

## **Gender Differences in Decisions on Student Disciplinary Behaviours by Disciplinary Panels of Selected Kenyan Secondary Schools**

Peter J. O. Aloka and Olaniyi Bojuwoye

### **Abstract**

The study investigated gender differences in decisions on student disciplinary behaviours by selected Kenyan secondary school disciplinary panels which may be due to composition of disciplinary panels, perceptions of students presenting with disciplinary behaviours and behaviour expectations of students on the basis of school categories. The study employed mixed methods approach and collected both quantitative and qualitative data using questionnaire and interview protocol. Participants of the study comprised seventy-eight disciplinary panel members (45 males and 33 females) of ten secondary schools. The results revealed gender differences in decision making behaviours by members of Kenyan secondary school disciplinary panels, gender differences in the perceptions of students presenting with disciplinary behaviours and differences between single-sex schools and coeducational schools on presenting disciplinary behaviours perceived to negatively affect disciplinary tones of schools, the latter possibly to indicate gender differences in behaviour expectations of students depending on categories of schools.

Due to escalating violent behaviours of secondary school students, in Kenya, public secondary schools were directed to evolve appropriate responses to their students' problem behaviours. The Kenyan Ministry of Education (2005) directed all public schools to review and or overhaul all the rules and regulations for governing students' behaviours as well as the methods and procedures for administering minor and severe disciplinary measures, as stipulated in the Kenya Education Act of 1967 (Aloka, 2012). Each Kenyan public secondary school is also to make available to each student a booklet of school rules and regulations where it is clearly stipulated standards of behaviours expected of students in schools, how the standards are to be achieved, the sanctions for breaking school rules and the rewards for good behaviours (Aloka, 2012). Further effort at ensuring the implementation of schools' policies on student behaviours is the requirement that each school should have disciplinary panel or committee made up of a small group of teachers. The role of a Kenyan secondary school disciplinary panel is not dissimilar to the stated by Bridge House (2012) which is to ensure that students adhere to the expected norms of conduct including orderly school and classroom behaviours. As also opined by Yahaya, Ramli, Hashim, Ibrahim, Rahman and Yahaya (2009) each Kenyan secondary school disciplinary panel is to











































- Suls, J. (2000). Opinion comparison: The role of corroborator, expert, and proxy in social influence. In J. Suls and L. Wheeler (Eds.), *Handbook of social comparison: Theory and research*. Kluwer Academic / Plenum Press, New York.
- Suls, J. M. & Wheeler, L. (2000). *Social comparison processes: Theoretical and empirical perspectives*. Hemisphere, Washington D. C.
- Trautmann, S. T., & Vieider F. M. (2011). Social influences on risk attitudes: Applications in economics. In: Roeser, S. (ed.), *Handbook of risk theory*, Springer, Chapter 30, forthcoming.
- Zhu, H. (2009). Group polarization on corporate boards: Theory and evidence on board decisions about acquisition of premiums, executive compensation, and diversification. *Journal of Operations Management*, Volume, 27(6), 495-511.
- Wanjohi G. (2012). *300 Students From Two Schools in Nyandarua Go On Strike*. The Newspaper Editorial, 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2012.
- Wheldall, K., & Beaman, R. (1998). Disruptive classroom behavior: separating fact from fantasy. In D. Shorrocks-Taylor (Ed.), *Directions in educational psychology* (pp. 230 – 243). London:Wurr Publishers Ltd.
- Yahaya, A., Ramli, J., Hashim, M., Ibrahim, M. A., Rahman, R. R. R., & Yahaya, N. (2009). Discipline problems among secondary school students in Johor Bahru, Malaysia. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Volume, 11(4), 659-675.