unpublished).

Zaudneh Y. (1987). Personnel Systems in Education. Addis Ababa University (unpublished teaching material).

## APPENDIX I

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

### A QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE FILLED OUT BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS & TEACHERS

#### **Dear Respondents**

The purpose of this questionnaire is to solicit data pertaining to student discipline from administrators and teachers working in senior secondary schools of Oromia. The data shall be utilized for studying student disciplinary problems with the ultimate objective of arriving at some conclusions regarding the problem. The investigator has a strong belief that the task requires a concerted effort of those concerned, including you. So, feel free and answer all the questions contained in the questionnaire please.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

**PART ONE: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION**

**Direction:** Please put a check mark "X" to show your decision or choice in the parenthesis.

1. Your academic qualification
  - 1.1  $\geq$  B.A / B.Sc ( )
  - 1.2 12 + 3 ( )
  - 1.3 12 + 2 (Diploma) ( )
  - 1.4 12 + 1 ( )
  - 1.5 12 and / or 12 + T.T.I. ( )
2. Your field of specialization
  - 2.1 Educational Administration ( )
  - 2.2 pedagogics ( )
  - 2.3 Subject area specialization ( )
  - 2.4 Vocational education ( )
  - 2.5 Others ( )
3. Sex
  - 3.1 Male ( )
  - 3.2 Female ( )
4. Age
  - 4.1  $\leq$  20 years ( )
  - 4.2 21 - 30 years ( )
  - 4.3 31 - 40 years ( )
  - 4.4  $\geq$  41 years ( )

5. Years of service in the Ministry of Education

5.1 In present position

- a) < 1 year ( )
- b) 1 - 5 years ( )
- c) 6 - 10 years ( )
- d) 11 - 15 years ( )
- e) 16 - 20 years ( )
- f)  $\geq$  21 years ( )

**PART TWO: DATA ON STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS**

**1A. Direction:** 23 assumed disciplinary problems are listed below. Indicate your choice by marking "YES" if the specific student disciplinary problem exists as a real problem in your school, and "NO" if it does not exist.

Item No.	Behaviours assumed to be disciplinary problems.	Yes/No
6	Sleeping in class.	
7	Coming to school without exercise books.	
8	Late-coming / tardiness.	
9	Absenteeism.	
10	Failing to do assignments.	
11	Cheating during examinations and tests.	
12	Stealing.	
13	Using of obscene languages.	
14	Raping or attempted raping.	
15	Bringing weapons to school.	
16	Getting into classrooms after the teacher arrived and leaving immediately following the teacher's foot steps.	
17	Coming to school without bringing the required textbooks.	
18	Fleeing from school jumping over fences and through other forbidden exits.	
19	Stealing examinations	
20	Robbing others.	
21	Defacing, damaging or destroying school property.	
22	Teasing / Joking upon teachers.	
23	Passive evasion (roaming, hiding) of students during class hours.	
24	Engaging in undesirable habits (like smoking, chewing 'Chat', drunkenness) in school.	
25	Bullying girl students for sexual purpose on their ways to and from school.	
26	Physical attacks / attempts of physical attacks on teachers.	
27	Disturbing and / or making noises while the teacher teaches.	
28	Physical attacks / attempts of physical attacks on sch. administrators	

- 1B. Direction. a) Based on the definition of the numbers 1 to 5 at the top left, circle one of the options given to each of the 23 assumed student disciplinary problems to show how frequently the problem occurs.
- (b) Based on the definitions of the numbers 1 to 5 at the top right, circle one of the options given to each of the 23 assumed student disciplinary problems to show the degree by which each problem disrupts the teaching-learning process.

How frequently do the disciplinary problems occur?

To what degree do the problems disrupt the teaching-learning process?

1. = Never occurs  
 2. = Occurs semesterly  
 3. = Occurs monthly  
 4. = Occurs weekly  
 5. = Occurs daily

1. = Very low  
 2. = Low  
 3. = Medium  
 4. = High  
 5. = Very High

Item Nos.	Options	Behaviours assumed to be student disciplinary problems	Item Nos.	Options
29	1 2 3 4 5	Sleeping in class.	52	1 2 3 4 5
30	1 2 3 4 5	Coming to school without exercise books.	53	1 2 3 4 5
31	1 2 3 4 5	Late coming / tardiness.	54	1 2 3 4 5
32	1 2 3 4 5	Absenteeism.	55	1 2 3 4 5
33	1 2 3 4 5	Failing to do assignments.	56	1 2 3 4 5
34	1 2 3 4 5	Cheatings during examinations and tests.	57	1 2 3 4 5
35	1 2 3 4 5	Stealing.	58	1 2 3 4 5
36	1 2 3 4 5	Use of obscene languages.	59	1 2 3 4 5
37	1 2 3 4 5	Raping / Attempted raping.	60	1 2 3 4 5
38	1 2 3 4 5	Bringing weapons to school.	61	1 2 3 4 5
39	1 2 3 4 5	Getting into classrooms after the teacher and leaving immediately following the teacher's footsteps.	62	1 2 3 4 5
40	1 2 3 4 5	Coming to school without bringing the required text books.	63	1 2 3 4 5
41	1 2 3 4 5	Fleeing from school jumping over fences and /or through other forbidden exits.	64	1 2 3 4 5
42	1 2 3 4 5	Stealing examinations.	65	1 2 3 4 5
43	1 2 3 4 5	Robbing others.	66	1 2 3 4 5
44	1 2 3 4 5	Defacing, damaging or destroying school property.	67	1 2 3 4 5
45	1 2 3 4 5	Teasing / Jocking upon teachers.	68	1 2 3 4 5
46	1 2 3 4 5	Passive evasion (roaming, hiding) of students during class hours.	69	1 2 3 4 5
47	1 2 3 4 5	Engaging in undesirable habits (like smoking, chewing 'Chat', drunkenness) in school.	70	1 2 3 4 5
48	1 2 3 4 5	Bullying girl students for sexual purpose on their ways to and from school.	71	1 2 3 4 5
49	1 2 3 4 5	Physical attacks / attempts of physical attacks on teachers.	72	1 2 3 4 5
50	1 2 3 4 5	Disturbing and / or making noises while the teacher teaches.	73	1 2 3 4 5
51	1 2 3 4 5	Physical attacks / attempts of physical attacks on school administrators.	74	1 2 3 4 5

**1C. Direction.** For the prevailing student disciplinary problems, the following 16 items (75 - 90) are assumed to be the causes. Please rank them in a descending order by giving “ 1 “ to the ‘first most severe’ cause, “ 2 “ to the ‘second most severe’ cause, “ 3 “ to the ‘third most severe’, and so on. It means you will give number 16 to the item you believe is the ‘least severe’ of all.

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 75. Lack of cooperation between teachers and students  | ( ) |
| 76. Inadequate preparation of lessons and teaching methods   | ( ) |
| 77. Indulgence of some teachers in favouritism   | ( ) |
| 78. Idle or under engaged students   | ( ) |
| 79. Absence of esprit de corps among teachers  | ( ) |
| 80. Students’ lack of knowledge of school rules & regulations  | ( ) |
| 81. Students denied participation in school administration   | ( ) |
| 82. Loss of hope in education as a result of seeing those grade 12 completers who were neither employed nor given chance for higher education.   | ( ) |
| 83. A demonstrated failure on the part of school to take a commensurate corrective measure in case of violation of school rules and regulations. | ( ) |
| 84. When the lesson taught is deemed difficult.  | ( ) |
| 85. Physical / corporal punishment.  | ( ) |
| 86. Repeated insults and reprimands.   | ( ) |
| 87. Over crowded classrooms.   | ( ) |
| 88. Lack of well furnished libraries, laboratories and shops.  | ( ) |
| 89. Lack or shortage of text books.  | ( ) |
| 90. Absence and / or inadequate guidance and counseling services.  | ( ) |

**1D. Direction:** The following seven (7) coping strategies are supposed to minimize student disciplinary problems and ultimately create a better learning-teaching environment. With this conception in mind, write “ 1 “ against the coping strategy that you recommend as the best of all, “ 2 “ against the second best, “ 3 “ against the third best, and so on. It means you write “ 7 “ against the strategy that you consider is the least recommendable of all.

91. Improving the preparation of lessons & methods of teaching. ( )
92. Giving due consideration for courses like adolescent psychology, educational psychology, classroom management skills in teacher education programs. ( )
93. Identifying the frequenting discipline problems of greater disruptive effect, searching for their causes and devising short-and long-term coping strategies. ( )
94. Orienting students about the rules and regulations of their respective schools at the beginning of the school year and facilitating for ‘reminders’ of such rules. ( )
95. Taking a fair and a commensurate corrective measure immediately in case of violation of such rules and regulations. ( )
96. Providing a student guidance and counseling services. ( )
97. Devising a mechanism of orientating disciplinary corrective measures toward inculcation of student self-control. ( )

Thank you for your sincere cooperation once more!

## APPENDIX II

### $r^2$ SHOWING THE DISRUPTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE IDENTIFIED 15 STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS (N = 284)

FORMULA USED: Product Moment Correlation(r).

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

$$\sum X = 5935$$

$$\sum X^2 = 143067$$

$$\sum Y = 7182$$

$$\sum Y^2 = 221552$$

$$\sum XY = 164537$$

$$r = 0.52$$

$$r^2 = 27\%$$

### APPENDIX III

## A PAIRED t - TEST OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS' PERCEPTION SCORES OF DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS DISRUPTING THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS

### NOTE:

$X_1$  = Sample population of Administrators.

$X_2$  = Sample population of Teachers.

- 1) Assumptions: The sample populations
- a) have the same variance
  - b) are normally distributed.

### 2) Hypotheses:

$$H_0: \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 = 0$$

$$H_1: \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 \neq 0$$

### 3) Computational Formula

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\left[ \frac{(N_1 - 1) S_1^2 + (N_2 - 1) S_2^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} \right] \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right]}}$$

$$N_1 = 51$$

$$\bar{X}_1 = 43.922$$

$$S_1 = 11.624$$

$$N_2 = 233$$

$$\bar{X}_2 = 45.242$$

$$S_2 = 12.242$$

$$N_1 + N_2 - 2 = 282$$

$$t = - 0.835$$

### APPENDIX III

## A PAIRED t - TEST OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS' PERCEPTION SCORES OF DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS DISRUPTING THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS

### NOTE:

$X_1$  = Sample population of Administrators.

$X_2$  = Sample population of Teachers.

1) Assumptions: The sample populations

a) have the same variance

b) are normally distributed.

2) Hypotheses:

$$H_0: \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 = 0$$

$$H_1: \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 \neq 0$$

3) Computational Formula

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\left[ \frac{(N_1 - 1) S_1^2 + (N_2 - 1) S_2^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} \right] \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right]}}$$

$$N_1 = 51$$

$$\bar{X}_1 = 43.922$$

$$S_1 = 11.624$$

$$N_2 = 233$$

$$\bar{X}_2 = 45.242$$

$$S_2 = 12.242$$

$$N_1 + N_2 - 2 = 282$$

$$t = - 0.835$$



**APPENDIX IVb**  
**CAUSES OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS**  
**AS RANKED BY TEACHERS (N = 233)**

**NOTE:**  $\sum R$  = Sum of the Ranks.  $\bar{X}R$  = Mean Values of the Ranks,  
 $R_{AV}$  = Average Rankings.  $S_s$  = Subjects.

Causes Ranked/ $S_s$	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90
052	7	8	15	4	16	10	14	6	1	13	12	11	2	3	9	5
053	9	11	16	8	6	7	5	4	2	3	13	15	1	10	12	14
054	9	11	12	13	8	7	6	2	14	15	16	1	5	3	4	7
055	9	8	13	11	14	6	12	1	5	3	16	15	2	5	4	10
056	8	9	14	13	12	10	11	7	1	3	16	15	2	5	6	14
057	7	16	14	13	15	12	11	8	1	2	9	6	5	4	3	10
058	15	16	14	13	10	12	8	9	1	5	7	11	2	3	6	4
059	9	6	12	8	14	10	3	1	4	5	15	13	2	11	16	7
060	9	8	16	1	15	7	14	10	2	4	13	12	3	5	6	11
061	7	6	16	8	15	14	13	9	1	2	12	11	3	4	5	10
284	5	9	11	3	6	10	16	1	2	7	15	14	4	12	13	8
$\sum R$	1989	2337	2586	1515	2395	1554	2388	1145	950	1573	2806	2471	1561	1981	2169	2247
$\bar{X}R$	8.54	10.03	11.10	6.50	10.28	6.67	10.25	4.91	4.08	6.75	12.04	10.61	6.70	8.50	9.31	9.64
$R_{AV}$	7.5	11	15	3	13	4	12	2	1	6	16	14	5	7.5	9	10



## APPENDIX Vb

### COPING STRATEGIES FOR STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS AS RANKED BY TEACHERS (N = 233)

NOTE:  $\sum R$  = Sum of the Ranks.  $\bar{X} R$  = Mean values of the Ranks.  
 $R_{AV.}$  = Average Rankings.  $S_s$  = Subjects

Strategies Ranked/ $S_s$	91	92	93	94	95	96	97
0 5 2	7	6	3	4	5	1	2
0 5 3	6	5	4	7	2	3	1
0 5 4	6	5	2	3	4	1	7
0 5 5	6	7	4	3	1	5	2
0 5 6	6	4	5	1	7	2	3
2 8 4	7	4	1	6	2	5	3
$\sum R$	1167	1023	756	700	809	1067	983
$\bar{X} R$	5.01	4.39	3.24	3.00	3.47	4.58	4.22
$R_{AV.}$	7	5	2	1	3	6	4

## APPENDIX Vb

### COPING STRATEGIES FOR STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS AS RANKED BY TEACHERS (N = 233)

NOTE:  $\sum R$  = Sum of the Ranks,  $\bar{X} R$  = Mean values of the Ranks,  
 $R_{AV.}$  = Average Rankings,  $S_s$  = Subjects

Strategies Ranked/ $S_s$	91	92	93	94	95	96	97
0 5 2	7	6	3	4	5	1	2
0 5 3	6	5	4	7	2	3	1
0 5 4	6	5	2	3	4	1	7
0 5 5	6	7	4	3	1	5	2
0 5 6	6	4	5	1	7	2	3
2 8 4	7	4	1	6	2	5	3
$\sum R$	1167	1023	756	700	809	1067	983
$\bar{X} R$	5.01	4.39	3.24	3.00	3.47	4.58	4.22
$R_{AV.}$	7	5	2	1	3	6	4

## DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my work and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: TAYE AGA

Signature: 

Place and Date of Submission: Addis Ababa University  
June 1997