



Analysis of student deviant behaviour most prevalent in schools of Bungoma County

*Janet Nabiswa¹ Dr. Bernard L. Misigo² Dr. Ferdinand N. Makhanu³

¹Department of Educational Psychology, Kibabii University, Bungoma

²Department of Educational Psychology, Moi University, Eldoret

³Department of Emergence Management Studies, Masinde Muliro University Of Science & Technology, Kakamega

Received; 22 October 2016 Accepted; 05 November 2016; © The author(s) 2016. Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

ABSTRACT: Deviant behaviour in secondary schools continues to be a matter of global concern. Knowledge of the kinds of deviance being indulged in and the role it plays in particular individuals, groups, schools, communities or sub-cultures is vital for any prevention programme yet this has been missing. Whereas several studies have been done in Bungoma County targeting student indiscipline and specific deviancy like theft, bullying and devil worship, limited studies exist that have purposed to undertake a holistic assessment to enable a fair picture of deviancy prevalence in the schools within the County. This study addresses this gap by examining types of deviance and their prevalence in selected secondary schools. Using a sample survey design, data was collected through questionnaires and interview schedules and analyzed descriptively. Results showed that all the twelve sampled types of deviant behaviour exist in sampled schools though in varying scale of severity. Prevalence ranged between 21% and 3%. The findings give an empirical backing for education stakeholders to reengineer strategies on addressing deviance and mitigate trend of deviant behaviour in schools. The study recommends respect for students' rights to self expression cognizance of dynamism in deviance and diversity of norms driven by modernity and complex societies.

Keywords: Bungoma County, deviance, schools, prevalence.

I. 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; Carra, Esterle, & Hedibel, 2009; UNODC, 2002). Although deviance as a phenomena varies from one country to another, deviant acts in a school environment include truancy, drug and alcohol abuse, promiscuity, dodging class, riots, smoking, vandalism, fighting, reporting late for class and insulting, resistance to change, to mention a few (Agboola & Salawu, 2011; Njoroge, Onduso & Thinguri, 2014). These acts negatively influence the learning and teaching process as they undermine the purpose of education (Torrente & Vazsonyi, 2012; Agboola & Salawu, 2011). In secondary schools, deviant behaviour is caused by an interaction of different factors (UNODC, 2005; Brady, 2006; ROK, 2006; Simatwa, 2012). Hirschi (2002) averred that 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. The researchers posit that it is imperative that deviance is examined as a phenomenon with multifaceted causes. Knowledge of the kinds of deviance being indulged in and the role it plays in particular individuals, groups, schools, communities or sub-cultures is vital for any prevention programme yet this has been missing. Whereas several studies have been done in Bungoma County targeting student indiscipline and specific deviancy like theft, bullying and devil worship, limited studies exist that have purposed to undertake a holistic assessment to enable a fair picture of deviancy prevalence in the schools within the County. This study addressed this gap by examining types of deviance and their prevalence in selected secondary schools of Kimilili Sub County, Kenya.

II. METHODOLOGY

A sample size of 50 composed of students, teachers and school management staff from eight schools was used. A mixture of sampling techniques was used, that is, multiphase and stratified sampling was used to

*Corresponding Author: *Janet Nabiswa¹

¹Department Of Educational Psychology, Kibabii University, Bungoma

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. Descriptive statistics: cross-tabulations and frequency tables was used to analyze the data.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Deviant or maladjusted behaviours are understood as any behaviors that imply violations from social norms (Humphrey & Schmallerger, 2011; Georges, 2009). The school system around the world has been grappling with a number of deviant behaviour patterns among youth in schools (Torrente & Vazsonyi, 2012; UNODC, 2002). In this study, this broad phenomena included a variety of behaviors specifically; substance abuse, drug and alcohol use, aggression, bullying, riots, promiscuity, abortion, vandalism, class boycott, violence, use of abusive language, examination malpractices, theft, perpetual truancy and writing or painting-graffiti on school walls (Sarwar, Nisa Awan, & Alam, 2010; Torrente & Vazsonyi, 2012). Besides the objective approach of seeing norms in terms of expectational and behavioural, that is, predetermined standards or thresholds widely consented upon by the society; there is the situational perspective that applies where there is no consensus about appropriate behaviour (Marshall & Robert, 2011; Adler & Adler, 2009). In the latter case, deviant behaviour shall then be dictated by social characteristics of the actor/ the victim, the social context of the behaviour, and the social audience that observes what occurred. Whether from objective or situational approach, this study explored existence and scale of prevalence of listed deviant behaviours among students in secondary schools of Kimilili Sub County. The school setting and the existing school culture then becomes the basis of norms being violated (Marshall & Robert, 2011). The result in Table 1.1a and 1.1b indicates the type of deviance and its prevalence as rated by respondents based on their position in school.

The weights given to the options were: score zero for “not in existence”, score 1 for “uncertain”, score 2 for “least severe”, score 3 for “severe” and score 4 for “most severe”. The sample for the pilot was 50 respondents. Hence the lowest score, being for “not in existence” is zero (0× 50) and the highest score, being for “most severe” is 200 (4× 50). In terms of percentage for positive response in the context of severity ratings, maximum score for least severe is 22% (2×50= 100; 100/450 × 100%); maximum score for severe is 33% (3×50= 150; 150/450 × 100%); maximum score for most severe is 45% (4×50= 200; 200/450 × 100%) and summation of weighted score being 100% (22%+33%+45%). The higher the percentage score respondents gave is interpreted as more prevalence of that deviant behaviour in the school setting of the county. As shown in the tables 1.1a and 1.1b, the prevalence rank column reflects the severity impact and that the top five types of deviant behaviour were theft, exam cheating, rudeness, property vandalism and class boycotts together with sneaking.

When the rating levels of severity :least severe, severe and most severe were combined to reflect aggregated severance and therefore positive response on deviance prevalence, theft was ranked number one with a weighted score of severity at 21% [(48%×22 + (24%×33) + (4%×45)]. Exam cheating was ranked number two with a weighted score of severity at 17% [(40%×22 + (10%×33) + (12%×45)]. Rudeness was ranked number three with a weighted score of severity at 16% [(58%×22 + (2%×33) + (4%×45)]. Property vandalism was ranked number four with a weighted score of severity at 12% [(42%×22 + (10%×33) + (0%×45)]. Class boycotts and sneaking were both ranked number five with a weighted score of severity at 9%. However, the incidence severity varied slightly with class boycotts being more at “least severe” while sneaking reflected some severe scores as captured in the tables 1.1a and 1.1b. The ranking of other types of deviancy: drug/alcohol/substance abuse, bullying, promiscuity, pornography, truancy, violence is as shown in the tables 1.1a and 1.1b.

Table1.1a Types of Deviancy and their Prevalence as rated by Management, Teachers and Students

Type of Deviant Behaviour	Position in School	Rating of Types of Deviancy in Schools					Total	Sum score of weights % rating	Prevalence rank
		Not in existence	Uncertain	Least severe	Severe	Most severe			
Drug/alcohol/substance abuse	Head Teacher	1(2)	0(0)	2(4)	0(0)	0(0)	3(6)	7	7
	Deputy H/T	2(4)	0(0)	6(12)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Head of Dept	3(6)	1(2)	4(8)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Class Teacher	0(0)	1(2)	3(6)	0(0)	0(0)	4(8)		
	Student	24(48)	2(4)	1(2)	0(0)	0(0)	27(54)		
	Sub-Total	30 (60)	4 (8)	16 (32)	0 (0)	0 (0)	50 (100)		
Theft	Head Teacher	0(0)	0(0)	3(6)	0(0)	0(0)	3(6)	21	1
	Deputy H/T	0(0)	0(0)	2(4)	6(12)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Head of Dept	1(2)	0(0)	5(10)	1(2)	1(2)	8(16)		
	Class Teacher	0(0)	1(2)	2(4)	1(2)	0(0)	4(8)		
	Student	3(6)	7(14)	12(24)	4(8)	1(2)	27(54)		
	Sub-Total	4 (8)	8 (16)	24 (48)	12 (24)	2 (4)	50 (100)		

Analysis Of Student Deviant Behaviour Most Prevalent In Schools Of Bungoma County

Bullying	Head Teacher	2(4)	1(2)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(6)	3	12
	Deputy H/T	6(12)	0(0)	1(2)	1(2)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Head of Dept	8(16)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Class Teacher	2(4)	1(2)	1(2)	0(0)	0(0)	4(8)		
	Student	23(46)	1(2)	1(2)	2(4)	0(0)	27(54)		
	Sub-Total	41 (82)	3 (6)	3 (6)	3 (6)	0 (0)	50 (100)		
Property Vandalism	Head Teacher	0(0)	1(2)	2(4)	0(0)	0(0)	3(6)	12	4
	Deputy H/T	0(0)	0(0)	6(12)	2(4)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Head of Dept	2(4)	1(2)	5(10)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Class Teacher	0(0)	1(2)	2(4)	1(2)	0(0)	4(8)		
	Student	8(16)	11(22)	6(12)	2(4)	0(0)	27(54)		
	Sub-Total	10 (20)	14 (28)	21 (42)	5 (10)	0 (0)	50 (100)		
Promiscuity	Head Teacher	1(2)	0(0)	2(4)	0(0)	0(0)	3(6)	7	7
	Deputy H/T	1(2)	2(4)	5(10)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Head of Dept	1(2)	4(8)	2(4)	1(2)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Class Teacher	2(4)	1(2)	1(2)	0(0)	0(0)	4(8)		
	Student	17(34)	6(12)	4(8)	0(0)	0(0)	27(54)		
	Sub-Total	22 (44)	13 (26)	14 (28)	1 (2)	0 (0)	50 (100)		
Class boycotts	Head Teacher	3(6)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(6)	9	5
	Deputy H/T	4(8)	1(2)	3(6)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Head of Dept	3(6)	2(4)	3(6)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Class Teacher	2(4)	1(2)	1(2)	0(0)	0(0)	4(8)		
	Student	11(22)	3(6)	13(26)	0(0)	0(0)	27(54)		
	Sub-Total	23 (46)	7 (14)	20 (40)	0 (0)	0 (0)	50 (100)		

Source: Field Data, 2016; **Note:** The figures in parentheses are percentage frequencies n=50

Table1.1 b Types of Deviancy and their Prevalence as rated by Management, Teachers and Students

Type of Deviant Behaviour	Position in School	Rating of Types of Deviancy in Schools					Total	Sum score of weights % rating	Prevalence rank
		Not in existence	Uncertain	Least severe	Severe	Most severe			
Exam cheating	Head Teacher	1(2)	0(0)	2(4)	0(0)	0(0)	3(6)	17	2
	Deputy H/T	0(0)	1(2)	6(12)	1(2)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Head of Dept	1(2)	1(2)	4(8)	2(4)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Class Teacher	0(0)	1(2)	1(2)	2(4)	0(0)	4(8)		
	Student	7(14)	7(14)	7(14)	0(0)	6(12)	27(54)		
	Sub-Total	9 (18)	10 (20)	20 (40)	5 (10)	6 (12)	50 (100)		
Pornography	Head Teacher	2(4)	1(2)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(6)	4	9
	Deputy H/T	2(4)	3(6)	3(6)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Head of Dept	1(2)	2(4)	5(10)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Class Teacher	2(4)	1(2)	0(0)	1(2)	0(0)	4(8)		
	Student	26(52)	0(0)	1(2)	0(0)	0(0)	27(54)		
	Sub-Total	33 (66)	7 (14)	9 (18)	1 (2)	0 (0)	50 (100)		
Truancy	Head Teacher	2(4)	0(0)	1(2)	0(0)	0(0)	3(6)	4	9
	Deputy H/T	5(10)	1(2)	1(2)	1(2)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Head of Dept	2(4)	3(6)	3(6)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Class Teacher	2(4)	1(2)	1(2)	0(0)	0(0)	4(8)		
	Student	19(38)	8(16)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	27(54)		
	Sub-Total	30 (60)	13 (26)	6 (12)	1(2)	0 (0)	50 (100)		
Sneaking	Head Teacher	2(4)	0(0)	1(2)	0(0)	0(0)	3(6)	9	5
	Deputy H/T	4(8)	0(0)	2(4)	2(4)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Head of Dept	2(4)	3(6)	3(6)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Class Teacher	1(2)	0(0)	3(6)	0(0)	0(0)	4(8)		
	Student	12(24)	9(18)	4(8)	2(4)	0(0)	27(54)		
	Sub-Total	21 (42)	12 (24)	13 (26)	4 (8)	0 (0)	50 (100)		

Analysis Of Student Deviant Behaviour Most Prevalent In Schools Of Bungoma County

Rudeness	Head Teacher	1(2) 0(0)	0(0) 1(2)	2(4) 6(12)	0(0) 1(2)	0(0) 0(0)	3(6) 8(16)	16	3
	Deputy H/T	0(0)	1(2)	7(14)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
	Head of Dept	0(0)	1(2)	3(6)	0(0)	0(0)	4(8)		
	Class Teacher	11(22)	3(6)	11(22)	0(0)	2(4)	27(54)		
	Student								
	Sub-Total	12 (24)	6 (12)	29 (58)	1 (2)	2 (4)	50 (100)		
	Head Teacher	2(4) 7(14)	1(2) 1(2)	0(0) 0(0)	0(0) 0(0)	0(0) 0(0)	3(6) 8(16)		
	Deputy H/T	4(8)	2(4)	2(4)	0(0)	0(0)	8(16)		
Violence	Head of Dept	1(2)	1(2)	2(4)	0(0)	0(0)	4(8)	4	9
	Class Teacher	18(36)	4(8)	3(6)	2(4)	0(0)	27(54)		
	Student								
	Sub-Total	32 (64)	9 (18)	7 (14)	2 (4)	0 (0)	50 (100)		

Source: Field Data, 2016; **Note:** The figures in parentheses are percentage frequencies n=50

This study looked at deviant behaviour not just as emanating from violation of accepted social norms but also emanating from a faulty set of behavioural or expectational norms which have to be observed for the accomplishment of school aspirations and espoused by school culture. The study established that all the twelve sampled types of deviant behaviour exist in schools of Kimilili Sub County but in varying intensity or scale of severity. The most prevalent was theft at 21% while the least prevalent was bullying at 3%. Marshall and Robert (2011) posited that deviance occurs dynamically and that from the perspective of time, situations and place, it will keep varying both in frequency and intensity. This assertion explains variation in the ratings of deviant behaviour in various schools of Kimilili Sub County. Simatwa (2012) on student behaviour in Bungoma County created a dichotomy justifying toleration of some deviant behaviour which could explain variance in severity scales.

Interviews conducted on key informants drawn from the County quality assurances officers did confirm prevalence of listed deviant behaviour. There is a tendency to understate their prevalence especially by management out of fear that it would be construed that they have failed in their duties. For instance, one key respondent noted:

It is lamentable that these cases couldn't be reported for fear that the quality assurances officers will be seen as not working..... "You know telling you that there are many indiscipline cases portray this office as unable to tame indiscipline..." Theft and promiscuity were common forms of deviancy as per county quality assurance surveys. However, most heads don't want to expose such out of fear of being seen as ineffective. In view of the dynamism with which deviance occurs together with the diversity in norms governing behaviour due to several groups in modern and complex societies to which schools are part of (Robison, 2014; Marshall & Robert, 2011; Clifton, 2011; UNESCO, 1995), the researcher selected 4% score as a basis of judging severe prevalence of selected types of deviant behaviour within schools of Kimilili Sub County.

IV. CONCLUSION

The study concluded that of the twelve selected types of deviant behaviour, only one: bullying was scored less than 4% that is at 3%, meaning that eleven were prevalent. This conclusion is agreeable with a study by Robison (2014) on children's voices and experience in school which noted while there were other deviant acts that were prevalent, there were low incidents of bullying. Concurrency to prevalence of the listed deviant behaviour was also noted by Magwa and Ngara (2014), citing studies in United Kingdom (UK), Nigeria, Botswana and South Africa. The study recommends that while students rights to self expression besides other rights as envisioned in the United Nations (UN) Convention (UNESCO, 1995) should be respected, there is increasing need among schools to package their organizational culture in a manner that takes cognizance of dynamism of deviance and diversity of norms being driven by modernity and complex societies of the 21st century. This will enable schools to tame intolerable deviance among students.

References

- [1]. 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, 4 (1), 375-381.
- [2]. Adler, P. A., and Adler, P.(2009). Constructions of Deviance: Social Power, Context, and Interaction, 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- [3]. 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
- [4]. Brady, P. (2006). "Working Towards a model of secondary school culture" (Discussion Paper), Ontario, Canada: Lake head University Publication. 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
- [5]. Chumbe, J., Likoko, S., Liambila, M. & Muthamia, H. (2015). Factors Influencing Secondary School Students to Steal and Their Need for Guidance and Counselling in Bungoma West District, Bungoma County in Kenya. International Journal of Science and Research, Vol.4 (1), 1083-1087
- [6]. Cohen, S., Marion, L. & Morrison K. (2011). Research Methods in Education (7th Ed.) London, UK: Routledge Falmer. Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V.L. (2011). Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research (2nd Ed.), Thousand Oaks, California, USA: Sage. Georges, S (2009). Deviant Behaviour and Violence in Luxembourg Schools. International Journal of Violence and School, Vol.10, 54-70.
- [7]. Hirschi, T. (2002). Causes of Delinquency <http://www.Heritage.Org>: Transaction Publishers. Accessed march2014.
- [8]. Humphrey, J. A & Schmaller, F. (2011). An Overview of Deviant Behaviour, Stockholm, Sweden: Jones and Bartlett Learning Publishers. 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.
- [9]. Marshall, B.C. & Robert, F.M. (2011). Sociology of Deviant Behaviour, Belmont, USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning Njoroge, E. W., Onduso, T.M., Thinguri, R. (2014). School Leadership Role In Predicting Deviant Behaviour Among Secondary School Students In Gatanga District, Muranga County. Researchjournal's Journal of Education, Vol. 9, 1-15
- [10]. ROK (2006). Kenya National Youth Policy, Nairobi, Kenya: Government Printers Simatwa, M.W. (2012). Management of Student Discipline in Secondary Schools in Kenya, a case study of Bungoma country. Educational Research, Vol.3(2), 172-189.
- [11]. Torrente, G and Vazsonyi, A, T. (2012). Adolescence and Social Deviance. Anales de Psicología, Vol.28(3), 639-642.
- [12]. UNESCO (2015). Education for all 2000 - 2015: Achievements and Challenges, Paris, France: Author.
- [13]. UNODC (2002). School-based education for drug abuse prevention, New York, USA: Author.
- [14]. UNODC (2005). Crime and Development in Africa, New York, USA: Author.