

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

¹Jorrum Mwei Mutiso, ²Jeremiah M. Kalai, ³Ursula A. Okoth
¹⁻³ University of Nairobi

¹motisojorrum@gmail.com ; ²jeremykalai@uonbi.ac.ke ; ³ursulla.achieng@uonbi.ac.ke

ABSTRACT

In a school set-up, discipline emphasizes upholding practical students' moral values, an essential ingredient in school management. The study aimed to investigate the influence of the 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. Questionnaires 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. Expert and peer review ensured the content, face, and construct. 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 the 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.

Keywords: Students' discipline, board of management, levies.

INTRODUCTION

Research studies hold that discipline is a vital element of human behavior in which an institution cannot function appropriately toward achieving its goals and objectives (Ouma et al., 2013). In a school system, disciplined students are those whose actions, inactions, and behaviours conform to the predetermined rules and regulations of

schools (Ali et al., 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 et al., 2013). Tozer (2015) opined that students' indiscipline has been severe and pervasive and, in most cases, affects students learning. Indiscipline manifests itself in actions such as truancy, riots, drug and alcohol abuse, vandalism, and arson (Marais & Meier, 2015).

Wet (2016) noted that school vandalism or destruction of school property is caused by former students, learners from neighboring schools, dropouts, drug and substance abuse, economic problems, and juridical and student-related factors. However, teachers, school administration, and management are considered less critical causes of student 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 manual employment in salt mining and fishing.

Ofori, Tordzro, Asamoah, and Chiaa (2018) classified the causes of student indiscipline in school property destruction as home, teachers, and school factors. Acts of students' disorder include violence, rape, assaults, armed robbery, destruction of property, and theft.

In Ethiopia and Uganda, the World Bank (2014) opines that parents who cannot afford to pay for extra costs retain their children at home, 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 parents' failure to comply with the payment of school levies negatively affects learning programs and school physical resources.

Alio and Chui (2023) note that hidden and extra costs influence students' low enrollment rates, graduation rates, and education achievement. Malonza (2020) asserts that most secondary schools do not involve students in setting school rules and regulations, food menus, extra school fees, and two-way communication between students or parents, and the school is nonexistent.

However, a few research studies explain that discipline has a limited, uncertain, and negatively significant impact on students' education achievement (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2014; Gakure, Mukuria, & Kithae, 2013). Thus, the findings on influence boards of management charges of financial levies on students' discipline need to be more conclusive and consistent.

Therefore, the inconsistent findings and the gaps identified prompt further research study on the influence of the board of management charging extra levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline. To address the identified gaps, the current study focused on Machakos County and embraced a mixed-method design in investigating the influence of the board of management's use of charging extra levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline.

Student 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 and eat vandalism, and destruction of school property, among others. Indiscipline behavior has an advanced effect on student's consistent teaching and learning, career choice, and progression.

Charging of extra levies has inflated the costs of secondary education, resulting in the exclusion of many needy students from accessing it. At times, most students with minor and major offenses are surcharged, which has led to increased concern by parents and other education stakeholders about whether those levies are a sure means

to arrest students' 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 contrary to the parent's ability to pay (Njeru & Orodho, 2003) and, if indeed, result in practical student 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 other government and non-government sponsors in public secondary schools. However, charging extra levies that arise from students' destruction of school property and vandalism aims to repair and replace the destroyed school properties and instill fear in the repetition of the vice.

Machakos County has experienced instances of students' misbehavior that encompass; 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 a 19.7% increase in students' misbehaviours.

Hence, there is a need to study the influence of boards of management's use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on student discipline in public secondary schools in Machakos County.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

To establish the influence of the 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 objective was investigated through the following

H₀₁: There is no statistically significant difference between mean responses by the board of management. Charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction is considered effective or ineffective on students' discipline in public secondary schools in Machakos County.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Myrick (2017) described indiscipline as unacceptable behaviours contrary to the school's rules and regulations for its success. In Sweden, Durrant (2017) notes that a student's indiscipline manifests itself in delinquency, truancy, theft, vandalism, and assault. However, Brister (2016) agrees that indiscipline behaviour among students is rampant in Australia. Kythreotis, Pashiardis, and Kyriakides (2016) noted that the entire student population's involvement in school

management enhances students' discipline and behavioural change.

In South Africa, Pillay (2012) held that parents' obligation was charging extra levies for transport, instructional materials, and physical resources. Students from disadvantaged families who were unable to meet the requirements were forced to drop out of school, which lowered graduation and enrollment rates. In contrast, Pillay's (2012) study failed to focus on the board of management's use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline in public secondary schools, as was the case for this study.

In Fiji, the government provides financial support for education in basic learning institutions and teaching salaries. In spite of that, institutions impose exaggerated extra charges for sporting activities, instructional materials, infrastructure, remedial work, uniform fees, and school magazines, among others (Koya, 2015). However, Koya (2015) notes that students from low-income families are disadvantaged because they are forced to drop out of school and frequently sent home, which results in students missing classes, engaging in truancy, low enrollment, low transition rate, and inconsistent 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 the influence of the board of management's use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline in public secondary schools.

Miako (2012) studied the influence of charging school levies and its effect on access and retention in Nyandarua North District, Kenya secondary schools. The total sample was 51, comprising 40 class teachers, 10 principals, and 1 district education officer. The quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, ranges, averages, and means. The quantitative data was presented in tables, line graphs, pie charts, and bar graphs. The study revealed that secondary costs remain high due to various school levies charged. The study also established students from low socio-economic status faced problems of absenteeism, transition from primary to secondary school education, dropouts, 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, which was conducted in a county that comprised eight sub-counties. Similarly, the above-quoted study investigated the influence of school levies and their effect on students' access and retention compared to the present study that investigated the influence of boards of management's 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 the implementation of subsidized secondary education in day secondary Kitui County, Kenya. The sample comprised 164 school principals, 17 chairpersons of parents' association, and 1 County director of education. The finding established a negative significant relationship between charging 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 the influence of discipline on primary school pupils' 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 a questionnaire as the only instrument to collect data. The instrument's reliability was tested using the test-retest technique. University experts enhanced the questionnaires' content and content validity. 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 ($R = .480$, $\beta = .480$, $R^2 = .230$, $p < .05$). 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, which used class teachers, students, discipline committee members, principals, and chairpersons of the board of management as study participants. The present study used a questionnaire and interview guide to collect data. The reviewed study was conducted among primary schools in Muhoroni Sub County, while the current study was conducted in secondary schools in Machakos County.

METHODOLOGY

The convergent parallel strategy belonging to the mixed methods research approach was employed for this study.

Data was gathered in two phases. The quantitative data was collected in the first phase, while the qualitative data was collected in the second phase. The quantitative and qualitative data were later merged into a single finding to triangulate the findings of the study. The target population refers to all subjects from which a representative sample is derived to generalize 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.

The study employed a 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 eight strata in Machakos County. Stratified random sampling enables the researcher to select the population from diverse subgroups, guaranteeing that the identified or selected sample accurately represents the target population of specific characteristics (Jackson, 2014). A simple random sampling technique was also employed to select the sample from each of the eight Sub Counties.

According to Black (2012), the proportionate stratified random sampling technique occurs when the sample selected from each stratum is proportionate to the population in each stratum. Similarly, using the purposive sampling technique, the study sampled 70 student leaders' representatives for the study. The purposive sampling technique considers the subjects to have adequate and required information from the sample (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).

The study used two instruments to collect data. The questionnaire was used to collect data from 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's use of charging financial levies on students' discipline had five statements: punitive, exaggerated, discriminatory, reduced students' disciplinary problems, and not parent and student participation.

The questionnaire for the class teachers, disciplinary committee members, and student leadership representative were administered separately. However, items were 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. The questionnaire and interview schedule were merged into a single finding to triangulate the findings of the study.

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 study variables' contents. In this study, the research instruments' content, face, and construct Validity were enhanced through expert judgment (Siddiek, 2018; Orodho, 2009), in this case, by the University of Nairobi supervisors and colleagues. The content validity index (CVI) was 0.7, further validated by the University expert's assistance in line with grammar, order of

wording, and use of words for both quantitative and qualitative instruments.

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

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 are 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.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

From Table 1 the teacher's questionnaire rate was 76.64%, disciplinary committee members 85.71%, and student leadership 91.43%. This was possible because of the researcher's initiative in administering the instruments. The high instrument return rate was appropriate for the study because Kothari (2009) indicates a return rate of 60% as suitable enough, while Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) recommend an instrument return rate of 50% as sufficient for data collection, analysis, and conclusion of the study findings. Therefore, the analysis of data provided by the research tools enhanced the accuracy of the sample representation for meaningful generalization of the study findings.

Table 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

The quantitative data was sought from the class teachers, disciplinary committee members, and student 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 quantitative data findings. The respondent's responses are shown in Table 1.2.

The study sought to collect and establish respondents' views on using a board of management charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline in secondary schools in Machakos County, Kenya. Their responses are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Respondent's views on the use of the board of management's 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	72 (24.7%)	102 (34.9%)	45 (15.4%)	43 (14.7%)	30 (10.3%)
		DCM	13 (19.9%)	30 (50.0%)	04 (6.8%)	09 (14.1%)	08 (9.2%)
		SLR	01 (1.7%)	03 (5.0%)	07 (11.7%)	34 (56.6%)	15 (25.0%)
ii	Extra financial levies charged for students are overcharged or exaggerated	CT	84 (28.8%)	96 (32.9%)	51 (17.5%)	29 (9.9%)	32 (10.9%)
		DCM	21 (32.2%)	29 (44.5%)	04 (6.5%)	06 (9.4%)	04 (6.9%)
		SLR	05 (8.3%)	08 (13.3%)	11 (18.3%)	24 (40.0%)	12 (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	14 (21.2%)	23 (36.3%)	05 (5.8%)	12 (18.8%)	06 (17.9%)
		SLR	01 (1.7%)	04 (6.7%)	07 (11.6%)	31 (51.7%)	17 (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	09 (14.1%)	12 (18.8%)	07 (10.6%)	22 (33.6%)	14 (22.9%)
		SLR	03 (5.0%)	03 (5.0%)	06 (10.0%)	29 (48.3%)	19 (31.7%)
v	Setting for extra financial levies is not participatory for students and parents.	CT	57 (19.5%)	56 (19.2%)	37 (12.7%)	101 (34.6%)	41 (14.0%)
		DCM	09 (14.0%)	14 (21.9%)	10 (15.7%)	18 (28.1%)	13 (20.3%)
		SLR	02 (3.3%)	04 (6.7%)	03 (5.0%)	33 (55.0%)	18 (30.0%)

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

Table 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 presentative 34 (56.6%), agree that charging financial levies is punitive. This implies that school administration and management decide whether punitive punishment should be administered to students without their participation. Most school principals and chairpersons of boards of management hold that the extra payments for destroying school properties and renovations instill fear and help reduce students' disciplinary problems. The finding implies that students from low socio-economic backgrounds were unable to meet the cost of these extra charges, which seemed punitive, leading to students dropping out and exhibiting indiscipline behaviors. The finding concurs with Lwanga and Atieno (2019), who averred that students from humble backgrounds who faced problems meeting extra charges for employing teaching staff and infrastructural development were forced to engage in indiscipline behaviour and sought manual employment in salt mining and fishing.

From the findings, a majority of the class teachers, 96 (32.9%), and disciplinary committee members, 29 (44.5%), disagree that charging students for extra financial levies for the destruction of school properties

and renovations is overcharged or exaggerated. This is in contrast to two-fifths 24 (40.0%) of the student leaders' representatives who agreed that charging extra financial levies for destroying school properties and renovations is overcharged or exaggerated. However, one of the chairpersons of the school board of management noted that schools charge for the destruction of property destruction and renovation according to the expenses to be incurred. This finding is consistent with Koya (2015), who noted that schools in Fiji impose exaggerated extra charges for sporting activities, instructional materials, infrastructure, remedial work, uniform fees, and school magazines, among others. This vice results in students needing more classes, truancy, low enrollment, low transition rate, and inconsistent completion rate.

The finding from Table 2 indicates that the majority of the class teachers, 147 (50.3%), and disciplinary committee members, 23 (36.3%), disagree that charging students extra financial levies is discriminatory destruction of school properties and renovations are discriminatory. The finding agreed with most principals, who agreed that payment of extra levies is not charged based on who participated and who did not participate. Similarly, most chairpersons of the school board of management stated that the extra charges are not pegged on the socio-economic status of students' background because all the students should

equally pay the payment. This finding is inconsistent with the student leader's representative 31 (51.7%), who agree that charging students extra financial levies for destroying and renovating school properties is discriminatory. This means that students who cannot pay extra school levies face the problem of school dropout and inconsistent learning, resulting in 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, lowered 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 student 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 hold that students' disciplinary behaviors are caused by mileage of family-related, school-related, emergency-related, and student-related factors but not mere charges for the

destruction of school properties. One of the principals had this to say;

"We only charge extra levies for the destruction of the school properties, but the actual cause of students' misbehavior can arise from several factors beyond school management. For example, emergencies such as food poisoning, lack of water and electricity, and 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 a limited, uncertain, and negative significant impact on students' education achievement.

Similarly, the majority of the class teachers 101 (34.6%), disciplinary committee members 18 (28.1%), and student leadership representatives 33 (55.0%) agreed that setting extra financial levies to be paid by the students for the 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 determine 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 remain 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, dropouts, 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 menus, extra school fees, and two-way communication between students or parents, and the school is nonexistent. On the contrary, Morogo, Kiprop, and Too (2018) note that parents' failure to comply with the payment of school levies negatively affects learning programs 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.

The inferential statistics ANOVA was used to indicate the relationship between the board of management's 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 the board of management's use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students 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 were tabulated in Table 1.3.

Table 3: ANOVA responses on the board of management's 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 indicate that $F(4,415) = 623.856$ and $p\text{-value} = 0.000$. Thus, the p -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 the board of management's use of charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on student discipline in Machakos County. This indicates that using financial levies for renovation and property destruction might deter students' indiscipline misbehavior because of fear of surcharging financial penalties.

CONCLUSIONS

The finding concluded that charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction on students' discipline does not minimize students' disciplinary problems and is not student and parent-participatory. Therefore, payment of financial levies for the destruction and renovation of school property should be owned through students' and parents' participation. These charges should not be viewed as punitive, overcharged, or discriminatory.

It was also established that there is a statistically significant difference between the board of management charging financial levies for renovation and property destruction and students' discipline ($F = 623.856$, $p < 0.000$). Thus, the use of financial levies by boards of management 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 for destroying and maintaining school properties that do not disfranchise students and parents from low socio-economic status.

REFERENCES

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. Brister, C. (2016). Corporal punishment in Australian schools: A Northern Territory Perspective *Research Paper No.13*.
4. Durrant, J. (2017). Positive discipline in everyday teaching: Guidelines for educators. Sweden: Save the Children.
5. 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>
6. Gakure, R. W., Mukuria, P., & Kithae, P. P. (2013). An evaluation of factors that affect the performance of primary schools in Kenya: A case study of Gatanga District. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 8 (13), 927- 937.
7. 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.
8. Jackson, L. S. (2014). *Research methods: A modular approach*. (3rd ed.).
 9. 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.
 10. Kothari, C. R. (2011). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd ed.).
 11. Koya, F. (2015). Educational levies in schools in Fiji; Consumer Council of Fiji. Civic Towers, Victoria Parade Suva.
 12. Lwanga, C., & Atieno.W. (2019). When poverty is high, extra levies in schools push children into fishing. DN 22nd November 2019. Nairobi, NMG.
 13. 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.
 14. Marais, M. & Meier, E. (2015). Perceptions of discipline and ensuing discipline problems in secondary education. *South African Journal of Education*. 20 (1): 34-41.
 15. Miako, J. K. (2012). School levies and their effects on access and retention since the introduction of subsidized secondary education in Nyandarua North District, Kenya. (Unpublished master's thesis), Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya.
 16. Morogo, M., Kiprop, D., & Too, F. (2018). Impact of non-payment of school levies by parents on secondary school programs and projects in Ainabkoi Sub-county, Uasin-Gishu County, Kenya. *British Journal of Education*, Vol.6, No.7, pp.108-122.
 17. Mutia, P. M., Cheloti, S. K., & Maithya, R. (2021). Extra levies are a determinant factor in implementing 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.
 18. Myrick, R. (2017). *Developmental guidance and counseling: a practical approach (4th Ed.)* Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media.
 19. 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.
 20. Njeru, E & Orodho, J. (2003). *Education Financing in Kenya: Secondary School Bursary Scheme Implementation and Challenges*. Nairobi. IPAR.
 21. 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.
 22. 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.

23. 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.
24. 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.
25. Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2016). *Empowerment Series: Essential research methods for social work* (4th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning Retrieved from <https://books.google.com>
26. 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.
27. Wet, D. C. (2016). The extent and causes of learner vandalism at schools. *South African Journal of Education* Vol 24 (3), 206- 211.
28. Whitley, B. E., & Kite, M. E. (2012). *Principles of research in behavioral science*.
29. 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>