

# RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPALS' DISCIPLINARY APPROACH AND STUDENTS' DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOURS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN NORTH CENTRAL ZONE OF NIGERIA.

Dr Idoko Boniface Idoko

Emmanuel Secondary School Ugbokolo.

## **ABSTRACT**

*The study examined the relationship between principals' disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours in secondary schools in North Central Nigeria. Three hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. The sample size of 306 was drawn from a population of 1755 Principals of secondary schools in the zone. The instrument for data collection was a self structured questionnaire titled "Disciplinary Approach and Disruptive Behaviour Questionnaire' (DADBQ)". Data collected were subjected to descriptive statistics. The findings revealed that there is significant relationship between autocratic and laissez-faire disciplinary approaches and students' disruptive behaviours, but there is no significant relationship between principals' democratic disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours. The researcher recommends that school counsellors should assist the principal to adopt democratic disciplinary approach, and that counsellors should educate principals of schools to enable them realize that autocratic and laissez-faire disciplinary approaches promote students' disruptive behaviours.*

## **KEYWORDS**

*Principals, Disciplinary, Democratic, Autocratic, Laissez-faire, Approach, Students, Disruptive, and Behaviours.*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The North Central Zone of Nigeria, which comprises Benue State, Nasarawa State, Kogi State, Kwara State, Plateau State, Niger State and the Federal Capital Territory, students' disruptive behaviours abound in schools. Such behaviours include: noise making in class, lateness to school, hatred for teachers, distracting others, interrupting the teacher, drinking alcohol, being domineering, pushing, fighting others, bullying, use of hand set in class, lack of interest, stealing, engaging in subject other than the one being discussed, attention seeking, staying outside the class as lessons go on, sleeping in class, and malpractices in assessments. Others include truancy, immorality, indecent dressing, use of drugs, cultism and challenging constituted authority.

Okolo, (2003) observed the prevalence of disruptive behaviours in Nigerian secondary schools as a factor militating against effective teaching and learning [1]. Eze and Umaru (2007), noted that in Nigerian schools teachers believe they spend a disproportionate amount of time dealing with behaviour problems compared with time spent on instruction and academic activities [2]. Disruptive behaviours among students does not only place the burden of assisting the students alone on the school counsellor, but that of the teachers who faces the stress of coping with such students and also the principal who has the responsibility of overseeing the disciplinary life of the school.

As a leader, the principal chooses from a variety of styles and techniques which various scholars have attempted to identify and classify. Shankar (2006) listed the principal's disciplinary approaches as follows: the autocratic, the democratic, and the Laissez-faire types. Democratic disciplinary style is the disciplinary style which emphasises the participation of both staff and students in making of disciplinary policies and decisions in the school. Autocratic disciplinary style is the disciplinary style which reserves the power and authority of decision making regarding disciplinary matters solely for the principal. Laissez-faire disciplinary style is the disciplinary style which allows complete freedom of the subordinates to do what they like without the principal's interference. The principal of a school usually adopts the approach which he deems suitable for achieving discipline in his school.

### **1.1. Statement of Problem**

Disruptive behaviours by secondary school students has continued to be on the increase with the attendant consequences. Defiance toward authority figures is occurring at startling rates (Becker-Fritz, 2000). Students are involving themselves in acts of cultism and gangsterism. This not only puts teachers at risk of injury, but students, as well. Students disruptive behaviours frustrates the whole aim of education as students no longer show commitment to their academic activities. The high rate of examination malpractices is a clear proof. Ikerionwu (2006) noted that results of eight percent of 86,657 students who took the 2005 SSCE were withheld based on well documented reports of cases of examination malpractice. On a similar note, Igwesi (2008) observed that except for 1996, the number of students who got involved in examination malpractice had been increasing on a yearly basis. Disruptive behaviours among students therefore, has become a major threat to the smooth running of our educational institutions and the attainment of their academic objectives. The principal as the administrative head then is saddled with the task of ensuring a disciplined environment conducive enough for learning to take place. This has to do with the disciplinary approach of each principal. Various principals therefore choose the best approach they are convinced is most helpful as far as discipline in their schools is concerned. But the truth remains that disruptive behaviours among students continues to constitute a major challenge to the administrations of many principals. And many principals seem to be helpless as their efforts towards curbing these seem not to yield much positive results. Whatever the style of discipline the principal chooses; it must be such that encourages students' display of desirable behaviours.

Different researchers have worked in the field of leadership approach and students' disruptive behaviours. Mbogori (2012), conducted a study on influence of head teachers' leadership styles on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Nairobi Province, Kenya. The study was carried out in 12 public secondary schools in Nairobi province. The study sought to achieve the following objectives: To investigate the influence of the head teachers' democratic leadership styles on students' discipline. To investigate the influence of the head teachers' autocratic leadership styles on students' discipline. To establish the influence of the head teachers' laissez-faire leadership styles on students' discipline. To establish whether other factors influence students' discipline other than the head teachers' leadership styles. Descriptive research design was used. The population comprised head teachers, teachers and students from 77 public secondary schools in Nairobi, and 12 schools were sampled. Data was collected using questionnaire and observation schedules. Findings revealed that majority of the headteachers were considered democratic, followed by the autocratic while laissez -faire style of leadership received the least support. Therefore, based on the findings of the study, it was concluded that the leadership style of the head teacher has a considerable influence on students' discipline in schools. Among the others, it was recommended that head teachers should adopt the democratic style which involves all in decision-making, it helps build preventive discipline and minimizes corrective discipline.

Kingori (2012), carried out a research on the influence of principals' leadership styles on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Tetu District, Kenya. The objectives of the study were: to establish the discipline issues in the schools, to establish if autocratic leadership style had an influence on students' discipline, to determine if democratic leadership style had an influence on students' discipline, to determine if laissez faire, transactional and transformational leadership styles had an influence on students' discipline. The study used a descriptive research survey. The population was 1635 and the sample size of 262 was used. Questionnaires were administered and data collected were analyzed using chi-square. The key findings of the study were that there were discipline issues in schools, most of the secondary school principals in the district applied autocratic leadership style at the expense of democratic, transformational and transactional leadership styles. The conclusion drawn was therefore that the application of autocratic leadership style was responsible for the discipline cases in the schools.

Cheloti, Obae and Kanor (2014), carried out a study which sought to establish the management styles used by principals and their influence on students' unrest in public secondary schools in Nairobi County. A descriptive research design was used. A sample of 15 principals, 60 class teachers and 600 students were selected using stratified, simple random and purposive sampling methods. Data were collected using questionnaires and interview guide. Inferential and descriptive statistics were used to analyze data. The results among other things indicated that autocratic style breeds hatred between administration and students, thereby causing unrest. It revealed that democratic style allows free participation in decision making and help diffuse conflict in school. The study recommended the democratic style as the best style to be adopted by Principals and recommended the combination of autocratic style and democratic style as next to democratic style.

These studies reviewed align with the present work in the area of the different disciplinary approaches, that is, the democratic, the autocratic and laissez-faire styles. However, their locations differ from the current study which focuses particularly on the relationship between principals' disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours in secondary schools in North Central Zone of Nigeria.

## **1.2. Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between principals' disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours in secondary schools in North Central Zone of Nigeria. Specifically, the study aimed to:

1. Ascertain the relationship between democratic style of discipline and students disruptive behaviours in secondary schools.
2. Establish the relationship between autocratic style of discipline and students disruptive behaviours in secondary schools.
3. Ascertain the relationship between laissez-faire style of discipline and students disruptive behaviours in secondary schools

## **2. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

The following hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance to serve as a guide to this study.

1. There is no significant relationship between principals' democratic disciplinary style and students' disruptive behavior in secondary schools.

2. There is no significant relationship between principals' autocratic disciplinary style and students' disruptive behavior in secondary schools.
3. There is no significant relationship between principals' laissez-faire disciplinary style and students' disruptive behavior in secondary schools.

## 2.1. Research Design

The design adopted for this study is correlational research design. This design is used because it is suitable for obtaining an understanding of the relationship between principal's disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours. The study was carried out in the North Central Zone of Nigeria. The population of this study comprise all the 1755 principals of the 1755 public Secondary Schools in the six States and the Federal Capital Territory that make up the North Central Zone. The researcher chooses to use public secondary school principals for this study owing to the fact that observable cases of students' disruptive behaviours seem to be more prevalent in the public schools.

The sample size for this study was 322 principals from 322 secondary schools in four States of the North Central Zone of Nigeria. This is drawn from the study population using the sample size table by research advisors (2006). The researchers used a questionnaire which was titled 'Disciplinary Approach and Disruptive Behaviour Questionnaire' (DADBQ). The reliability of the instrument was ascertained by means of pilot study using 30 respondents who are not part of the sample of this study. The analysis yielded a cumulative Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of .88. Pearson Product-Moment Co-relation Coefficient was used to test the formulated hypotheses at .05 level of significance.

## 2.2. Result

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between principals' democratic disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours.

Table 1: Correlation of Democratic Disciplinary Approach and Students' Disruptive Behaviours

Behaviour		Democratic	Disruptive
	Pearson Correlation	1	.457
	Sig (2-tailed)		.059
Democratic	N	100	100
Disruptive Behaviours	Pearson Correlation	.457	1
	Sig (2-tailed)	.059	
	N	100	100

Sig. (2-tailed)  $r = .457, p = .059 > .05$

Table 1 shows that the Person Correlation (  $r$  ) analysis is .457, sig(2-tailed) = .059.  $p = .059 > .05$ . This implies that the relationship is not significant because the p- value of .059 is more than .05. The null hypothesis is therefore, retained. This implies that there is no significant relationship between principals' democratic disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between principals' autocratic disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours.

Table 2: Correlation of Autocratic Disciplinary Approach and Students' Disruptive Behaviours

		<b>Autocratic</b>	<b>Disruptive Behaviour</b>
Autocratic	Pearson Correlation	1	.631
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.036
	N	181	181
Disruptive Behaviour	Pearson Correlation	-.631	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.036	
	N	181	181

Sig. (2-tailed)  $r = -.631, p .036 < .05$

Table 2 shows that the Person Correlation (  $r$  ) analysis is .631, sig(2-tailed) = .036 and  $p < .05$ . This implies that the relationship is significant because the p- value of .036 is less than .05. We therefore reject the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between principals' autocratic disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours. This implies that there is a significant relationship between autocratic disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relationship between principals' laissez - faire disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours.

Table 3: Correlation of Laissez-Faire Disciplinary Approach and Students' Disruptive Behaviours

		<b>Laissez- Faire</b>	<b>Disruptive Behaviour</b>
Laissez- Faire	Pearson Correlation	1	.611
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.042
	N	41	41
Disruptive Behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.611	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.042	
	N	41	41

Sig. (2-tailed)  $r = .611, p=.042 < .05$

Table 3 shows that the Pearson Correlation (  $r$  ) analysis is .611, sig(2-tailed) = .042,  $p < .05$ . This implies that the relationship is significant because the p- value of .042 is less than .05. The null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between principals' laissez – faire disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours is therefore rejected. This implies that there is significant correlation between laissez- faire disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours.

### 2.3. Discussion of Findings

Hypothesis one revealed that there is no significant relationship between democratic disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours in secondary schools in North Central Zone of Nigeria. The presence of democratic disciplinary approach reduces the presence of disruptive

behaviours among students. The more democratic approach the principal applies, the less disruptive behaviours the students exhibit. This implies that disruptive behaviours by the students are low where the principal uses democratic disciplinary approach. This finding is in line with the study of Katolo (2016), which established that principals in their respective secondary schools who practiced democratic leadership styles by encouraging open door policy where students are free to see them to explain their problems experienced less students 'disruptive behaviours. It established therefore, that principals' democratic leadership approach influence positively on public secondary school students' discipline. This finding is also in agreement with Duze (2011), who's finding clearly, indicated that there is significant relationship between the students' level of participation in decision-making and the internal discipline of the school. It is much easier for students to keep rules that they were part of those who made it than keeping to rules they feel was made somewhere and just thrown on them. It is not likely that they will revolt over the rules and regulations they themselves participated in making. Disruptive behaviours therefore, could be minimized among the students if democratic disciplinary approach is adopted. The study therefore, encourages democratic disciplinary approach. And went further to even recommend that all school administrators in Nigeria should wisely adopt participatory decision-making for optimal goal attainment. The finding also agrees with Mbogori (2012), who insisted that the leadership style of the head teacher has a considerable influence on students' discipline in schools. And recommended that head teachers should adopt the democratic approach which involves all in decision making, helps build preventive discipline and minimizes corrective discipline. Democratic disciplinary approach by involving students in dialogue and in decision making, promotes preventive discipline on the part of the students. Here the use of corrective discipline like punishment will be highly minimized. If the students are given enough reasons to see why those rules need to be there, which the head teacher who uses democratic disciplinary approach offers through his open door policy and dialogue, there would be less temptation towards disruptive behaviours. It thereby builds preventive discipline. The finding equally agrees with Owiti (2016), who's study revealed that the democratic leadership style helps in improving students' discipline and established that principal's democratic leadership approach influences students' discipline positively. This is very important because here, democratic approach is seen beyond just preventive discipline and corrective discipline to improving discipline. Democratic approach is concerned with the worth of every student and confers respect and self-esteem on the students with they in turn would like to uphold through self-respect. When the students are given trust by the principal, they invariably would respond with cooperation, high morale and team work. Under this climate, the students will collaborate with their Principal to provide a disciplined school environment.

Aneke (2012), however, have a contrary opinion. For him, the democratic approach of discipline with the associated freedoms and rights given to students probably make students to misconstrue the disciplinary approach as weakness on the part of school authorities. Being mainly adolescents, they readily abuse such democracy by behaving unruly. This position might have risen from a misconception on the proper understanding of democratic disciplinary approach. Democratic disciplinary approach does not mean undue freedom to warrant the students taking it as weakness on the part of the administration, instead it involves open-door policy that encourages participations by the students through which the Principal builds consensus (Goldman 2000). Just as it is well put in the finding of Shankar (2006), the democratic treatment of students makes them responsible persons with self confidence, emotional stability and sense of security. And so reduces incidence of students' disruptive behaviours.

The implication of this finding is that principals who use the democratic disciplinary approach have fewer cases of students' disruptive behaviours. This finding is justifiable because the democratic disciplinary approach opens the students to dialogue with the principal and

encourages openness on the part of the students. Students are part of the decision-making process on disciplinary issues and so they have the opportunity to make their feelings known and also contribute to whatever decision to be taken. Students under this approach feel more involved and committed to the school disciplinary projects. Democratic disciplinary approach makes the students stake-holders in the disciplinary life of the school. Being stake-holders confers on them the obligation to be more responsible and respectful towards school rules and regulations. This obviously will promote discipline in the school and as such less disruptive behaviours. This justifies the finding that Principals' democratic disciplinary approach has no significant relationship with students' disruptive behaviours, rather the use of democratic approach reduces students' disruptive behaviours.

The second hypothesis found that there is a significant relationship between autocratic disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours. Autocratic disciplinary approach correlates positively with students' disruptive behaviours in secondary schools in North Central Zone of Nigeria. This implies that autocratic disciplinary approach promotes students' disruptive behaviours. This finding is in agreement with Kuria (2012), who asserted that head teachers' use of autocratic leadership negatively influence students. That is to say, the more autocratic approach is used, the poorer the student discipline. This can be deduced from the popular concept of children born of military parents in the military barracks. Often, the iron-handed disciplinary posture of the parents makes such children more stubborn and resistant to disciplinary measures. Also, this finding agrees with Chege, Anne and Wanjiru (2012), who in their study found a significant relationship in the autocratic leadership approach and students' discipline. Principals who were using the autocratic disciplinary approach in the schools were easily identified by the level of students' discipline. This is further buttressed by Kingori (2012), who's key findings were that there were discipline issues in schools, most of the secondary school principals in the district applied autocratic leadership approach at the expense of democratic, transformational and transactional leadership approaches. The conclusion drawn was therefore that the application of autocratic leadership approach was responsible for the discipline cases in the schools. The implication here is that principals who adopt the autocratic disciplinary approach, which is an iron-hand, rigid coercive style, impact negatively on students' discipline and so disruptive behaviours among students is on the increase. This finding is consistent with Nzulumike (2000) who showed that the ready resort to unconvincing punishments by teachers is one of the major causes of undisciplined behaviour among students. Since the autocratic principal on give orders which must be obeyed, and the opinions of the students does not count, the natural feeling of being underrated could lead to lack of conviction on the part of the students about some of the disciplinary measures of the principal. This concurs with Ejionueme (2004), whose finding indicated that lack of clear rules of behaviour and excessive application of punishment for correcting misbehaviour are causes of bad behaviour among schooling adolescents. Autocratic disciplinary approach was therefore, not recommended for curbing disruptive behaviours among students because it involves absolute authoritarian control and gives little or no room for inputs but simply expects the students to follow the rules at all times. Similarly, this result aligns with Cheloti, Obae and Kanor (2014), whose study indicated that autocratic approach breeds hatred between administration and students, thereby causing unrest. When students are forced by the autocratic principal to follow the rules all the time and students are usually not given reasons for the rules, and there is little or no room for negotiations, the atmosphere is indeed charged with hatred and any little spark could lead to unrest. However, this finding does not fall in line with the finding of Aneke (2012), who declared that autocratic approach of discipline does not increase or reduce students' exhibition of disruptive behaviours. This could simply be as a result of the location of his study which is Obollo-Afor, in Enugu State, which is in the Eastern part of Nigeria, which the researcher carried out this work in the North Central Zone of Nigeria. The difference in location may account for the disparity of the findings. Notwithstanding, the

autocratic disciplinary approach as pointed out by Skiba and Peterson(2000), exercises harsh and punitive strategies that have not proven sufficient to foster a school climate that can prevent disruptive behaviours. This finding is justifiable giving the very nature of autocratic disciplinary approach. Where the principal directs and expects compliance. Here the power to discipline and decision-making resides solely on the autocratic principal, who make choices based on his own ideas and discretions, and would rarely seek or accept advice from the students. Autocratic approach is forceful, dogmatic and demining.

This will not be appreciated by the contemporary students who crave rapaciously for freedom, and expect to be respected even when they show nothing to deserve such respect. Under this kind of situation, the atmosphere is fearful and punitive (Stratford 2013). Since the autocratic principal takes decisions independently with little or no input from the students, a clear division exists between the principal and his students which may breed distrust, hatred, ill-feelings and sometimes silent competition which could degenerate to high level of disruptive behaviours among the students. This explains why students confronted by autocratic disciplinary approach often resort to violent protests. Instead of curbing students' disruptive behaviours, autocratic disciplinary approach rather provoke students' disruptive behaviours. Skiba and Peterson (2000), observed that harsh and punitive disciplinary approach have not proven sufficient to foster a school climate that can prevent the occurrence of school violence. Snowman (2014), captured it all when he stated that punishment does not permanently eliminate undesirable behaviours but at best suppresses them temporarily. Instead of helping to curb disruptive behaviours among students, autocratic disciplinary approach by principals of schools rather contribute to students' disruptive behaviours.

The third hypothesis established that there is significant positive correlation between laissez-faire disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours. That means laissez-faire disciplinary approach increases students' disruptive behaviours in secondary schools in North Central Zone of Nigeria. This agrees with Odo (2007), whose study not only identified the following as the prevalent disruptive behaviours: violence to fellow students, truancy, cheating in examinations, gross disobedience, writing on the walls, noise making, gossiping, and careless use of money, but clearly assert that laissez-faire leadership style by principals account for these students' deviant behaviours. This finding is also in agreement with Aneke (2012), who revealed that laissez faire style had dominant influence on students' exhibition of disruptive behaviours, since the Principal hands off the students to follow their desires. Furthermore, the finding is in line with Adefemi (2010), whose study revealed a correlation between the laissez-faire leadership style and school discipline. The finding also aligned with Kuria (2012), whose study revealed that head teachers' use of autocratic leadership negatively influence students' discipline. This implied that the more autocratic approach is used, the poorer the students' discipline. Accordingly, he insisted that laissez-faire leadership approach was not suited for use by head teachers because complete delegation without follow-up mechanisms created student discipline problems. This finding revealed the laissez-faire disciplinary approach, where the principals allow students to do what they like, as encouraging students' disruptive behaviours. This is obvious from the fact that laissez-faire approach gives undue freedom to students without the principal's interference such that the students make choices and decisions without being held accountable for such decisions. Is it a style where the principal allows a high amount of independence to the students. He tends to avoid power and authority and depends largely on the initiatives of the students. For Chamundeswari (2013), the laissez-faire disciplinary approach is characterized by a lack of involvement of the principal, the environment is nonpunitive, there are few demands on students, and there is a lot of freedom. This obviously inclines towards accommodating students' disruptive behaviours for the least, if not outrightly encouraging it. This is why Mbogori (2012), posit that the hands-off approach of the laissez-faire principal does not take long before discipline



starts deteriorating in schools. This will eventually affect the smooth running of the school programmes or worse still lead to strikes and other anti-social behaviours. The duty of the principal includes control of affairs, laissez-faire approach rather makes him permissive and he careless about the behaviours of the students whom he hardly gives time to monitor their behaviours. In most cases, laissez-faire principals do not prompt discipline because they are too liberal and flexible. This is why students' disruptive behaviours correlate highly with this disciplinary approach.

### **3. SUMMARY**

This study was carried out to determine the relationship between principals' disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behaviours in secondary schools in North Central Zone of Nigeria and the major findings are as follows:

1. There is no significant relationship between principals' democratic disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behavior in secondary schools.
2. There is significant relationship between principals' autocratic disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behavior in secondary schools.
3. There is significant relationship between principals' laissez-faire disciplinary approach and students' disruptive behavior in secondary schools.

### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings of this work, the following recommendations are made:

1. School counsellors should assist the principal to adopt democratic disciplinary approach which makes students responsible persons with self confidence, emotional stability and sense of security. This will help students to be more committed to the learning process and there will be decline in students' disruptive behaviours.
2. Counsellors through regular workshops should enlighten principals of schools to understand that the harsh and punitive tone of autocratic disciplinary approach has not proven sufficient to foster a school climate that can prevent the occurrence of students' disruptive behaviours.
3. School counsellors should educate principals of schools to enable them realize that laissez-faire disciplinary approach promotes students' disruptive behaviours. For such practice of complete freedom to the youngsters lead to chaotic conditions, juvenile lawlessness and increase in crime. Principals who practice laissez-faire disciplinary approach therefore, may make no meaningful progress in the fight against students' disruptive behaviours.

#### **4.1. Counselling Implications**

The findings of this study have some implications for Guidance and Counselling. The following implications are therefore considered.

1. School counsellors could organize periodic seminars for principals to update their skills on managing emerging and unfamiliar students' disruptive behaviours, such that the principals come to appreciate the benefits of involving students in decision-making about disciplinary life of the school.
2. Counsellors through individual counselling for students identified with disruptive behaviours could assist such individuals overcome such disruptive behaviours.

3. The school Counselors' good use of the notice boards and bill boards for campaign against disruptive behaviours among the students could be very helpful. The students may be enlightened on the benefits of self-discipline.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Adefemi, O. (2010). Principals' leadership styles and school discipline in Kwara State., Nigeria. *International Journal of Afro-Asian Studies*. 2(2), 41-51.
- [2] Aneke, C.C. (2012). Influence of school disciplinary styles on students' disruptive behaviours and motivation to learn in Obollo-afor education zone of Enugu state. Unpublished M.Ed Project, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- [3] Becker-Fritz, T. (2000). Emergency behavior management program. Retrieved 23rd March ,2017 from [www. Prevent schoolviolence.com/prog.html](http://www.PreventSchoolViolence.com/prog.html)
- [4] Chamundeswari, S. (2013), Teacher management styles and their influence on performance and leadership development among students at the secondary level. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development.* 2, (1), 53-67.
- [5] Chege, A., Anne, C., & Wanjiru, A. (2012). Influence of head teachers' leadership styles on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Nairobi County. Retrieved 23rd March ,2017 from [http://www. Research kenya.or.ke/ api/content/libraries/8](http://www.ResearchKenya.or.ke/api/content/libraries/8).
- [6] Cheloti, S. K., Obae, R.N., & Kanori, E.N. (2014). Principals' management styles and students' unrest in public secondary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 2(2), 47-60.
- [7] Duze, O.C . (2011). Students' and teachers' participation in decision-making and impact on school work and school internal discipline in Nigeria. *African Research Review*, 5 (2), 200 – 2014.
- [8] Ejionueme, L.K.J. (2004). Strategies for curbing the disciplinary problems of students. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- [9] Eze, U.N. & Umaru, Y. (2007). Teachers' perceived strategies for managing classroom disruptive behaviour in secondary schools. *Review of Education*, 18: 34 – 50.
- [10] Goodman, R. H., & Zimmerman Jr., W. G. (2000). Thinking differently: recommendations for 21st century school board/superintendent leadership, governance, and teamwork for high student achievement. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service. (ERIC Document Production Service No. ED480398).
- [11] Igwesi, B.N. (2008). Examination malpractice: Nigeria's education pain in the 21st century. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Research Development*,10(4), 40-45.
- [12] Ikerionwu, J.C. (2006). Cases of examination malpractice in secondary schools. *Nigerian Journal of Education Management*.5, 139-145.
- [13] Katolo, G.N. (2016). Principals' leadership practices and their influence on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Makindu sub county. Retrieved on 8th January, 2018 from <http://repository.seku.ac.ke/handle/123456789/1957>.
- [14] Kingori, C. M. (2012). Influence of principals' leadership styles on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Tetu District, Kenya. Unpublished. M.Ed research project, University of Nairobi.
- [15] Kuria, L. T. (2012). Influence of principals' leadership styles on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Kikuyu district in Kenya. Unpublished M.Ed Project. University of Nairobi
- [16] Mbogori, J. M. (2012). Influence of headteachers leadership styles on students discipline in public secondary schools in Nairobi Province, Kenya. Unpublished M.Ed Project, University of Nairobi.
- [17] Nzulumike, C.L. (2000). Philosophical analysis of indiscipline in secondary schools in Nsukka zone. Unpublished M.ED. Thesis, University of Nigeria Nsukka.
- [18] Odo, C.C. (2007). Factors responsible for students deviant behaviours in secondary schools in Imo State. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. University of Nigeria, Nsukka
- [19] Okolo, A. N. (2003). Strategies for handling adolescents psycho-social problems in secondary school. *The Educational Psychologist*, 1(1), 163–171.
- [20] JOWiti, B.O. (2016), Influence of principals' leadership styles on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Kikuyu Sub County, Kenya. Unpublished Med Thesis, University of Nairobi.
- [21] Shankar, U. (2006). Psychology of discipline. In kuppuswamy (ed.) *Advanced educational psychology*, 434 – 444. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers pvt. limited.

- [22] Skiba, R. J. & Peterson (2000). School discipline at a crossroads: From zero tolerance to early response. *Exceptional Children*, 66(3), 335-347.
- [23] Snowman, B. (2014). *Psychology applied to teaching*. (7th ed.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin company.
- [24] Stratford, M. (2013). The relationship between classroom management styles of teachers and the occurrence of discipline problem in international schools. *J.Adv. comput.sc.Technol* 8:05-10.

## APPENDIX A

### Disciplinary Approach and Disruptive Behaviour Questionnaire (Dadbq)

#### Section A: Background Information

Please Mark the Aproprate Box

1. Gender: male [  ] female [  ]
2. Location: Benue [  ] Kwara [  ] Nasarrawa [  ] Plateau [  ]

Instruction: Tick [  ] those options that represent your opinion.

#### Section B: Disciplinary Approach in the School

NOTE: S.A – Strongly Agree, A – Agree, D – Disagree, SD – Strongly Disagree

#### Responses

S/N	ITEM DESCRIPTION	S A	A	D	S D
3	Students need to be supervised closely, to prevent them from indulging in disruptive behaviours				
4	Students need to be part of decision-making process				
5	In complex situations, Principals should let students work problems out on their own				
6	Most students in general indulge in disruptive behaviour				
7	Providing guidance without pressure is the key to being a good principal				
8	Principalship requires staying out of the way of students as they do their work				
9	As a rule, students must be given rewards or punishments to motivate them to achieve good behaviours				
10	Most students need frequent communication from their principals				
11	As a rule, principals should allow students to appraise their own behaviours				
12	Most students feel insecure about their behaviours				
13	Principals need to help students accept responsibilities for their behaviours.				
14	Principals should give students complete freedom to choose how to behave				
15	The principal is the chief judge in disciplinary matters of students.				
16	it is the Principal's job to help students find their "passion"				
17	In most situations, students need little inputs from their principal				
18	Effective Principals give disciplinary orders and clarify procedures				
19	Students are basically competent, if given the chance they will behave well				
20	In general, it is better to leave students alone				

**Section C: Students' Disruptive Behaviours**

**Rate the Involvement of Your Students in the Following Behaviours**

S/N	ITEM DESCRIPTION	Very Low	Low	High	Very High
21	Noise making in the class				
22	Lateness to school				
23	Leaving school before closing time				
24	Hatred for teachers				
25	Distracting other students in the class				
26	Interrupting the teacher				
27	Fighting				
28	Lack of interest in the class				
29	Staying outside the class during lessons				
30	Sleeping in the class				
31	Malpractices during assessments				
32	Bullying				
33	Abuse of hard drugs				
34	Smoking of cigarette				
35	Cultism				
36	Dressing immodestly				
37	Calling teachers provocative nicknames				
38	Challenging authority of prefects				
39	Stealing				