



Influence of Board of Management's use of Charging Financial Levies for Renovation and Property Destruction on Students' Discipline in Public Secondary Schools in Machakos County, Kenya

Jorrum Mwei Mutiso

Doctor of Education Student, University of Nairobi, Kenya

mutisojorrum@gmail.com

Jeremiah M. Kalai

Lecturer, Faculty of Education, University of Nairobi, Kenya

jeremykalai@gmail.com

Ursulla A. Okoth

Lecturer, Faculty of Education, University of Nairobi, Kenya

Accepted 20th August 2024

Published 27th December 2024

How to Cite:

Mutiso, J. M., Kalai, J. M., & Okoth, U. A. (2024) Influence of Board of Management's Use of Charging Financial Levies for Renovation and Property Destruction on Students' Discipline in Public Secondary Schools in Machakos County, Kenya. *Msingi Journal*, 8(2), 58–71. <https://doi.org/10.33886/mj.v8i2.576>

Abstract

In a school set-up, discipline emphasizes on upholding effective students' moral values hence, an essential ingredient in school management. The purpose of the study was to investigate influence of Board of Management's use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Machakos County, Kenya. The study employed the Systems Theory. The study embraced a mixed methods design. The study had a population of 350 principals, 350 BOM chairpersons, 8026 class teachers, 700 student leaders and 240 disciplinary committee members. A sample of 35 principals, 381 teachers, 70 students, 70 disciplinary committee members and 35 boards of management members was selected through stratified, simple random and purposive sampling techniques. Questionnaire and interview guides were used to collect data. Two schools were used to conduct the pilot study to enhance the validity and reliability of the study instruments. The content, face and construct were ensured through expert and peer review. Instruments reliability was enhanced through the split-half technique. The descriptive statistics of frequencies and percentages and inferential statistics ANOVA were used to analyse the quantitative data using the Statistical Software for Social Sciences (SPSS). The information was presented in Tables. Qualitative data was analysed using themes and presented using narratives. The study established that there is a statistically significant difference between use of; Board

of Management's use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline ($F = 1,415 = 623.856$ and $p\text{-value} = 0.000$). Thus, the $p\text{-value}$ was less than the acceptable significant level of 0.05.

Key words: students' discipline, levies, board of management

Introduction

Research studies hold that discipline is a vital element of importance in human behavior without which an institution cannot function properly towards the achievement of its goals and objectives (Ouma, Simatwa, & Serem, 2013). In a school system, disciplined students are those students whose actions, inactions and behaviours conform to the predetermined rules and regulations of schools (Ali, Dada, Isiaka, & Salmon, 2014). However, discipline does not just relate to obeying the school rules and regulations but requires students to discern whatever is right or wrong (Gitome, Katola, & Nyabwari, 2013). Tozer (2015) opined that students' indiscipline has been a pervasive and serious issue and, in most cases, affect students learning. Indiscipline manifests itself in actions such as; truancy, riots, drugs and alcohol abuse, vandalism, arson among others (Marais & Meier, 2015).

Wet (2016) noted that school vandalism or destruction of school property is caused by former students, learners from neighbouring schools, drop-outs, drug and substance abuse, economic problems and student-related factors. However, teachers and school administration and management are considered less important causes for students' vandalism (Wet (2016). Lwanga and Atieno (2019) averred that students from humble backgrounds who faced problems of meeting extra charges for employing teaching staff and infrastructural development were forced to engage in indiscipline behaviour and sought for manual employment in salt mining and fishing.

Ofori, Tordzro, Asamoah and Chiaa (2018) classified the causes of students' indiscipline of school property destruction as; home factor, teachers factor and school factor. Acts of students' disorder include violence, rape, assaults, armed robbery, destruction of property and theft. In Ethiopia and Uganda, World Bank (2014) opines that parents who cannot afford to pay for extra costs retain their children at home hence, affecting their educational achievement. This implies that despite efforts made by different governments to ensure successful free and compulsory education, the issue of extra charges causes a threat to students' participation in education. Morogo, Kiprop and Too (2018) note that failure to comply with payment of school levies by parents negatively affects learning programmes and school physical resources.

Alio, and Chui (2023) note that hidden and extra costs influence students' enrollment rate, graduation rates and education achievement. Malonza (2020) asserts that most secondary schools do not involve students in setting school rules and regulations, food menu, extra school fees levy. Moreover, the two-way communication between students and/or parents and school was non-existent.

However, a few research studies explain that discipline has limited, uncertain and a negative significant impact on students' education achievement (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2014; Gakure,

Mukuria, & Kithae, 2013). Thus, the findings on influence of Boards of Management charges of financial levies on students' discipline are somehow inconclusive and inconsistent. Therefore, the inconsistency findings and the gaps identified prompt for further research study on influence of Boards of Management use of charging extra levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline. To address the gaps identified, the current study focused on Machakos County and embraced a mixed method design in investigating influence of Boards of Management use of charging extra levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline.

Statement of the Problem

Students indiscipline is a major concern among school management and administration, parents, teachers, governments and other stakeholders in education. The student's disciplinary issues arise from sneaking out of school, drug and substance abuse, assault, disobedience to school administration and fellow students' leadership, theft, refusal to attend classes etc. Indiscipline behavior has an adverse effect on student's consistency in learning and career choice and progression.

Charging of extra levies has inflated the costs of secondary education resulting in exclusion of many needy students from accessing it. At times most, students with minor and major offences are surcharged which has led to increased concern by parents and other education stakeholders if those levies are a sure means to arrest student's indiscipline. Some head teachers arbitrarily increase school levies on the pretext of students' indiscipline contrary to the MOE guidelines. At times, these extra levies are charged in total disregard of the parents' ability to pay (Njeru & Orodho, 2003) and indeed if it would result to effective students' discipline. As the Kenyan economy continues shrinking and the inflation rate bites coupled with student's indiscipline, most households face the problem of meeting the school's extra levies despite the Kshs 22000 per student annual subsidy, the National Government Constituency Development Fund (NG-CDF) and support given by other government and non-government sponsors in public secondary schools. However, charging of extra levies that arise from student's destruction of school property and vandalism is aimed to repair and replace the destroyed school properties and instill fear against the repetition of the vice.

Machakos County has experienced instances of students' misbehavior that include; bullying of other students, indulgence in drugs and substance abuse, theft and class boycotts, vandalism and burning of school property (County Education Office, 2020). This finding is supported by Nyang'au (2016) whose study revealed that public secondary schools in Matungulu Sub-County, Machakos County had witnessed 19.7% increase in students' misbehaviours. Hence, the need to conduct a study on influence of Boards of Management's use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on student's discipline in public secondary schools in Machakos County.

Objective of the Study

The main objective of the study was to establish the influence of Board of Management's use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Machakos County.

Hypothesis of the Study

H_{01} : There is no statistically significant difference between mean responses by Board of Managements' use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction and students' discipline in public secondary schools in Machakos County.

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will be significant to the Ministry of Education, Teachers Service Commission (TSC) and Schools' Boards of Management in policy formulation and implementation on students discipline management of secondary schools in Machakos County. The findings of this study may form the basis for further research in the stakeholders' participation in management of secondary schools and its role in enhancing students' discipline in the ever-changing global education landscape.

Delimitations of the study

The study focused on influence of Board of Management's use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Machakos County. The study participants were class teachers, disciplinary committee members, student's leadership representative, principals and chairpersons of Boards of Management.

Limitations of the study

Some participants were reluctant to take part in the study for fear that the information provided might be used against them by the school administration. However, the researcher assured the participants that the findings of the study were to be used only for academic purposes. The researcher assured the study participants their identities will be concealed by not writing their names and those of their schools anywhere on the study tools during filling and collecting instruments.

2.1 Literature Review

Myrick (2017) described indiscipline as unacceptable behaviours that are contrary to the schools laid down rules and regulations for its success. In Sweden, Durrant (2017) notes that student's indiscipline manifests itself in delinquency, truancy, theft, vandalism, assault among others. In Australia, Brister (2016) agrees that indiscipline behaviour of various forms among students is on the rampant. Kythreotis, Pashiardis and Kyriakides (2016) noted that involvement of the entire student's population in school management enhances students' discipline and behavioural change. In South Africa, Pillay (2012) holds that charging of extra levies for transport, instructional materials and physical resources was parents' obligation. Students from disadvantaged families who were unable to meet the requirements were forced to drop out of school, lowered graduation and enrollment rates. In contrast, Pillay (2012) study failed to focus on Board of Management use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline in public secondary schools as is the case for this study.

In Fiji, the government provides financial support for education in basic learning institutions besides teachers' salaries. In spite of that, institutions impose exaggerated extra charges for sporting activities, instructional materials, infrastructure, remedial work, uniform fee, school magazines

among others (Koya, 2015). However, Koya (2015) notes that students from poor families are disadvantaged because they are forced to drop out of school, and frequently sent home that result to students missing classes, engaged in truancy, low enrollment, low transition rate and inconsistency completion rate.

In Zimbabwe, Ngwenya (2016) notes that although primary school education in rural schools was free, extra charges such as; remuneration for teaching and subordinate staff, infrastructural repair and maintenance, examinations and boarding were rampant in schools. This had an impact on student's enrollment, dropout and graduation rates. However, the current study focused on influence of Board of Management use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline in public secondary schools.

Miako (2012) conducted a study on influence of charging school levies and its effect on access and retention in secondary schools in Nyandarua North Sub-County, Kenya. The total sample was 51 that comprised; 40 class teachers, 10 principals and 1 sub-county education officer. The study revealed that secondary costs remains high due to a variety of school levies charged. The study also established that students from low socio-economic status faced problems of absenteeism, low transition from primary to secondary school education, drop outs and low education performance because of extra charges in secondary schools. However, the quoted study was conducted in one Sub County in contrast to the current study that was conducted in a County that comprised eight Sub Counties. Similarly, the above quoted study investigated on influence of school levies and its effect on students access and retention compared to the present study that investigated on influence of Boards of Management use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline in public secondary schools.

Another study by Mutia, Cheloti and Maithya (2021) investigated the influence of charging extra levies on implementation of subsidized secondary education in day secondary schools in Kitui County, Kenya. The sample consisted of 164 school principals, 17 chairpersons of parents' association and 1 County director of education. The finding established a negative significant relationship between charging of extra levies and students transition and graduation rates ($r = -.747$; $p \leq .01$). This implies that payment of extra levies results in low transition and graduation rates.

Odoyo, Odwar and Kabuka (2016) conducted a study on influence of discipline on primary schools' pupil's academic performance in Muhoroni Sub County, Kenya. descriptive survey and correlational research designs were employed for the study. Using stratified sampling technique, 817 pupils were sampled from a population of 2450 pupils. The study adopted questionnaire as the only instrument to collect data. Instruments' reliability was tested using test-retest technique. The questionnaires' content and content validity was enhanced by university experts. It was established that pupils' discipline was low (5.6%), moderate (26.2%), high (50.6%) and very high (17.6%). It was concluded that discipline was positively correlated with pupils' academic achievement in which ($R = .480$, $\beta = .480$, $R^2 = .230$, $p < .05$). It was recommended that discipline should be enhanced in primary schools for pupils' academic achievement. Although the above reviewed study was rich in methodology, it however had limited participants and instruments when compared to this study that used class teachers, students, discipline committee members,

principals and chairpersons of Boards of Management as study participants. The present study used questionnaire and interview guide to collect data. Whereas the reviewed study was conducted among primary schools in Muhoroni Sub County, the current study was conducted in secondary schools in Machakos County.

Methodology

Research Design

The convergent parallel strategy belonging to the mixed methods research approach was employed for this study. Data was gathered in two phases. In the first phase, the quantitative data was collected while in the second phase the qualitative data was collected. The quantitative and qualitative data were later merged into a single finding for triangulation of the findings of the study.

Target population

Target population refers to the entire subjects from which a representative sample is derived for generalization of the study findings (Whitley & Kite, 2012). The study had a target population of 9316 that included; 350 principals, 8026 class teachers, 350 chairpersons of schools' boards of management, 350 students' leaders' representatives and 240 disciplinary committee members from all the eight Sub Counties of Machakos County.

Sampling and Sample Size

The study employed stratified sampling technique to sample 35 principals, 35 chairpersons of schools' Boards of Management, 381 class teachers and 70 disciplinary committee members from each of the 8 strata's in Machakos County. Stratified random sampling enables the researcher to select the population from diverse sub-groups that guarantees that the identified or selected sample to accurately represent the target population of specific characteristics (Jackson, 2014). Simple random sampling technique was also employed to select the actual sample from each of the eight Sub Counties. According to Black (2012) proportionate stratified random sampling technique occurs when the sample selected from each stratum is proportionate to the population in each stratum. Similarly, using purposive sampling technique the study sampled 70 students' leaders' representatives for the study. Purposive sampling technique considers the subjects with adequate and required information from the sample (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).

Study instruments

The study used two instruments to collect data. Questionnaire was used on class teachers, disciplinary committee members and student leaders' representatives to collect the primary data (Cohen & Morrison, 2012) because it involved more than one respondent (Creswell, 2014). According to Kothari (2011), the rating scale may include descriptions such as; strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree. In this study the questionnaire was premised on a 5-point Likert scale of strongly disagree (SD=1), disagree (D=2), undecided (U=3), agree (A=4) and strongly agree (SA=5). The rating scale for Boards of Management use of charging financial levies on students' discipline had five statements that were; punitive, exaggerated, discriminatory, reduce students' disciplinary problems and lack of parents and students participation. The questionnaire for the class teachers, disciplinary committee members and student's leadership representative were administered

separately but items merged into one table because the items were similar for comparison and contrast of the findings.

The interview guide was employed to gather qualitative data from secondary school principals and chairpersons of the school boards of management. The responses from the respondents were reported in narrative and prose forms. Questionnaire and interview schedules were merged into a single finding to triangulate the findings of the study.

Validity and Reliability of instruments

Validity of the instruments

Fawcett (2013) notes that a test is considered valid when it measures what it purports to measure. According to Rubin and Bellamy (2012) face validity is considered valid when the instruments measure the intended concepts. Rubin and Bellamy (2012) also state that content validity is the extent to which the instruments measure the contents of the study variables. In this study, the content, face and construct validity of research instruments were enhanced through expert's judgment (Siddiek, 2018; Orodho, 2009), in this case by the university of Nairobi supervisors and colleagues. The content validity index (CVI) was 0.7 that was further validated by the University expert's assistance in line with use of grammar, order of wording and use of words for both quantitative and qualitative instruments.

Reliability of the instruments

A pilot study was conducted in two schools. A total of 8 respondents were used for the purpose of the pilot study that included; 2 class teachers, 2 disciplinary committee members, 2 students leaders' representatives, 1 principal and 1 chairperson of Board of Management. The pilot participants were not included in the actual sample because of their prior access to the study instruments. Split-half technique was employed to test for the instrument's reliability. The pilot study aimed to identify and refine the weaknesses in the study instruments before the actual study. A correlation co-efficient of 0.7 was obtained (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003; Orodho, 2009) that ensured the appropriateness of the instrument's reliability.

Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized to analyse the descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics were calculated using frequencies and percentages and the results displayed in a table. The inferential statistics ANOVA was used to analyse the hypothesis of the study. The qualitative data from the principals and the chairpersons of boards of management were presented in prose and narrative forms. Participants' consent was first sought before collecting data. Participants' were assured of the confidentiality of their responses and that the study only aimed to gather data for the purpose of the study.

Findings and Discussions

Questionnaires return rate

Table 1.1 Questionnaire return rate

Participants	Number Issued	Number Returned	Percentage
Class teachers	381	292	76.64
Disciplinary Committee members	70	60	85.71
Students leadership	70	64	91.43

From Table 1.1, the teacher's questionnaire rate was 76.64%, disciplinary committee members 85.71%, and student's leadership 91.43%. This was possible because of the researcher's own initiative of the administration of the instruments. The high instruments return rate was appropriate for the study because Kothari (2009) indicate a return rate of 60% as suitable enough while Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) recommends an instrument return rate of 50% as sufficient for data collection, analysis and conclusion of the study findings. Therefore, the analysis of data provided in the research tools enhanced accurate sample representation for meaningful generalization of the findings of the study.

Board of Managements' use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline

The quantitative data was sought from the class teachers, disciplinary committee members and students' leaders' representatives. This information employed a five-point Likert scale as strongly disagree (SD) = 1, disagree (D) = 2, undecided (U) = 3, agree (A) = 4, and strongly agree (SA) = 5. The questionnaires for the class teachers (CT), disciplinary committee members (DCM) and students' leaders' representatives (SLR) were filled up separately but later merged during the analysis of data because the statements for the respondents were similar to compare and contrast the findings. The qualitative data was sought from school principals and chairpersons of the school Board of Management and reported in verbatim and prose form to validate the findings of the quantitative data. The respondent's responses are shown in Table 1.2.

Respondents views on Board of Managements' use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline

The study sought to collect and establish respondents' views on use of Board of Managements' use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline in secondary schools in Machakos County, Kenya. Their responses are shown in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2: Respondent's views on use of Board of Managements' use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline

	Statement	Respondents	SD	D	N	A	SA
i	Charging extra financial levies for students is punitive	CT	7 (24.7%)	2 (34.9%)	1 (15.4%)	0 (14.7%)	2 (10.3%)
		DCM	1 (19.9%)	3 (50.0%)	3 (6.8%)	0 (14.1%)	0 (9.2%)
		SLR	0 (1.7%)	1 (5.0%)	0 (11.7%)	3 (56.6%)	4 (25.0%)
ii	Extra financial levies charged for students are over charged or exaggerated	CT	84 (28.8%)	96 (32.9%)	51 (17.5%)	29 (9.9%)	32 (10.9%)
		DCM	2 (32.2%)	1 (44.5%)	2 (6.5%)	9 (9.4%)	0 (6.9%)
		SLR	0 (8.3%)	5 (13.3%)	0 (18.3%)	1 (40.0%)	1 (20.0%)
iii	Charging extra financial levies for students is discriminatory	CT	48 (16.4%)	147 (50.3%)	40 (13.7%)	35 (12.1%)	22 (7.5%)
		DCM	1 (21.2%)	4 (36.3%)	2 (5.8%)	3 (18.8%)	0 (17.9%)
		SLR	0 (1.7%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (11.6%)	7 (51.7%)	1 (28.3%)
iv	Charging financial levies for students do not reduce students' disciplinary problems	CT	29 (9.9%)	21 (7.2%)	49 (16.8%)	122 (41.8%)	71 (24.3%)
		DCM	0 (14.1%)	9 (18.8%)	1 (10.6%)	7 (33.6%)	2 (22.9%)
		SLR	0 (5.0%)	3 (5.0%)	0 (10.0%)	6 (48.3%)	9 (31.7%)
v	Setting for extra financial levies is not students and parents participatory	CT	57 (19.5%)	56 (19.2%)	37 (12.7%)	101 (34.6%)	41 (14.0%)
		DCM	0 (14.0%)	9 (21.9%)	1 (15.7%)	0 (28.1%)	1 (20.3%)
		SLR	0 (3.3%)	2 (6.7%)	0 (5.0%)	3 (55.0%)	3 (30.0%)

Where; CT = class teachers, DCM = disciplinary committee members, SLR = student leaders' representatives = SLR

Table 1.2 indicates that most class teachers 102 (34.9%) and half of the disciplinary committee members 30 (50.0%) disagree that charging financial levies is punitive. On the contrary, more than half of the student leadership representatives 34 (56.6%) agree that charging financial levies is punitive. This implies that school administration and management decide on the punitive punishment to be administered to the students without their participation. Most school principals and chairpersons of Boards of Management hold that the extra payments for destruction of school

properties and renovations instills fear and therefore helps to reduce students' disciplinary problems. The finding implies that students from low socio-economic background were unable to meet the cost of these extra charges that seemed punitive leading to students drop out and indiscipline behaviour. The finding concurs with Lwanga and Atieno (2019) who averred that students from humble backgrounds who faced problems of meeting extra charges for employing teaching staff and infrastructural development were forced to engage in indiscipline behaviour and sought for manual employment in salt mining and fishing in the neighbourhood.

From the findings, a majority of the class teachers 96 (32.9%) and disciplinary committee members 29 (44.5%) disagree that charging of students for extra financial levies for destruction of school properties and renovations are higher or exaggerated. This is in contrast to the 24 (40.0%) of the student's leaders' representative who agreed that charging of extra financial levies for destruction of school properties and renovations are higher or exaggerated. However, one of the chairpersons of the school Board of Management noted that schools charges for the destruction of property and renovation were in tandem with the expenses to be incurred. Koya (2015) had noted that in Fiji, schools impose exaggerated extra charges for sporting activities, instructional materials, infrastructure, remedial work, uniform fee, school magazines among others. This vice results to students missing classes, truancy, low enrollment, low transition rate and inconsistency completion rate.

The finding from Table 1.2 indicate that majority of the class teachers 147 (50.3%) and disciplinary committee members 23 (36.3%) disagree that charging students extra financial levies for destruction of school properties and renovations is discriminatory. The finding agreed with majority of the principals who agreed that payment of extra levies is not charged according to who participated and who did not participate. Similarly, most chairpersons of school Board of Management stated that the extra charges are not pegged on socio-economic status of students' background because the payment should equally be paid by all the students. This finding is inconsistent with the student leader's representative 31 (51.7%) who agree that charging students extra financial levies for destruction and renovation of school properties are discriminatory. This means that students who are unable to pay extra school levies face the problem of school dropout and inconsistency learning resulting to low educational performance. Pillay (2021) agrees with this finding by stating that school management charging of extra levies for transport, instructional materials and physical resources was parents' obligation and students from disadvantaged families who were unable to meet the requirements were forced to drop out of school, led to low graduation and enrollment rates.

From the findings, it can be deduced that most respondents; class teachers 122 (41.8%), disciplinary committee members 22 (33.6%) and students leadership representatives 29 (48.3%) agreed that charging students extra financial levies for destruction and renovation of school properties do not reduce students' disciplinary problems. The finding was supported by most chairpersons of the school Boards of Management and principals who held that students disciplinary behaviours are caused by a mileage of family related, school related, emergency related and students related factors but not mere charge for destruction of school properties. One of the principals had this to say;

“We only charge extra levies for destruction of the school properties but the actual cause for students misbehaviour can arise because of several factors that might be beyond the school management. For example, emergencies such as; food poisoning, lack of water and electricity, accidental death of a student among others may cause destruction of school properties by the students (Principal, 4).”

The finding is consistent with Zimmerman and Kitsantas (2014) and Gakure, Mukuria, and Kithae (2013) who reiterated that discipline has limited, uncertain and a negative significant impact on students’ education achievement.

Similarly, majority of the class teachers 101 (34.6%), disciplinary committee members 18 (28.1%) and students leadership representatives 33 (55.0%) agreed that setting extra financial levies to be paid by the students for destruction and renovation of school properties is not parents and students participatory. One of the principals had this to say;

“If we let students and parents to engage in determining how the property destroyed could be compensated, no charges will be administered and therefore the vice of students indiscipline will persist. Therefore, parents and students cannot be involved except for the Boards of Management and disciplinary committee members (Principal, 3).”

This finding agreed with Miako (2012) who echoed that the costs of educating secondary school students remains high due to a variety of school levies charged. Similarly, Miako (2012) further established that students from low socio-economic status faced problems of absenteeism, transition from primary to secondary school education, drop outs and low education performance because of extra charges in secondary schools. Malonza (2020) also agrees that most secondary schools do not involve students in setting school rules and regulations, food menu, extra school fees levy and the two-way communication between students or parents and school was non-existence. On the contrary, Morogo, Kiprop and Too (2018) note that failure to comply to payment of school levies by parents negatively affect learning programmes and school physical resources. This implies that parents and students were not given a free hand in determining the charges to be imposed on student’s indiscipline acts.

Relationship between Boards of Management use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students discipline

The inferential statistics ANOVA was used to indicate the relationship between Board of Managements’ use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students’ discipline. The null hypothesis stated that,

Ho2: there is no statistically significant relationship between Board of Managements’ use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students’ discipline in Machakos County. This is shown in Table 1.3. In this study, the relationship was considered appropriate because it compared means from different populations namely; class teachers, disciplinary committee members and

student leadership representatives. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was run and the results tabulated in Table 1.3.

Table 1:3 ANOVA responses on Board of Managements' use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline

	Sum of Squares	df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	659.586	4	164.897	623.856	.000
Within Groups	108.635	411	.264		
Total	768.221	415			

Results in Table 1.3 indicates that $F(1,415) = 623.856$ and $p\text{-value} = 0.000$. Thus, the $p\text{-value}$ was less than the acceptable significant level of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis accepted that; there is a statistically significant difference between mean responses by board of managements' use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students discipline in Machakos County. This indicates that use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction might be a deterrent to students' indiscipline misbehavior because of fear of surcharging financial penalties.

Conclusions

The finding concluded that charging of financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline does not minimize students' disciplinary problems and it is not students and parents participatory. Therefore, payment of financial levies for destruction and renovation of school property should be owned through students and parents' participation. These charges should not be viewed as punitive, overcharged and discriminatory. It was also established that there is a statistically significant difference between board of management charging of financial levies for renovation and property destruction and students' discipline ($F = 623.856$, $p < 0.000$). Thus, Boards of Management use of financial levies for renovation and destruction of property has an influence on students' discipline.

Recommendations

It was recommended that secondary school Boards of Management should have clear and fair charges on destructions and maintenance of school properties that do not disfranchise students and parents from low socio-economic status.

References

- Ali, A. A., Dada, I. T., Isiaka, G. A., & Salmon, S. A. (2014). Types, causes and management of indiscipline acts among secondary school students in Shomolu Local Government Area of Lagos State. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, 8 (2), 254-287.
- Alio, G. E., & Chui, M. M. (2023). influence of hidden costs on participation of students in public secondary schools in Mandera West Sub-County, Mandera County, Kenya. *African Journal of Emerging Issues (AJOEI)*, Vol (5), Issue 7, Pg. 21-33.
- Brister, C. (2016). Corporal punishment in Australian schools: *A Northern Territory Perspective*

- Durrant, J. (2017). Positive discipline in everyday teaching: Guidelines for educators. Sweden: Save the Children.
- Fawcett, A. L. (2013). Principles of assessment and outcome measurement for occupational therapists and physiotherapists: *Theory, skills and application*. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com>
- Gakure, R. W., Mukuria, P., & Kithae, P. P. (2013). An evaluation of factors that affect performance of primary schools in Kenya: A case study of Gatanga District. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 8 (13), 927- 937.
- Gitome, J. W, Katola, M. T., & Nyabwari, B. G. (2013). Correlation between students' discipline and performance in the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1 (8), 1 – 10.
- Jackson, L. S. (2014). *Research methods: A modular approach*. (3rd ed.).
- Kythreotis, A., Pashiardis, P. & Kyriakides, L. (2016). The influence of school leadership styles and school culture on students' achievement in Cyprus secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(2): 218-240.
- Kothari, C. R. (2011). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd ed.).
- Koya, F. (2015). Educational levies in schools in Fiji; Consumer Council of Fiji. Civic Towers, Victoria Parade Suva.
- Lwanga, C., & Atieno.W. (2019). When poverty, extra levies in schools push children into fishing. DN 22nd November 2019. Nairobi, NMG.
- Malonza, B. I. (2020). Influence of principals' management practices on discipline among students in public secondary schools in Matungulu Sub-County, Machakos County, Kenya. (Unpublished master's thesis), Africa Nazarene University, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Marais, M. & Meier, E. (2015). Perceptions of discipline and ensuing discipline problems in secondary education. *South African Journal of Education*. 20 (1): 34-41.
- Miako, J. K. (2012). school levies and their effects on access and retention since the introduction of the subsidized secondary education in Nyandarua North District, Kenya. (Unpublished master's thesis), Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Morogo, M., Kiprop, D., & Too, F. (2018). Impact of non-payment of school levies by parents on secondary school programmes and projects in Ainabkoi Subcounty, Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. *British Journal of Education*, Vol.6, No.7, pp.108-122.
- Mutia, P. M., Cheloti, S. K., & Maithya, R. (2021). extra levies as determinant factor in the implementation of free and compulsory education in public day secondary schools in Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management United Kingdom*, Vol. IX, Issue 6, pg. 142-166.
- Myrick, R. (2017). *Developmental guidance and counseling: a practical approach (4th Ed.)* Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media.

- Ngwenya, V. C. (2016). The best way of collecting fees without infringing on the Liberties of learners in Zimbabwean primary schools. *International Journal of Research in Business and Technology* Vol 8, No. 3, page 45-59.
- Njeru, E & Orodho, J. (2003). *Education Financing in Kenya: Secondary School Bursary Scheme Implementation and Challenges*. Nairobi. IPAR.
- Nyang'au, E. O. (2016). *Effects of disciplinary strategies on students' behaviour in public secondary schools in Matungulu district, Machakos County in Kenya*. M.Ed. Research project report. University of Nairobi.
- Odoyo, N. S., Odwar, J. A. & Kabuka, E. K. (2016). Impact of Discipline on Academic Performance of Pupils in Public Primary Schools in Muhoroni Sub-County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice* Vol.7, No.6, page 164-173.
- Ofori, K. N., Tordzro, G., Asamoah, E. & Chiaa, E. (2018). The Effects of Indiscipline on Academic Performance of Junior High School Students in the Fanteakwa District of Ghana. *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol.9, No.21, 109-117.
- Ouma, M. O., Simatwa, E. W., & Serem, T. D. K. (2013). Management of pupil discipline in Kenya: A case study of Kisumu Municipality. *Educational Research*, 4 (5), 374-386.
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2016). Empowerment series: Essential research methods for social work (4th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning Retrieved from <https://books.google.com>
- Tozer, J. (2015). *'We're letting the students take over': Teacher cleared over confrontation with Girl, 13, warns of anarchy threat*. South Africa: Pretoria printing press.
- Wet, D. C. (2016). The extent and causes of learner vandalism at schools. *South African Journal of Education* Vol 24 (3), 206- 211.
- Whitley, B. E., & Kite, M. E. (2012). Principles of research in behavioral science.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2014). Comparing students' self-discipline and self-regulation measures and their prediction of academic achievement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 39 (2), 145 -155. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com>