

**Article History**

Received: 06.08.2023

Accepted: 14.10.2023

Published: 28.11.2023

Issue no: 1 | Vol no: 4 | November 2023: 235-248

## Relationship between classroom management practice and students' disruptive behaviour in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county, Mombasa County, Kenya

Mutua Mercy<sup>(1)</sup> Fredrick B. J. A. Ngala<sup>(2)</sup> Henry K. Kiplangat<sup>(3)</sup>

(1,2,3) Kabarak University, Kenya.

Main author email: [mmutua27@gmail.com](mailto:mmutua27@gmail.com)**Cite this article in APA**

Mutua, M., Ngala, F. B. J. A., & Kiplangat, H. K. (2023). Relationship between classroom management practice and students' disruptive behaviour in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county, Mombasa County, Kenya. *Editon consortium journal of educational management and leadership*, 4(1), 235-248. <https://doi.org/10.51317/ecjempl.v4i1.436>

**Abstract**

This study sought to assess and recommend ways of solving the problem of students' disruptive behaviour in the classroom in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county, Mombasa County, Kenya. The objective of this study was to find out the relationship between classroom control practices by prefects and student disruptive behaviour in the classroom mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county, Mombasa County, Kenya. The data was collected and analysed using a descriptive design, and the study's target population included 24 mixed secondary schools, 96 class teachers, and 840 form four students in Kisauni Sub-county. The study sampled 8 schools and 24 class teachers using both the purposive and simple random sampling techniques. A simple random sampling procedure was employed in order to select the actual students/respondents to participate in the study. Descriptive statistics computed included means, frequencies, standard deviation and percentages. In order to test hypotheses, f- and t-statistics shall be computed to test significant statistical differences at a 95 per cent significance level. Data were presented in diagrams, charts and tables. There is a moderate positive correlation between prefects' classroom control practices and students' disruptive behaviour ( $r = .269$ ,  $p .000 < .05$ ). Prefects' classroom control practices are an important predictor of the students' disruptive behaviour ( $\beta = .269$ ,  $p = .000 < .05$ ,  $t = 4.286$ ). The study is significant in that it will help teachers understand different student disruptive behaviours in secondary school, which will give directions on how to curb such behaviours.

**Key words:** Classroom management practices, classroom control practices by prefects, disruptive behaviour, order, prefects' responsibilities.



This article is distributed under the license of a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/). It is permitted to be used, reproduced and distributed in line with Editon Consortium Publishing guidelines. The work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified on the SAGE and Open Access pages

## INTRODUCTION

Students' disruptive behaviour is a major concern in many parts of the world (Babinski, 2022). For decades, students and teachers have been troubled by disruptive behaviour in their classrooms (Gregory et al., 2021). Kind of disruptive behaviour seems to be similar in character over time (Martinez & Losen, 2020). Students who engage mostly in disruptive behaviour also use drugs like Fags and alcohol (Monarque et al., 2023). Large-scale studies across many Countries in North America, Europe and the Middle East have shown that boys and girls tend to be victims of bullying at similar rates (Eijigu & Teketel, 2021). United States of America (USA) has identified disruption as the most serious problem facing the educational system of the nation. If students were bored, they were far more likely to look for ways to alleviate this boredom by talking and fighting (Explore Education Statistics, 2022). Brunner (2021) reported that teachers in South Africa were becoming increasingly distressed about disciplinary problems in class. In South Africa, 38.8 per cent of students reported that bullying was associated with poor academic performance (Mthethwa, 2021). The population and development director in Botswana remarked at the Commission on Population and Development's 45th session that Botswana was deeply concerned about the incidence of alcohol and substance abuse among the Country's youth and adolescents (Sebeelo, 2021). Kimanya secondary school in Masaka district were expelled for smoking marijuana and sneaking from school in Uganda (Scheier & Griffin, 2021).

School-wide approaches to disruptive behaviour involve implementing various programs by teaching staff to enforce positive behaviour and provide sanctions towards unwanted behaviour (Rafi et al., 2020). Slater and Main (2020) point out classroom management practices is the one of the prevalent challenges facing teachers because disruptive students take up valuable learning time. In secondary schools in Polland, prefects are student leaders who are elected and assigned specific duties and responsibilities by the school administration to

maintain students' discipline as one of the interventions (Eymeri & Tanguy, 2021). In many British schools, prefects have considerable power and effectively run the school outside and inside the classroom. The role of prefects is to assist teachers in maintaining acceptable behaviour standards, discipline and order among students (Berceanu, 2021). Prefects' responsibilities in Kenyan schools are giving directions, managing daily routines, presenting students' issues for action, and enforcing school rules and regulations (Geurts et al., 2023). Classroom management was considered a precondition for learning; effective teaching and learning cannot take place in poorly managed classrooms (Riden et al., 2021). Therefore, creating a positive class environment is important in preventing students' bad behaviour (Caldarella et al., 2021b). It is apparent that student disruptive behaviour was, therefore, a problem that affects secondary school students locally, nationally and internationally.

According to Aaas (2021), the conditions of students' disruption in secondary classes in Kenya are disheartening as violent behaviour incidences are widespread and frequent. Okumbe (2018) did a study on the management of students' behaviour in secondary schools in Nairobi County, which observed that teachers used a wide range of methods to manage student behaviour in class. These included expulsion, suspension, rewards, pinching and self-commitment in writing to maintain good conduct. At least all teachers experienced multiple disruptive behaviours ranging from dozing in class at (57.89%), poor management of class at (11.65%), lateness and handling assignments at (10.53%) in Embu East Sub-county. It was concluded that the effectiveness of the method of maintaining student behaviour depended on the traditions and ethos of their environments. It was clear that student disruptive behaviour was common in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county. A student may consider talking with other students sitting beside them as perfectly normal, not aware of their effect on the other students or the class (Rogers, 2020). This has been detailed below.

**Table 1: Kisauni Sub-county Suspension of Students on SDB Statistics in Mixed Secondary Schools from 2020-2022**

Disruptivebehaviour	2020	2021	2022	SDB (%) for 3 years
Sleeping	85	100	130	29%
Drug abuse	80	90	120	27%
Fighting	60	75	100	22%
Noise making	20	40	45	10%
Bullying	35	50	62	13%

Source: Kisauni Sub-county Education Office- SDB statistics Sep 2022

This situation calls for the need to investigate the relationship between classroom management practices and students' disruptive behaviour in mixed secondary in Kisauni, as there is a limited study done in the Sub-county to discover the classroom management practices to be used to deal with students' disruptive behaviour.

Disruptive behaviour was a serious problem facing secondary school students in Kenya, especially in the coastal region. Mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county have been experiencing student disruptive behaviour problems of various forms (Kisauni Sub-county Education Office, 2022). Kisauni Sub-county was chosen for this study owing to its cases of student disruption in mixed secondary schools. In 2020, the disruptive behaviour cases increased in that 5 out of 22 schools experienced bullying, sleeping, drug abuse and fighting among students in classes (Kisauni Sub-county Director of Education, *ibid*). According to Okumbe (2018), suspension was commonly used as a disciplinary method by teachers. It has been reported that many secondary school students in Kenya engage in disruptive behaviour in class settings (Babinski, 2022). Mixed schools had more cases of disruptive behaviour than single girls or boys schools. Shier (2020) found that mixed schools had internal problems that were related to fighting and substance abuse among students. Disruptive behaviour is uncomfortable and may cause frustration, stress, and lack of motivation and slow down social development (Mauliya et al., 2020). Disruptive behaviour is particularly worrying, considering the fact that some abusers have been suspended out of

the classroom. The Ministry of Education had directed all schools to set up effective classroom management practices to deal with disruptive behaviour, which most of the schools were experiencing among the students (Kisauni Sub-county Director of Education, 2022). It was, therefore, imperative to investigate the relationship between classroom management practices and students' disruptive behaviour in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county, Kenya.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Punishment Roles Played by Prefects

Amemiya et al. (2020) allow prefects to punish students for minor offences within the school and, at all times, assist the teaching staff in the general discipline of the school. Muller-Kuhn et al. (2021) assert that prefects play a key role in resolving conflicts among students for a peaceful learning environment. Class monitors help the teacher to create and maintain order in the classroom (Geurt et al., 2023). Effective classroom managers are more adept at preventing disruption from occurring in the first place (Rocha et al., 2020). Few studies have delved into the influence of punishment roles played by prefects on students' disruptive behaviour. Prefects work with and for the school community to ensure the smooth running of the school (Mutua et al., 2023). They should be able to command the respect of their fellow students, exercise authority in a responsible manner, and be proactive (Muller-Kuhn et al., 2021). Learners should have a say in the school's affairs, including disciplinary matters (Aryatiet al., 2021). According to the Ministry of Education (2022), a problem should be given

immediate attention and analysis, including how a student sees the payoff for his or her behaviour. Prefects should, therefore, be able to assist teachers in executing punishment roles.

### **Reporting Disrupting Students**

A prefect was one of the top leaders in a school. The Republic of Kenya (Irsheid & Teacher, 2018) observes that prefects represent other students in their prefecture and that they take responsibility for what happens in the classroom all the time. Strickland et al. (2019) observe that drug and substance abuse have a high clientele among school-going age. This was a challenge to prefects since they could also be victims or have to manage fellow students who were already intoxicated. Kamau (2017), in the study of the role of prefects, aver that they are very important in a school since they are the ones who interact more with students. Prefects must, therefore, be used to detect crimes in a class. Few studies have delved into the influence of reporting roles played by prefects on the influence of disruptive behaviour.

### **Modelling Behaviour and Performance by Prefects**

Prefects help by ensuring that the physical facilities are well maintained and utilised by the students without waste, and they act as role models to other students (Kashyap, 2021). Prefects achieve their objectives by setting goals and proposing what should be done in order to achieve the set goals. This could be done by encouraging other students to perform duties without necessarily being pushed or supervised (Rocha et al., 2020). For students to have a successful year in the classroom, they must understand and practice the behaviours a class teacher expects of them (Mutua et al., 2023). This trend puts behavioural analysis and behaviour modification into a broader social context (Lintner & Salamounova, 2020). Muller-Kuhn et al. (2021) observe that prefects or student leaders help in making the voices of students and opinions heard in school management and promote the general welfare of the students at the school level. Students could, therefore, be helped by prefects to know and reinforce what is appropriate as well as good cooperative behaviour.

### **Prefects Monitoring Students Doing Assignment**

The role of prefects includes supervising students as they carry out their duties, maintaining orders and discipline, and assisting in the running of the school's day-to-day activities (Rocha et al., 2020). The teacher can assign the class monitors any duties to help the classroom run more smoothly, safely and efficiently. A good classroom environment should promote independent learning (Shao et al., 2020). Teachers were under a significant amount of pressure to ensure that they provided a conducive classroom setting to students' academic and emotional success (Greener, 2021). It was also found that students who are able to participate in making decisions at the school level are more committed to decision-making and democracy in other contexts (Franklin & Harrington, 2019). Prefects are appointed to help the staff with duties as a routine (Tobia, 2022). Prefects arrange for proper supervision of the preparatory classes and deal wisely with minor cases of indiscipline (Kashyap, 2021). Therefore, prefects play a very important role in the classroom because of the functions they perform, like giving directions to other students whom they lead and setting the pace of activities for them (Irsheid & Teacher, 2018).

### **Theoretical Framework**

This research will be supported by the Classical/Scientific management theory. The theory guides an explanation of students' disruptive behaviour in class with classroom management practices used to handle disruptive behaviours. Fredrick Taylor believed that the reason most organisations fail is that they lack successful systematic management (Tintore et al., 2020). Teachers are instructed that a good teacher mark is to be in control of the class (Bokulich, 2020). Teachers should identify the cause of disruptive behaviours in the classroom, whether it is individual or collective (Kools et al., 2020). Taylor wrote that –the best management was true science resting upon clearly defined laws, principles and rules as a foundation.

The theory measures the application of five main classical management functions in the educational management process, namely planning, organising,

directing, staffing and controlling. The class should come up with plans and objectives to deal with disruption in the classroom (Riden et al., 2021). Then, the class teacher is to organise and put the resources that are available in order of priority and preference. Teachers' management features were effective in solving problems (Granero-Gallegos et al., 2020). Class teachers structure students' work lives by maintaining systems and rules. These enable teachers to shape appropriate behaviour effectively and minimise disruptive behaviours (Slater & Main, 2020). Classroom disruption is often indicated as the main cause of wasted classroom time (Babinski, 2022). Classical management theory enables teachers to help students get things done, and students see how they owe it to the amazing insights they have every day to figure out how to manage time and energy for ideas to emerge and be shared.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

This study employed a descriptive survey design. Descriptive survey design is used in preliminary and exploratory studies (Walter, 2021) to allow researchers to gather information, summarise, present and interpret for the purpose of clarification. Adam (2020) notes that a survey is a method of gathering information by administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals. McCombes (2019) noted that survey research was intended to produce statistical information about an aspect of education that interests policymakers and educators.

### Population of the Study

Casteel and Bridier (2021) define a target population as the particular entity of people, objects or units to which a researcher can reasonably generalise his or her research findings. The target population comprised all 24 mixed secondary schools, 96 class teachers, and 840 form four students in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county, Kenya.

### Sampling Procedures and Sample Size

The target population comprised all 24 mixed secondary schools, 96 class teachers, and 840 form-four students. Eight schools (30% of the target population) were sampled. Purposive sampling was used to sample 8 schools which are notorious for disruptive behaviour (Campbell et al., 2020). On average, each form four class has 3 streams. The researcher sampled an average of 3 class teachers per school to represent at least (100%) of all form four class teachers. That is, from the 8 schools, 24 class teachers constituted the sample size (3 class teachers of form four classes in the 8 schools). Using Krejcie and Morgan's table of sample size determination (1970), a sample size of 265 was obtained from a target population of 840. This study used a simple random sampling method in order to select the actual students/respondents to participate in the study. The research implemented qualitative and quantitative data methods to measure the variables in the study.

**Table 2: Sample Size**

Population	Target population	Sample size	Percentage
Class teachers	96	29	30%
Students	840	265	30%
<b>TOTAL</b>	936	294	30%

Mulisa (2022) stated that selecting the sample was dependent upon the research problem. The sample size of this research will be 265 students, that is (30%) of the population, at a confidence level of 95 per cent according to the sample size calculation from Krejcie and Morgan table. According to Adam (2020), at least (30%) of the cases per group were required for

research. The actual sample consists of 840 students and 96 class teachers. This sample was a convenient sample (Berndt, 2020). Table 2 gives more details on the breakdown of schools, students, and class teachers who were sampled proportionately.



### Instrumentation

The research instruments used in this study were questionnaires. Questionnaires were the most reliable tool for collecting data on such phenomena (Alnaami & Masuadi, 2020). The researcher used the Teachers' and Students' questionnaire. Questionnaires were administered to students and class teachers. Different students' disruptive behaviour was assessed using 6 items, asking participants to assess disruptive behaviour misbehaved by students in class.

### Reliability of the Instrument

The researcher used a split-half method of testing reliability. Split-half reliability measures the degree of internal consistency by checking one-half of the results of a set of scaled items against the other half (Maier & Lakens, 2020). In the split-half method, each person obtains two scores by dividing the test into equivalent halves. The researcher established the internal reliability of the instrument by using the Cronbach alpha method. It involves a single administration of the instrument, which yields greater internal consistency (Morey, 2020). By piloting the instruments, ambiguous items were removed. A reliability coefficient of 0.8 and above was considered acceptable (Willan & Thabane, 2020).

### Data Analysis, Interpretation and Presentation

Data analysis is the vehicle to generate and validate interpretations, formulate inferences and draw conclusions (Cho et al., 2021). The data gathered was analysed using inferential and descriptive statistics. Data was coded and entered for analyses using SPSS version 25.0. The descriptive statistics calculated were frequencies, means, and percentages and p-values and T-tests were used to test the hypotheses (Gradesfixer, 2019).

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings contain analysis of the data collected with regard to the identified objectives in which the independent variables, namely, Classroom control practices by prefects and the influence on the dependent variable, student disruptive behaviours in Kisauni Sub-county, were examined.

#### Response Rate

The respondents gave out a total of 294 questionnaires, of which 29 were for teachers, and 265 were for students. Of the questionnaires given to the teachers, all (100%) were duly received and found to be okay for data analysis.

**Table 3: Response Rate**

	Issued	Returned	Per cent
Teachers	29	29	100
Students	265	208	78.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>89.25</b>

Of the questionnaires given to the students, 226 were received. On examination, 18 were found to be wrongly filled with errors such as double ticks and blank areas. These were set aside, leaving 208, which were used in the data analysis, corresponding to a (78.5%) response rate. The overall response rate was (89.25%). According to Madson and Cooper (2021),

this is an acceptable response rate that meets the acceptable standards of survey research. This is a sufficient response rate for providing information regarding the relationship between classroom management practices and students' disruptive behaviour in mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county, Kenya.

**Table 4: Response to Classroom Control Practices by Prefects**

Item	Students Responses				Teachers Responses			
	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Our prefects report students who are disruptors to the class teacher	1	5	4.10	1.155	3	5	4.76	.511

Our class prefects ensure that all students complete assignment	1	5	2.00	1.272	4	5	4.86	.351
Prefects punish students who misbehave in class	1	5	2.01	1.268	2	5	4.03	.731
Prefects keep keys to classrooms and laboratories	1	5	3.04	1.583	1	5	3.21	.978
Prefects guide and counsel disruptors in class	1	5	4.24	1.159	1	5	4.07	1.120
Prefects frisk students suspected of misbehaving before entering class	1	5	2.93	1.476	2	5	3.66	.857
Our prefect ensures that all students do the assignment as instructed by the teacher	1	5	3.93	1.358	4	5	4.76	.435
Our prefects, being the role models, they behave well and perform better in class	1	5	2.24	1.480	3	5	4.69	.660
<b>Overall mean</b>			<b>3.06</b>	<b>1.344</b>			<b>4.26</b>	<b>.705</b>
<b>Combined mean</b>							<b>3.66</b>	<b>1.025</b>

Evaluation of the results on classroom control practices by prefects shows that teachers had higher means compared to students in all but one of the statements. This was in Prefects guide and counsel disruptors in class, whereby students had a mean of 4.24( $SD = +1.159$ ) while teachers had a mean of 4.07 ( $SD = +1.120$ ). Our class prefects ensured that all students who completed assignments had the highest disparity, with students having a mean of 2.00 ( $SD = +1.272$ ) corresponding to rarely, with teachers having a mean of 4.86 ( $SD = +0.351$ ), which corresponds to frequently. According to Rogowsky et al. (2020), teachers should encourage students to complete assignments and engage in other learning activities.

They should stick to rules set for completion of the assignment and let them be responsible for themselves. Students who are attending to academic tasks cannot at the same time be engaged in disruptive off-task behaviour. Alqahtani (2020) further said that teachers should ensure that there is clear communication of assignments and monitor their progress and completion of assignments. The overall mean for the students' responses was 3.06 ( $SD = +1.344$ ), while that for teachers was 4.26 ( $SD = +0.705$ ), with the combined mean being 3.66 ( $SD = +1.025$ ). This means that the respondents find that classroom control practices by prefects occur moderately.

**Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on Classroom Control Practices by Prefects**

Item		Never	Rarely	Sometime s	Frequentl y	Always	Mea n	SD
Our prefects report students who are disruptors to the class teacher	Teacher s	0(0%)	0(0%)	1(3.4%)	5(17.2%)	23(79.3%)	4.76	.511
	Students	8(3.8%)	11(5.3%)	48(23.1%)	27(13.0%)	114(54.8%)	4.10	1.155
Our prefects report students who are	Teacher s	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	4(13.8%)	25(86.2%)	4.86	.351
	Students	106(51.0%)	40(19.2%)	33(15.9%)	13(6.3%)	16(7.7%)	2.00	1.272

disruptors to the class teacher								
Prefects punish students who misbehave in class	Teacher s	0(0%)	1(3.4%)	4(13.8%)	17(58.6%)	7(24.1%)	4.03	.731
	Students	106(51.0%)	34(16.3%)	45(21.6%)	5(2.4%)	18(8.7%)	2.01	1.268
Prefects keep keys to classrooms and laboratories	Teacher s	1(3.4%)	4(13.8%)	16(55.2%)	4(13.8%)	4(13.8%)	3.21	.978
	Students	57(27.4%)	20(9.6%)	52(25.0 %)	15(7.2%)	64(30.8%)	3.04	1.583
Prefects guide and counsel disruptors in class	Teacher s	1(3.4%)	2(6.9%)	5(17.2%)	8(27.6%)	13(44.8%)	4.07	1.120
	Students	5(2.4%)	24(11.5%)	18(8.7%)	30(14.4%)	131(63.0%)	4.24	1.159
Prefects frisk students suspected of misbehaving before entering class	Teacher s	0(0%)	2(6.9%)	11(37.9%)	11(37.9%)	5(17.2%)	3.66	.857
	Students	47(22.6%)	45(21.6%)	38(18.3%)	31(14.9%)	47(22.6%)	2.93	1.476
Our prefect ensures that all students do the assignment as instructed by the teacher	Teacher s	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	7(24.1%)	22(75.9%)	4.76	.435
	Students	20(9.6%)	16(7.7%)	31(14.9%)	33(15.9%)	108(51.9%)	3.93	1.358
Our prefects, being the role models, they behave well and perform better in class.	Teacher s	0(0%)	0(0%)	3(10.3%)	3(10.3%)	23(79.3%)	4.69	.660
	Students	105(50.5%)	23(11.1%)	35(16.8%)	16(7.7%)	29(13.9%)	2.24	1.480
<b>Overall mean</b>						<b>Teachers</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>.705</b>
						<b>Students</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>1.344</b>



Combined overall mean							3.66	1.025
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	------	-------

Our prefects report students who are disruptors to the class teacher, with (3.4%) of the teachers saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and (96.5%) saying it does happen frequently or always. With respect to the students, (3.8%) said that it never occurs, while (28.4%) said it happens rarely or sometimes and (67.8%) said it happens frequently or always. Our prefects report students who are disruptors to the class teacher, with all (100%) of the teachers saying it occurs frequently and always. Among the students, (51%) said that it never occurs, while (35.1%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes and (14%) said it happens frequently or always. Prefects punish students who misbehave in class; (17.2%) of the teachers said it occurs rarely or sometimes, and (82.7%) said it happens frequently or always. Among the students, (51%) said that it never occurs, while (37.9%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes and (11.1%) said it happens frequently or always. Prefects keep keys to classrooms and laboratories had 3.4 per cent of the teachers said this never happens, (69%) saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and (27.6%) saying it happens frequently or always. Among the students, (27.4%) said that it never occurs, while (34.6%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes and (38%) said it happens frequently or always.

Prefects guide and counsel disruptors in class had (3.4%) of the teachers saying it never happens, (24.1%) saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and (72.4%) saying it happens frequently or always. Among the students, (2.4%) said that it never occurs, while (20.2%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes and (77.4%) said it happens frequently or always.

Prefects frisk students suspected of misbehaving before entering class, (44.8%) of the teachers said it occurs rarely or sometimes, and (55.2%) said it happens frequently or always. As per the students, (22.6%) said that it never occurs, while (39.9%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes and (37.5%) said it happens frequently or always. Our prefects ensure that all students do assignments as instructed by the teacher (100%), saying it happens frequently or always. Among the students, (9.6%) said that it never occurs, while (22.6%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes and (67.8%) said it happens frequently or always. Our prefects, being the role models, behave well and perform better in class, with (10.3%) of the teachers saying it occurs rarely or sometimes and (89.7%) saying it happens frequently or always. Among the students, (50.5%) said that it never occurs, (27.9%) said it occurs rarely or sometimes and (21.6%) said it happens frequently or always.

According to Holland et al. (2021), teachers should encourage students to complete assignments and engage in other learning activities. They should stick to rules set for completion of the assignment and let them be responsible for themselves. Students who are attending to academic tasks cannot at the same time be engaged in disruptive off-task behaviour. Alqahtani (2020) further said that teachers should ensure that there is clear communication of assignments and monitor their progress and completion of assignments. This means that the respondents find that classroom control practices by prefects occur moderately.

### Correlation Analysis

**Table 6: Correlation Analysis**

Variable	Students Disruptive Behaviour	
Prefects' Classroom Control Practices	Pearson Correlation	.305**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	237

The Pearson Correlation between Prefects' Classroom Control Practices and Students'

Disruptive Behaviour is .269 ( $p = .000 < .05$ ). This shows there is a weak correlation between Prefects'

classroom control practices and students' disruptive | behaviour.

**Table 7: Model Summary of Prefects' Classroom Control Practices**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.269a	.073	.069	.70553
a. Predictors: (Constant), Prefects' Classroom Control Practices				

The model exhibits a goodness of fit, as shown by the adjusted R<sup>2</sup> value of .069. Accordingly, it can be inferred that changes in the independent variable of prefects' classroom control practices account for about six points nine per cent (6.9%) of the

variability in the student's disruptive behaviour. As a result, there are additional elements that contribute to the remaining (93.1%) of the diversity in students' disruptive behaviour in the mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county, Kenya.

**Table 8: ANOVA of Prefects' Classroom Control Practices**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9.145	1	9.145	18.372	.000b
	Residual	116.975	235	.498		
	Total	126.120	236			
A. Dependent Variable: Students' Disruptive Behaviour						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Prefects' Classroom Control Practices						

The F calculated value of 18.372 exceeds the F table value of 3.942 (df. 572,  $p=.000 < .05$ ). This result is important because it supports the discovery made by the regression model and shows that prefects'

classroom control practices are an important predictor of students' disruptive behaviour.

**Table 9: Model Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.894	.209		9.044	.000
	Prefects' Classroom Control Practices	.273	.064	.269	4.286	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Students Disruptive Behaviour						

The model coefficient shows that prefects' classroom control practices are an important predictor of students disruptive behaviour in the mixed secondary schools in Kisauni Sub-county, Kenya ( $\beta = .269$ ,  $p = .000$ ). The t value = 4.286 is also significant. This is a serious matter, as reported by (Massonie et al., 2020), who found that a noisy environment may have a negative impact on the ability of students to remain academically engaged. As per WHO et al. (2023), teachers may suffer from exhaustion if they are not successful in their efforts to manage their classrooms and facilitate a quiet environment and good possibilities for the students to learn.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Conclusion:** The study concludes that classroom control practices by prefects are handled well. This is because prefects report students who are disruptors to the class teacher, class prefects ensure that all students complete assignments, the prefects are involved in punishing students who misbehave in class, and prefects generally keep keys to classrooms and laboratories. Other results show that prefects are active in guiding and counselling disruptors in class, and they are also involved in frisking students suspected of misbehaving before entering class, and they also ensure that all students do the assignment as instructed by the teacher. Altogether, prefects

being the role models, they behave well and perform better in class.

**Recommendations:** The Prefect's duty should be clearly defined by classroom managers to avoid conflict with skills negotiation in order to execute their duties as prefects. There should be school forums where all students are involved and sensitised that prefects are there to help them in day-to-day running schools/classes since teachers alone cannot run all students effectively. Students should be actively engaged in problem-solving and applying new knowledge to real-world problems rather than textbooks to be more motivated. Schools should also be strongly encouraged to utilise students as partners

in decision-making processes. Methods of maintaining student behaviour are of paramount importance to students. There is a need to conduct research to find out the influence of methods of maintaining student behaviour on test scores in classes in Kenya. Further studies also need to be carried out on the role of parents in maintaining student behaviour in secondary schools. This is because parents are called upon when their children are either suspended or expelled from school due to students misbehaving in school. The studies should be done in other parts of Kenya to validate the current discussions.

## REFERENCES

- Aaas, K. (2021). Learning through Communication: Exploring learning potential in teacher teams lesson study talk. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, 10(1), 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1108/1jll-07-2020>
- Adam, A. (2020). Sample size determination in survey research. *Journal of Scientific Research & Reports*, 26(5), 90–97. <https://doi.org/10.9734/JSRR/2020/v26I530263>
- Alnaami, N., & Masuadi, E. (2020). Clinical Learning Evaluation Questionnaire: A Confirmatory factor analysis. *Adv Med Educ Pract*. 11, 953-61.
- Alqahtani, R. M. (2020). The Effects of a Token Economy System to Improve Social Academic and Behaviour Skills with Children in KSA. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 10(3), p.11.
- Amemiya, J., Fine, A., & Wang, M. (2020). Trust and discipline: Adolescent's institutional and teacher trust predict classroom behavioural engagement following teacher discipline. *Child Development*, 91(2), 66-678. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13233>
- Aryati, P.A., Hikmat, M. H. & Thoyibi, M. (2021). Strategies to Cope with Students' Discipline Problems in Senior High School. *Indonesian Journal on Learning and Advance Education (IJOLAE)*, 3(1), 40-47. <http://journals.a.id/index.php/ijolae/article/view/9474>
- Babinski. E. (2022). Disruptive Behaviour Disorders in Children and Adolescents. Reference module in *Neuroscience and Biobehavioural Psychology*, 5.412-423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-8-818697-8>
- Berceanu, I. (2021). The Institution of the Prefect According to the Romanian Administration Code, 2019, *MPRA*, 92651. [https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/92651/1/MPRA\\_paper\\_92615](https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/92651/1/MPRA_paper_92615)
- Berndt, E. (2020). Sampling Methods. *Journal of Human Lactation*, 36(2), 24–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/080334420906850>
- Bokulich, A. (2020). Towards a Taxonomy of the Model- ladenness of data. *Philosophy of Science*, 87(5), 793–806.
- Brunner, C. (2021). Conceptualising epistemic violence. An Interdisciplinary and assemblage for IR. *Int. Polit.*, pp. 9, 193–212.
- Caldarella, p., Larsen, R., Williams, L., Wills, H., & Wehby J. (2021b). Effects of Middle School Teachers' Praise-to-reprimand Ratios on Students' Classroom Behaviour. *Journal of Positive Behaviour Interventions*. Advanced online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10983007211035185>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling. Complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652.661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/744987120927206>

- Casteel, A., Bridier, N. (2021). Describing Population and Samples in Doctoral Student Research. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 16, 33362
- Cho, S., Weng, C., Kahn, M., & Natarajan, K. (2021). Identifying Data Quality Dimensions for person-generated wearable devices data: Multi-method study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 9(12), e31618.
- Eijigu, T., & Teketel, S. (2021). Bullying in schools: prevalence, bystanders reaction and associations with sex and relationships. *BMC Psychology*, 9(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-021-00685-5>
- Explore Education Statistics. (2022). *School, Pupils and their Characteristics*. <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/school-pupils-andtheir-characteristics>
- Eymeri-Douzan, J., & Tanguy, G. (2021). Prefects, Governor and commissioners. *Territori Representatives of State in Europe, Birmingham: Palgrave Macmillan*.
- Franklin, H., & Harrington, I. (2019). A review into effective classroom management and strategies for student engagement: Teacher and student roles in today's classroom. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 7(12), 1.
- Geurts, E., Reijls, R., Leenders, H., Jansen, M., & Hoebe, C. (2023). Co-creation and Decision-Making with students about Teaching and Learning: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Educational Change. Advanced online publication*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10>
- Gradesfixer. (2019). *Research Methodology: Exploratory, Descriptive and Explanatory*.
- Granero-Gallegos, A., Gomez-Lopez, M., Baena-Etremera, A., & Martinez-Molina, M. (2020). Interaction effects of disruptive behaviour and motivation profiles with teacher competence and school satisfaction in secondary school physical education. *International Journal of Environmental*, 17(1), 114. <https://doi.org/10.90/ijerph17010114>
- Greener, S. (2020). Attendance and attention. *Interactive Learning Environment*, 28(1), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820>
- Gregory, A., Osher, D., Bear, G., Jagers, J. & Sprague, R. (2021). Good intentions are not enough: Centering Equity in School Discipline Reform. *School Psychology Review*, 50(2-3), 220. <https://doi.10.1080/2372966x.2020.1861911>
- Holland, M., Courtney, M., & Vergara, J. (2021). Homework and children: Purpose, policy and non-academic impact, *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 50(4), pp.631–651.
- Irsheid, E. A. I., & Teacher, E. S. L. (2018). The Effectiveness of Students' Involvement in Leadership Process in Schools and its Impact on Increasing Their Academic Achievement in Jordanian Schools: The Case of Schools in Ramtha City. *International Journal of Education and Research & Development*, 6(9)47-56.
- Kamau, A. (2017). *Influence of Students' Council Involvement in Management of Students' Discipline in Public Secondary Schools in Naivasha Sub-county, Kenya*. (Doctoral Dissertation University of Nairobi). <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/handle11295/101380>
- Kashyap, D. (2021). *Essay on Discipline: Definition, Concept, Components and Principle*. <https://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/essay/discipline/essay-on-discipline-definition-concepts-components-and-principles/3727>
- Kisauni Sub-county Education Office. (2022). *Education Management Information System (EMIS) June 2020*.
- Kools, M., George, B., & Steijn, B. (2020). Developing schools as learning organisations- “Why” and “How”? *European Journal of Education*, 55(1), 3-8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12384>
- Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*.
- Lintner, T., & Salamounova, Z. (2021). Classroom Space and Student Positions in Peer Social Networks. An exploratory study. *Studia Paedagogical*, 26(2), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.5817/Sp2021-2-3>
- Madson, G., & Cooper, A. (2021). *Future of Survey Research Conference*. Durham (NC): Duke University. <https://sites.duke.edu/surveyreserach/report/>

- Maier, M., & Lakens, D. (2022). Justify your alpha. A primer on two practical approaches. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychology Science*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/ts4r6>
- Martinez, P., & Losen, D. (2020). *Lost Opportunities: How Disparate School Discipline Continues to drive Differences in her Opportunity to Learn*. Learning Policy Institute; Center for CIVIL Rights Remedies at the Civil Rights Project, UCLA.
- Massonie, J., Frasset, P., Mareschal, D., & Kirkham, N. (2020). Scientific Collaboration with Educators: Practical insights from class noise reduction intervention. *Mind, Brain and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mbe.12240>
- Mauliya, I., Relianisa, Z., & Rokhyati, U. (2020). Lack of motivation factors creating poor academic performance in the context of graduate English department students. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 6(2), 73–85.
- McCombes, S. (2019). *Research Design: Types, methods and Examples*. Scribbr.
- Ministry of Education. (2022). National Education Policy. [https://www.education.gov.in/sites/uploadfiles/mhrd/files/NEP\\_Final\\_English\\_O.pdf](https://www.education.gov.in/sites/uploadfiles/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_O.pdf)
- Monarque, M., Sabetti, J., & Ferrari, M. (2023). Digital interventions for substance use disorders in young people: a rapid review. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy*, 18, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13011-023-00518-1>
- Morey, R. (2020). *Power and Precision*. <https://medium.com/@richardmorey/power-and-precision-47f644ddea5e>
- Mthethwa, A. (2021). ‘Our schools’ bullying score. *Daily Maverick*. [www.dailymaverick.co.za](http://www.dailymaverick.co.za)
- Mulisa, F. (2022). When does a researcher choose a quantitative, qualitative or mixed research approach? *Interchange*, 53(1), 131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-021-09447-z>
- Muller-Kuhn, D., Zala-Mezo, E., Habig, J., Strauss, N., & Herzig, P. (2021). Five contexts and three characteristics of student participation and student voice- A literature review. *Int.J.Stud.Voice*, 6(2).
- Okumbe, S. (2018). Education and Management. *Theory and Practice*: Nairobi University Press.
- Rafi, A., Ansar, A., & Sami, M. (2020). The implication of positive reinforcement strategy in dealing with disruptive behaviour in the classroom: A scoping review. *Journal of Rawalpindi Medical College*, 24(2), 173,1779.<https://doi.org/10.37939/rmc.v24i2.1190>
- Riden, B. S., Kumm S., & Maggin, D. (2021). Evidence-Based behaviour management for students with or at risk of EBD. A mega review of the literature. *Remedial and Special Education*, 43(4), 255-269. <http://doi.org/10.1177/074419325211047947>
- Rocha, T., Peixoto, F., & Jesus, S. (2020). Aesthetic development in children, adolescents, and young adults. *Analise Psicologica*, 38, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.14417/ap.1657>
- Rogers, K. (2020). The effects of classroom seating layouts on participation and assessment performance. *Journal of Learning Spaces*, p. 9.
- Rogowsky, B., Calhoun, M., & Tallal, P. (2020). Providing instruction based on students’ learning style preferences does not improve learning. *Frontier in Psychology*, 11(February) 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.00164>
- Scheier, L M., & Griffin, K. W. (2021). Youth marijuana use: a review of causes and consequences. *Curr Opin Psychol*, 38, 11-8.
- Sebeelo, B. (2021). “Undisciplined” drinking multi-sectoralism and political power. Examining problematisatory in Botswana alcohol policy. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, p. 94, 103228, pp. 1–7.
- Shao, G., Wei, Q., Leng, L. (2020). Synchronous classroom: Its Practical Significance, Existing Problem and Solutions. *Curr.Teach.Math.Meth*. 40, 70–76.
- Shier, H. (2020). Is Silencing Children Unethical? Gatekeeping Rights and Ethics. *Ethical Research Involving Children*: Blog, <https://childrethics.com/blog/is-Silencing-children-unethical-gatekeeping-rights-and-ethics/>



- Slater, E. V., & Main, S. (2020). A measure of classroom management: Validation of a pre-service teacher self-efficacy scale. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 46(5), 616–630. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1770579>
- Strickland, J. C., Lile, J. A., & Stroops, W. W. (2019). Unique prediction of Cannabis use severity and behaviours by delay discounting and behavioural economic demand. *Behavioural Processes*, pp. 140, 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2017.03.017>
- Tintore, M., Cunha, r., Labral, I. (2020). A scooping review of problems and challenges faced by school leaders. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*. 1-39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220942527>
- Tobia, V., Sacchi, S., Cerina, V. (2022). The influence of classroom seating arrangement on children's cognitive processes in secondary school: the role of individual variables. *Curr Psychol.*, 41, 6522-6533. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-01154-9>
- Walter, W. (2021). Survey design and significance testing: Key issues. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47(3), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102344>
- WHO & the WHA. (2023). An explainer: An introduction to the World Organisation, *The World Health Organisation, and the World Health Assembly*. <https://www.who.int/about/governance/world-health-assembly/the-who-and-thewha-an-explainer>
- Willan, A., & Thabane, L. (2020). Methods for pilot studies. *Clin Trials*; 17(4), 414-9.