

*Full Length Research Paper*

# **Student deviance and prevention strategies to boost academic performance in secondary schools: A case study of Bungoma County, Kenya**

**\*Janet Nabiswa<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Bernard L. Misigo<sup>2</sup> and Dr. Daniel Korir<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Educational Psychology, Kibabii University, Bungoma

<sup>2,3</sup>Department of Educational Psychology, Moi University, Eldoret

\*Corresponding Author's Email: [Janetnabiswa@yahoo.com](mailto:Janetnabiswa@yahoo.com)<sup>1</sup>, Tel.: +254 718 826 834

## **Abstract**

Schools, known to exhibit strong school culture practices that drive academic excellence have equally suffered from rampant theft and exam cheating across counties in Kenya. Could it be a unique trend of deviance that could be reflecting absence of a well executed deviance prevention curriculum? Knowledge of the emerging trends in kinds of deviance being indulged in presupposes an effective rollout of preventive strategies within school cultures yet this has been missing. The aim of the study was to address this gap by investigating prevention strategies being applied to minimize student deviant behaviour in schools within Bungoma County. Mixed research design was employed while sampling strategy was a blend of multiphase, stratified and purposive sampling. A sample size of 400 out of 155,796 composed of students, teachers and school management staff in secondary schools of Bungoma County was used. Results were analyzed using cross-tabulations, frequency tables, Chi square and simple linear regression. The study found that preventive strategies that were rated highly across schools in ordered ranking were: strong academic programs that are inclusive for all cadres of students; vision of success that is rallied to by school members; cohesiveness and goal focus. However, effective prevention curriculum as a component of preventive strategies was poorly rated. Essentially, it means most schools in Bungoma County lacked a school-wide positive behaviour support system empirically known to offer an effective framework for creating school environment that mitigates deviancy among all students. The study concluded that although a significant relationship between preventive strategies and student deviance prevalence in the studied area existed, effective prevention curriculum as a core component of preventive strategies is poorly applied. It's recommended that a deviance prevention curriculum anchored on school-wide positive behaviour support systems be implemented in all schools.

**Key words:** prevention strategies, school culture, student deviance, secondary, Kenya

## **Introduction**

Deviant behaviour in secondary level schools continues to be a matter of great concern globally; though it is a more worrying trend in developing countries like Kenya (Adegun, 2013; Masese, Nasongo, & Ngesu, 2012; UNODC, 2012). These acts negatively influence the learning and teaching process as they undermine the purpose of education (Agboola & Salawu, 2011). In secondary schools, deviant behaviour is caused by an interaction of different factors that can be traced within

and outside school as two distinct yet overlapping environments where the student is socialized into deviance (Carlson, 2012; Carra, et al., 2009). According to academic literature reviewed for this study, family factors that contribute to deviance include a history of drug and alcohol abuse, poor parent- child relationship, violence and socio-economic status of the family (Malayi, Mauyo, & Nassiuma, 2013; Mbuthia, 2013; Carlson, 2012). As for school factors, the size of the school, an unsafe school physical environment, inappropriate classroom management, teachers humiliating remarks and teacher-

pupil relations that are too strict have been cited (Richwood, 2013). According to Hirschi (2002), although deviant behaviour may show a small degree of specialization, there is a strong tendency for persons who engage in one type of delinquent behaviour to engage in other types as well. In this vein, the researcher posited that it was imperative that deviance is examined as a phenomenon with multifaceted causes that demand a blend of strategies to mitigate it; be they preventive or corrective.

Minimizing deviant behaviour demands that prevention strategies be embedded in the organizational culture and work processes (Greenwood, 2008). These Prevention strategies are those which generally reduce the likelihood of engaging in deviant behaviour (UNODC, 2012; Victory, 2005). As posited by Greenwood (2008), the environment and situational factors play a critical role in shaping behavior hence several programs have been shown to produce significant effects in mitigating deviancy among youths. This study focused on the information-based programmes and life skills prevention strategies practiced within secondary schools of Bungoma County. An information-based programme is a prevention strategy based on the premise that youth in secondary school, a majority of whom are adolescents, indulge in deviance because they are unaware of the consequences. Provision with information will therefore assist them refrain from deviant behaviour (UNODC, 2012). Guidance programmes are an integral part of discipline enforcement within schools. Within a school set up, it is an authoritative direction given to a student through directing, giving opinion, explaining so that they know who they are, enhance personal development, achieve physical maturity and attain an assertive ego (Lutomia, 2007). As for the life skills prevention strategy, the focus is inculcation of a range of social skills. The underlying assumption is that deviant behaviour is at least partly due to poor social coping strategies, undeveloped decision making skills, low self esteem, and inadequate peer pressure resistance skills, among others (Baldry, 2004). In view of the above argument, prevention strategies if well embedded in the school organizational culture manifest as programmes that can facilitate both academic and socio-emotional learning. They are universal since they target the whole class and student fraternity. Preventive strategies have broadly been categorized based on family factors; educational factors and individual characteristics together with personal and social competence (UNODC, 2012). This study explored whether some of them exist within the school organizational culture and their role in minimizing prevalence of deviant behaviour among students in secondary schools of Bungoma County. This study was guided by Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Theory of Human Development which stresses process-person-context-time interrelatedness (Bronfenbrenner, 2001). As averred by Case (2006), the novelty in this theory is not the identification of environmental influences, but rather the interactions among the influencing entities and their

impact on the individual. The researchers used this theory in guiding their investigation into preventive strategies as a deviance mitigation factor among students within Bungoma County schools.

### ***Theoretical Framework***

This study was guided by Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Theory of Human Development which stresses process-person-context-time interrelatedness (Bronfenbrenner, 2001). The interrelationships of variables within the school as an organization and the range of variables within the micro systems and meso systems segments of the Bioecological Model was a premise upon which this study examined the student deviance and prevention strategies to boost academic performance in secondary schools using Bungoma County, Kenya as a case reference. From the model, interface between the school organizational structure as an important aspect of the school environment together with positive school culture embedded therein as preventive strategies contributed to student deviant behaviour in schools as organizations (Bronfenbrenner, 2001; Tudge, Mokrova, Hatfield, & Karnik, 2009). As a component of process-person-context-time within the model, context is characterized as four environmental systems: Micro systems, Mesosystems, Exosystems, and Macrosystems (Bronfenbrenner & Evans, 2000; Christensen, 2010; Tudge et al, 2009). The four fit well as a premise upon which to interrogate on-goings inside and outside the school setting to enable the researchers appreciate drivers to deviance in schools. This study was however confined to the Micro systems and meso systems segments that capture interrelationships and on-goings inside the school and the family set up. The novelty in this theory is not the identification of environmental influences, but rather the interactions among the influencing entities, herein seen as prevention strategies of school culture and their impact on the individual student's deviance.

### **Research Design and Methodology**

The research paradigm that informed this study was a Pragmatic approach which is a philosophical underpinning for mixed methods studies (Creswell, 2012). The study was conducted using mixed methods research design that comprised of concurrent triangulation, correlation and cross sectional survey to address the study objective. Deviant behaviour, by nature, is a multi-faceted, mutative and multidimensional phenomenon that can be better explored when several different methods are applied (Bahar & Esin, 2013). A sample size of 400 participants out of a population size [N] of 155,796 composed of students, teachers and school management staff from 252 schools was used. The blending of participants was premised on the view that deviance within a school set up is a multi-faceted and multidimensional phenomenon and the three segments were to provide reliable data. This was

derived by adopting a sample determination table used in social research as prescribed by Saunders et al. (2007:212) and Cohen, et al. (2011:95). This sample was large enough to yield adequate statistical power in addition to avoiding the crisis of representation that faces many quantitative inquiries (Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007).

A mixture of sampling techniques was used, that is, multiphase and stratified sampling was used to select schools, students and teachers while purposive sampling was used to select school management staff. The data for the study was obtained through questionnaire, interviews, document analysis and direct observations. The questionnaire which was scored on a five- point scale was employed as the main instrument for data collection. Students and teachers were targeted as respondents from whom data features of school culture and preventive strategies utilized to curb deviant behaviour were sought. Descriptive statistics: cross-tabulations and frequency tables was used to analyze the data while inferential statistics was mainly by chi-square and simple regression. The schools selected were based on the following strata: rural and urban schools; national, extra County, County schools.

### **Research Findings and Discussion**

Citing Gruenert (2005) among other previous studies, Engin et al. (2014) in concurrence with Brandy (2006) posited that school culture as a concept within educational administration imply a system of behaviours that evolves dynamically within given school settings and is embraced by members of that school. Bahar and Esin (2013) amplified the value of culture in school set-up within their assertion that survival of school is closely related to the behaviours of its members especially students and teachers. As asserted by Ayse and Musa (2013) culture transforms people's behaviour, attitudes and organizational effectiveness which could impact on the

level of performance and deviance in a school setting which was the focus of the study. The researchers were keen on how preventive strategies as characteristics of positive school culture were being practiced in schools as perceived by all respondents. Table 1 captures their responses on a five-likert scale of excellent, very good, good, fair and poor. Respondents were asked to evaluate application of the 9 listed preventive strategies of a positive school culture practiced in their respective schools. The selected strategies were sampled out of those used in previous studies on school culture and tested for reliability analysis for Cronbach's alpha coefficient. All had a coefficient of over 0.93 and the nine averaged at 0.965. Testing instrument reliability in this manner is an acceptable approach in social sciences (Lane et al., 2013; Dalal, 2005; Durrand, 2002).

As indicated in Table 1, goal focus which in the context of school culture implies the ability for the school to exhibit goals and objectives that are clear, acceptable and supported by all members was rated along the practice continuum at 38% excellent, 24% very good and 22% good. This reflects an overall positive rating of good and above at 84%. Such a high rating could be associated with Government rules and regulations that clearly guide school operations and routine. Implementation of school curriculum anchored on attainment of Education goals and objectives could also be alluded to that high score. The 16% could be attributed to poor staffing and infrastructure in some schools that makes it hard to achieve set goals and objectives. Communication adequacy as a school culture denotes quality and quantity of information flow both vertically and horizontally within school systems. It was rated at 20% excellent, 24% very good, 40% good, 6% fair and 10% poor. On aggregate 84% rated it good and above although the 10% poor rating raises a concern because sharing of information or communication generally within a system is very critical for posting good performance and mitigating deviancy.

**Table 1:** Preventive Strategies of a Positive School Culture practiced in Schools as Rated by all Respondents

| Preventive Strategies of Positive School Culture                                   | Rating of Strategies as practiced in Schools |           |         |        |        | Total    |
|--|--|-----------|---------|--------|--------|----------|
|  | Excellent                                    | Very Good | Good    | Fair   | Poor   |          |
| Goals focus  | 153(38)                                      | 95(24)    | 88(22)  | 64(16) | 0(0)   | 400(100) |
| Communication adequacy   | 80(20)                                       | 95(24)    | 160(40) | 24(6)  | (10)   | 400(100) |
| Cohesiveness   | 128(32)                                      | 136(34)   | 96(24)  | 40(10) | 0(0)   | 400(100) |
| The school has a vision of success with broad support in the school and community  | 176(44)                                      | 96(24)    | 120(30) | 8(2)   | 0(0)   | 400(100) |
| A healthy school culture that promotes student bonding to school                   | 72(18)                                       | 135(34)   | 128(32) | 65(16) | 0(0)   | 400(100) |
| School leaders are engaged and committed to prevention of deviance                 | 63(16)                                       | 184(46)   | 129(32) | 24(6)  | 0(0)   | 400(100) |
| A strong academic program that promotes success for students of all ability levels | 184(46)                                      | 136(34)   | 72(18)  | 4(8)   | 0(0)   | 400(100) |
| Effectiveness of the Disciplinary committee in handling deviancy                   | 45(11)                                       | 129(32)   | 134(34) | 56(14) | 36(9)  | 400(100) |
| Effectiveness of the G/C committee in handling deviancy                            | 28(7)  | 116(29)   | 143(36) | 75(19) | 38(10) | 400(100) |

**Source:** Field Data, 2016; Note: The figures in parentheses are percentage frequencies n=400

School organizational structures along departments and class teachers could explain the high rating while bureaucracy could account for the 10% poor rating. Cohesiveness is about having a school culture where there is a clear sense of identity and members of the school feel attracted to membership and have a strong sense of belonging. It was rated at 44% excellent, 24% very good and 30% good. On aggregate, it rated at 98% above good on the practice of good culture continuum. This high rating could be attributed to the fanatical wave of formulating vision and mission statements for all schools since the year 2000 as part of strategic and performance based management paradigm within Government circles.

A healthy school culture that promotes student bonding to their school was also highly rated on the positive school culture practice continuum. Although only 18% rated it excellent, 34% and 32% rated it very good and good respectively. That puts the aggregate also at 84%. School leadership engagement and commitment on preventing deviance also scored lowly on excellence at 16% just as it was the case with effectiveness of the disciplinary committees together with that of Guidance and counseling at 11% and 7% respectively. Generally however, respondents reported that on a practiced continuum, school leadership was engaged and committed to prevention of deviance at 46% very good and 32% good. Effectiveness of the disciplinary committee in handling

deviancy was rated at 32% very good and 34% good, while effectiveness of the Guidance and counseling committee in handling deviancy was rated at 29% very good and 36% good. The rating for effectiveness of disciplinary together with Guidance and counseling committees at 9% and 10% poor respectively is indicative of failure by the school culture to systematically address deviancy because such lapses could allow mutation of vices within the system.

The weights given to the options were: score 1 for “poor”, score 2 for “fair”, score 3 for “good”, score 4 for “very good” and score 5 for “excellent”. The sample for the study was 400 respondents. Hence the lowest score, being for “poor” is 400 (1× 400) and the highest score, being for “excellent” is 2000 (5× 400) while grand total score for positivity rating was 6000 (400+800+1200+1600+2000). In terms of percentage for positive response in the context of positivity/effective ratings, maximum score for poor is 6.7% (1×400= 400; 400/6000 × 100%); fair is 13.3% (2×400= 800; 800/6000 × 100%); maximum score for good is 20% (3×400= 1200; 400/6000 × 100%); maximum score for very good is 26.7% (4×400= 1600; 1600/6000 × 100%); maximum score for excellent is 33.3% (5×400= 2000; 2000/6000 × 100%) and summation of weighted score being 100% (7%+13 %+20%+27%+33%). The higher the percentage score respondents gave was interpreted as more

presence of that preventive strategy within the school culture in the school setting of the County. However, based on weighted scales, between 1% and 7% was interpreted to mean that preventive strategy of school culture was poorly applied, between 7% and 13% was interpreted to mean that preventive strategy of school culture was fairly applied, between 14% and 20% was interpreted to mean that preventive strategy of school

culture was good in being applied, between 21% and 26% was interpreted to mean that preventive strategy of school culture was very good in being applied, while between 27% and 33% was interpreted to mean that preventive strategy of school culture was excellently being applied. The scaled calculation and subsequent ratings along an applicability continuum is as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2:** Rating on Practice Continuum of Preventive Strategies of Positive School Culture by all Respondents

| Preventive Strategies of Positive School Culture                                   | Scaled Weighted rating % | Rank |
|--|--------------------------|------|
| Goals focus  | 25.6                     | 4    |
| Communication adequacy   | 22.0                     | 7    |
| Cohesiveness   | 25.9                     | 3    |
| The school has a vision of success with broad support in the school and community  | 27.3                     | 2    |
| A healthy school culture that promotes student bonding to school                   | 23.6                     | 6    |
| School leaders are engaged and committed to prevention of deviance                 | 24.8                     | 5    |
| A strong academic program that promotes success for students of all ability levels | 28.1                     | 1    |
| Effectiveness of the Disciplinary committee in handling deviancy                   | 21.6                     | 8    |
| Effectiveness of the G/C committee in handling deviancy                            | 20.3                     | 9    |

**Source:** Field Data, 2016; n=400

As indicated in the Table 2, apart from effectiveness of the Guidance and Counselling committee in handling deviancy that was rated good in terms of being applied, those ranked number 3 to 8 were within the very good cluster of application. Those ranked 1 and 2 besides being scored excellent in application were presence of a strong academic program that promotes success for students of all ability levels and usage of school has a vision of success with broad support in the school and community. On overall, this can be interpreted to mean presence of a moderate to good application of school culture preventive strategies. The weighted rating for effectiveness of disciplinary committees in handling deviancy was at 22% meaning very good and a reflection of a positive school culture. On the hand, the study found that on a weighted average, deviance prevalence in Bungoma schools was within least severe segment. This could be explained by strict ministerial and Teachers Service Commission (TSC) directives on zero tolerance to corporal punishment and respect for child rights as stipulated in the Basic Education Act (ROK, 2013a). This finding is corroborated by Adelman and Taylor (2005) and NCSE (2012) on learning and behaviour problems (out of either severe emotional

disturbance or behavioural disorders) that where disciplinary mechanisms are used to manage misbehaviour using reasonable, fair and non-denigrating guidelines, positive results on reduced deviance will be achieved.

The researcher was keen to find out evaluation of some other two preventive strategies from first tier of school management where head teachers and their deputies are targeted and their feedback corroborated with that of students. Table 3 is a cross tabulation capturing their responses. As indicated in Table 3, on an integrated continuum of strategies that serve students and families with multiple levels of need, 19% of school management rated it very good and above while 22% of students rated it good. On aggregate, 41% of a combined rating of school management and students rated it at very good and above while 38% rated it as good. On problem solving adequacy where the school culture enables members to perceive problems and solve them using minimal energy besides sustaining such initiatives, school management rated it at 11% very good and above while students rated it at 5%. On aggregate, only 16% of a combined rating by school management and students

agreed that the characteristic was practiced at a very good and above rating.

**Table 3:** Preventive Strategies practiced in Schools as rated by School Management and Students only

| Preventive Strategies of School Culture  | Position in School | Rating of Preventive Strategies of School Culture |           |         |         |        | Total     |
|--|--------------------|---|-----------|---------|---------|--------|-----------|
|  |                    | Excellent   | Very Good | Good    | Fair    | Poor   |           |
| An integrated continuum of strategies that serves students and families with multiple levels of need | School Management  | 13 (4)  | 44 (15)   | 17 (6)  | 5 (2)   | 0 (0)  | 79 (27)   |
|  | Students           | 10 (3)  | 57 (19)   | 93 (32) | 49 (17) | 7 (2)  | 216 (73)  |
|  | Sub total          | 23 (7)  | 101(34)   | 110(38) | 54 (19) | 7 (2)  | 295(100)  |
| Problem-solving adequacy   | School Management  | 15 (5)  | 18 (6)    | 33 (11) | 13 (5)  | 0 (0)  | 79 (27)   |
|  | Students           | 0 (0)   | 15 (5)    | 138(47) | 47(16)  | 16 (5) | 216 (73)  |
|  | Sub total          | 15 (5)  | 33 (11)   | 171(58) | 60 (21) | 16 (5) | 295 (100) |

**Source:** Field Data, 2016; **Note:** The figures in parentheses are percentage frequencies n=295

Heads of departments in charge of Guidance and counseling and the class teachers occupy the second tier of management and are critical players at this level of school management from the perspective of implementing positive school culture characteristics. The researchers were keen to triangulate their feedback with regard to application of preventive strategies. They were asked to rate the listed two preventive strategies of positive school culture as captured in Table 4 that directly impact on their roles within the system. On optimal power equalization, their rating was at 14% for very good and above, 52% for good and 27% for fair. Optimal power equalization as a preventive strategy of school culture demands that the school culture allows a relatively equitable distribution of influence between members of the school and management. It implies that heads of department and class teachers were given some leverage to deal with

student deviancy within their jurisdictions. This finding is corroborated by Adelman and Taylor (2005) in their application of transaction model to explain student deviance particularly on the assertion that each part of school environment transacts with others to affect overall outcome; positive or negative. This is further confirmed by Simon (2013) on building student resilience when he affirms the strategic role of empowered teachers in helping students attain high level performance regardless of risk factors. As for an effective prevention curriculum that is embraced by all students, the score was at 9% good, 33% fair and 58% poor. This is a reflection of poor application of this preventive strategy and perhaps could explain why even perceived good schools with an established culture of performance are faced with forms of deviance that affect un established schools.

**Table 4:** Preventive Strategies of School Culture practiced in Schools as rated by Heads of Guidance and Counseling together with Class Teachers only

| Preventive Strategies of Positive School Culture   | Rating of Culture |           |        |        |        | Total    |
|--|-------------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
|  | Excellent         | Very Good | Good   | Fair   | Poor   |          |
| Optimal power equalization   | 7(7)              | 15(14)    | 55(52) | 28(27) | 0(0)   | 105(100) |
| An effective prevention curriculum or program that is faithfully implemented with all students | 0(0)              | 0(0)      | 9(9)   | 35(33) | 61(58) | 105(100) |

**Source:** Field Data, 2016; **Note:** The figures in parentheses are percentage frequencies n=105

Furthermore, if Heads of departments in charge of guidance and counseling and class teachers are not well resourced in terms of supply and coordination, they may not only be frustrated but may also experience high burn out from the perspective of mitigating deviancy (Dunber ,2004; Lane et al., 2013). Students learning in resource starved environments are more vulnerable to anti social behavior (Dunber, 2004) which was perceived in the study as deviance. The two categories of respondents were

asked to rate resource utilization as a preventive strategy of positive school culture directly impact on their roles within the system. As a preventive strategy of school culture resource utilization denotes a school setting where both human and physical resources are well coordinated to allow effective operations with minimal strain. Table 5 is a cross tabulation capturing responses from students, Heads of departments and class teachers.

**Table 5:** Preventive Strategies of Positive School Culture practiced in Schools as rated by Teachers (HODs &Class Teachers) and Students only

| Preventive Strategies of Positive School Culture | Position in School | Rating of Culture |           |          |        |      | Total    |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------|--------|------|----------|
|  |                    | Excellent         | Very Good | Good     | Fair   | Poor |          |
| Resource utilization                             | Teachers           | 8(3)              | 23(7)     | 54(17)   | 20(6)  | 0(0) | 105(33)  |
|  | Students           | 61(19)            | 39(12)    | 72(22)   | 36(11) | 8(3) | 216(67)  |
| Sub total  |                    | 69 (22)           | 62 (19)   | 126 (39) | 56(17) | 8(3) | 321(100) |

**Source:** Field Data, 2016; **Note:** The figures in parentheses are percentage frequencies n=321

As indicated in Table 5, resource utilization was rated at 10% for very good and above by teachers, (Heads of departments and class teachers) while 31% of the students rated it at very good and above. However 17% of the teachers rated it at good in terms of it being practiced in their schools compared to 22% of the students. On overall, 27% of the teachers rated it at good and above while 53% of the students rated it at good and above. Teachers who rated it at fair were 6% compared to 11% of

the students. Further 3% of the students felt that this aspect of school culture was poorly practiced in their respective schools. In terms of weights, utilization was rated at 6.93% by teachers while students rated it at 15.73%. This yields a combined rating of 22.66%.

The researchers calculated aggregate weighted rating of all preventive strategies as evaluated by segmented respondents based on their positioning in schools. Their responses are as captured in Table 6.

**Table 6:** Rating on Practice Continuum of Preventive Strategies of Positive School Culture by Respondents

| Preventive Strategies of Positive School Culture                          | Scaled Weighted rating % | Rank |
|---|--------------------------|------|
| Goals focus   | 25.6                     | 4    |
| Communication adequacy  | 22.0                     | 8    |
| Cohesiveness  | 25.9                     | 3    |
| A vision of success with broad support in the school and community        | 27.3                     | 2    |
| A healthy school culture that promotes student bonding to school          | 23.6                     | 6    |
| School leaders are engaged and committed to prevention of deviance        | 24.8                     | 5    |
| A strong academic program that promotes success for students              | 28.1                     | 1    |
| Effectiveness of the Disciplinary committee in handling deviancy          | 21.6                     | 10   |
| Effectiveness of the G/C committee in handling deviancy                   | 20.3                     | 11   |
| An integrated continuum of strategies that serves multiple levels of need | 21.8                     | 9    |
| Problem-solving adequacy  | 16.4                     | 13   |
| Optimal power equalization  | 20.1                     | 12   |
| An effective prevention curriculum  | 10.0                     | 16   |
| Resource utilization  | 22.7                     | 7    |

**Source:** Field Data, 2016

The study further tested the following hypothesis: There is no significant influence of prevention strategies within school culture in minimizing student deviant behaviour in Bungoma County Schools. To test this hypothesis, chi square ( $\chi^2$ ) tests were done to compare the prevention strategies within school culture being practiced and various variables/types of deviance as an indicator of

student deviant behaviour in Bungoma County Schools. Top two preventive strategies with weighted average rated above 27 % as captured in Table 6 were picked for tests against listed student deviant behaviour. Tables 7 and 8 present a summary of the Chi-square test coefficients, degrees of freedom and the significance values for each of the variables.

**Table 7:** Results of Chi-square tests on association between a strong academic program promoting success of all students and Student Deviant Behaviour

| Type of Deviance                  | Chi-square Value | df | Sig. |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|----|------|
| Drug, alcohol and substance abuse | 77.71            | 9  | 0.00 |
| Theft                             | 94.31            | 12 | 0.00 |
| Property Vandalism                | 91.55            | 9  | 0.00 |
| Rudeness                          | 3.72             | 12 | 0.00 |
| Exam cheating                     | 1.47             | 12 | 0.00 |
| Sneaking                          | 1.12             | 9  | 0.00 |

**Source:** Field Data, 2016

As indicated in the Table 7, the results of the Chi-square tests showed that there is a statistically significant relationship between student deviant behaviour and a strong academic program promoting success of all students as a preventive strategy within school culture that affects deviant prevalence in schools. All the listed six types of deviant behaviour showed a statistically significant relationship. Thus, drug, alcohol and substance abuse ( $\chi^2= 77.71$ ,  $df=9$ ,  $p<0.05$ ); theft ( $\chi^2= 94.31$ ,  $df=12$ ,  $p<0.05$ ); property vandalism ( $\chi^2= 91.55$ ,  $df=9$ ,  $p<0.05$ ); exam cheating ( $\chi^2= 1.47$ ,  $df=12$ ,  $p<0.05$ ); sneaking ( $\chi^2=$

$1.12$ ,  $df=9$ ,  $p<0.05$ ); rudeness ( $\chi^2= 3.72$ ,  $df=12$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). On the basis of these tests, it is conclusive that there is a statistically significant relationship between student deviant behaviour and a strong academic program promoting success of all students as a preventive strategy within school culture that affects deviant prevalence in schools. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected. Another variable tested was a vision of success with broad support base of stakeholders as a preventive strategy within school culture that affects deviant prevalence in schools.

**Table 8:** Results of Chi-square tests on association between a vision of success with broad support base of stakeholders and Student Deviant Behaviour

| Type of Deviance   | Chi-square Value | df | Sig. |
|--------------------|------------------|----|------|
| Theft              | 1.18             | 12 | 0.00 |
| Property Vandalism | 1.01             | 9  | 0.00 |
| Rudeness           | 91.87            | 12 | 0.00 |
| Exam cheating      | 1.81             | 12 | 0.00 |
| Sneaking           | 98.97            | 9  | 0.00 |

**Source:** Field Data, 2016

As indicated in the Table 8, the results of the Chi-square tests showed that there is a statistically significant relationship between student deviant behaviour and this variable. All the listed five types of deviant behaviour showed a statistically significant relationship. Thus, theft ( $\chi^2= 1.18$ ,  $df=12$ ,  $p<0.05$ ); property vandalism ( $\chi^2= 1.01$ ,  $df=9$ ,  $p<0.05$ ); exam cheating ( $\chi^2= 1.81$ ,  $df=12$ ,  $p<0.05$ ); sneaking ( $\chi^2= 98.97$ ,  $df=9$ ,  $p<0.05$ ); rudeness ( $\chi^2= 91.87$ ,  $df=12$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). On the basis of these tests, it is conclusive that there is a statistically significant relationship between

student deviant behaviour and a vision of success with broad support base of stakeholders as a preventive strategy within school culture that affects deviant prevalence in schools. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected. This null hypothesis was further explored by conducting simple regression analyses to assist the researchers predict strength and direction of relationship between preventive strategies within school culture and prevalence of student deviant behaviour using specific variables. The findings are as captured in Tables 9 to 10.

**Table 9:** Regression of Cohesiveness as preventive strategy within school culture against Rudeness as a variable of Student Deviant Behaviour

|                           |      |                     |             |       |           |
|---------------------------|------|---------------------|-------------|-------|-----------|
| Single R                  |      | 0.09                |             |       |           |
| Adjusted square           | R    | 0.09                |             |       |           |
| Std. Error                |      | 0.96                |             |       |           |
|                           | df   | Sum of squares      | Mean square | F     | Sig. of F |
| Regression                | 1    | 38.07               | 38.07       | 41.41 | 0.00      |
| Residual                  | 398  | 365.93              | 0.92        |       |           |
| Variables in the Equation |      |                     |             |       |           |
| Variables                 | B    | Standard error of B | Beta        | t     | Sig. of t |
| Rudeness                  | 0.32 | 0.05                | 0.31        | 6.43  | 0.00      |
| Constant                  | 1.83 | 0.11                |             | 15.89 | 0.00      |

Predictor/independent Variable: Cohesiveness  
Dependent Variable: Rudeness

As indicated in the Table 9,  $R^2_{adj}$  was 0.09,  $F = 41.41$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ; beta weight = 0.31. The results of the regression indicated that cohesiveness as preventive strategy within school culture is a significant predictor of student deviant behaviour, which is explained by 9% of the variance. By examining the beta weight in the Table 9, the beta weight value reveals a moderate relationship that is within the decision criterion of coefficient range 0.3 to 0.7. It is

evident that the variance in student deviance was significantly accounted for by cohesiveness as preventive strategy within school culture. It is evident and therefore conclusive that this preventive strategy within school culture positively influenced student deviant behaviour on the account of rudeness. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected.

**Table 10:** Regression of Goal focus as preventive strategy within school culture against Rudeness as a variable of Student Deviant Behaviour

|                           |      |                     |             |       |           |
|---------------------------|------|---------------------|-------------|-------|-----------|
| Single R                  |      | 0.13                |             |       |           |
| Adjusted square           | R    | 0.13                |             |       |           |
| Std. Error                |      | 0.94                |             |       |           |
|                           | df   | Sum of squares      | Mean square | F     | Sig. of F |
| Regression                | 1    | 52.88               | 52.88       | 59.95 | 0.00      |
| Residual                  | 398  | 351.11              | 0.88        |       |           |
| Variables in the Equation |      |                     |             |       |           |
| Variables                 | B    | Standard error of B | Beta        | t     | Sig. of t |
| Rudeness                  | 0.33 | 0.04                | 0.36        | 7.74  | 0.00      |
| Constant                  | 1.79 | 0.10                |             | 17.34 | 0.00      |

Predictor/independent Variable: Goal focus  
Dependent Variable: Rudeness

As indicated in Table 10,  $R^2_{adj}$  was 0.13,  $F = 59.95$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ; beta weight = 0.36. The results of the regression indicated that goal focus as preventive strategy within school culture is a significant predictor of student deviant behaviour, which is explained by 13% of the variance. By examining the beta weight in the Table 10, the beta weight value reveals a moderate relationship that is within the decision criterion of coefficient range 0.3 to 0.7. It is evident that the variance in student deviance was significantly accounted for by goal focus as a preventive strategy within school culture. It is evident and therefore conclusive that this preventive strategy within school culture positively influenced student deviant behaviour on the account of rudeness. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected.

### Conclusion and Recommendation

Preventive strategies that were rated highly across schools were: strong academic programs that are inclusive for all cadres of students; vision of success that is rallied to by school members; cohesiveness and goal focus at weighted rating of 28%, 27%, 26% and 26% respectively. However, effective prevention curriculum as a component of preventive strategies was poorly rated. Only 9% of respondents rated it good in regard to how it's practiced in schools while a majority at 58% rated it poor and 33% of respondents rated it as fair. This result essentially means most schools in Bungoma County lacked a school-wide positive behaviour support system yet this has empirically been known to offer an effective framework for creating school environment that mitigates deviancy among all students (McKevitt & BraaKsma, 2008; McGoey et al., 2016). This view is corroborated by Hansen et al. (2014) study on teacher perception and positive behaviour intervention with regard to managing deviance in schools. The study recommends that secondary schools should deliberately embrace a

comprehensive prevention curriculum that is anchored on a school-wide positive behaviour support system within their school culture in order to mitigate deviance prevalence which could otherwise escalate to levels that academic performance and learning in schools will be compromised.

### References

- Adegun, O. A. (2013). An analysis of the offences committed by youths in selected remand homes in South West Nigeria, implication for school administrators. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 4 (1), 375-381.
- Adelman, H. S. & Taylor, L. (2005). *Revisiting learning and behaviour problems: moving schools forward*, California, USA: Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Agboola, A.A. & Salawu, R.O. (2011). Managing deviant behavior and resistance to Change, *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 6 (1), 235-242
- Ayse, N. & Musa, G. (2013). Organizational culture in a successful primary school: An ethnographic case study. *Journal of Educational Practices*, Vol. 13 (1), 221-228
- Bahar, G. & Esin, C. (2013). Implications from the diagnosis of a school culture at a higher education institution, *Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 4 (1), 44-60
- Baldry, A. (2004). The impact of direct and indirect bullying on the mental and physical health of Italian youngsters, *Journal of Aggressive Behavior*, Vol.30, 343-355
- Carlson, A. (2012). How parents influence deviant behaviour among adolescents: An analysis of their family life, their community, and their peers. *Perspectives New Hampshire's Sociology Journal*, 42-51.
- Carra, C., Esterle, M., & Hedibel, M. E. (2009). Violence in schools: European trends in research. *International Journal on Violence and Schools*, Vol.9(1), 3-7
- Case, D. O. (2006). *Looking for information: A survey of research on information seeking, needs, and behavior* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). New York : Academic Press.
- Cohen, S., Marion, L. & Morrison K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education* (7th ed.), London, UK: Routledge Falmer

- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, USA: Pearson Education.
- Dalal, R.S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol.90(6) 1241-1255.
- Dunbar, C. (2004). *Best practices in classroom management*. Michigan: State University.
- Durrand V. M. & Crimmins, D.B. (2002). *Motivation assessment scale*. Early childhood services team. Surrey centre, Toronto.
- Engin, K., Gokhan, K. & Derya, Y. (2014). Organizational cynicism, school culture, and academic achievement: The Study of structural equation modeling. *Education Sciences: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 14(1), 102-113.
- Greenwood, P. (2008). Prevention and intervention programs for juvenile Offenders. *Journal for Prevention and Intervention Programs for Juvenile Offenders*, Vol.18(2), 185-210.
- Hansen, J.M., Labat, M.B. & Labat, C.A. (2014). The Relationship between Teacher Perceptions of Positive Behavior Intervention Support and the Implementation Process, *Delta Journal of Education*, Vol.4(2), 61-79.
- Hirschi, T. (2002). Causes of delinquency <http://www.Heritage.Org>: Transaction Publishers. Accessed March, 2014.
- Lane, K.L., Menzies, H.M., Ennis, R. & Bezdek, J. (2013). School wide systems to promote positive behavior and facilitate Instruction. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, Vol. 7(1), 6-31.
- Lutomia, A.G. (2007). *Career Guidance and Counselling*. Nairobi: Uzima Press.
- Malayi, A., Mauyo, L.W. & Nassiuma, B.K. (2013). The impact of parenting styles on acquisition of deviant behaviour among children aged 8-18 years in western Kenya. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies*, Vol.2(10), 496-501.
- Masese, A; Nasongo W. J. & Ngesu, L. (2012). The extent and panacea for drug abuse and indiscipline in Kenyan schools. *Asian Journal of Medical Sciences*, Vol.4(1), 29-36.
- Mbuthia, W. W. (2013). "Perceived factors influencing deviant behaviour among the youth in njathaini community, (Unpublished Masters Thesis). Nairobi, Kenya: Kenyatta University.
- McGoey, K.E., Munro, A.B., McCobin, A. & Miller, A. (2016). Implementation of culturally relevant school-wide positive behavior support, school psychology forum: *Research in Practice*, Vol.10(12), 134-141.
- McKevitt, R.C& Braaksma, A.D. (2008). Best practices in developing a positive behavior support system at the school level. *Journal of best practices in school psychology*. Vol. 3, 735-748.
- NCSE (2012). The Education of students with challenging behavior arising from severe Emotional Disturbance/ Behavioural Disorders. *NSCE Policy Advice Paper No. 3*, Dublin, Ireland: Trim publishers.
- Onwegbuzie, A. J. & Collins, K.M. (2007). A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social research. *The qualitative report*. Vol. 12(2), 281-316.
- Richwood, G. (2013). School culture and physical activity: A systematic review. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, Vol.143, 1-28.
- ROK (2013a). *Basic education act*, Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research methods for business students*, (4th ed.), England, UK: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Simon, G. (2013). *Building student resilience: Strategies to overcome risk and adversity*, Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- UNODC (2012). *International standards on drug use prevention*, New York, USA: UNODC.
- Victory, S. J. (2005). Adolescent Deviance: Why student role performance matters. (Unpublished M.A thesis). USA: Wichita State University.