

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.



**Managing Learner Discipline: A Case Study of Two
Secondary Schools in the Khomas Region,
Namibia**

A Minor Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Award of the Degree of Master in Education at the
University of Cape Town

By

Oiva Shuuvani Hipondoka

January 2009

DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Date..30/01/09.....

Signed by candidate

Oivā Shuuvēni Hipondoka

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people played a significant role for me to bring this work to fruition. My sincere thanks are due to my supervisor, Mr David Gilmour, for his academic guidance throughout my work. It was because of his positive critical comments that this thesis came to completion.

A heartfelt thank you to Mrs. Ingrid Thomson from UCT Libraries, Ms. Namutenya Hamwaalwa from the Namibian National Planning Commission, Mrs. Erika Kaura from the Namibian Ministry of Education Resource Centre; and the University of Namibia library staff, especially those at the special collection department for their professional assistance.

I am indebted to Ms. Janis Wylie and Mr. David Khanye for sharing with me her valuable knowledge and his computer skills, respectively. The study schools are greatly thanked for making data collection possible. Their willingness to participate in the study is highly appreciated.

My family assisted me in most of the needs towards my studies. Without their support my dreams could not be realised. My thanks are also extended to my friends, whose the list can not fit here. Remember that every word of encouragement you said to me contributed significantly to this study.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank the Almighty for giving me the strength to cross this academic level.

DEDICATION

To my Dad, the late tate Sem Martin Hipondoka, who had always encouraged me to work hard in life, including during my studies at UCT, but could not see the latest results of his encouragement.

University of Cape Town

ABSTRACT

This study is concerned with how two schools in the Khomas Region manage learners' discipline. In particular, it seeks to determine why the two schools experience different states of discipline despite the fact that they have learners from similar social backgrounds.

The study uses a case study approach. The qualitative methods comprise on-site observations, semi-structured interviews and a review of disciplinary and other policy documents. Interviews were done with the School Boards, the two principals, heads of department, teachers, Learners' Representative Council and learners. The study draws its conceptual framework from seven factors that are believed to influence school discipline: strategy, structures and procedures, school identity and purpose, school resources, parents and community involvement, leadership and management, and school culture.

The study revealed that the two schools have many disciplinary practices in common. However, active teamwork, which falls under the school culture factor, and leadership and management were more pronounced in School B than in School A. Compared with School A, School B was characterized by fairly good discipline, and the study consequently attributed these factors, teamwork, leadership and management as the major cause of different levels of discipline in these two schools. It also emerged in the study that School B has a better academic performance in comparison with School A, which suggests that there is a positive relationship between academic performance and discipline.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	II
DEDICATION.....	III
ABSTRACT.....	IV
LIST OF TABLES.....	VIII
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
1.3 RESEARCH METHODS.....	2
1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	3
1.5 CHAPTER OUTLINE.....	3
CHAPTER TWO: DISCIPLINE IN NAMIBIA AND SCHOOL SELECTION.....	5
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	5
2.2 NAMIBIA'S DISCIPLINE POLICY.....	5
2.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE SELECTED SCHOOLS.....	6
2.3.1 <i>School A</i>	7
2.3.2 <i>School B</i>	10
CHAPTER THREE: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	15
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	15
3.2 DIMENSIONS OF DISCIPLINE.....	16
3.2.1 <i>The Purposes of School Discipline</i>	16
3.2.2 <i>Understanding 'Discipline'</i>	17
3.2.3 <i>The Causes of Disciplinary Problems</i>	18
3.3 A SCHOOL-WIDE APPROACH TO DISCIPLINE.....	21
3.4 FACTORS INFLUENCING SCHOOL DISCIPLINE.....	24
3.4.1 <i>Strategy</i>	25
3.4.2 <i>Structures and Procedures</i>	26
3.4.3 <i>School Identity and Purpose</i>	27
3.4.4 <i>School Resources (Technical and Human)</i>	28
3.4.5 <i>Parents and Community Involvement</i>	29
3.4.6 <i>Leadership and Management</i>	30
3.4.7 <i>School Culture</i>	32
3.5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	34
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY.....	37
4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	37
4.2 THE CASE STUDY.....	37
4.3 METHODS.....	37
4.4 SELECTION OF SCHOOLS.....	39
4.5 SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS.....	40
4.6 ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	41
4.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	42
4.7.1 <i>A case study approach</i>	42
4.7.2 <i>Fieldwork</i>	42

CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	44
5.1 INTRODUCTION	44
5.2 STRATEGY	44
5.2.1 <i>School Rules and Punishment Procedures</i>	45
5.2.2 <i>Maintaining Discipline Responsibility</i>	56
5.2.3 <i>Evaluation of the Discipline Policy</i>	58
5.2.4 <i>Summary and Analysis</i>	58
5.3 STRUCTURES AND PROCEDURES	60
5.3.1: <i>Disciplinary Structures</i>	60
5.3.2: <i>Disciplinary Procedures</i>	64
5.3.3: <i>Summary and Analysis</i>	66
5.4 SCHOOL IDENTITY AND PURPOSE	66
5.4.1: <i>The School's Vision and Mission</i>	68
5.4.2: <i>Learner Discipline Definition and the State of Discipline in the School</i>	71
5.4.3: <i>Summary and Analysis</i>	73
5.5 SCHOOL RESOURCES (TECHNICAL AND HUMAN)	74
5.5.1 <i>Human Resources</i>	75
5.5.2 <i>Physical Resources</i>	77
5.5.3 <i>Summary and Analysis</i>	79
5.6 PARENTS AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	81
5.6.1 <i>Communication with Parents/Community</i>	82
5.6.2 <i>Significance of Parents/Community Involvement</i>	83
5.6.3 <i>Summary and Analysis</i>	85
5.7 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT	86
5.7.1 <i>A Visible and Supportive Principal who Delegates Appropriate Discipline Authority</i>	87
5.7.2 <i>Staff development</i>	88
5.7.3 <i>Summary and Analysis</i>	88
5.8 SCHOOL CULTURE	89
5.8.1 <i>School Culture</i>	90
5.8.2 <i>Summary and Analysis</i>	96
CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	99
REFERENCES	102
APPENDIX A: NAMIBIA'S DISCIPLINE POLICY	106
APPENDIX B: INSTRUMENTS USED TO COLLECT DATA AND A LETTER OF PERMISSION	116
APPENDIX C: SCHOOLS TEACHING STAFF PROFILE	135
APPENDIX D: SCHOOLS MISSION STATEMENTS	139
APPENDIX E: SCHOOLS PHYSICAL AND EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES	140

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: School A Matric Results for Ordinary Level (2007)	9
Table 2.2: School A Matric Results for Higher Level (2007)	10
Table 2.3: School B Matric Results for Ordinary Level (2007)	12
Table 2.4: School B Matric Results for Higher Level (2007).....	13
Table 3.1: An Analytical Framework	35
Table 3.1: An Analytical Framework (Continued).....	36
Table 4.1: School Respondents Data	41
Table 4.2: School Learner Respondents Data.....	41
Table 5.2.1: Strategy Indicators	45
Table 5.3.1: Structures and Procedures Indicators	60
Table 5.4.1: School Identity and Purpose Indicators	67
Table 5.5.1: School Resources Indicators	75
Table 5.6.1: Parents and Community Involvement Indicators.....	81
Table 5.7.1: Leadership and Management Indicators.....	86
Table 5.8.1: School Culture Indicator	90

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

1.1 Introduction

This study investigates the management of learners' discipline at two secondary schools in the Khomas Region, Namibia. Specifically, it attempts to establish the underlying reason(s) as to why these two schools have different levels of discipline despite the fact that their students come from similar social backgrounds. In this introductory chapter, the focus is on the statement of the problem, the methods used to collect data, research questions, and the chapter outline.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Numbers of authors suggest that learners' discipline is a world wide problem (see Steyn *et al.*, 2003:230, and Van Wyk, 2004:78). Education in Namibia is also affected by this growing problem. It appears that in some schools, teaching and learning are constantly disrupted by students who do not behave. According to the Ministry of Education (2000:1), there is an apparent deterioration of discipline in schools. The Ministry claims that even in some well administered schools with highly professional teachers and clear and fair school rules there are some individual learners who make themselves guilty of persistent unacceptable behaviour, serious misconduct and even criminal acts.

The Ministry of Education and Culture (1992:3 [author's page numbering]) briefly explains the problem of learners' discipline as follows:

As all of us are aware, our schools are faced with problems caused by a lack of discipline both inside and outside the classroom. Teachers complain that learners have become unruly; newspapers report incidences of rock throwing on school playgrounds; communities are outraged by acts of vandalism and theft of school property; many parents are questioning what is happening in school; and some feel that school is no longer a safe place for their children to be.

In the same vein, a study conducted by Ama (2003) on secondary school teachers' perceptions of the factors which affect quality education in the Windhoek Education Region revealed that indiscipline is one of the leading factors.

The teachers interviewed by Ama indicated that the level at which discipline has disintegrated in the schools has placed them at the mercy of the learners. The learners claim to have rights, which were acquired when corporal punishment was banned in all Namibian schools in 1991 (Ama, 2003:57). The study concluded that there is an urgent need to restore discipline in schools in order to create an enabling school environment for the teachers to impart knowledge to the learners and for the learners to study and acquire the necessary skills for the higher education or fit in the world of work.

Although there is a growing concern about discipline, it is noteworthy that not all schools are experiencing disciplinary problems. And the main question that needs to be answered is: *why do schools have different levels of discipline despite the fact that their students come from similar social backgrounds?* Finding the answer to this question is the main purpose of this study.

Though the problem of discipline in schools has been well researched in other parts of the world, very little research could be found concerning the discipline situation in the Namibian schools. Therefore, the international literature will supplement the local literature in exploring the issue of discipline in schools.

1.3 Research Methods

A case study approach was used in this study. This approach was coupled with qualitative methods such as on-site observations, semi structured interviews and a review of disciplinary and other policy documents.

1.4 Research Questions

The basic question of this study is: Why do schools with learners from similar social backgrounds experience different levels of discipline? The main assumption here is that if the student populations have similar socio-economic characteristics then differences in learner behaviour can largely be attributed to differences in school practices. To ensure that this question is adequately addressed, seven questions which emerged in the literature review were posed. These are:

- What are the study schools' strategies to maintain discipline?
- Which structures and procedures do these schools have in place to deal with discipline?
- What is the identity of the study schools in relation to discipline, and what is their vision and mission statement?
- What technical and human resources are available in the study schools?
- Do the study schools involve the parents and community in maintaining discipline?
- Do the study schools have a leadership and management style that is supportive of disciplinary efforts?
- What culture do the study schools have in relation to discipline?

1.5 Chapter Outline

Chapter 2 is divided into two sections. The first section focuses on the Namibian discipline policy, highlighting two disciplinary documents; *Discipline from Within: Alternatives to Corporal Punishment* and the *Education Act, 2001, (Act No.16 of 2001)*. The last section provides a contextual description of the case study schools.

Chapter 3 presents a review of literature on school discipline. The aspects explored include the purposes of school discipline, how the concept of discipline is defined by various authors, and the causes of disciplinary problems. The chapter also introduces

the issue of a school-wide approach to discipline, which leads to a discussion of the managerial factors that influence school discipline.

Chapter 4 describes the case study approach utilised in this research, along with the methods which were used in this study to collect data. These were on-site observations, semi-structured interviews and a review of disciplinary and other policy documents. The aspects such as the selection of schools, selection of respondents, analysis of data, and limitations of the study are also included in this chapter.

Chapter 5 presents and analyses the data collected. The key factors that influence discipline are covered separately, and they form seven sections of this chapter. The school practices that noted in all the sections are brought together in the final section (School Culture, Section 5.8) to build a synoptic 'picture' of each school.

Chapter 6, which is the last chapter, summarises the insights that surfaced in the study. It also proposes topics for future research, and concludes the discussion.

CHAPTER TWO: DISCIPLINE IN NAMIBIA AND SCHOOL SELECTION

2.1 Introduction

This chapter consists of two sections. The first section provides a brief background to Namibia's discipline policy, and the second section gives a contextual description of the case study schools.

2.2 Namibia's Discipline Policy

Since Namibia gained its independence in 1990, many changes have occurred in the education sector. One of these was the abolishment of corporal punishment in all Namibian schools in 1991. Among other developments, the fact that Namibia became a democratic country and a signatory to the Convention on the Rights of the Child necessitated this change.

The first major policy document on school discipline to appear was *Discipline from Within: Alternatives to Corporal Punishment*, in which the former Deputy Minister of Education and Culture, Buddy Wentworth, expressed the abolishment of corporal punishment in Namibian schools as follows:

As a matter of human dignity and individual human rights, the constitution, as a consequence of a decision of the High Court, expressly forbids the use of corporal punishment. It is also clear that corporal punishment cannot be regarded as acceptable in a democratic society. It is humiliating, it increases, not decreases, resentment and aggressiveness, and it has no long-term value. However, alternatives must be found to solve the all-too obvious problems of discipline in schools, but they must be alternatives which take into account the dignity and worth of both teacher and learner (Ministry of Education and Culture, 1992:1 [author's page numbering]).

The text which followed in the document explained the concept of 'discipline from within'. It suggested that discipline in learners should not be "imposed from outside, but [be] more positive self-discipline — discipline from within" (1992:2 [author's page numbering]).

To put it differently, good behaviour in learners should not be instilled by force, but it should be done in such a way that learners themselves be aware of the imperativeness of good behaviour. This enables them to be self responsible in the end.

The document also provided some guidelines on alternatives to corporal punishment, but without concrete exemplars, and schools had to improvise and develop their own alternative disciplinary practices and procedures to fill in the gap. This was not an easy exercise for educators. This situation is echoed by Harber (1996:164) who noted that “schools in Africa face enormous problems in developing more democratic and peaceful forms of education where they did not exist before”.

Formal policy to back up the ministerial position came later. Several ministerial directives were issued after independence to guide state schools until such time as a code of conduct for learners could be finalised. The principles of ‘Discipline from Within’ were codified in the Education Act, 2001 (Act No.16 of 2001), under which the general rules of conduct for learners at state schools appear. This and the five-page-long document *Discipline from Within: Alternatives to Corporal Punishment* were given to all schools to provide a framework as to how learners’ discipline should be managed. A condensed version of these two documents appears in Appendix A.

It is against this background that two schools were selected as case studies to investigate how they were dealing with discipline (the selection of the schools is discussed in Chapter 4). The contextual description of the schools is given below.

2.3 Description of the Selected Schools

This section provides a background to the selected schools. The selection criteria are discussed in Chapter 4, section 4.4. The aspects covered here include: their location, population data, the activities taking place at school, and the Grade 12 results for 2007. Since the basic purpose of discipline is to allow teaching and learning to take place without hindrance, the assumption is that a better disciplined school will get better results. It is hoped that a look at the two schools’ results will test the authenticity of this assumption. A full description of the schools’ facilities is provided in Chapter 5 under the schools’ resources section (3.4.4) as well as in Appendix E.

An attempt was made to collect information on learner progression and drop-out rates and Matric results prior to 2007, to build a fuller picture of learners' behaviour. Unfortunately, none of the schools studied could provide this information. For reasons of confidentiality the schools are given the fictitious names, School A and School B.

2.3.1 School A

Established in 1983, School A is located in one of the middle income residential areas in Windhoek. At its inception, it was run as a private school, partly funded by the Government of that time. Although apartheid was in effect in the country, the school was declared open to all gifted learners of all races. School A is co-educational with grades 8 to 12. The school has a male principal, who has been leading the school for the last three years, and is assisted by 4 heads of department and 30 teachers. There are 1015 learners, and this translates into a teacher-learner ratio of 1:29 (see Table 4.2 for the learners per grade). Out of this total number of learners, 140 boys and 140 girls are staying in the hostel (28% of learners).

The demographics of teachers is 90% black, 7% coloured and 3% white. In the case of learners, it is 90% black and 10% coloured. The school fees are the same throughout the grades, with boarders paying N\$ 2418.00 p.a. (about US\$ 270.00) while non-boarders pay N\$ 1050.00 (about US\$ 115.00).

The school starts at 07h10 and finishes at 13h10 from Monday to Friday. Assemblies are held only on Mondays in the main hall, and are conducted by a staff member on duty. The teaching day starts with a staff briefing meeting every day, where a prayer has to be said by one of the staff members. The teachers take registers immediately after the morning briefings. The school's timetable operates on a seven-day cycle, and each day there is a break averaging some 36 minutes. This means that the break time varies on a daily basis. The afternoon study is only for boarders, and it takes place in a different hall at the hostel. The school shares the facilities with Namibia College of Open Learning (NAMCOL) learners, who attend classes after the morning sessions. Some teachers at the school offer lessons to NAMCOL learners. English is the medium of instruction, and other languages, such as Afrikaans and German are taught as subjects.

School A boasts of producing quality athletes and soccer players. For that reason, there are always sport and cultural activities taking place after school. Prominent sport codes at school include soccer, netball, volleyball and basketball. Some of the recent trophies which the school won in various tournaments are proudly displayed in the principal's office. The school has a mini-bus, which in most cases is seen after school with learners on board in either school uniform or sport outfits. Academically, although the school was among the top performers in the past, many teachers at the school felt that the performance needs improvement. The Matric results for 2007 are shown in Tables 2.1 and 2.2.

It is important to note that the Grade 12 candidates of 2007 were the first group to write the new Namibia Senior Secondary Certificate (NSSC) Ordinary and Higher Level Examinations, replacing the International General Certificate for Secondary Education (IGCSE) and Higher International General Certificate for Secondary Education (HIGCSE) Examinations of Cambridge International Examination in the United Kingdom. The new Namibia Senior Secondary Certificate Ordinary level (NSSCO) and Namibia Senior Secondary Certificate Higher level (NSSCH) syllabuses and examinations are of an equivalent standard to the IGCSE and HIGCSE examinations respectively. This implies that the grading scales remained the same as was the case for IGCSE and HIGCSE: that is, A* (highest) to G (lowest) for Ordinary level and U (ungraded) and I (incomplete) for a fail and an absent candidate respectively. At the Higher level, 1 is highest and 4 lowest (Ministry of Education, 2008: 1 [author's page numbering]).

The results for Ordinary level are grouped here into two bands, A* - C and D - G, partly for convenience, but primarily to group the results into performance bands with A*-C being higher than D-G.

Table 2.1: School A Matric Results for Ordinary Level (2007)

Subjects	Number of learners	Distribution of symbols			
		A* - C	D - G	U (ungraded)/ I (incomplete)	% Graded/Pass
Computer Studies	15	11 (73.3%)	4 (26.7%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
Afrikaans 2 nd Language	21	6 (28.6%)	15 (71.4%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
English 2 nd Language	157	35 (22.3%)	112 (71.3%)	10 (6.4%)	93.6%
Biology	100	24 (24.0%)	57 (57.0%)	19 (19.0%)	81.0%
Physical Science	57	25 (43.9%)	32 (56.1%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
Mathematics	138	23 (16.7%)	104 (75.4%)	11 (7.9%)	92.1%
Development Studies	147	40 (27.2%)	102 (69.4%)	5 (3.4%)	96.6%
Geography	122	25 (20.5%)	94 (77.0%)	3 (2.5%)	97.5%
History	64	3 (4.7%)	59 (92.2%)	2 (3.1%)	96.9%
Accounting	36	5 (13.9%)	27 (75.0%)	4 (11.1%)	88.9%
Business studies	92	34 (36.9%)	56 (60.9%)	2 (2.2%)	97.8%
Economics	23	5 (21.7%)	16 (69.6%)	2 (8.7%)	91.3%
Office Admn & Keyboard	13	4 (30.8%)	9 (69.2%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
% Passes by Category	985	240 (24.4%)	687 (69.7%)	58 (5.9%)	94.1%

(Source: compiled from Namibia Senior Secondary Certificate Ordinary [NSSCO] 2007. Khomas Region. The Directorate National Examinations and Assessment [DNEA])

As the results show, 69.7% of learners received D to G symbols and 24.4% received A* to C. 5.9% failed or did not write. The overall pass rate is 94.1%. Although this pass rate appears to be high, the majority of learners (69.7%) passed with weak results (D-G).

As in the case for Ordinary level, the results at the Higher level are grouped into two bands; 1 – 2 and 3 – 4.

Table 2.2: School A Matric Results for Higher Level (2007)

Subjects	Number of candidates	Distribution of symbols			
		1 - 2	3 - 4	U(ungraded)	% Graded/Pass
English 2nd Language	16	4 (25.0%)	12 (75.0%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
Physical Science	8	2 (25.0%)	6 (75.0%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
History	7	0 (0.0%)	4 (57.1%)	3 (42.9%)	57.1%
Accounting	1	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	0.0%
Business studies	7	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	4 (57.1%)	42.9%
Economics	14	1 (7.1%)	7 (50.0%)	6 (42.9%)	57.1%
% Passes by Category	53	7 (13.2%)	32 (60.4%)	14 (26.4%)	73.6%

(Source: compiled from Namibia Senior Secondary Certificate Higher [NSSCH] 2007.Khomas Region. The Directorate National Examinations and Assessment [DNEA])

The results at the Higher level show that 60.4% of learners received grades 3 – 4, 13.2% received grades 1 – 2 and 26.4% failed, a 73.6% pass rate. As in the case of Ordinary level, the majority of learners (60.4%) did not pass with good grades. The number of learners who failed at the Higher level is higher (26.4%) than at the Ordinary level (5.9%).

2.3.2 School B

The school is regarded as one of the inner city schools, and is separated from a main shopping centre by a minor road. School B opened its doors for the first time on 23 January 1962 with 265 pupils, a principal and ten members of staff, which grew to a total of 14 members of staff towards the end of that year (School B Diary, 2008:19).

The school has a male principal, who has been in charge of the school for the last 5 years. He is assisted by 4 heads of department and 27 teachers. There are 730 learners (see Table 4.2 for the breakdown of learners by grade), which yields a teacher-learner ratio of 1:23.

Out of this total number of learners, only 100 girls (14%) are staying in the hostel. The demographics of teaching staff is 47% black, 34% white and 19% coloured. School B draws most of its learners from the middle and low income residential areas. Although the school had no black learners at its inception in 1962, its present demographics of learners is made up of 95% black, 4% coloureds, and 1% white.

The yearly fees are N\$ 2587.00 pa (about US\$ 290.00) for boarders and N\$ 850.00 (about US\$ 95.00) for non-boarders. The fees are the same in all grades. This is marginally different from School A (about N\$ 200.00 less expensive) and suggests that the learners are of similar socio-economic status. As indicated earlier this is significant in being able to attribute the differences between the schools to school factors rather than external factors.

The school starts at 07h15 and classes end at 13h15 from Monday to Friday. Each morning, the academic staff starts with a 15 minutes briefing, where one of the staff members has to say a prayer. The teachers take registers after the morning briefings. School B is one of the previously advantaged schools, and it is co-educational with Grades 8 – 12. The school's timetable operates on a seven-day cycle, and each day a break of 40 minutes is taken after the fifth period of lessons. Assemblies are held on separate days for junior and senior grades in the hall, and are being conducted by a staff member on duty. This means that there is no specific day for assemblies as in the case of School A. The medium of instruction is English, which is a second language to many learners, and Afrikaans and German are taught as subjects.

As you enter the main hall, a rich collection of trophies which the school won since its inception are on display. A closer look, however, reveals that only a very limited number of these trophies were won in recent years. The school has a minibus, which can often be seen leaving and entering the school during school hours, occupied mainly by the caretaker. Despite the fact that the school in the past was one of the top academic and sport performers in the region, many school members were not satisfied with the current academic performance, and currently there are no athletic, sport and cultural activities taking place at the school. The Grade 12 results for 2007 are shown in Tables 2.3 and 2.4.

Table 2.3: School B Matric Results for Ordinary Level (2007)

Subjects	Number of candidates	Distribution of symbols			
		A* - C	D - G	U(Ungraded)/ I(incomplete)	% Graded/Pass
Otjiherero 1 st Language	9	5 (55.6%)	4 (44.4%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
Afrikaans 2 nd Language	99	18 (18.2%)	74 (74.7%)	7 (7.1%)	92.9%
English 2 nd Language	116	70 (60.3%)	46 (39.7%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
Foreign Language German	13	1 (7.7%)	12 (92.3%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
Biology	59	21 (35.6%)	33 (55.9%)	5 (8.5%)	91.5%
Physical Science	66	17 (25.8%)	48 (72.7%)	1 (1.5%)	98.5%
Mathematics	90	11 (12.2%)	67 (74.4%)	12 (13.3%)	86.6%
Development Studies	60	17 (28.3%)	42 (70.0%)	1 (1.7%)	98.3%
Geography	50	13 (26.0%)	37 (74.0%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
History	25	3 (12.0%)	22 (88.0%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
Accounting	26	6 (23.1%)	16 (61.5%)	4 (15.4%)	84.6%
Business studies	46	17 (37.0%)	27 (58.7%)	2 (4.3%)	95.7%
Economics	20	5 (25.0%)	11 (55.0%)	4 (20.0%)	80.0%
% Passes by Category	679	204 (30.0%)	439 (64.7%)	36 (5.3%)	94.7%

(Source: compiled from Namibia Senior Secondary Certificate Ordinary [NSSCO] 2007.Khomas Region. The Directorate National Examinations and Assessment [DNEA])

The table above shows that most (64.7%) of the learners received D–G symbols and only 30% received A* to C, with 5.3% for ungraded and incomplete. The overall performance is 94.7%, which is almost similar to School A (94.1%). Although the pass rate in School B is high, as was observed in School A, the majority of learners did not pass with good symbols.

Table 2.4: School B Matric Results for Higher Level (2007)

Subjects	Number of candidates	Distribution of symbols			
		1 - 2	3 - 4	U (Ungraded)	%Graded/ Passed
English 2nd Language	5	2 (40.0%)	3 (60.0%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
Biology	10	4 (40.0%)	6 (60.0%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
Physical Science	3	0 (0.0%)	3 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
Mathematics	6	2 (33.3%)	4 (66.7%)	0 (0.0%)	100.0%
Geography	9	2 (22.2%)	6 (66.7%)	1 (11.1%)	88.9%
Business studies	6	0 (0.0%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.7%)	83.3%
Economics	6	0 (0.0%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.7%)	83.3%
Average		19.4%	74.2%	6.4%	93.6%
% Passes by Category	45	10 (22.2%)	32 (71.1%)	3 (6.7%)	93.3%

(Source: compiled from Namibia Senior Secondary Certificate Higher [NSSCH] 2007. Khomas Region. The Directorate National Examinations and Assessment [DNEA])

Table 2.4 shows that 22.2% of learners achieved grades 1 – 2 and 71.1% achieved 3 – 4. 6.7% of learners failed, an overall pass rate of 93.3%. School B results at the Higher level indicate that learners performed better compared to School A where 13.2% achieved a grade 1 or 2.

As can be seen in the Matric results of the two schools, although many subjects received a 100% pass rate, the majority of learners in both schools did not get good symbols, e.g. A*, A and B at Ordinary level or grades 1 and 2 in the case of the Higher level. For instance, only 13.2% of learners in School A and 22.2% in School B received grades from 1 to 2 at the Higher level.

The pass rate of schools on the Ordinary level shows that both schools performed almost the same (94.1% in School A and 94.7% in School B), while on the Higher level School B performed better (a 93.3% pass rate) than School A (73.6%), though there is a difference in the subjects they offer as well as the number of candidates (e.g. 53 candidates in School A and 45 in School B). However, the results show that the overall performance of School B is better compared to School A.

In sum, the description of the schools reveals that both schools have a similar history and student composition. Both pre-date the country's independence and they were regarded as 'rich' schools. The school fees are similar, suggesting that the student intake is from a similar socio-economic background. A key difference is learner performance, and although School B performed better than School A in the 2007 Matric results, both schools' performance is not encouraging in that many learners did not receive good grades. As indicated earlier, the study will look at whether there is a link between academic performance and discipline in the two schools, and this will be highlighted in Chapter 6.

What follows next is a review of the literature on school discipline.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER THREE: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

3.1 Introduction

The importance of having a school environment conducive to teaching and learning cannot be overemphasised. Although order is a prerequisite for effective teaching and learning, press reports of indiscipline in schools are heard from everywhere, all the time. For instance, in *The Namibian* newspaper from 2005 to 2008 there are about 50 items on school discipline (The Namibian, <http://www.namibian.com.na>). Barlow and Robertson (in Desmond, 1999:5) argue that “in contemporary times, schools, once thought to be the harbingers of safety and all that is good, are now increasingly perceived as more violent places and less ‘champions’ of the cause. It is for these and related reasons that schools have drawn some of their sharpest criticism”.

School leaders, teachers and parents are concerned about the future of schooling. In fact, the issue of indiscipline in schools is not a new phenomenon. As Johannes (2005:1) says, “since schools came into being, behaviour problems have existed”. Ramsey (1981:19) puts it this way: “wherever people congregate to discuss schools and schooling, the number one topic of conversation is discipline”, and Thomson (in Moles, 1990:viii) claims that discipline problem “is serious, it is pervasive, and it seldom improves despite the energies committed to controlling it”.

In reviewing the international literature on school discipline, Steyn *et al.*, (2003:231) argue that although most of the disruptive behaviour in schools is not of a serious nature, it is important to note that the teaching-learning situation is always adversely affected.

This chapter is divided into 3 sections. Section 3.2 is concerned with clarifying the various dimensions of discipline, Section 3.3 considers discipline in the context of the school as a whole, and Section 3.4 builds the model which is the frame for the research.

3.2 Dimensions of Discipline

This section focuses on the following aspects: the purposes of school discipline, understanding discipline, and the causes of disciplinary problems.

3.2.1 The Purposes of School Discipline

In order to understand school discipline, it is always necessary to identify the purposes served by it (Desmond, 1999:3). Discipline in schools serves three main functions: 1) to create an environment conducive to teaching and learning, 2) to ensure safety of staff and students, and 3) to prepare students for life in a democratic society (Desmond, 1999; Joubert *et al.*, 2004). Concerning the first purpose, discipline is depicted as “a very practical and common function for schools and their constituents” (Desmond, 1999:3). This implies that discipline is needed in every school to have an ordered atmosphere for teaching and learning to take place.

In terms of safety, Joubert *et al.*, (2004:78) point out that “if certain learners are too scared to attend school because they constantly feel threatened or the behaviour of learners in a school disrupts the normal teaching and learning process, this has a serious impact on learners’ access to equal educational opportunities”. Akin to what Joubert *et al.*, say, Ramsey (1994:7) agrees that “without order, safety, and a sense of security and civility, schools cannot work and learning will not occur”.

In respect of preparing students for democracy, Sergiovanni indicates that “the best discipline strategies are those that teach students citizenship”(in Desmond, 1999:4). “In democratic societies, societal ideals include principles of trust and respect, fair and equal treatment, and importantly, the freedom and willingness to participate” (Desmond, 1999:4). This means that these qualities can only be transmitted if the school has discipline in place.

According to Ramsey (1981:271), “discipline is at the heart of what schools are all about. It constitutes, in many ways, the only enduring curriculum. Positive discipline is both the goal and the daily life blood of the schools. Its attainment requires the efforts of an active, continuing coalition among teachers, students, administrators,

parents, and the community-at-large”. To put it in a nutshell, “a school stands or falls on the effectiveness of its discipline” (Ramsey, 1994:7). What the above authors are saying is that without discipline at school, its core function — teaching and learning — will be adversely affected, and learners will not be fully prepared to be responsible citizens.

However, even if there might be an agreement on the purposes of discipline, there is still the issue of the definition of discipline which is discussed below.

3.2.2 Understanding ‘Discipline’

Discipline is viewed in a number of ways, ranging from narrow concerns with rules; to definitions concerned with moral improvement, to broader definitions which attempt to capture the idea in its context – the school. Starting with the first approach to defining discipline, according to Reyes (in English, 2006:294), discipline in schools is “always defined as school/state pupil control measures”.

Typical definitions in relation to moral improvement include Reyes who also suggests that “Discipline is a product of training that produces specific character or behaviour grounded in some moral or mental improvement” (ibid). In the same vein, Travis (2001:3) defines discipline as “a training which corrects, molds, or perfects the mental faculties or moral character; obedience to authority or rules; punishment to correct poor behaviour”. Another definition provided by Wynne (in Moles, 1990:168) suggests that discipline means “making students observe rules of conduct congruent with the norms prevailing in social gatherings and work sites in mainstream adult society”.

On the other hand, authors such as Gillborn *et al.*, (1993:110) argue that discipline should not be narrowly conceived as the imposition of rules by those in authority, nor as a moral principle, but rather acknowledged to be an enabling and integrating principle. In other words, discipline is a precondition for schools to attain their goals. According to Gillborn *et al.*, discipline should be viewed as “what links institutional purposefulness and orderliness with individual purposefulness and orderliness” (ibid).

The linkage, as Gillborn *et al.*, argue, is mainly affected, in practical terms, through the school's concentration on different features which they have termed the 'dimensions of discipline': encouraging high expectations; ensuring engagement in learning; using dialogue as a way of building shared understanding and a mutuality of trust; building relationships on respect; and being watchful that values and practices were coherent and consistent.

These five dimensions are inextricably intertwined in the sense that "...a disciplined school is a school not only with a sense of purpose, but with a sense of purpose that is communicated to, and internalised by, the pupils themselves; a school that is intent upon becoming a 'knowable community' " (Gillborn *et al.*, 1993:26).

It is important to note that the above definitions suggest that school discipline involves many aspects. However, for the purpose of this study, the definition employed follows that suggested by Gillborn *et al.*, (1993) to be a working definition. This is because Gillborn *et al.*'s definition captures the issue of a school-wide approach to discipline, which is discussed in detail in Section 3.3. Discipline and student behaviour are regarded as bearing the same meaning in this study.

3.2.3 The Causes of Disciplinary Problems

According to the Namibian Ministry of Education and Culture (1992:3 [author's page numbering]), "discipline problems can have many causes, and if we all take time to understand these causes, we will be better able to understand the problems. Then we will be better equipped to cope more effectively with them". These causes are wide ranging. As Thomson (in Moles, 1990:x) notes, student discipline is a many-layered issue. "The causes and the solutions lie in strata, ranging from the individual classroom through school and community and state to national public opinion" (ibid.).

Likewise, Travis (2001:1) and Sonn (2005:21) indicate that for us to understand why learners misbehave, first of all we need to consider or understand where these learners come from and what their circumstances are. As Sonn puts it, "many learners come from difficult and stressful circumstances which they cannot cope with. The causes of

their discipline problems can, in some instances, be traced to their inability to deal with these circumstances” (2005: 21).

Evidence found in relevant literature suggests that the causes of learner discipline problems can be grouped into five categories: *learner-related factors* (these include inability to cope with the physical and emotional changes of adolescence, peer pressure to rebel against school, feelings of alienation and isolation, and unmet special learning needs); *teacher-related factors* (such as inadequately prepared teachers, and teachers with negative attitudes); *school-related factors* (such as racism, sexism, ageism and other forms of discrimination, bullying and intimidation either within the school or outside, being ridiculed in class, being different [accent, culture, religion] and then ridiculed or isolated at school, and under-resourced schools in dilapidated conditions); *parent or family-related factors* (such as family conflict between parents and between parents and other siblings, death or divorce in the family, and poverty in the home leading to stress and tension); and *society-related factors* (such as violence in the neighbourhood and fear for personal safety in the home and coming to and from school) (Ministry of Education and Culture, 1992; Wolhuter and Steyn, 2003; Sonn, 2005).

Sonn argues that any learner who might experience any of these situations may feel unhappy and frustrated at school. “An unhappy or frustrated child is unlikely to be focused in the class and therefore be more likely to display disruptive behaviour, have little or no motivation, low-self esteem, may lack concentration and / or become apathetic (2005:22). Travis (2001:1) is of the opinion that since teachers spend a majority of their time with learners, they are usually on the front line of discipline and discipline problems. This means that, according to Sonn (2005:22), teachers need to understand that learners have different needs and circumstances, and treating them as if they are the same will not work.

According to Andy (2000:9), “engaging in misbehaviour is sometimes a response to academic failure. The improvement in classroom order usually succeeds when marginal students are provided opportunities to experience academic and social success”.

In the same vein, Kyriacou (in Rogers, 2002:40) argues that “the golden rule of maintaining discipline is to realise that good discipline is a natural consequence of good teaching. If we teach effectively by making the work clear and interesting and helping pupils to stay ‘on task’ by keeping them involved in the lesson and helping them when they have problems with the work, we will find that discipline will follow”.

Sonn (2005:22) gives a stern warning that if the above circumstances “are ignored when a teacher or school deals with discipline, they may succeed in ‘sorting the learner out’, but it will only be for a short period of time. Because the root of the problem has been ignored and the learner has not learned how to cope with it, the learner may continue to misbehave” (see also Porteus *et al.*, 2001:39).

Sonn continues that “the school may respond with harsher methods because the learner refuses to be disciplined. This leads to a vicious cycle of misbehaviour and punishment which achieves very little or nothing. Even worse is the fact that the learner has not learned how to cope with those circumstances which lead to his or her misbehaviour” (2005:22).

The underlying message from the above authors is that when we deal with discipline problems in our schools we should bear in mind that there are factors which we need to understand, and this will help us to prevent those problems from reoccurring. Furthermore, maintaining discipline in the school is everyone’s responsibility. As the Ministry of Education and Culture in Namibia (1992:5 [author’s page numbering]) puts it, solving disciplinary problems does not rest with one person - “[t]he solution rests with all of us — the parents, the teachers, the principals, the learners, and the whole community. We all have the responsibility to work together to provide the best conditions for the education of our children”.

As an attempt to create an orderly, respectful, and predictable school environment, many schools in developed countries have tried to implement comprehensive discipline strategies referred to as the school-wide approach (Nelson, 2002:18). The following section focuses on this approach.

3.3 A School-Wide Approach to Discipline

Schools use a wide range of educational and non-educational approaches and practices to deal with violence or discipline problems. These programmes are based on the belief that violence is a learned behaviour. This implies that the focus is on primary prevention—the seek to prevent violence before it occurs (Nelson, 2002:16). In other words, the current programmes follow the belief that ‘prevention is better than cure’.

Duke (in Moles, 1990:19) states that the issue of student behaviour has been examined and addressed from a variety of perspectives. “Some have dealt with behaviour problems clinically, investigating the origins of dysfunctional student conduct and developing highly personalised treatments. Some have adopted instructional approaches in which students are taught how to behave appropriately and teachers are encouraged to regard good instructional practice as the first line of defence against misconduct. Some have sought to control student behaviour through cooperative action involving school authorities, parents, community agencies, government programs, juvenile justice offices, and the like. Some have invested energy in providing organisational structures to reduce the likelihood of inappropriate student behaviour”.

Despite all these attempts, some schools were and are still unable to maintain discipline. Although there is an argument that there is no one best strategy to deal with disciplinary problems, because schools operate under different contexts, current researchers claim that the last strategy mentioned by Duke (in Moles, 1990:19), which is a school-wide approach, has proved to be effective in most schools (Duke and Meckel, 1980; Moles (in Moles, 1990); Sonn, 2005; Cowie and Jennifer, 2007).

As Duke (in Duke and Meckel, 1980:26) says, “only in the past few decades, in fact, has interest begun to shift from dealing with problems on an individual or classroom basis to a school-wide level.” Proponents of a school-wide or systemic approach, as others prefer to label it, argue that it is more productive than treating the symptoms of the problem — discipline.

This approach concerns changing the organisation of the school, and the school culture is a most important focus of change efforts in organisational development. According to Sonn (2005:5), the culture of the school reflects how things are done at school. This includes the values and beliefs of the school, its norms and its practices and the overall feel of the school.

An example of a school-wide approach is Duke and Meckel's (1980) 'Systematic Management Plan for School Discipline (SMPSD)'. These authors believe that:

"Schools can increase their credibility as rule-governed organisations by encouraging the collaborative development of discipline policies, rules, conflict-resolution procedures, and consequences for disobeying rules. To achieve such broad-based participation, educators must come to regard schools as communities of individuals sharing common goals and certain basic rights" (p. 46).

Travis (2001:1) expresses a similar point of view: "well disciplined schools do not happen by accident — a solid discipline plan requires cooperative ownership and responsibility of students, parents, and school personnel". Travis further states that "An effective discipline plan should inspire a climate in which all students take responsibility for their own behaviour, treat each other with kindness, and learn the value of productive work and good citizenship".

According to Duke and Meckel (1980:39), the two fundamental premises of SMPSD are: "to be effective, control procedures must be 1) applicable on a school-wide rather than a class-by-class basis and 2) comprehensive rather than partial". Concerning the first premise, these authors claim that teachers who give up on their colleagues and decide to content themselves with establishing order in their own classrooms make it hard to establish a truly school-wide plan for managing behaviour problems.

For at least four reasons, according to Duke and Meckel (1980), a systemic approach to the reduction of student behaviour problems is preferable to a series of individual classroom efforts:

"Firstly, the majority of serious student behaviour problems, at least the ones that puzzle educators the most, do not occur in class. Instead, they take place

before school, between classes, after school, on the bus, in the cafeteria, etc. These are occasions when adult supervision tends to be lacking. Putting emphasis on better classroom management techniques probably does little to eliminate these out-of-class behaviour problems. This implies that only well-coordinated initiatives on a school-wide basis make all the difference.

Secondly, there is a belief that a major source of concern on the part of students, parents, and school administrators seems to be teacher inconsistency. One teacher enforces certain rules that another teacher ignores. Such inconsistency undermines student respect for the school as a rule-governed organisation. The point here is that not very much can be done to reduce between-teacher inconsistency without members of the school community working together in a collaborative manner.

Thirdly, contemporary legal developments demand schools to revisit their disciplinary measures. Previously, educators had the broad discretionary powers of parents in dealing with their students. Nowadays, the courts have upheld the principle that students have constitutional rights. This means that any violations of these rights may result in a lawsuit. Therefore, it is absolutely imperative that educators develop consistent, school-wide disciplinary policies that acknowledge the rights of students.

Lastly, a school-wide approach regards the administrative support as crucial in the success of any effort to improve school discipline. What is crucial here is that without a strong support from the school office, teachers will not be able to maintain discipline in their classrooms” (p. 40).

The second major premise on which SMPSD is based deals with the desirability of comprehensive, rather than piecemeal, change. The argument made by Duke and Meckel (1980:41) is that “always well intentioned efforts to innovate have failed because the attention was given to changing only one dimension of schooling”. Duke and Meckel further claim that “a school consists of interdependent organisational components, many of which exert some impact on the creation and resolution of student behaviour problems” (ibid).

In a similar vein, Moles (in Moles, 1990:15) points out that student discipline is always a school-wide concern, and much misbehaviour happens outside the classroom, therefore, “the whole school is an important focus of attention, both as a social organisation and as a setting for misbehaviour”.

The main argument here is that the school is an organisation where various factors or parts make up the whole, and the probability of reducing disciplinary problems will be

increased by considering how well each of these organisational factors is functioning and how they relate to each other (see, for example, Duke and Meckel, 1980; Sonn, 2005). But what are these important factors? What follows is the answer to this question.

3.4 Factors Influencing School Discipline

Referring to the notion of school as an organisation, Davidoff and Lazarus (1997) argue that “in every organisation there are particular aspects or elements which make up that organisation, and each of these needs to be functioning healthily for the whole to be healthy. Any unhealthy or malfunctioning element will have a negative ripple effect throughout the system” (p.17).

In this vein, there seem to be seven key factors influencing school discipline. Five of these could be called organisational elements in the sense that they refer to factors generic to all organisations which are amenable to policy change in a formal sense. There are also two key factors, not strictly organisational in nature, that influence and are themselves influenced by these factors. These are leadership and management, necessary to bind and drive policy, and school culture which is the outcome of the inter-relationship between the organisational elements and leadership and management.

These factors are drawn from the work of Duke and Meckel, 1980; Duke (in Moles, 1990); and Sonn, 2005, and they are:

1. ***Strategy*** (Duke and Meckel, 1980; Duke (in Moles, 1990); Sonn, 2005)
2. ***Structures and procedures*** (Duke and Meckel, 1980; Duke (in Moles, 1990); Sonn, 2005)
3. ***School identity and purpose*** (Duke (in Moles, 1990); Sonn, 2005)
4. ***School resources (technical and human)*** (Duke (in Moles, 1990); Duke and Meckel, 1980; Sonn, 2005)
5. ***Parents and community involvement*** (Duke and Meckel, 1980)
6. ***Leadership and management*** (Duke (in Moles, 1990); Sonn, 2005)
7. ***School culture*** (Duke (in Moles, 1990); Sonn, 2005)

It is believed that these elements work as a chain, and if one is absent, the discipline policy at school will be paralysed. It is unclear, however, whether these elements have equal weighting or whether certain elements are either prior to or have greater influence than others. It is hoped that this study will be able to provide a sense of the relative significance of factors.

It is important to mention that the above factors are regarded as lenses through which discipline can be examined in the school, therefore, they will provide a frame for this study, and a brief description will be given to each of them.

3.4.1 Strategy

This primarily concerns the mechanisms by which the school ensures that organisational goals are pursued. Such mechanisms include rules, sanctions, supervision and evaluation of discipline policy.

As always said that there is no 'a game without rules', it also appears that every organisation requires rules in order to achieve its objectives. Duke and Meckel (1980:45) argue that "rules constitute one of the central features of school organisation, and they presumably exist to enable the school to achieve its objectives in a relatively efficient and fair manner".

Duke and Meckel add that "when behaviour is judged to be problematic, the judgement typically is based on the student's failure to observe a rule. School personnel expend considerable time and energy in an effort to enforce rules and handle instances of rule-breaking behaviour" (ibid). Therefore, these authors suggest that school rules and sanctions "afford a logical place to begin thinking about a plan for improving school discipline" (ibid).

According to Cotton (2006:15), "rules, sanctions, and procedures are developed with input from students, are clearly specified, and are made known to everyone in the school". Furthermore, Cotton claims that "student participation in developing and reviewing school discipline programmes creates a sense of ownership and

belongingness, and widespread dissemination of clearly stated rules and procedures assures that all students and staff understand what is and is not acceptable” (ibid).

Although the need to have rules and sanctions is emphasised here, some believe that too many rules and harsh sanctions sometimes do not help to maintain discipline. As Duke and Meckel (1980:18) put it: “too many rules, for example, may actually contribute to the creation of behaviour problems by overtaxing the capacity of teachers and administrators to enforce them, thereby leading to inconsistent discipline, teacher frustration, and the undermining of the school’s credibility as a rule-governed organisation”. Similarly, Porteus *et al.*, (2001:30) argue that “too many rules become confusing and restrictive, and children become unable to focus their attention on the important rules”. When it comes to sanctions such as suspensions, for example, according to Duke and Meckel (1980:18), these “may serve more as rewards than as punishments for certain students who dislike school”. This implies that for school rules and sanctions to be effective, they need to be carefully planned.

Duke and Meckel (1980:28) are of the opinion that “the availability of accurate, up-to-date data on the nature and extent of student behaviour problems is important for the development of effective strategies”. They further state that “data permit school personnel to concentrate on priority problems, anticipate future concerns, combat rumours and set realistic objectives involving the improvement of student behaviour” (p. 28). In other words, making information available about student’s behaviour makes supervision easy.

It is also stressed that a discipline policy needs to be evaluated on a regular basis (Sonn, 2005; Duke and Meckel 1980; Cotton, 2006). This enables the school to make adjustments where it is needed.

3.4.2 Structures and Procedures

A school discipline policy and plan need to be guided and supported by structures and procedures. According to Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:25), “structures and procedures allow the different aspects of organisational life to interrelate in a coherent way”. Clarke (2007:90) puts it this way: “the point to make, and to make repeatedly, is that

good discipline is everybody's business, and that it requires a team effort. To achieve this, however, there need to be policies, structures and systems to make it work".

These are various units and departments in the school, the lines of communication between them, who they report to, how and where decisions are made, what their responsibilities are and what their rules, regulations and procedures are (Sonn, 2005:4). The structures include a disciplinary committee, a School Board, the Learners' Representative Council, and so on. These structures are expected to execute their duties within the framework of the Government or school discipline policy.

Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:25) argue that "if we understand democracy, in its simple definitional form, to mean the involvement or participation of all role players in decisions relating to their organisation either through direct participation or representation, the school's structures and procedures need to reflect this involvement".

However, Porteus *et al.*, (2001:85) suggest that "conflict resolution procedures should take place on an individual basis (involving only those who were directly involved) and in private".

3.4.3 School Identity and Purpose

"Every organisation or school has what is known as its own particular identity" (Davidoff and Lazarus, 1997:22). When it comes to discipline, according to Sonn (2005: 6), the school should have a common understanding of discipline, which has to be reflected in its vision and mission statement. This means that in order to determine the formal identity of the school in relation to discipline, we need to look at what is stated in the vision and mission statement of the school.

As Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:22) say, "the school policy — in national, regional, local, and school-specific terms — reflects the identity of a school. It encapsulates particular principles that act as guidelines for practice".

Davidoff and Lazarus argue further that “the identity of the school is defined by how people perceive the school from the outside and from the inside” (1997:44). In other words, how the people see the school, in this case in terms of discipline, reveals what the situation on the ground is. For instance, as Sonn (2005:4) says, “the school might be known as an academic school, a school with good community links, a good extra-mural school, or a gangster school”. This means that the activities which take place in the school reveal its identity.

Sonn further explains that the purpose of education in the school should be known and shared by every school member for discipline to achieve its goal. In the same breath, Cotton (2006:15) claims that “well-disciplined schools tend to be those in which there is a school-wide emphasis on the importance of learning and intolerance of conditions which inhibit learning”.

3.4.4 School Resources (Technical and Human)

These are resources that the school need to help maintaining discipline. The physical resources include things such as cleaning equipment, individual student record cards, classrooms, etc., and human resources include the teaching and non-teaching staff. Human resources also include the development and capacity building of the people in the organisation and the formal and informal relationships between people (Sonn, 2005; Davidoff and Lazarus, 1997; Duke (in Moles, 1990); Duke and Meckel, 1980).

Cotton (2006:15) hold the same view that “well disciplined schools are those assisting teachers to improve their classroom management and discipline skills by arranging for staff development activities as needed”. In my opinion, staff development is also crucial, especially for teachers who are new in the profession to learn how to deal with disciplinary cases.

Concerning the physical resources, Sonn (2005:7) indicates that the school needs to know what resources it has at its disposal to deal with its discipline policy. For instance, according to Sonn (2005:7), “if respect for the environment and cleanliness is the school policy, does the school have sufficient garbage bins within reach of the classrooms and are they emptied regularly”?

These are some of the questions that need to be answered in order to determine the state of physical resources at school. It is also expected that all school members should share a collective responsibility for looking after the physical resources.

3.4.5 Parents and Community Involvement

The relationship between home and the school is vital, because, as Sonn (2005:8) says, “discipline is not only learned at school. Children learn about discipline at home and in the communities in which they live. If there is a breakdown in discipline outside of the school, discipline in the school will also be affected.”

At school level, the involvement of all role-players (principal, teachers, learners, parents and community) appears to be the crucial factor, with parental involvement worthy of being singled out as being of special importance (Wolhuter and Steyn, 2003; Pienaar, 2003). “When parents become involved in the activity of the school, education becomes a family affair” (Clarke, 2007:69). Andy (2000:1) expresses a similar point of view by stating: “as a matter of fact, all people around the students include school personnel; their family members, the policy makers, and the society share the tasks to create an optimum environment for the younger generations to maximise their potentials”.

Ramsey (1981:261) also argues that “discipline is not just a classroom problem — it is a school-wide issue. Likewise, safe schools and the responsible behaviour of young people are not just school matters, but are genuine concerns for the entire community and for society at large. Thus, achieving proper discipline should become broad-based cooperative and collaborative venture”

Therefore, according to Sonn (2005:9), “community involvement in the school is important because the values, goals and purposes of the school can be shared and owned by the community”. Similarly, Clarke (2007:69), argues that “keeping students and parents informed of what is happening makes them feel part of the institution”.

Although there is an emphasis on parental and community involvement in maintaining school discipline as seen above, for Porteus *et al.*, (2001:88), “perhaps the [biggest] challenge for schools in establishing an effective disciplinary process at school, or simply in building a school that is safe and secure for both educators and learners, is the meaningful involvement of parent figures in the process”. What Porteus *et al.*, say was observed by Duke and Meckel (1980:25) that educators sometimes complain that the parents of ‘problem’ students, particularly those from lower-class neighbourhoods, refuse to take part in school efforts to curb indiscipline. As a result, schools find it difficult to deal with these students.

It is believed that solving this problem can only be done through effective communication between the school and home. As Cotton (2006:15) claims, “well disciplined schools are those which have a high level of communication and partnership with the communities they serve. These schools have a higher-than-average incidence of parent involvement in school functions, and communities are kept informed of school goals and activities”.

It is therefore important to note that the onus is on the schools to ensure that the parents and community are being involved in maintaining discipline.

3.4.6 Leadership and Management

“At the heart of school or any organisational life are leadership and management. It is these aspects of school life that ensure that all other aspects are held together and developed” (Davidoff and Lazarus, 1997:32). These two aspects are said to have more influence in the sense that without strong leadership and management at school, according to Sonn (2005:5), there won’t be “co-ordination and proper functioning of organisational elements”.

Leadership and management, according to Sonn (2005:5), deals with “the day to day operation of the school (the way it manages itself) and the vision and goals the school sets for itself (the leadership functions of the school)”. “Another way of looking at it is to see leadership as directing a school, and management as holding the school , maintaining the well-being of the school and ensuring that the systems set in place are working well” (Davidoff and Lazarus, 1997:32).

Sonn, (2005:8) is of the opinion that “the leadership and management of the school is important for the development and implementation of school policy”. For example, in Sonn’s words, “if a school decides on a discipline policy which is participatory, but has an authoritarian leadership style which prevents participation, the discipline policy is bound to fail” (ibid).

According to Nelson (2002:40), “the principal plays an important leadership role in establishing school discipline by effective administration and by personal example”. Nelson further argues that “as instructional leaders, principals must promote teaching and assist with practices for effective discipline” (ibid).

Blasé and Blasé (in Nelson, 2002: 41) argue that “principals who are power oriented, and who want to control teachers with bureaucratic ‘snooping’ are not effective. The supportive, inquiry-oriented leader who encourages collegiality and reflective professional development, and assists staff in discipline matters is more successful”.

Nelson (2002:43) suggests that “principals should take responsibility for dealing with serious infractions, but they should encourage teachers to handle routine classroom discipline problems”. This is another way of developing leadership qualities among teachers. In the same vein, Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:32) point out that “leadership and management relate not only to those in positions of power (for example, principals, heads of department), but also to leadership and management capacity: the ability of all those in leadership positions (and potentially that means every teacher and other role players in the school) to be creative and responsible leaders”.

Cotton (2006:15) is of the opinion that “many poorly disciplined schools have principals who are visible only for ‘official’ duties such as assemblies or when enforcing school discipline. In contrast, principals of well-disciplined schools tend to be very visible in hallways and classrooms, talking informally with teachers and students, speaking to them by name, and expressing interest in their activities”. Similarly, Nelson (2002:40) points out that “principals of well-disciplined students are usually highly visible models...effective principals are respected and liked rather than feared by students. They can communicate steadfast consideration and respect for students; yet adhere firmly to the school’s discipline programme”.

Ramsey (1981:44) agrees with Cotton and Nelson that “more than any other single person, the school principal is the key to successful discipline. Consciously and unconsciously the entire school staff mirrors the strengths, weaknesses, and priorities of the principal”.

What the above authors claim is that without a strong, visible and affable principal, the discipline policy cannot be easily implemented. Therefore, sound leadership is a prerequisite for a warm and caring learning environment.

3.4.7 School Culture

Ramsey (1994:8) claims that school discipline is not only about rule, regulation, regimentation, policy, or punishment; but student behaviour reflects the beliefs and values of the organisation. In other words, the culture drives discipline in the school. The culture of the school concerns how activities are carried out at school. “It is the prevailing pattern of activities and interactions, and of shared norms, attitudes, and values” (Moles, in Moles, 1990:18). Moles further stresses that where there is a cultural campaign for order and safety, the school climate is more supportive of student learning.

Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:41), likewise argue that “the culture of an organisation, or school, diffuses its particular qualities and characteristics into every corner of school life. It cannot be avoided and it cannot be escaped. Very often, it lives, influences and affects the life of the school in ways that people in the school are barely aware of”.

Davidoff and Lazarus continue that in relation to other organisational elements, “culture is an extremely important aspect of school life — one which has a profound effect on and is affected by every other element in the organisation” (ibid). To put it differently, the school culture is the outcome of organisational elements working together or not. Therefore, the functioning of these elements determines what culture the school has — a positive culture reflects the well functioning of these elements and vice versa.

According to Gultig *et al.*, (1999:5), “a true culture of teaching and learning, as well as a supportive management culture, can only thrive in a school where the major stakeholders feel ownership of the school’s mission and ethos”. Cotton (2005) concurs with Gultig *et al.*, on this point that “a warm social climate, characterized by a concern for students as individuals, is typical of well-disciplined schools. Teachers and administrators take an interest in the personal goals, achievements, and problems of students and support them in their academic and extracurricular activities” (p. 15).

It is therefore important to note that building a positive culture of discipline at school is not an individual responsibility. It requires teamwork and commitment from all school members. This implies that the type of leadership that allows all players — teachers, learners, parents and the community at large to be involved is crucial.

As indicated earlier, the above factors provided the conceptual framework of this study. The analytical framework developed to assist in the process of data collection and analysis is shown in Table 3.1 in the next section.

3.5 Summary and Conclusions

After reviewing the literature on school discipline, important questions have emerged which provided guidance in conducting this study. These questions are premised on the assumption that acceptable learner behaviour hinges on the seven organisational elements that function as a whole.

These are:

1. What are the study schools' strategies to maintain discipline?
2. Which structures and procedures do these schools have in place to deal with discipline?
3. What is the identity of the study schools in relation to discipline, and what is their vision and mission statement?
4. What technical and human resources are available in the study schools?
5. Do the study schools involve the parents and community in maintaining discipline?
6. Do the study schools have a leadership and management style that is supportive of disciplinary efforts?
7. What culture do the study schools have in relation to discipline?

The above questions assisted the researcher to answer the basic question of this study. The subsidiary questions were built on these questions and the seven elements provide the analytical framework for the research. This framework appears in summary below in Table 3.1.

The following chapter outlines the methodology by which the framework was operationalised.

Table 3.1: An Analytical Framework

Factors/Elements	Key Indicators
<p>Strategy</p>	<p>School rules and punishment procedure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear rules developed with input from learners 2. Rules made known to everyone in the school 3. Available and up-to-date data on the nature and extent of discipline in the school 4. Clear sanctions which are accepted by all 5. Punishment as a last resort after several attempts have failed <p>Maintaining discipline responsibility</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. A shared responsibility of maintaining discipline in the school <p>Evaluation of the discipline policy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. A school discipline policy which is frequently evaluated
<p>Structures and procedures</p>	<p>Disciplinary structures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appropriate structures for discipline are in place, e.g. disciplinary committee, Learner Representative Council, etc. 2. Each committee member knows his/her responsibilities <p>Disciplinary procedures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Clear disciplinary procedures 4. Disciplinary decisions guided by the ministerial policy
<p>School identity and purpose</p>	<p>The school's vision and mission</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A clear vision for the school 2. A school's vision is shared by all members 3. A mission statement is developed by all role-players 4. A common understanding of the purpose of education in the school <p>Learner discipline definition and the state of discipline in the school</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Understanding of learner discipline 6. The state of discipline in the school 7. An ordered atmosphere

Table 3.1: An Analytical Framework (Continued)

Factors/Elements	Key Indicators
School resources (technical and human)	<p>Human resources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Availability of a school counsellor and other persons needed to maintain discipline 2. A great emphasis on professional development in relation to managing learners' discipline <p>Physical resources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Enough physical resources at school 4. A shared responsibility of looking after the schools' resources
Parents/community involvement	<p>Communication with parents/community</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Informing parents when changes are made in the discipline policy 2. Effective channels of communication with the parents/community are in place <p>Significance of parents/community involvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Expressing the significance of parents/community involvement
Leadership and management	<p>A visible and supportive principal who delegates appropriate discipline authority</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A visible and supportive principal 2. Delegates appropriate discipline authority to disciplinary structures where possible <p>Staff development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Arranges for staff development opportunities in relation to managing learners' discipline
School culture	<p>School culture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A school is described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the approach and strategies which were used to collect data. The case study approach, qualitative methods used, selection of schools, selection of respondents, analysis of data, and the limitations of the study are the main themes of this chapter.

4.2 The Case Study

The method used in this study is a case study approach. Two secondary schools in the Khomas Region were selected for this purpose. According to Kane and O'Reilly-De Brún (2001:116), "case studies give 'in-depth' information, showing how processes work, patterns are lived out, the ideal is converted to the real, change occurs, and many other important areas which 'fall through' when using surveys and other techniques".

Similarly, Yin (2003:1) points out that "case studies are the preferred strategy when 'how' or 'why' questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context". It is because of these arguments that a case study was chosen as the approach in this study. In order to make sure that the study questions were adequately answered, three weeks were spent at each school.

4.3 Methods

The qualitative methods used were on-site observations, semi-structured interviews and reviewing of disciplinary and other policy documents. These methods were chosen to assist the researcher in finding answers to the seven key questions of the study.

The observation schedule which was used is shown in Appendix B. The aspects observed were such as the attitudes of the school members towards time; how learners behaved during assemblies, in the corridors, and around the school; activities of school members during breaks and after school; general relationship among the school members; whether the principal was seen around the school or not (visible); and the technical and human resources which were available. This was in line with Cohen and Manion's (1985:122) argument that "whatever the problem or the approach, at the heart of every case study lies a 'method of observation' ". In the same vein, Lichtman (2006:139) claims that "observing humans in natural settings assists in understanding the complexity of human behaviour and interrelationships among groups". Although there was no formal classroom observation schedule, the researcher observed the lessons of 12 out of 14 teachers interviewed in School A and 11 out of 15 in School B.

Interviews were done with the School Board, the two principals, heads of department, teachers, Learners' Representative Council (LRC) and learners. The purpose of the interviews was mainly to obtain the information on the schools' identity and purpose, the strategies they use in maintaining discipline, the structures and procedures they have in place, and the leadership and management of the schools. The decision to use interviews parallels Lichtman's claim that interviews are used "to hear what the participant has to say in her own words, in her voice, with her language and narrative. In this way, participants can share what they know and have learned and can add a dimension to our understanding of the situation that questionnaire data does not reveal" (2006:119).

All interviews were conducted at the schools except in the case of parents who were School Board members, who were interviewed at their work places during lunch time. Most of the interviews with teachers and heads of department were conducted shortly after they were observed teaching, and this was mostly done during free periods, breaks and after school, while the principals were interviewed during free periods. All learners were interviewed during breaks and after school. The questions used appear in Appendix B.

In both schools learners were interviewed in groups. School Board members who were parents were contacted through the assistance of learners belonging to their households and class teachers. Each interview lasted for about 30 minutes.

Except for the parents who were School Board members, the majority of respondents were willing to participate in the study. Only 3 out of 7 Board members in School A and 4 out of 7 in School B agreed to be interviewed (respondents data is shown in Tables 4.1 and 4.2).

Disciplinary and other relevant documents were analysed to supplement the information obtained through the other two methods of data collection. These include the schools' prospectuses and minutes of staff meetings. These methods were selected because, as Kane and O'Reilly-De Brún (2001:108) argue, complementary methods, also known as triangulation, provide 'stronger' information than the use of a single technique. A tape recorder was used to ensure that all the information given by interviewees was recorded, and notes were taken during observations.

4.4 Selection of Schools

Although there is a belief that indiscipline is rife in state secondary schools rather than in primary schools, the choice of secondary schools in this study was largely based on my experience. As a former teacher, I had an opportunity to teach in both primary and secondary phases, and had noticed a difference in learners' discipline between the two phases of education with there being more problems at a secondary level— hence the selection of secondary schools.

The process of selection of schools started at the Regional Office, following a letter seeking permission to conduct a study in the state schools (see Appendix B). The selection was done with the assistance of one of the education inspectors, who had been in the office for more than 5 years. After a briefing about the purpose of the study and the kind of information needed, the inspector welcomed the study for its substance and endorsed it.

Currently, the Khomas Region has 26 state secondary schools. The data collected from the Regional Office helped in the process of selecting the study schools by using the following criteria: both schools should have almost the same number of learners who are from similar social backgrounds; be co-educational and have the same grades, e.g. grades 8 - 12; boarding and government schools; and one of the schools should be perceived to be more disciplined than the other.

The Regional Office had no information about schools' yearly fees (since the school fees indicate the social status of learners), and this data was obtained from the Ministry's Head Office. Although the state of discipline in the schools is known apocryphally at the Regional Office, it appears that this information is not documented so that it can be factored into this study. Therefore, the selection of the two schools in terms of learners' behaviour was not entirely empirically supported with respect to the issue of discipline. However, as indicated in Chapter 2, the school fees are relatively similar indicating a similar student socio-economic profile, such that differences in disciplinary patterns can be largely attributed to differences in the schools rather than in the learners.

When the provided information was scrutinised, the two schools, which were given fictitious names, School A and B, were selected. After selecting the schools, the researcher proceeded to the principals of the two schools to request permission, which was granted on the spot in both cases. Although permission at School B was granted by the principal himself, he was not available at the time of the study and one of the heads of department acted as the principal.

4.5 Selection of Respondents

In order to capture the views of the whole school, respondents were selected across all sectors. The respondents were School Board members, the two principals, heads of department, teachers, Learners' Representative Council and learners of the study schools. Apart from the principals, all the respondents were randomly selected. An attempt was made initially to differentiate the teacher sample by gender and subject specialisation as well as by experience, but this was not operationalisable. In the event, the level of experience became the main point of comparison.

For a complete list of teaching staff by gender, years at the current school, experience, subject specialisation and qualifications, see Appendix C. The learners were also selected in all grades (Grades 8-12). Tables 4.1 and 4.2 below show the respondents data.

Table 4.1: School Respondents Data

Respondents	School A		School B	
	Total	Interviewed	Total	Interviewed
Principal	1	1	1	1 (acting)
School Board Members	13	5 (38%)	13	6 (46%)
Heads of Department	4	3 (75%)	4	2 (50%)
Teachers	27	14 (52%)	25	15 (60%)
Learners' Representative Council	24	11 (46%)	20	12 (60%)
Total	69	34 (49%)	63	36 (57%)

Table 4.2: School Learner Respondents Data

Grade	School A		School B	
	Total	Interviewed	Total	Interviewed
8	224	36 (16%)	147	22 (15%)
9	216	30 (14%)	172	25 (15%)
10	229	34 (15%)	171	25 (15%)
11	174	27 (16%)	116	20 (17%)
12	172	27 (16%)	124	21 (17%)
Total	1015	154 (15%)	730	113 (15%)

All these segment of the schools population were involved in the study due to the fact that discipline at school hinges on them. In other words, a school-wide approach calls for all these groups to be actively involved in maintaining discipline in the sense that their individual contribution is what good discipline constitutes.

4.6 Analysis of Data

The information collected was analysed with the assistance of the analytical framework developed in this study, and it is descriptive in nature. This means that data was organised and analysed around the seven elements with their key indicators which emerged from the literature review.

The elements were discussed separately and they form the seven sections of Chapter 5. The indicators in the analytical framework were grouped by focus areas in a table at the beginning of each section. This is shown in Table 3.1. The recorded information was also used in the process.

According to Kane and O'Reilly-De Brún (2001:287), the “analysis of qualitative data involves getting the information (*collecting*), boiling it down (*reducing*), organizing it in various ways to help you to see patterns and relationships (*displaying*), deciding what you have got (*drawing conclusions*), and satisfying yourself and others that you have found what you think you have (*verifying*)”. Following this argument, after the key indicators were grouped, the data collected was analysed school-by-school, considering what the different groups of respondents conveyed in order to assess where the similarities and differences were before drawing conclusions.

4.7 Limitations of the Study

This study had limitations with regard to the approach used to collect data and the fieldwork. These limitations are discussed below.

4.7.1 A case study approach

The first limitation is intrinsic to small-scale case studies. Since this was a case study of 2 (8%) state secondary schools out of 26 in the Khomas Region, it will not be possible to generalise the findings that emerged in this study to all schools in the country. Secondly, the selection of schools may not represent the range of discipline issues faced by schools as a whole.

4.7.2 Fieldwork

Although the researcher wanted to have an equal representation of age and gender in the study, this was unfeasible due to the fact that all interviews had to be done on a voluntary basis. Thus, the researcher primarily interviewed only those who agreed to participate in the study. However, as is noted in Chapter 5, there were negligible gender differences in responses.

The other limitation concerns the involvement of parents in the study. The decision made to leave out the parents in the study was deliberate. This is because parents were represented by the School Board members. Unfortunately, only a few parents who were serving on the School Board (3 out of 7 in School A and 4 out of 7 in School B) agreed to be interviewed. However, this did not impact severely on the results obtained, because the same issues were fully discussed with other sectors.

Finally, the presence of the researcher in the schools might have had an effect on the learners' behaviour, especially those who participated in the study and who knew what the researcher was interested in. It was for that reasons that the researcher spent a period of three weeks at each school as an attempt to obviate this factor.

The data collected is presented and analysed in the next chapter.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and analyses the data collected through observations, review of disciplinary documents and interviews with School Board members (11), principals (2), heads of department (5), teachers (29), Learner Representative Council members (23) and learners (267) of the sampled schools (see Chapter 4 for School A and B respondents data).

All questions were formulated around the seven key elements which are believed to influence school discipline, as they have been discussed in Chapter 3. These elements form the seven sections of this chapter and they are:

- 5.1. Strategy,
- 5.2. Structures and procedures,
- 5.3. Parents and community involvement,
- 5.4. School identity and purpose,
- 5.5. School resources (technical and human),
- 5.6. Leadership and management, and
- 5.7. School culture.

5.2 Strategy

It is believed that the school's strategy plays a pivotal role in maintaining discipline. This is because the strategy provides directions as to how discipline should be dealt with at school. The key elements of the successful strategy usually have to do with the following key indicators which were the basis of the interviews:

- Clear rules developed with input from learners;
- Rules made known to everyone in the school;
- A shared responsibility of maintaining discipline in the school;

- Available and up-to-date data on the nature and extent of discipline in the school;
- Clear sanctions which are accepted by all;
- Punishment as a last resort after several attempts have failed; and
- A school discipline policy which is frequently evaluated.

The indicators are grouped together by focus areas for analysis purposes in Table 5.2.1.

Table 5.2.1: Strategy Indicators

Indicators	
<p>School rules and punishment procedure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear rules developed with input from learners 2. Rules made known to everyone in the school 3. Available and up-to-date data on the nature and extent of discipline in the school 4. Clear sanctions which are accepted by all 5. Punishment as a last resort after several attempts have failed 	<p>Maintaining discipline responsibility</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. A shared responsibility of maintaining discipline in the school <p>Evaluation of the discipline policy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. A school discipline policy which is frequently evaluated

5.2.1 School Rules and Punishment Procedures

This deals with the indicators concerning clear rules developed with input from learners; rules made known to everyone in the school; available and up-to-date data on the nature and extent of discipline in the school; clear sanctions which are accepted by all; and punishment as a last resort after several attempts have failed. According to the Namibian discipline policy (see Appendix A), discipline in schools should be maintained by means of formal school rules. And as the literature suggests, school rules should be developed with input from all school members (see, for example, Cotton, 2006:15). The discussion will cover the schools separately, starting with School A and then School B in all cases.

At **School A** there was no consensus on who was involved in the development of school rules. Both the teachers and learners that participated in the study responded that they were not involved in the development of school rules.

By contrast, the principal, three School Board members and a head of department responded that teachers and learners were involved. This could be that the latter group knew that teachers and learners were supposed to be involved in the development of school rules, hence such a contradiction. However, the school has a system whereby rules are printed in the school diary, which is accessible to all school members.

Although the majority of learners responded that the school rules are needed and they obey most of them, some felt that some of the rules are vague and need to be specific. When a Grade 11 learner was questioned about why learners do not obey some of the school rules she responded:

We mostly violate school rules because of peer pressure. The way we behave in the school is not the same as we do at home. At home we want our parents to see us as 'sweet kids' but here sometimes we enjoy teachers when they feel bad about our behaviour. Just to put pressure on them, you know?

Such response indicates that some learners know that indiscipline is not needed, but sometimes they are being influenced by their peers. It also appears that they enjoy seeing teachers irritated by their misbehaviour.

The major discipline problems identified by the majority of **School A** respondents were fighting in groups, drinking, smoking, swearing, absenteeism, and a lack of respect towards teachers. The minor disciplinary problems were such as bunking classes, homework not done, text book left home, back-chatting, lying, making noise in the class, not putting on a proper uniform, and coming late to school/class.

The impression the researcher got from the teachers' responses concerning the major and minor discipline problems they experience in the school was that the problems that appear as major to some, to others were minor and vice versa. This appears to have implications when it comes to punishing learners.

The absence of uniformity among teachers' responses in grouping the offences indicates that teachers do not apply punishments of the same weight to similar offences. This also shows a lack of seriousness from the teachers' side in the sense that the major and minor offences are clearly indicated in the school diary, which every teacher is given.

Concerning the strategies the school uses to maintain discipline, the majority of the respondents, including learners, were quick to point out that the school has rules in place, which are made available to every school member.

However, some LRC members and learners complained that the diary in which the rules are printed was issued very late in July, and, for instance, the Grade 8s who are new at school have been there since the beginning of the year without the rules being made available to them in writing. This indicates that learners prefer to know how the school expect them to behave right from the beginning of the year, even they disobey them.

The school has a points system whereby every time a learner breaks a certain rule he/she is given points. The offences are assigned weight, ranging between 2 for relatively minor cases to 7 for major violations. Minor offences netting a 2-point include books not covered, school uniform and attire not correct, and a textbook left at home. Towards the extreme end of the scale, there is vandalism and sexual harassment, which are regarded as criminal offences, and count for 5 points each.

The highest points, 7, are given to a learner found causing deliberate injury by utilising a weapon. Beyond this point system, there are offences such as fighting and smoking dagga on school premises. These offences are not assigned points. They are considered to exceed the point limit system, thus a learner who got involved in any of these activities has to be suspended immediately. There are also some instances which are far below the point level system. For example, if a learner is found in possession of a cell-phone or any sound producing device turned on during school hours, no points will be given. Instead, the device has to be confiscated and given back to the owner at the end of the term.

The school takes actions against the offender as soon as he/she gets 2 points. This means that for minor offences a learner first gets a verbal warning, a written warning signed by the head of department, the teacher and the learner, and then 2 points. This agrees with Thompson and Sharp (1994:78) that “informal and formal warnings are usually the first steps in the sanctions system”.

All the respondents indicated that in the case of minor offences the punishments included detention on Fridays, or cleaning the walls and the school yard. However, only detention was observed as a punishment during the time of this study at that school.

When it comes to major offences the school management suspends a learner for a period of time, depending on the nature of the offence, or sometimes the School Board has to be called in so that it can write a recommendation letter to the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry for a learner to be expelled.

Teachers are empowered to deal with all minor offences they encounter in their classrooms, and if the case is beyond their limit, they always refer it to their respective heads of department.

The other strategy is that class monitors are given a monitor book for noting absence for both teachers and learners. This recording of absence is done in every lesson and the book has to be submitted every Friday to the respective head of department for controlling.

When asked whether the sanctions are appropriate, the majority of learners responded that they are ‘ok’, which can be translated to mean as appropriate. They also indicated their satisfaction that most of the teachers do not subject them to corporal punishment.

All the School Board members, the principal, heads of department, teachers, LRC members and a few learners expressed concern about the effectiveness of the strategies they use at school, especially detention. They indicated that in most cases learners repeat the same offences, which is an indication that they did not learn anything from the punishment.

One female teacher who had been at school for more than five years mentioned that some learners use detentions as their opportunity to do the work which they could not do during the week, or which they were supposed to do during the weekend, and so to these learners it is not a punishment. Another male teacher, who had been in the school for two years felt that detention is not only a punishment for learners but teachers are being punished too, since they have to invigilate those learners. Another concern from this teacher was that for a learner to sit for detention, there is a form to be filled in, and for this teacher the administrative duty involved is not worth the effort.

Similarly, one School Board member felt that detention should be revisited. According to this School Board member, “punishment should be something which learners hate and should be educative”. He propounded punishments like giving a demanding project or community work. He also indicated that writing a recommendation letter to the Permanent Secretary for a learner to be expelled is a long process; therefore they only give endless warnings to learners as a way of avoiding the expulsion process. These complaints correspond with what Thompson and Sharp (1994:39) say that “repeated punishments of the same children are not doing anything to prevent school rules being broken, they are not doing anything for the child, they are very likely to involve time and energy on the part of at least some members of staff, to no effect whatsoever”.

The ineffectiveness of the school’s strategies in maintaining discipline was evident during the three weeks I spent at that school. It was surprising to see the large number of learners who sat for the three detention sessions that I observed. The school has a total number of 1015 learners and according to the detention lists, an average of 96 learners sat for detention every Friday, i.e. about 10 per cent of the learner population.

It was also a case that in every morning briefing, teachers talked about indisciplined learners, while the principal had to deal with disciplinary cases in his office on a daily basis. I also attended one staff meeting, which lasted for four hours and almost the whole discussion was centred on discipline. In my view, these were some of the key indicators of unsuccessful strategies.

Most of the respondents have indicated that the main causes of discipline problems in the school are such as a lack of commitment from the teachers' side; peer pressure; the rigid ministerial policy, e.g. the school is not allowed to expel learners; lack of teamwork among the teaching staff; some learners who completed grade 10 through Namibia College of Open Learning (NAMCOL); parents who give too much money to their kids; and lack of parental involvement.

Surprisingly, every respondent emphasised the issue of lack of teachers' commitment as the main cause of discipline problems, while all teachers noted a lack of teamwork among themselves. For example, the principal expressed it this way:

What I personally experience in this school is a lack of commitment from the teachers and learners' side. Teachers do not really want to go the extra mile. Sometimes you come up in the morning stating what a certain learner did then you hear one teacher says this learner also did what and what, but that teacher did not do anything to the learner...it is really a problem.

The other problem is that one of bureaucracy from the Ministry itself. You find that sometimes it was a simple thing, but people here in Windhoek since education offices are near, which is a good thing, but sometimes is a problem, this open door policy from our superiors is becoming a problem. For every simple thing, a teacher did this or a learner did that, you send a learner go and call your parent so that we can discuss this, the parent just say no and go straight to the inspector or director and then it becomes more complicated then the case is. So, the following of channels is one of the problems and that is most probably from the parents' side.

It was clear from observations that some teachers were not taking their work seriously. For instance, there was a chronic absence of teachers averaging more than 2 daily out of a total of 34 teachers. That amounts to more than 30% of teachers being absent per week. And to make things worse, some of the teachers who were present bunk classes. As a result, it was a common feature to find groups of learners strolling around the school ground during lessons. When I asked some Grade 12 learners why they were spending time outside the classroom during lessons, one responded that: "our teacher is in the computer lab and it is boring to sit doing nothing in the class". Another one immediately added: "the teacher is always bunking classes". Obviously, such responses indicate that the way teachers behave at that school has a great impact on learners' behaviour. These learners felt that since teachers were poor role models, they could behave as they wished.

At **School B**, as in **School A**, the rules are printed in the school diary. None of the School Board members and learners was involved in the development of the rules, except the acting principal and 2 teachers who had been there a long time.

In both schools learners were not involved in the development of school rules. These findings are similar to what Kamupingene (2001:193) noted when he found that in all his four study schools learners were rarely involved in the development of school rules.

Although learners were not involved in the development of the rules, most of them have indicated that they obey some of the rules because they felt that every governed institution should have rules. However, some learners complained that some of the rules are not fair, for instance, one group of Grade 10 boys was complaining about the rule that restricts them from wearing belts with decorated buckles. Two boys were wearing the same belts in question, and when I asked them why they did so while are restricted, one responded: "I do not understand why wearing a belt like this is not allowed here, 'cos it does not have any effect on learning".

This indicates that these learners felt that because some of the rules were imposed on them, they did not see a need to obey them. Involving learners in the development and evaluation of school rules makes learners understand why rules are needed at school. As Bunn *et al.*, (1992: 23) state, when the rationale and importance of rules are not discussed with learners, they will fail to understand the values underlying the rules, and this in turn, could lead to some learners feeling alienated from the school. In the same vein, Thompson and Sharp (1994:2) claim that "'school rules' tend to concentrate on issues important for the adults in the school, and unless widened considerably to include children's priorities and children's voices in their formulation and implementation, they will continue to be seen by children as of dubious relevance to their lives".

Concerning the discipline problems at **School B**, the majority of respondents, including learners, indicated that most of the problems they experience are minor, and there are few major cases. The major cases that they defined were fighting, drinking, and repetitive instructions to learners before they conform.

The minor problems included coming late to school/class; homework not done; making noise in class; bunking of classes; a learner leaving a required text book at home; not wearing the proper uniform; eating sweets (lollipops) in class; swearing; and disrespect for teachers.

When asked about the major and minor discipline problems at school, a male English teacher responded:

I want to make a general statement that it differs from individual to individual. Sometimes people blow up, you know, small situations and they totally blow them out of proportion. But I would say my main disciplinary problem at school would be the fact that it doesn't seem as learners tend to listen, especially not the first time. Here I'm referring to being reprimanded. They tend to listen from the third and fourth time that you have to repeat yourself...that poses a problem to me. We do not have a problem with violence as such...learners fight occasionally, but it is not a norm around here. So, we don't really have those kinds of problems on the premises, outside is something else, because we don't know what is happening there.

When it comes to the strategies that the school uses to maintain discipline, the school has a filing system whereby every learner's information is recorded and parents are always contacted if the school experiences disciplinary problems with a learner. Like at **School A**, **School B** has a referral system whereby the heads of department are assigned grades to deal with serious cases which teachers are unable to handle.

In the case where there is a teacher absent, his/her learners are sent to the classes of teachers who are free, or sometimes learners go to the hall if there are many teachers absent. The school gates are always kept locked for learners not to go out, and there is a system that learners replace what they damage intentionally.

For minor offences, **School B** reprimands offenders in the form of cleaning walls, standing in front of the administration block facing a wall, and picking up litter around the school. For major offences, the learner gets suspended for two weeks or more, depending on the nature of the offence. Expulsion is only possible after the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry has been consulted by the School Board and the right procedure has been followed, e.g. a proper hearing was done with the learner, the parent/guardian and the School Board. The acting principal emphasized that the school does not brook any form of corporal punishment, since it is against the law.

To the question as whether or not these strategies are effective, most of the respondents indicated that it is only suspension which seems to work; the main reason being embarrassment on the part of learners. Prior to suspension, a parent or guardian of a guilty learner has to be summoned to school and be officially informed. Thus, learners feel embarrassed when they see their parents visiting the school due to their misdeeds. However, some teachers and LRC members felt that the problem of ineffective strategies lies with the school management in the sense that the management is reluctant to consider their suggestions. For instance, a Geography teacher explained: when we have meetings and you are teacher X (referring to herself) your ideas will not be considered, but if it is teacher Y (referring to a head of department) the ideas are always marvellous.

When the acting principal was asked whether the strategies they use to maintain discipline are effective or not he had this to say:

Some of them are very effective, but what we also need to realise is that the learners, if I can use the word, are not stupid, they know through the government what their rights are, and that to me is a major problem...it is giving them I don't want to say a loophole...there is no fixed discipline measurement coming in from the government to say you can do this or you can do that and the learners know that.

What was observed in **School B** was that the most frequent punishment used was standing in front of the administration block facing a wall. Most of the time you walk past the administration block you find both boys and girls standing there. Although a formal count was not taken, it seems an average of 6 learners stand there per day (30 per week), and the school's enrolment is 730. In comparison with the number of learners in **School A** who sit for detention on Fridays (an average of 96 learners), this figure appears to be lower (4% vs. 10%). In discussion with some learners about this type of punishment, they articulated how they enjoy it, using it as a way of getting a chance to be outdoors. In a nutshell, this is an indicator of the inefficiency of this form of punishment.

What is not clear in **School B** is how sanctions are classified. Although rules are clearly stated in the diary, it is not made clear as to what sanctions are applicable to what offences.

Therefore the issue of application of sanctions in **School B** is questionable. There is also a concern about learners being denied their opportunity to stay in class, since the punishment (standing in front of the administration block) is administered during lessons, unlike in **School A** where learners are punished after school.

It is apparent that the two schools experience the same problems with the punishments they use. And the central question here is: *why do the study schools cling onto ineffective punishments?* As the acting principal pointed out above, the issues of learners' rights and lack of guidelines on how to punish learners from the Ministry are seen as some of the major contributing factors to this inefficiency. As a female teacher in **School B** commented: "learners misunderstood the concept 'rights,' and they forgot that everyone got rights like them".

Therefore, in this study, **School B** made it clear that the issue of learners' rights in relation to discipline is one of the major limiting factors in finding effective punishments. This implies that **School B** expects the Government or the Ministry to provide them with a guideline on how to punish learners alongside the learners' rights. In other words, stating clearly the learners' rights in the constitution without providing effective alternatives to corporal punishment to schools, is seen as a serious problem in finding punishments that will change learners' behaviour. However, Mlombo (1997:37) argues that "looking at alternatives to corporal punishment is not only about finding other effective ways of ensuring order in the school system, but also about creating an environment in which punishment is seldom needed". In other words, schools should consider the issue of 'discipline from within' (see Chapter 2) rather than focusing on hunting for effective punishments.

The majority of teachers, LRC members and learners of **School B** indicated that the lack of extramural activities at their school contributes to discipline problems. According to these respondents, the school management has suspended all sport and cultural activities, claiming that the school has no funds to maintain these activities. The teachers interviewed also indicated that the decision to suspend extramural activities at their school should be reversed because learners appear to be bored. The reason given was that if learners are kept busy with academic, sport and cultural activities, they will have little or no time to get involved in violent activities at school.

To summarise, both the schools had the rules in the diaries, which is accessible to every school member. What these schools practice corresponds with the literature. It is believed that clear rules that are made known to everyone in the school precludes confusion. The rules in both schools were tailored to their contexts and they cover areas such as the use of time, absenteeism, physical facilities, safety procedures, attitudes towards academic work, school uniform, the use of personal belongings, and general social behaviour.

Since the study schools have formulated their rules based on the ministerial discipline policy, it was not surprising that most of the rules in these schools were similar. There is a general belief that because secondary schools experience similar behaviour problems, the rules will be similar. As Munn *et al.*, (1992: 18) put it: “ it may be argued that as far as social behaviour is concerned all secondary schools have very similar rules to do with respecting the rights of other people and treating them as you would expect to be treated”.

It emerged from the study that the two schools did not involve learners in the development of the school rules, and in the case of teachers, only 2 **School B** teachers who had been at school for more than 10 years were involved. The response that was frequently provided by the two schools’ respondents was that the rules have been in effect before their assumption of duty at their respective schools.

In that learners from both schools indicated that they only obey some of the rules, this demonstrates that they disagree with some of the rules. It is important to note that the basic purpose of involving learners in the establishment of rules is to make sure that they agree on them, and if learners were not involved, they will hardly recognise those rules. Involving learners in the development of rules will also give rise to a sense of ownership. In other words, learners will treat the rules as theirs.

One might ask: *what should be done in case the rules were developed while learners were not in the school?* What is worth noting is that learners can still be involved in the rules, not necessarily in their development, but rather in their evaluation. This implies that it is a school’s responsibility to ensure that learners are consulted when

changes are made in the discipline policy, or that the rules are clarified for newcomers, e.g. Grade 8s.

Concerning the strategies that the two schools use to maintain discipline, it is quite interesting to observe that these schools have responded positively to the government's call to terminate caning in schools. Both schools have come up with the strategies that they consider best fit their contexts. This is in agreement with Munn *et al.*, (1992:1) that "as every teacher knows, there is no infallible recipe for ensuring effective discipline. Instead, each school and teacher adopt a range of strategies which seem appropriate to their own particular circumstances and which are more or less effective".

The procedures that the two schools follow before punishing learners, for instance, giving verbal and written warnings, indicates that these schools use punishments as a last resort.

5.2.2 Maintaining Discipline Responsibility

Indicator 6 calls for a shared responsibility of maintaining discipline in the school. This is needed in the sense that if the school experiences discipline problems, every school member is being affected. To ensure that this does not happen, maintaining discipline should not be seen as a 'one-wo/man activity'.

In **School A**, all School Board members, the principal, heads of department, teachers and LRC members responded that maintaining discipline at school should be a collective effort. This implies that the principal, teachers, learners and parents are responsible for ensuring that the school rules are enforced. Although this is what it was supposed to be, the majority of the respondents felt that they do not work as a team in maintaining discipline. Most of the learners responded that the principal and teachers should have the responsibility of maintaining discipline.

In the case of **School B**, all the School Board members, heads of department, teachers, the acting principal and the majority of LRC members expressed that every school member should have the responsibility of maintaining discipline.

A female teacher who had taught at the school for more than ten years expressed it this way:

Everybody...you can't expect one single person or just the management or just certain teachers, everybody plays a very important role in maintaining discipline. And if people complain about the discipline in general, it is usually one or two people that do not bring their share or that do not do their share of the workload that causes the problem. So, it is easy to point fingers and to say the school discipline is in a state of disarray, it is better to say what can I do from my side to improve it.

Most of the learners have responded that the principal, teachers and LRC should have a responsibility to maintain discipline and not them. Apart from learners, the staff and LRC members indicated that they work as a team in maintaining discipline, and this was evident during the time of the study, as it will be discussed in detail later in this section.

In summary, the learners at both schools appeared not to recognise the role they ought to play in maintaining discipline. Their responses suggested that only the management team and teachers should have a responsibility of maintaining discipline. This is a sign of weakness from the schools' side not to inculcate a sense of responsibility in learners. Although some teachers discuss this issue in their classrooms with learners, as a male teacher in **School B** indicated, it needs to be practised at the school level. The teacher in **School B** explained that as a teacher, he tells his learners about the role they play in maintaining discipline in the school. According to this teacher, the school functions as a three-legged pot. This implies that for the school to have good discipline its three legs, which are the parents, the teaching staff and learners, need to function well. The teacher therefore always remind learners to keep their leg functioning and not to rely on others' legs.

Working as a team is regarded as a core in maintaining discipline in the school. This was observed in **School B**. During the three weeks I spent there, I noticed how teachers worked as a team in supervising learners. Together with the LRC, the presence of teachers was quite obvious in the corridors and stairs during the changing of lessons as well as in the assembly hall. This practice was in stark contrast with **School A** where teachers were often absent and bunked classes.

5.2.3 Evaluation of the Discipline Policy

According to indicator number 7, a school discipline policy should be frequently evaluated. This creates room for new rules as the school experiences new discipline problems. Since the school is part of the society, with rapid technological advances, like the use of cell phones, its discipline policy needs to be revisited from time to time.

Most of the **School A** respondents indicated that the evaluation of the school discipline policy is seldom done, and it is only done by the school management and teachers. However, one head of department indicated that he does not see the need to evaluate the discipline policy because everything in the policy mirrors the Government discipline policy, which has not changed since 2001. Such response shows that there is a lack of interest in the school to evaluate the discipline policy.

In the case of **School B**, the majority of the respondents indicated that they only revisit the discipline policy when the need arises. The acting principal and four teachers explained that only the school management and teachers are involved; since they do it during staff meetings.

To summarise, it seems the two schools do not have a specific time frame for reviewing the discipline policy, and they do not involve learners. As is well documented, frequent evaluation of the discipline policy enables the school to get rid of ineffective strategies and improve it as a result.

5.2.4 Summary and Analysis

This section looked at the strategies that the study schools employed through the lenses of the following key indicators: clear rules developed with input from learners; rules made known to everyone in the school; a shared responsibility of maintaining discipline in the school; available and up-to-date data on the nature and extent of discipline in the school; clear sanctions which are accepted by all; punishment as a last resort after several attempts have failed; and a school discipline policy which is frequently evaluated.

The findings revealed that the two schools have a good system of displaying the school rules by printing them in their school diaries. This practice enables every school member to have full access to the rules. However, **School B** did not state clearly the specific sanctions for breaking the rules, and this has implications when it comes to punishing learners. It is not clear in **School B** about how the minor and major offences are dealt with as in the case of **School A**. Therefore, it appears that there is no uniformity in punishing offenders at **School B**.

It emerged from the study that learners from both schools were not involved in the development of school rules, nor in the evaluation of discipline policy, and the majority of learners do not consider themselves as having a role in maintaining discipline. This is a clear indication that the two schools overlooked the importance of involving learners in the school activities, especially which concern them directly. Therefore, it should be noted that “the best results are always achieved when all stakeholders, including learners, are involved in finding effective solutions to discipline” (MSTP, 2007:15).

With regard to discipline problems that the two schools experience, it appears that **School A** experiences more major problems than **School B**. This may be related to a lack of teamwork among the teaching staff in the process of maintaining discipline. It also appears that **School A** hardly evaluates its discipline policy.

The lack of support from the Ministry in providing guidelines on how to punish offenders and lack of extra-mural activities are believed to be the major causes of discipline problems in **School B**. The former point should be regarded as a serious challenge for the Ministry to find effective alternatives to corporal punishment.

Having looked at the strategy factor, the discussion proceeds to the next section which concerns the structures and procedures that are required for the implementation of the school's strategy.

5.3 Structures and Procedures

This section deals with the structures and procedures that the study schools have and follow in dealing with discipline. It is expected that every school should work out who should deal with discipline, and how disciplinary cases should be dealt with, and it should be made known to everyone in the school. This helps the school to maintain high standards of uniformity in dealing with disciplinary matters. The key indicators that are usually associated with successful structures and procedures are:

- Appropriate structures for discipline are in place, e.g. disciplinary committee, Learners' Representative Council, etc.;
- Each committee member knows his/her responsibilities;
- Clear disciplinary procedures; and
- Disciplinary decisions guided by the Ministerial policy.

As in the previous section, the indicators are clustered in Table 5.3.1 for analysis purposes.

Table 5.3.1: Structures and Procedures Indicators

Indicators	
Disciplinary structures 1. Appropriate structures for discipline are in place, e.g. disciplinary committee, Learner Representative Council, etc. 2. Each committee member knows his/her responsibilities	Disciplinary procedures 3. Clear disciplinary procedures 4. Disciplinary decisions guided by the ministerial policy

5.3.1: Disciplinary Structures

Indicators 1 and 2 suggest that a school should put in place the structures and procedures needed to deal with discipline, and that each member of the committee should know their responsibilities.

The data collected indicates that there are identical structures and procedures in both schools. Therefore to avoid a repetition, the schools will not be covered separately as it was the case in the previous section.

The structures in place in the schools are: the Learners' Representative Council, teachers, heads of department, principal, and the School Board. All these groups have defined their responsibilities as follows:

When the School Board members in both schools were questioned about the role of their committee in relation to discipline, all of them referred the researcher to a section in their school diaries, which quoted from the Education Act, 2001, Section 17, as their main guideline when executing their duties. According to the Act, a School Board is the overall manager of the school. While the principal is responsible for daily operations of the school, all major decisions at the school level have to be taken by the School Board. The Act describes the powers and functions of a School Board as follows:

- (a) To develop the mission, goals and objectives of the school;*
 - (b) To advise the school's management on the extra-mural curriculum of the school;*
 - (c) To advise the regional director of education on the curriculum of the school;*
 - (d) Subject to the Public Service Act, to recommend to the Permanent Secretary the appointment of teachers and other staff members at the school;*
 - (e) Subject to the restrictions imposed by the Permanent Secretary and upon conditions as the School Board may determine, to allow the reasonable use of the school facilities for community purposes;*
 - (f) To consider any case of misconduct by a learner or staff member of the school with the aim to (1) ensure that such misconduct is properly investigated, and (2) recommend to the Permanent Secretary the appropriate disciplinary measures to be taken regarding serious misconduct of a learner; and*
 - (g) To exercise other powers and perform other duties and functions as may be authorized or imposed by or under this Act.*
- (School A Diary, 2008:7; School B Diary, 2008:8)

As shown above, the School Board is entrusted with a myriad of responsibilities. All the School Board members indicated that when it comes to discipline in the school, they only deal with serious transgressions which require major steps to be taken

against the offender. This means that in the case where the school does not experience major disciplinary problems, i.e. which require the intervention of the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education, the School Board has little to do with discipline.

This situation was manifest to the researcher when he tried to interview the parents who were School Board members of the study schools. Apart from being busy, because all of them were fulltime workers elsewhere in town, they tried to avoid being interviewed on the premise that the issue of learners' discipline is being handled at the school level by teachers, therefore they were not the right people to be interviewed.

Since both schools have four heads of department, in order to cover all grades the principals are assigned Grade 12 to deal with referral cases from the Grade 12 teachers. **School A** principal explained that his overall role in maintaining discipline was to make sure that teachers and learners are in their respective classrooms. As part of the school management, the principal decides with the heads of department the measures to be taken against learners found guilty of misconduct. The principal is also there to guide teachers in their disciplinary decision making, and to keep the inspector informed about what is happening at school regarding discipline.

The acting principal of **School B** stated that his overall role is to constantly monitor teachers and learners, while maintaining a supportive role towards them. He indicated that teachers need to feel his presence, and to know that he is there watching what they are doing. It is not only to check on them, but also to guide them.

As in the case of the principals, all the heads of department in both schools indicated that they are assigned Grades to deal with referral cases. They are also there to make sure that all disciplinary cases in the school are handled in a proper manner.

In **School A**, all the respondent teachers indicated that their role in maintaining discipline in the school is to make sure that learners obey the rules. Six teachers explained that they try to be role models to learners, for instance, by being involved in extra-mural activities and by trying to show good behaviour at all times.

In the same vein, in **School B**, the majority of teachers responded that their role is to make sure that they teach the facts; ensure that school rules are followed, not; and lead by example.

What these teachers do is in line with the Ministry's claim that "learner values, morals and behaviour can, to a very large extent, be positively influenced by the exemplary conduct and behaviour of teachers and other staff, both while on duty and in their private lives" (Ministry of Basic Education and Culture, 2000:2).

In both schools all the LRC members responded that they work within the framework of the Education Act, 2001. Both schools have the same section on the powers and functions of LRC in their diaries, and it reads as follows:

- 1) *The LRC, as a highest body of elected leaders of the learners of the school, must*
 - a) *promote the best interest and welfare of the school and its learners;*
 - b) *liaise between learners and the school management;*
 - c) *with approval of the principal, undertake projects and programmes aimed at-*
 - i. *improving and maintaining the school environment and facilities;*
 - ii. *providing cultural, sport and social activities for learners; and*
 - iii. *improving the health and welfare of learners;*
 - d) *assist the principal and teachers to ensure adherence to the code of conduct of the school by all learners so as to create and maintain an orderly and disciplined school environment conducive to learning; and*
 - e) *perform any other reasonable tasks assigned to the LRC by the principal.*
- 2) *The LRC may establish committees for specific functions or projects of the LRC, which may include learners who are not members of the LRC as members, and must designate a member of the LRC as chairperson of such committee.*
(School A Diary, 2008:7; School B Diary, 2008:9).

In summary, as indicated earlier, the two schools have similar structures. As shown by the respondents from both schools, their roles in maintaining discipline are clearly defined and all the respondents demonstrated that they know their responsibilities.

5.3.2: Disciplinary Procedures

According to indicators 3 and 4, disciplinary procedures should be clear and made known to every school member, and should be guided by the Ministerial policy. As the Ministry has made clear, every school has to deal with cases of serious misconduct swiftly, fairly and firmly, but always within the legal provisions, regulations and procedures laid down for misconduct of learners (Ministry of Basic Education and Culture, 2000:2).

As stated earlier, the two schools follow similar disciplinary procedures. Based on the responses from the schools, it emerged that teachers deal with minor offences. Where the teacher is unable to handle the case, it is referred to the responsible head of department or the principal in the case of Grade 12. Where further actions are required for major cases, the head of department refers the case to the entire school management including the principal. In the case of a serious misconduct, the School Board is called in and if the case is unresolved the School Board writes a recommendation letter to the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry for the final decision. The recommendation letter reaches the Permanent Secretary through the inspector and Regional Director.

Surprisingly, in both schools there were uncertainties among the teachers, LRC members and learners as to who makes the final disciplinary decisions at the school level. Some assumed that it was the principal, whilst others thought it was the School Board. This indicates that it is not clear to these respondents about who makes the final decision in the school, which might result in some learners not considering some of the decisions as legitimate, since they do not know who has the right to make final decisions. However, the school management in both schools responded that the final decision at the school level rests with the School Board, which is the governing body.

For instance, a School Board member at School A explained the procedures as follows:

We follow the channel which is stipulated in the Education Act, and it all depends on the nature of the offence. It starts with the teacher, then the head of department, the principal, the School Board and then the Permanent

Secretary. The School Board sends the recommendations via inspector and the Regional Director. A hearing has to be done with the learner together with the parent or guardian.

Based on the comments at both schools, it seems that all the disciplinary decisions are made within the framework of the Government and schools' policy. In 2000, the Ministry of Basic Education and Culture released a Circular, FORM ED.1/2000, to remind state schools about the importance of following correct procedures in dealing with disciplinary problems. The circular, *inter alia*, was triggered by complaints from schools that the Ministry is reluctant in assisting them to maintain discipline.

The importance of following correct disciplinary procedures was expressed in the Circular this way:

...currently there seems to be a misconception that the Ministry is reluctant to support schools in their efforts to maintain discipline and to act against learners guilty of serious misconduct. Nothing could be further from the truth! The perceived inaction and delays in finalising misconduct cases are in most cases invariably caused by: (i) incomplete submissions and documentation received from schools, and (ii) correct procedures not being followed in the disciplinary process (2000:2).

Therefore, it is noteworthy that following the correct procedures, as the Ministry stated above, is very crucial, especially when it comes to serious offences where major actions need to be taken against the offender.

In summary, it is apparent that both schools follow similar disciplinary procedures. In both schools the heads of department and the principal deal with all referral cases from the teachers.

However, teachers, LRC members and learners at both schools differed in their responses regarding the authority that has the disciplinary power on decision making related to discipline at the school level. This reveals that the schools' management did not make it clear to teachers, LRC members and learners who makes the final disciplinary decisions within the school.

5.3.3: Summary and Analysis

The data under the structures and procedures factor were presented based on the following key indicators: appropriate structures for discipline are in place; each committee member knows his/her responsibilities; clear disciplinary procedures; and disciplinary decisions guided by the Ministerial policy.

In this study it was found that the study schools have similar structures and procedures. In line with the Ministerial policy, this is significant because the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry will only consider the recommendations by the School Board, e.g. to expel a learner, if the school has followed the correct procedures. It also appears that the people represented in the committees are familiar with their responsibilities. Again this matches with the indicator above.

However, when it comes to the authority that makes the final disciplinary decisions, the uncertainty among the respondents demonstrates that they do not know how disciplinary decisions are made. As indicated in the previous section, this may be because staff and learners are not involved in disciplinary policy. This again reminds us the importance of involving all school members in the school activities, i.e. evaluation of discipline policy, in order to avoid such confusion.

To ensure that the people represented in the structures discussed above plus the entire school community are fully engaged in maintaining discipline, the school identity in relation to discipline should be positive and there must be a common purpose of education in the school. The next section explores these issues.

5.4 School Identity and Purpose

This section looks at what identity the study schools envisaged in relation to discipline and what the situation on the ground is. The formal identity of the school is revealed in its vision and mission statement. In other words, the school should clearly indicate in the vision and mission statement what it stands for *vis-à-vis* discipline.

The vision expresses the overall purpose of the school and it has to be translated into a mission statement for action. The familiarisation of the school members with the vision and mission statement as well as their perceptions about the state of discipline provide insights into the identity of the school from within.

The purpose of education in the school should be also made clear and shared by every school member. This is crucial in that discipline should not be perceived as an end in itself, but a means to an end. As Thompson and Sharp put it, “effective schools have always striven to provide appropriate learning environments. All schools are now required to meet this challenge, to demonstrate accountability, and consequently have become more aware of ‘image’. A major component of good ‘image’ is the maintenance of an ordered atmosphere” (1994:1).

The key indicators under this factor are:

- A clear vision for the school;
- A school’s vision is shared by all members;
- A mission statement is developed by all role players;
- A common understanding of the purpose of education in the school;
- Understanding of learner discipline;
- The state of discipline in the school; and
- An ordered atmosphere

The key indicators are grouped in Table 5.4.1

Table 5.4.1: School Identity and Purpose Indicators

Indicators	
<p>The school’s vision and mission</p> <p>1. A clear vision for the school</p> <p>2. A school’s vision is shared by all members</p> <p>3. A mission statement is developed by all Role players</p> <p>4. A common understanding of the purpose of education in the school</p>	<p>Learner discipline definition and the state of discipline in the school</p> <p>5. Understanding of learner discipline</p> <p>6. The state of discipline in the school</p> <p>7. An ordered atmosphere</p>

5.4.1: The School's Vision and Mission

This deals with the indicators concerning a clear vision for the school, a school's vision being shared by all members, a mission statement developed by all role players, and a common understanding of the purpose of education in the school.

In **School A** there is no documented vision, only the mission statement which is included in the school diary. The mission statement starts as follows: The **School A** "will strive at all times to ensure an environment which will be safe and conducive for the learning process and where merit in academic, sport, cultural and leadership spheres will have pride of place" (School A Diary, 2008:2). One of its objectives is to "teach learners to respect democratic principles and to understand that democracy requires self-respect, self, control, a responsibility of the community as well as an acceptance of authority" (ibid). How this school developed a mission statement without a vision is not clear. However, it is obvious that the image that the school is trying to project in relation to discipline is made explicit in the mission statement.

The absence of the school's vision resulted in the respondents giving general statements about the vision of the school, and most of them referred to the mission statement.

According to the principal and a male teacher who had been at the school for 3 months, the school's vision is the same as for the Ministry, which is to try and provide quality education to all learners. The principal indicated that 'quality' is their watchword.

A male teacher who had been at school for more than six years responded as follows:

I have a personal vision. I would like to see this school as a well disciplined and well maintained school in Khomas Region. The school was academically good. It was among the top 5 in the region. I want to see the school going back to that state. We lack that common vision...Right now we are just coming to school to teach and there is no common vision.

And a head of department stated:

Umm...we got a lot of things on different aspects... I think is to maintain the very good results, to maintain a very good pass rate, because after all they are all here for a good academic performance, and also to educate a balanced child, not only on the academic side but also on the cultural side, extramural activities...to develop the whole child in all areas.

Six LRC members and the majority of learners have responded that the vision of the school is to achieve a 100% pass rate (which is the first objective on the mission statement of the school) and to make the school 'shining'. Typically, the responses from other respondents were: "to achieve 100% pass"; "it is in the school diary"; "I'm not sure"; "I can't tell"; "to prepare learners for the future"; and "to produce future leaders". This is a clear indication that the school does not have a unified vision. The lack of a common vision at the school could be the main cause of a lack of teamwork among the teaching staff as discussed in the previous section.

All the respondents indicated that they did not take part in the establishment of the mission statement of the school, and the answer that was frequently given was that they found it in the school. The principal, for instance, responded: "it is an old mission statement which was established before I came here. I personally agree with it and do not see a need to change it". When asked what the mission statement is, the majority responded that "it is in the school diary", which shows that it is not internalised.

There was a variation in the responses concerning the purpose of education in the school. Some of the responses were: "to prepare learners in academic, cultural and sport"; "to produce quality learners who will be able to further their studies at tertiary institutions"; and "to teach learners to be able to help themselves in the future".

At **School B**, there is also no documented vision. Similarly, the school has only a mission statement which is included in the diary. Among the mission statement's objectives, there is one which reveals the kind of image the school attempts to project in relation to discipline: to "optimise the performance and potential of learners by creating a caring, listening and learning environment" (School B Diary, 2008: 4).

When the respondents were asked about the school's vision they gave general responses. For example, the acting principal said that the school's vision "aims for learners to achieve their own goals, to go out of the school one day and be responsible, disciplined, young men and women who can go into the society and do the job".

Responses from teachers include: "to have learners who are socially well adapted"; "doing academically well"; "having good communication skills"; and "to develop leadership potential in the learners and expose them to various cultures". The majority of learners responded that they do not know the school's vision, while 3 members of LRC responded that the school's vision is to increase the pass rate of grade 10 and 12.

Only the acting principal and two teachers who had been with the school for more than ten years were involved in the development of the mission statement of the school. Like in **School A**, most of the respondents indicated that the mission statement is in the diary, and there was no consensus in the responses concerning the purpose of education in the school. The respondents gave varied responses about the purpose of education in the school, such as: "to maintain high standards of teaching and learning in the school"; "to achieve 100% pass in all subjects"; and "to have a well disciplined institution".

However, 11 out of 15 teacher respondents raised concern that the school does not prepare learners in all aspects of life i.e. sport, culture, etc. What these teachers want the school to do agrees with Thompson and Sharp's claim that "schools are agencies operating in *loco parentis* with now statutory duties to teach children not only academic and practical skills but also social attitudes as well" (1994:29).

In summary, both schools do not have a documented vision. In **School A**, none of the respondents was involved in the development of the mission statement, whereas in **School B** only the acting principal and two teachers who had been with the school for more than ten years were involved in the establishment of the mission statement. In both schools there was no agreement in the responses concerning the purpose of education in the school.

This lack of clarity and agreement corresponds with Kantema's findings for the Rundu Education Region (in Lewis, 2002: 159), and indicates very strongly a need to 're-vision' in an inclusively way.

5.4.2: Learner Discipline Definition and the State of Discipline in the School

The three last indicators concern how the schools understand the concept of learner discipline, the state of discipline in the schools, and whether the schools have an ordered atmosphere. This was required in order to determine whether the identity the study schools are striving to have, as indicated in the mission statements, exists or not.

In **School A**, all the School Board members, heads of department, teachers, LRC members and learners associated learner discipline with conformity to school rules — such as punctuality, respect, and commitment towards academic work. However, the definition given by the principal approached the concept from a different angle. The principal defined learner discipline as: “learners need to know where they are from, where they are heading, and how to get there”. This means that, in the principal's words, learners need to know their family background, what they want to achieve in education and how to achieve it. Discipline is therefore a precondition for achieving that purpose. What the principal claims here is that for the learners to achieve what they want in education, ought to be disciplined in the first place. Therefore, the principal perceived learning as closely linked to discipline.

In looking at how this school perceives learner discipline, there is a close link with the definition given by Wynne (in Moles, 1990) in Chapter 3. Both definitions emphasise the positive behaviour that is required for teaching and learning to take place.

Concerning the state of discipline in the school, most of the respondents acknowledged that some learners do misbehave. A School Board member expressed it this way: “if I'm to judge it on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is lower and 10 is higher, I would say it is 7, which is very bad”.

For the principal, the state of discipline at school is ‘middling’, which implies that there are good learners who know exactly what they are in the school for, and on the other hand there is a small group of learners who are always on the wrong side of the law. The principal has indicated that although they experience discipline problems at school, the situation is not worse, which means that no learner has been expelled from the school from the time he took over school leadership. Similarly, a group of five girls from Grade 8 responded that the state of discipline at school is ‘balancing’, which is similar to a female teacher who said that discipline at school is 50 per cent good.

A grade 10 learner commented: “sometimes I use to feel very sorry for our teachers. We really give them tough time. I think we need to change a bit”. In general, all grades expressed similar views that the state of discipline in the school was poor. Based on the responses and observations, it is apparent that there are discipline problems in the school, which does not correspond with the identity the school is trying to project in the mission statement.

In **School B**, all the respondents including learners defined learner discipline by referring to school rules issues such as respect for teachers, learners to be self responsible, tidiness, and commitment. Here it is evident that the two schools perceived learner discipline in the same way — to behave in conformity with the school rules. With regard to the state of discipline in the school, all the respondents maintained that they do not experience major disciplinary problems and discipline at school is fairly good. Great care was taken here to see if there is consistency among learners and teachers responses. All the learners from Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12 responded that discipline at school is good, except a group of four Grade 8 boys who stated that they are not impressed by the state of discipline compared to their previous school. Both new teachers at the school and those who had been there for more than a year responded alike that discipline at school is good.

For instance, this is how the acting principal described the state of discipline:

I don't want to compare and I think it is dangerous to compare, but if I compare our school discipline towards other schools, let me say the other top schools in Windhoek, I don't think we need to stand back for them one step. We are there and in certain cases I feel other schools can come and have a look at what is discipline sometimes in the class as well as outside the class.

What these respondents say was supported by observations. It was clear during the visits that **School B**'s discipline was much better than **School A**.

To summarise, the two schools defined learner discipline almost in the same way, that it involves conformity to school rules in order teaching and learning to take place. According to responses and observations, the state of discipline in **School A** is poor, while in **School B** it is fairly good. It was also observed that there was not an ordered atmosphere at **School A** compared to **School B**.

5.4.3: Summary and Analysis

This section looked at whether there is a clear vision at the two schools which is shared by all members; whether every school member was involved in the development of the mission statement; whether there is a common understanding of the purpose of education in the school; how the study schools understand the concept of learner discipline; their state of discipline; and whether the schools have an ordered atmosphere.

It was found in the study that both schools do not have documented vision statements. The absence of a written vision in the study schools could be linked to Kantema's findings that "...many principals [in Namibia] lack theoretical knowledge that could help guide them in drawing up vision and mission statements" (in Lewis, 2002:159). Although both schools have statements in their mission statements, which indicate the kind of image they are trying to project in relation to discipline, none of the respondents in **School A** was involved in the development of the mission statement, and only the acting principal and two teachers who had been with the school for more than ten years in **School B** were involved there.

Both schools' respondents did not demonstrate a thorough knowledge of the mission statement, and the impression that the researcher got from the responses is that the mission statements were developed some years ago, with little importance accorded to them at present. Therefore, it appears that the inclusion of the mission statements in their respective school diaries is a mere formality, as opposed to being used as a guideline to achieve their goals. Both schools' responses demonstrated that there is no common understanding of the purpose of education in their schools. And this raises questions as to how the study schools carry out their activities without a common goal.

The study revealed that both schools have a common view about what learner discipline implies. Both schools perceived learner discipline involving learners behaving in conformity with the school rules.

It surfaced from the responses and observations that **School A** is poorly disciplined compared to **School B**. In other words, though the two schools made it clear in their mission statements about the image they want to maintain in terms of discipline, it is only **School B** that appears to put it into action. As Sonn (2005:14) argues, "a mission statement needs to be made a reality in the school; people should be able to see it in action not just as a piece of paper in a fancy frame".

It is believed that the school as an organisation needs to identify the resources, both human and technical, that it has at its disposal and make use of them in order to ensure that a conducive environment to teaching and learning prevails. The next section focuses on what resources the study schools have.

5.5 School Resources (Technical and Human)

The maintenance of discipline will be encumbered if a school does not have human and technical resources in place. It is believed that without human resources such as a school counsellor, Life Skills teachers and other individuals who can contribute to maintaining discipline, it is usually difficult for the school to deal with discipline problems.

The same applies to technical resources. Resources such as a school fence, playground, dustbins, etc., are believed to have an immense impact on school discipline. For instance, a strong school fence helps to prevent learners from absconding; enough playgrounds avoid conflicts among learners, e.g. during Physical Education lessons; and enough dustbins help to keep the school clean. Therefore every school needs to consider the kinds of human and technical resources it has at its disposal as it tries to maintain discipline.

The following indicators are usually associated with well disciplined schools with reference to human and technical resources:

- Availability of a school counsellor and other persons needed to maintain discipline;
- Enough physical resources at school;
- A shared responsibility of looking after the school's resources; and
- A great emphasis on professional development in relation to managing learners' discipline.

These indicators are grouped in Table 5.5.1 to guide the analysis.

Table 5.5.1: School Resources Indicators

Indicators	
<p>Human resources</p> <p>1. Availability of a school counsellor and other persons needed to maintain discipline</p> <p>2. A great emphasis on professional development in relation to managing learners' discipline</p>	<p>Physical resources</p> <p>3. Enough physical resources at school</p> <p>4. A shared responsibility of looking after the schools' resources</p>

5.5.1 Human Resources

Indicators 1 and 2 suggest that the school should have a counsellor and other persons needed to maintain discipline, and there should be a great emphasis on professional development in relation to managing learners' discipline.

At **School A** most of the respondents, especially learners were quick to point out that the school has qualified teachers as their main human resources (see Appendix C). There are 2 Life Skills teachers (who function as school counsellors, but declined to be interviewed) and the security guards, who are on the premises at all times. Where a learner needs special attention, the school approaches social workers in the community who are available.

All the respondents indicated that professional development is important to maintaining discipline in the school in that it enables people to improve their skills, but it does not take place at this school. The principal responded that he attended courses on whole school management, and not discipline *per se*, and only four teachers and two heads of department indicated that they had discipline related subjects when they were at the training institution, but felt they were not equipped enough to deal with current discipline problems.

A head of department, for instance, responded as follows:

I did not attend any and I think it is very important. You know it is like becoming a HOD is to guide and to work with different people with different views and all what we normally have is only workshops for principals and I think the heads of department also need those guidelines and that help from other people, because we now have to work with adult people in the department and I think if you are trained and going to workshops and all that I think the relationship will also be better, because some heads of department like I sometimes there are leadership shortages...So, I think there is really a need to move forward.

A male teacher who had been at the school for four years added:

Yes, professional development is needed but the Ministry has failed in upgrading teachers' proficiency. There is a lack of commitment from the Ministry's side...even teacher training has not changed in the country. There is stagnation in education.

Some of the responses from the teachers concerning professional development were: "I think so, it will help you to work with your learners better"; "Yes, when it comes to school discipline, professional development is needed because it boosts your

classroom management skills”; and “I did not attend any, but I see it is needed very much”. All of these comments indicate unmet need for professional development.

School B was as well resourced as **School A** in relation to human resources. All the respondents felt that qualified teachers they have in the school are their prime human resources when it comes to discipline. There are three Life Skills teachers, who serve as school counsellors (but only one could be interviewed) and the security guards. The Life Skills teachers work closely with the social workers in the region.

Similarly, all the respondents in **School B** indicated that professional development plays a major role in the process of maintaining discipline. However, all respondents raised concern about the lack of professional development at the school and in the education sector in general. For instance, the acting principal indicated that he only attended one course six years ago on school management, where the issue of discipline was highlighted. Apart from this course, the acting principal felt that the knowledge he has mostly came from his own parents and the church. None of the School Board members and heads of department respondents attended a course on how to maintain discipline. Seven teachers responded as their counterparts in **School A** that they had subjects related to discipline at their training institution, but it was not enough. Only a Life Skills teacher responded that she attended courses on counselling.

To summarise, the two schools have human resources in place as they try to maintain discipline. Both schools laid great stress on professional development. Unfortunately, none of the schools renders professional development opportunities to its members.

5.5.2 Physical Resources

According to indicators 3 and 4, there should be enough physical resources at school and taking care of those resources should be a shared responsibility.

In **School A**, although the school appears to have most of the resources needed (see Appendix E), since it is a previously advantaged school, most of the respondents could not link the resources to discipline issues. This was a clear indication that these respondents did not know the importance of physical resources in relation to discipline.

According to the respondents and observations, the school has enough conduct forms to record disciplinary cases; sport facilities; cleaning equipment; and a strong fence. However, the principal and 5 teachers indicated that the school hall is small and the classrooms are inadequate. This was evident during the assemblies in the hall at the time of the study. Due to limited space, all six classes of Grade 8 with a total of 224 learners had to stand in front of the hall. The classrooms, designed for a private school, are too small. The teacher-learner ratio is 1:29 and the classrooms appear crowded (the recommended standard ratio is 1.25). This contributes to disciplinary problems as discussed in Chapter 3.

On the issue of who has the responsibility of looking after the resources, there were variations in the responses. All the School Board members, heads of department and LRC members stated that the caretakers (who are the institutional workers) take care of the school resources. Similarly, 11 teachers responded that it is the caretakers, and only four teachers who stated that the whole school should take care of the resources. For the principal, it is the responsibility of the school management. Most of the learners indicated that the teachers take care of the resources. Surprisingly, none of the respondents mentioned that it is everyone's responsibility.

It was observed that though some resources were not sufficient, as stated above, the school neglected some of the facilities that directly concern the learners. For example, there is a library which is not open for learners. The amphitheatre is dirty and as you walk around the classrooms you could see graffiti on the walls. By contrast, the administration block and the hall are in a very good state. This situation could be attributed to the fact that there is not a shared responsibility of looking after the resources in the school.

At **School B**, most of the respondents also struggled to identify the physical resources that could be linked to discipline. The school is also previously advantaged and it has most of the resources (see Appendix E). The school has enough disciplinary record cards; classrooms; sport facilities; cleaning equipment; a hall; and a strong fence. Three teachers pointed out that the school is privileged, but the resources are neglected. What these teachers stated was noted during observations. As in the case of **School A**, the library is not in use and the amphitheatre appears as if no cleaning had taken place since the beginning of the year. All the sport facilities are locked and covered with unkempt grass. However, this was not a surprise to the researcher since most of the respondents appeared not to know that physical resources impact on discipline.

When asked who has the responsibility of taking care of the resources, all the heads of department, teachers and learners responded that it is the caretaker. The acting principal stated that the teachers take care of the resources, and only a single School Board member responded that according to the Ministry, the whole school — the School Board, the school management, teachers and learners — must have a responsibility to take care of the school resources. By looking at these responses, it is apparent that the school does not have a shared responsibility of looking after the resources.

In summary, the schools have most of the physical resources, except in **School A** where the classrooms and the hall appear to be a matter of concern. The responses from both schools indicated that they do not have a shared responsibility of looking after the resources.

5.5.3 Summary and Analysis

This section looked at the human and physical resources that the two schools have, whether there is shared responsibility of looking after the physical resources, and whether there is an emphasis on professional development in relation to managing learners' discipline.

It was found that both schools have most of the resources required to help them maintain discipline. Both schools identified similar human resources, such as teachers, Life Skills teachers and the security guards. This similarity illuminates that these are the most important human resources to these schools when it comes to discipline. Having qualified teachers at school was regarded in both schools as very crucial compared to other resources. Perhaps this is because learners spend most of their time with teachers in the classroom, where discipline is mostly required for teaching and learning to take place.

It also emerged that the two schools use their Life Skills teachers as school counsellors. These teachers are responsible for pastoral care of learners. The presence of the security guards in both schools was also perceived to be vital for good discipline and the overall well-being of the school.

Although the respondents acknowledged the importance of professional development with reference to discipline, it appears that there are no seminars going on in both schools. What is not clear, however, is why the schools are aware of the importance of professional development but they are not doing it.

The study schools appear to be fortunate when it comes to most of the physical resources required to help them maintain discipline. Surprisingly, most of the respondents in both schools could not link them to discipline, which is a clear indication that they do not know how important those resources are in assisting them to keep order in their schools. It is also disturbing to learn that the two schools do not utilise some of their resources.

The variation in the responses in both schools about who has the responsibility to look after the resources proved that it is not a shared responsibility, and this could be the main reason why some of the resources are badly neglected. Therefore, it should be kept in mind that these are some of the practices which directly affect discipline at school.

Since schools are located in the communities which they serve — by providing education opportunities to children — it is believed that the involvement of the parents and the communities at large in the school activities usually has a positive effect on discipline. The next section deals with this issue.

5.6 Parents and Community Involvement

This aspect is crucial in the sense that the school cannot function in isolation in maintaining discipline. It is believed that sound communication between the school and the parents or community contributes to good discipline at school. Since the school can hardly see what is happening outside its fence, the community serves as an informant for the school when it comes to learners' behaviour outside the school, especially when they misbehave while in school uniform. Furthermore, parents need to feel the ownership of the school, by being involved in the school activities. It is therefore a responsibility of the school to ensure that a healthy relationship with the parents and community is maintained.

The following indicators are usually associated with successful parents and community involvement in the school activities:

- Informing parents when changes are made in the discipline policy;
- Effective channels of communication with the parents/community are in place; and
- Expressing the significance of parents/community involvement.

The key indicators are grouped in Table 5.6.1.

Table 5.6.1: Parents and Community Involvement Indicators

Indicators	
<p>Communication with parents/community</p> <p>1. Informing parents when changes are made in the discipline policy</p> <p>2. Effective channels of communication with the parents/community are in place</p>	<p>Significance of parents/community involvement</p> <p>3. Expressing the significance of parents/community involvement</p>

5.6.1 Communication with Parents/Community

Based on indicators 1 and 2, the school should inform parents when making changes in the discipline policy, and there should be effective channels of communication between the school and the parents/community. It is believed that if this occurs, it eliminates confusions and fosters good relationships.

At School A, most of the respondents indicated that parents are being informed every time the school makes changes in the discipline policy. This happens during parent-teacher meetings, through newsletters, and when the school issues the school diary and term reports to learners to take them to parents. The school communicates with parents/community by writing letters, phoning, through the media and the parents who are School Board members.

However, two heads of department explained that sometimes they experience problems with parents who change their postal addresses without notifying the school. It also appears that some learners do not deliver invitation letters to their parents, especially when the content concerns the learner, and these are some of the reasons the school uses different means of communication.

In **School B**, most of the respondents indicated that they also inform parents when they make changes in the discipline policy. This information is communicated through newsletters, in the school diary, and during parent-teacher meetings. The school also phones and writes letters to parents and make use of the media to communicate with the community.

To summarise, the two schools update the parents when they make changes in the discipline policy. They also use similar methods, which seem to be effective, to communicate with the parents and the community.

5.6.2 Significance of Parents/Community Involvement

Indicator 3 suggests that parents and community involvement in the school activities is regarded as essential for maintaining discipline in the school. As Kantema (in Lewis, 2002:162) says, “schools are not supposed to function in isolation and the principals have to enter into a variety of relationships within as well as outside the school”.

At **School A**, the parents and the community are regarded as the ‘ambassadors’ for the school. This means that they are expected to represent the school outside in monitoring learners’ behaviour. Three of the teacher respondents felt that the school and the community should work hand in hand in teaching learners good behaviour. According to these teachers, there should be a close link between discipline at home and school.

For the principal, homes with good discipline should try to influence those which do not have this, and if there is discipline in the community there will be discipline in the school. The principal added that the parents and community can assist the school to identify effective measures to maintain discipline.

When one School Board member was asked about the role of the parents/community in maintaining school discipline he explained:

The school should work hand in hand with the community. They are the eyes and ears of the school out there. If they see our learners on the streets during school hours, they should inform us.

Similarly, all learners held the same view with the rest of the school. However, all the respondents including learners indicated that parents and community involvement in the school activities is poor. All the School Board members, heads of department, 6 teachers and the principal indicated that lack of parental involvement is one of the major causes of discipline problems in the school. These respondents maintained that learners nowadays are just afraid of their parents and if parents do not come to school to ask about the behaviour of their children the situation will not improve.

A head of department complained that some parents give alcohol to learners while they are in uniform, and sometimes learners used to fight in their presence at the school gate after school but they (parents) just turn a blind eye. In the same vein, the principal pointed out that although the school is big with more than 1000 learners, you hardly find more than 100 parents attending meetings. According to the principal, parents only come to school to complain if the school wants to suspend their kids for misbehaving. The principal explained that there are prominent persons in the community who can visit the school to inspire learners to focus on their learning, but they are not doing it.

In **School B**, respondents had similar views on this issue. They all indicated that the parents and community play a major role in maintaining discipline in the school. According to the respondents, when the school works with the community to monitor learners' behaviour, the level of indiscipline is likely to be low. Since the school is part of the community, the community needs to show to the learners that they work closely with the school in monitoring their behaviour. Two LRC members have also expressed similar views as **School A** teachers that since many learners appear to be more afraid of their parents than teachers, it will be good if parents can get involved in maintaining discipline. According to these LRC members, some learners misbehave in the school because they know that their parents will not hear about it, especially for minor cases.

All the respondents including learners indicated that parents and community involvement in the school activities is very poor. Four teachers felt that the absence of sport and cultural activities at school could be one of the contributing factors. The acting principal was of the opinion that the fact that some parents do not live near the school could be the cause.

To recapitulate, both schools regarded parents and community involvement necessary in the process of maintaining discipline. Unfortunately, both schools experience lack of parental and community involvement.

5.6.3 Summary and Analysis

The information collected under the school's resources factor was presented based on the following key indicators: informing parents when changes are made in the discipline policy; effective channels of communication with the parents/community are in place; and expressing the significance of parents/community involvement.

According to Kantema (in Lewis, 2002:162), "under Namibia's education reform, parents and the community at large are regarded as equal partners in education". This study revealed that the study schools welcomed this idea. Based on the responses, it appears that both schools inform the parents when they make changes in the discipline policy. The channels of communication in both schools are similar, and it seems that the two schools use every platform to communicate with the parents and community.

Interestingly, all the respondents from both schools acknowledged the importance of parents and community involvement in the school activities. But if we look at the comments made by the same respondents, it seems the schools are grappling to get parents and communities involved. Perhaps the question to ask is: *what can the study schools do to make parents/community involved in the school activities?* Kantema (in Lewis, 2002:162) is of the opinion that "parents can only participate fully in school activities if the relationship between them and the school is sound". And in building such a relationship, according to Kantema, "principals should express appreciation and give recognition to the contributions made by parents and the community at large" (ibid). Perhaps the study schools need to consider this advice.

It is worth noting that all the five factors which have been discussed up to this point should be regarded as various building blocks which are required to be put together for the school to perform. Sound leadership and management at school is therefore indispensable for binding these elements. The next section focuses on this issue.

5.7 Leadership and Management

At the centre of school discipline is the issue of leadership and management. Effective leadership and management is required to coordinate all the disciplinary activities in the school. This implies that the principal plays a central role in this task. As Kantema (in Lewis 2002:153) put it succinctly, “the principal is viewed as the central element in the improvement of the institutional programme of the school. It is the principal who can create a school environment where effective learning and teaching can take place”. It is therefore a must for every school to have a sound leadership and management style to ensure that discipline related activities are closely monitored.

The key indicators which are usually associated with successful leadership and management are:

- A visible and supportive principal;
- Delegates appropriate discipline authority to disciplinary structures where possible, and
- Arranges for staff development opportunities in relation to managing learners’ discipline.

For purposes of analysis, the indicators are grouped in Table 5.7.1

Table 5.7.1: Leadership and Management Indicators

Indicators	
<p>A visible and supportive principal who delegates appropriate discipline authority</p> <p>1. A visible and supportive principal</p> <p>2. Delegates appropriate discipline authority to disciplinary structures where possible</p>	<p>Staff development</p> <p>3. Arranges for staff development opportunities in relation to managing learners’ discipline</p>

5.7.1 A Visible and Supportive Principal who Delegates Appropriate Discipline Authority

According to the first two indicators, the principal should be visible and render his support as well as delegate appropriate discipline authority to disciplinary structures where possible.

At **School A**, during the fieldwork of this study, the principal was seldom seen around the school. Most of the time he was attending to visitors in his office, mainly parents. All of the teachers, heads of department and School Board members indicated that the principal's office is always open for them to solicit for his support. However, the majority of LRC members and learners across all grades responded that they do not get any support from the principal, and they criticised him for being always on the teachers' side when they have problems with their teachers.

As explained in section 5.3, the principal encourages all staff to deal with the disciplinary matters which fall under their responsibilities. For instance, seven teachers pointed out that the principal always reminds them not to refer minor offences to the heads of department, but to deal with them.

In **School B**, on the other hand, the acting principal was seen most of the time around the school carrying a whipping stick, though he was never seen using it, and was mostly checking on learners who were to be punished at the administration block, as indicated in the previous sections.

All the School Board members, heads of department and teachers responded that they get support from the principal's office. As was in the case of **School A** learners, most of the learners complained that the principal does not listen to them whenever they are called to the office concerning their behaviour.

All the people represented in the disciplinary structures in **School B** responded that they are given authority to deal with all the disciplinary matters which they can handle as long as they do it within the parameters of the school and Government policy.

5.7.2 Staff development

The last indicator asks for the principal to arrange for staff development opportunities in relation to managing learners' discipline. As indicated in section 5.3, no staff development takes place at either school. However, several teachers from both schools claim that being allowed to deal with disciplinary cases in their classrooms enables them to develop problem solving skills. For example, a female teacher in **School B** commented: "the principal always asks what you tried to do before you refer a learner to him", which is similar to what seven teachers in **School A** said that the principal always reminds them not to refer minor offences to the heads of department, but to deal with them.

The only group of respondents which seem to be looked after in both schools is the LRC, whereby the schools have a system of taking them out for camping at the beginning of each year where they receive a course on leadership. The LRC members from both schools indicated that the course is useful since they learn how to be leaders of others.

5.7.3 Summary and Analysis

The following indicators were used to present the data under the leadership and management factor: a visible and supportive principal; delegates appropriate discipline authority to disciplinary structures where possible, and arranges for staff development opportunities in relation to managing learners' discipline.

It was revealed in the study that the principal at **School A** was hardly seen moving around the school to make sure that there is an orderly environment at school, as opposed to the acting principal at **School B**.

This is also convincingly evidenced by the learners who had a habit of standing outdoor during lessons and teachers bunking classes in **School A**, as pointed out earlier. This was not the case at **School B**. It was noted that **School A** did not have a specific time for parents' appointments, and that could be the main reason the principal was always attending to parents.

In **School B**, it was made clear in the diary that parents and guardians must phone beforehand and make appointments before coming to school concerning disciplinary matters.

It is signalled in the study that learners from both schools do not see themselves getting any support from their principals, especially in disciplinary related matters. The unanimity among learners from both schools about lack of support from the principal's office explains that learners are not treated as other school members, and this can have a negative impact on learners' behaviour.

The study shows that both principals delegate discipline authority to disciplinary structures, but it seems that this only works in **School B**, where there are fewer disciplinary problems. The striking feature that both schools have in common is that the principals do not arrange for staff development opportunities, except LRC members who attend a leadership course at the beginning of each year. This is indeed a problem when the school does not offer workshops on how to maintain discipline, because the staff will not know what is required in the process.

The combination of the six factors discussed thus far, create what could be called the 'school culture'. This is where the discussion turns to.

5.8 School Culture

The school's culture influences the way the school manages learners' discipline. It is reflected in how the school carries out its activities. As Davidoff and Lazarus (1997:20) put it, the aspects of school life that reflect its school overall culture include: "the extent to which teachers and students are motivated; the way in which students and parents are involved or not involved in the life of the school; the way in which people relate to one another; the general attitude towards teaching and learning; the approach to discipline; late (or punctual) arrivals; missing of classes; and whether staff development is fostered or supported". As can be seen, the school culture involves many aspects which together provide a 'picture' of the school.

Since the scope of the study is limited to discipline, only discipline related activities are considered in this section. This implies that the practices which emerged in the six previous sections form the basis for the discussion of this section.

Therefore, as stated in the section on the school identity and purpose, the schools' practices which emerged in all the six sections will be brought together in this section in order to see the similarities and differences between the schools as they try to manage learners' discipline, and perhaps this will then answer the research question.

Apart from these practices, there is a general indicator which is usually associated with successful school culture in relation to discipline:

- A school is described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork.

This indicator will be covered first.

Table 5.8.1: School Culture Indicator

Indicator
<p>School culture</p> <p>1. A school is described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork</p>

5.8.1 School Culture

The indicator under this factor suggests that a school should be described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork. A happy school is regarded as a school where school members are willing to work with one another and share the school ethos. For instance, when the school members are working as a team in managing learners' discipline, it contributes to a happy school and this constitutes the culture of the school.

At **School A**, there was no consensus in the responses about the description of the school. All learners across grades and LRC members described the school as well resourced but they do not see it as a 'happy school'.

Since the scope of the study is limited to discipline, only discipline related activities are considered in this section. This implies that the practices which emerged in the six previous sections form the basis for the discussion of this section.

Therefore, as stated in the section on the school identity and purpose, the schools' practices which emerged in all the six sections will be brought together in this section. In so doing, the similarities and differences between the schools as they try to manage learners' discipline will be identified. Hopefully, this may also help answer the research question.

Apart from these practices, there is a general indicator which is usually associated with successful school culture in relation to discipline:

- A school is described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork.

This indicator will be covered first.

Table 5.8.1: School Culture Indicator

Indicator
<p>School culture</p> <p>1. A school is described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork</p>

5.8.1 School Culture

The indicator under this factor suggests that a school should be described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork. A happy school is regarded as a school where school members are willing to work with one another and share the school ethos. For instance, when the school members are working as a team in managing learners' discipline, it contributes to a happy school and this constitutes the culture of the school.

At **School A**, there was no consensus in the responses about the description of the school. All learners across grades and LRC members described the school as well resourced but they do not see it as a 'happy school'.

From the School Board members' side, only the parents described the school as good and they have indicated that they are happy to be School Board members. All the teachers, heads of department and the principal responded that the school is physically good but there is no teamwork. Teamwork here is referred to school members sharing disciplinary responsibilities.

As one head of department (Humanities, female teacher) commented:

It is a well resourced school, but I think...I think there is a lot of gossiping going around in the staff, there is a lot of jealousy...I don't think, I don't think we as a staff we work together as we should. I think most of the staff members don't even talk to one another, we don't have really a good relationship. So, I think as a staff we should be able to work with everyone, but I think there is a big problem at school. I think the learners will be only happy if the teachers are doing their jobs and if teachers are not doing their jobs then learners complain a lot and they bunk classes...teachers are not prepared, a lot of things start, a lot of wrong things start when the staff is not there, when the staff is not committed to work as a team.

Also one School Board member stated:

If you are a School Board member you become sensitive to some issues, and all these causes you to be disillusioned, for example, expenditure. You are creating more enemies than friends, because you try to put things right while others downplay it...I'm not happy to be a School Board member at all. My term expires at the end of this year and I will not be available any more. I think I will be much more effective than being a School Board member.

Similarly, a female teacher who is new at the school added that "...this school is terrible...just starting from the teaching staff to the learners, the relationship is not good".

And one learner from Grade 9 expressed it as follows: "The school has all the resources but the majority of teachers are not serious with their work. So, I'm not happy to be in this school". One LRC member described the school as well resourced, but relaxed and lacking in discipline. In fact all the LRC members and learners responses fell between these two responses. However, the majority of learners pointed out that compared to other schools the school is good in sport.

For the principal, he described the school as follows:

I can say it is a good school, very big and dynamic, but it has also its challenges and problems as I indicated earlier, but we are not stuck. we try to move forward. People used to say to us it was one of the best schools, but now a government school and a private school are two different things. In the private school you take the best learners but in the government you take the rest, but we are trying to move towards the direction that the government wants us to be.

Generally, most of the responses highlighted that although the school is well resourced, there is a lack of commitment and teamwork from the teaching staff. And as was discussed in section 5.2, the staff continually complained about a lack of commitment and teamwork at school. However, each staff member blamed others for not being committed, without showing commitment him/her self.

What was observed in this school was that only the principal and some heads of department were telling learners to be in their classrooms, while other teachers ignored the problem. According to the staff meeting held during the time of the study, the majority of teachers in the school did not have any other responsibilities in the school apart from teaching, which indicates that not only disciplinary related activities are not shared at school, but also other school activities.

As the Humanities' head of department explained above, the general relationship among the teachers was not good. For instance, some teachers (both males and females) remained in their classrooms during breaks, and they were hardly seen talking to others. There was no supervision from the teachers and LRC members during the changing of lessons, and in many cases learners were late for their classes. The LRC members were only visible at assemblies, and other learners did not show much respect towards them.

Although there was no formal classroom observation schedule, the researcher observed the lessons of 12 out of 14 teachers interviewed. There was a noticeable difference in learners' behaviour in different grades. For instance, Grade 10 F was a problem to every teacher observed teaching it. The learners were disrupting lessons by talking among themselves, not answering in turns, and some were doing other

things which had nothing to do with the lesson at hand, i.e. reading newspapers. Both boys and girls behaved alike, and the teachers had to remind them to behave throughout the lesson.

The class in question was referred to the principal during the time of the study, so that he can reprimand them for their behaviour. When the principal questioned the learners as to why most of the teachers were complaining about their behaviour, they responded that some teachers just hate them and they labelled their class as the most undisciplined in the school. The learners further stated that these teachers always tell them they are stupid and they will fail at the end of the year, instead of encouraging them. The principal promised them to talk to the staff about their complaints; at the same time he warned them that if they continue misbehaving he will suspend the entire class.

On the other hand, there were some grades, e.g. Grade 8A where teachers did not experience many disciplinary problems. Overall, however, irrespective of the teachers' gender or experience, observations showed most grades presenting disciplinary issues. Collectively, these observations suggest that **School A** is not a 'happy school' and teamwork is not a common feature.

At **School B**, the majority of respondents explained that it is a good school and they are happy to be there, except that the school disregarded sport and cultural activities. The acting principal, for instance, responded that "the school has problems as other schools, but it is a quiet, calm school and there is a lot of learning going on in the school". Similarly, one School Board member responded that "the school is academically good, but other things like sport and cultural activities are non-existent, which makes the school not to develop the whole child".

A female Life Skills teacher described the school as follows:

This school is my house...(laughing), I lived here for long time each day and these children are like my own children, I promise you. I miss them during the holidays, they become like your own... I feel that I made such a lot of input in this school than the principal, I feel he has to listen to me as well because I'm older than him at school. I have a good relationship with most of the teachers,

others I'm still trying to know them better so I feel I belong here. For me your work circumstances determine whether you are going to stay in the place and I could have changed schools twenty times over, I could have run away to a private school, which is for me not an option. I like teaching here...I even like my classroom, you see, I got a big lovely classroom. I like my school because it is my school... (laughing).

Other responses from the teaching staff include:

It is a developing educational institution because of the followings: there is proper integration of members of staff; the learners or the higher percentage of the learners at our school is not from the area; and we are classified as an inner city school. So, that in itself poses a lot of challenges to the teachers and learners of this institution (male Afrikaans teacher).

It is a good school with enough resources, things are well organised, there is mutual respect and the academic results are encouraging for one to be here (female Accounting teacher).

All the LRC members and learners responded that the school is good, except that it focuses more on academic than other things, e.g. sport. They explained that they need to have fun at school for enhancing learning.

What was stated by these respondents was supported through observations. As indicated in the first section, school members worked as a team, especially between the LRC and teachers (it is obvious that this is because there was support from the heads of department and the acting principal). Everyday there were teachers and LRC members on duty to check on learners in the corridors and stairs during the changing of lessons as well as in the assembly hall. Where a teacher was absent, the learners had to go to the classes of the teachers who were free during that time for invigilation. Learners were walking in file and there was order in the corridors.

Learners had five minutes to change classes and they were always punctual. All other teachers were seen standing at the doors of their classrooms to ensure that learners were entering in order --- girls first. According to a male teacher in **School A**, all these practices were introduced at their school but they were not enforced.

In classrooms settings, one lesson for each of the 11 teachers who were interviewed was observed. In all the classes, learners behaved well, and there was a similar pattern of behaviour across all grades. For instance, there were no cases of learners reading newspapers during lessons, as was the case in **School A**. Since there were no disruptions in the lessons, teachers spent the whole time on teaching, unlike in **School A** where teachers had to temporarily bring teaching to a halt to rebuke learners who were misbehaving.

By considering all these practices and the responses given above, the school qualifies to be called a 'happy school', especially that there is teamwork among the school members.

What is important to note is that these are just a few aspects of the two schools' culture. As stated at the beginning of this section, these aspects plus those noted in sections 5.2 to 5.7 will be brought together in this section in order to build up a picture of the study schools' culture.

Starting with **School A**, it was found that it is not a 'happy school', and the school has a culture of school members, especially teachers not working as a team in maintaining discipline. Teachers and learners have developed a habit of bunking classes, and every Friday, an average of 10% of the learners sit for detention. In fact detention is the most used punishment in the school. The school hardly evaluates its discipline policy, and it does not involve learners. The learners do not see themselves as having a responsibility in maintaining discipline.

The school does not have a formal, written vision, and the mission statement is not internalised. Every school member has his/her own purpose for education, and the school is thought of by its members as being poorly disciplined with a disorderly atmosphere. There is not a shared responsibility of looking after the resources and no professional development takes place at school. The involvement of parents and the community is very poor, no matter how hard the school tried to invite them. The principal is rarely seen around the school, and he is partial towards the teaching staff when it comes to dealing with learners' disciplinary cases.

On the other hand, the school has a good system of printing the rules and other relevant information in the diary, which is accessible to all school members. The school has the disciplinary structures in place and the necessary human and physical resources. Punishment at school is used as a last resort after several alternatives have failed, and learners are punished after school to enable them to attend lessons. Learners are also encouraged to participate in sport and cultural activities.

In contrast, **School B** is a 'happy school' with the staff and LRC members working as a team in maintaining discipline. The school is thought of by its members as being disciplined with an orderly atmosphere. The presence of the principal is felt in the school (which was displayed by the acting principal during the time of the study). There is sound time management, and teachers and learners are always in their classrooms during lessons, except learners who were punished.

But, the school also does not have a formal, recognised vision and the mission statement is not internalised. Learners were not involved in the development of the rules. The school does not have fixed time for the evaluation of the discipline policy and it does not involve learners. The few individuals who violate the school rules are punished during lessons by standing in front of the administration block. There is not a shared responsibility of looking after the resources and most of these are neglected. Learners do not see themselves having a responsibility in maintaining discipline, and there is no sport and cultural activities taking place at the school. Learners do not get support from the principal's office. The involvement of parents/community in the school activities is minimal.

To recapitulate, the two schools have many practices in common, but they differ in a few aspects, and these are what made a difference between them in managing learners' discipline. These will be explored below under summary and analysis.

5.8.2 Summary and Analysis

Since the thrust of this study was to find out what the two schools do differently that causes them have different levels of discipline, it is imperative to start with the differences.

Firstly, the absence of teamwork and commitment among the teaching staff in **School A**, and the existence of these qualities in **School B**, is regarded as the first major difference in this study. As Watkins and Wagner (2003: 33) argue, “the degree to which staff in a school collaborate with each other has an important impact on the patterns of behaviour at the organisational level”. And to get discipline working at school, “the main ingredient is the commitment of the people involved” (MSTP, 2007:18 [author’s page numbering]). This means that the presence of these qualities in **School B** contributed significantly to its discipline.

The second aspect that came out clearly in the study is the issue of the principal being visible in the school. The acting principal’s practice in **School B** of moving around the school for his presence to be felt by teachers and learners, as opposed to **School A**’s principal, proved to impact on discipline at school. This finding support the claim made by Cotton (2006:15), Nelson (2002:40) and Ramsey (1981:44), as discussed in Chapter 3. These are the distinctive practices the study found to cause the two schools not to have the same state of discipline.

As indicated earlier, **School B** also experiences minor disciplinary problems. This could be because of the practices both schools have in common, which have an adverse effect on discipline. It was found that both schools did not involve learners in the development of the school rules as well as in the evaluation of the discipline policy. The schools do not have documented visions, and their mission statements are not internalised. Looking after the physical resources is not a shared responsibility and most of the resources are neglected in both schools. Learners are not made to realise the responsibility they have in maintaining discipline, and they do not get support from the principals’ office. Finally, both schools suffer from a lack of parental and community involvement in the school activities.

It is apparent that the minor problems that **School B** experiences are a direct consequence of what is stated above. This is a clear indication that when the school experiences disciplinary problems, it means that the school had missed something which was supposed to be done. The findings also show that some factors are more important than others in maintaining discipline.

In other words, the school can fail to have some factors in place, such as a shared responsibility of looking after the physical resources, etc., as seen in **School B** above, but the presence of teamwork (which falls under the school culture factor) and leadership and management can make a difference.

Although all **School B** respondents insisted that they only experience minor disciplinary problems from a few individuals, Watkins and Wagner advise that the notion of ‘it’s just a tiny minority’ should be avoided. According to these authors, “many social systems contain beliefs that their dangerous miscreants are small in number but have a disproportional effect because of contagion effects: one rotten apple can spoil the whole barrel...” (2003: 6). This means that if **School B** does not try to work on the minor disciplinary cases it experiences, they could degenerate into major offences sooner or later.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to find out why schools with learners from similar social backgrounds experience different levels of discipline. In order to explore this question, two schools were selected as case studies in the Khomas Region.

The key questions that guided the development of the subsidiary questions were: What are the study schools' strategies to maintain discipline? Which structures and procedures do these schools have in place to deal with discipline? What is the identity of the study schools in relation to discipline, and what is their vision and mission statements? What technical and human resources are available in the study schools? Do the study schools involve the parents and community in maintaining discipline? Do the study schools have leadership and management style that is supportive of disciplinary efforts? And lastly, what culture do the study schools have in relation to discipline?

The methods that were used to collect data included on-site observations, semi-structured interviews and a review of disciplinary and other policy documents. Interviews were done with the School Board, the two principals, heads of department, teachers, Learners' Representative Council members and learners. The literature review provided a framework for the study, in which seven key elements that are believed to influence school discipline emerged. These are: strategy, structures and procedures, identity and purpose, school resources, community involvement, leadership and management, and school culture.

Although the literature generated the lists of factors described above, there was no indication of their relative significance or which of the factors might be considered most important. However, the two factors that emerged in the study to have most impact on discipline are teamwork (which falls under school culture) and leadership and management.

It surfaced in the study that discipline in **School B** is fairly good compared to **School A**. The data showed that this was due to the school staff and students who worked as a team at the time of the study as well as the high visibility of the (acting) principal.

These two factors were absent in **School A**. It was found here that neither staff nor students worked as a team in the process of maintaining discipline. Rather, they worked in isolation, which severely impacted on discipline. This supports Middlewood and Bush's claim that "the team process produces positive effects that could not be achieved by individuals acting alone" (2005:112).

Within the staff an attempt was made to see how the teachers who were new at the two schools and those had been there for more than a year viewed the issue of discipline, but there was no noticeable difference in the responses in both schools. This suggests stability in the responses and behaviours.

As indicated, the visibility of the (acting) principal in **School B** had a great effect on discipline in the school. There was order in the school during and between lessons, unlike in **School A** where the principal was rarely seen and where some learners and teachers had a habit of bunking classes.

Both schools have disciplinary structures and procedures in place, and these could have also contributed to good discipline in the case of **School B**, but the other factors such as the strategy, identity and purpose, school resources and community involvement appeared to be weak in these schools. For instance, the study revealed that under the strategy factor, neither school involved learners in the establishment of school rules nor in the evaluation of discipline policy; the punishments they administer to offenders for minor offences are not effective, and learners are not made to be aware of the role they play in maintaining discipline.

In the case of the school identity and purpose factor, neither school had written visions and the mission statements are not a part of daily practise. Although both schools have the necessary physical resources, most of these are neglected. It was also found that parental and community involvement in the schools' activities is minimal. Despite all these drawbacks, the presence of teamwork and a visible (acting) principal in **School B** made a difference.

The study found that there was a link between discipline and academic performance. The two schools' Grade 12 results for 2007 show that **School B** performed better compared to **School A**. This could partly be attributed to an orderly atmosphere in **School B**, which is the first main purpose of discipline, as noted in Chapter 3.

The findings of this study carry valuable information which many schools can utilise. It emerged in the study that good discipline in the school depends on how well the above seven factors work as a whole. This implies that the absence of any factor can be felt in the school, as observed in the study schools. However, this study does not claim that these are only existing factors that influence school discipline. Therefore, future research should explore more factors to add to this list. Furthermore, since the sample of this study included only two schools, it is believed that a study that will cover many or different schools will show a broader picture of how schools manage learners' discipline.

The study concludes by stating that maintaining discipline in the school should not be perceived as an individual activity; good discipline in the school hinges on the school members functioning collaboratively as a united team.

REFERENCES

- Ama, H. (2003) *An Investigation into Secondary School Teachers' Perceptions of the Factors that Affect Quality Education in Windhoek Education Region*. (MEd) Windhoek. University of Namibia.
- Andy, C. (2000) *A Study on Whole School Approach to Discipline and Guidance in a Practical School*. (MEd) Hong Kong. The University of Hong Kong Libraries. <http://Sunzi1.lib.hku.hk/hkuto/view/B31961563/ft.pdf>
- Barlow, M. and Robertson, H. J. (1994) *Class Warfare: The Assault on Canadian Public Education*. In S. Desmond (1999) *School Discipline Theory and Practice: Implications for Policy Development in an Isolated, Rural School Setting*. (MEd) Newfoundland. Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Clarke, A. (2007) *The Handbook of School Management*. Cape Town: Kate McCollum.
- Cohen, C. and Manion, L. (1985) *Research Methods in Education*. Second edition. London: Croom Helm.
- Cotton, K. (2006) *Schoolwide and Classroom Discipline*. <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/Sirs/5/cu9.html>
- Cowie, H. and Jennifer, D. (2007) *Managing Violence in Schools. A Whole-School Approach to Best Practice*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Davidoff, S. and Lazarus, S. (1997) *The Learning School. An Organisation Development Approach*. Cape Town: Juta and Co, Ltd.
- Desmond, S. (1999) *School Discipline Theory and Practice: Implications for Policy Development in an Isolated, Rural School Setting*. (MEd) Newfoundland. Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Duke, D. L. (1977) *A Systematic Management Plan for School Discipline*. In D. L. Duke and A.M. Meckel (1980) *Managing Student Behavior Problems*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Duke, D. L. and Meckel, A. M. (1980) *Managing Student Behavior Problems*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Duke, D. L. (1990) 'School Organisation, Leadership, and Student Behaviour'. In O. C. Moles (Ed.) *Student Discipline Strategies. Research and Practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Gillborn, D., Nixon, J. and Rudduck, J. (1993) *Dimensions of Discipline. Rethinking Practice in Secondary Schools*. London: HMSO.
- Gultig, J., Ndhlovu, T., Bertram, C. and Butler, D. (1999) *Creating People-Centred Schools: School Organisation and Change in South Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Harber, C. (1996) Educational Violence and Education for Peace in Africa. *Peabody Journal of Education*. Vol 71 (3), pp, 151-169.
- Jacobs, M., Gawe, N. and Vakalisa, N. (2001) Teaching – Learning Dynamics. A Participative Approach for OBE. In E.A. Johannes (2005) *Using Collaborative Action Research to Improve Classroom Discipline: An Action Research Study at a Secondary School in the Boland*. (MEd) Cape Town: University of the Western Cape.
- Johannes, E. A. (2005) *Using Collaborative Action Research to Improve Classroom Discipline: An Action Research Study at a Secondary School in the Boland*. (MEd) Cape Town: University of the Western Cape.
- Joubert, R., De Waal, E. and Rossow, J. P. (2004) Discipline: Impact on Access to Equal Educational Opportunities. *Perspectives in Education*. Volume 22 (3), pp, 77-87.
- Kamupingene, T. K. (2001) *Understanding School Discipline Policy in Namibia: The Case of Four Schools in the Windhoek Conurbation*. (PhD) Cape Town. University of the Western Cape.
- Kane, E. and O'Reilly-De Brún, M. (2001) *Doing Your Own Research*. London: Marion Boyars Publishers Inc.
- Kantema, S. H. (2002) 'Managing School Effectively: What do Rundu Principals Do'? In S. G. Lewis (Ed.) *Informing Reform: Namibian Research to Inform Education Policy and Practice*. Volume 1, pp, 153-170. Windhoek: Namibian Educational Research Association.
- Kyriacou, C. (2002) 'Effective Teaching in Schools'. In B. Rogers (Ed.) *Teacher Leadership and Behaviour Management*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Lichtman, M. (2006) *Qualitative Research in Education. A User Guide*. London: Sage Publications.
- Management Systems and Training Programmes (MSTP). (2007) *Positive Discipline at Your School. Seven Steps to Prevent Corporal Punishment and Focus on Learning*. Cape Town.
- Middlewood, D. and Bush, T. (2005) *Leading and Managing People in Education*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

- Ministry of Education and Culture. (1992) *Discipline from Within: Alternatives to Corporal Punishment. A Guide for Principals, Teachers, Learners, Parents and Communities*. Windhoek.
- Ministry of Basic Education and Culture. (2000) Policy on Misconduct of Learners in Government Schools: Prescribed Disciplinary Procedures. Circular: Form Ed.1/2000. Windhoek.
- Ministry of Basic Education, Sport and Culture. (2002) Government Gazette of the Republic of Namibia. Windhoek.
- Ministry of Education. (2008) Replacement of the IGCSE/HIGCSE System with the NSSC Curriculum and Examinations System. http://www.mec.gov.na/ministry_of_education
- Mlombo, W.V. (1997) *Corporal Punishment. A Closer Look*. Cape Town: Quaker Peace Centre.
- Moles, O. C. (1990) 'General Introduction'. In O. C. Moles (Ed.) *Student Discipline Strategies. Research and Practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Munn, P., Johnstone, M. and Chalmers, V. (1992) *Effective Discipline in Secondary Schools and Classrooms*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Nelson, M. F. (2002) *A Qualitative Study of Effective School Discipline Practices: Perceptions of Administrators, Tenured Teachers, and Parents in Twenty Schools*. (PhD) Johnson City. East Tennessee State University.
- Pienaar, G. (2003) A Different Approach to Classroom Discipline. *Educare. Vol 32, Issue 1&2, pp, 261-274.*
- Porteus, K., Vally, S. and Ruth, T. (2001) *Alternatives to Corporal Punishment. Growing Discipline and Respect in Our Classrooms*. Sandown: Heinemann Publishers (Pty) Ltd.
- Ramsey, R. D. (1981) *Educator's Discipline Handbook*. New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Ramsey, R. D. (1994) *Administrator's Complete School Discipline Guide: Techniques and Materials for Creating an Environment where Kids can Learn*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Reyes, A. H. (2006) 'Alternatives Education: The Criminalisation of Student Behaviour'. In F.W. English (Ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Educational Leadership and Administration. Volume 1, A-K*. London: Sage Publications.
- School A. (2008) *Diary*. Windhoek.

- School B. (2008) *Diary*. Windhoek.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994) Building Community in Schools. In S. Desmond (1999) *School Discipline Theory and Practice: Implications for Policy Development in an Isolated, Rural School Setting*. (MEd) Newfoundland. Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Sonn, B. (2005) *Discipline in Schools. Discipline in a Culture of Human Rights*. Cape Town: Paarl Print.
- Steyn, S. C., Wolhuter, C. C., Oosthuizen, I. J. and Van der Walt, J. L. (2003) An International Perspective on Learner Discipline in Schools. *South African Journal of Education*. Volume 23 (3), pp, 225-232.
- The Directorate National Examinations and Assessment (DNEA) (2007). Namibia Senior Secondary Certificate Ordinary (NSSCO). Khomas Region.
- The Directorate National Examinations and Assessment (DNEA) (2007). Namibia Senior Secondary Certificate Higher (NSSCH). Khomas Region.
- The Namibian. (2008) Daily Newspaper. <http://www.namibian.com.na/>
- Thompson, D. and Sharp, S. (1994) *Improving Schools. Establishing and Integrating Whole School Behaviour Policies*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Thomson, S. D. (1990) 'Foreword'. In O. C. Moles (Ed.) *Student Discipline Strategies. Research and Practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Travis, E. (2001) Discipline in the Schools. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 451 554.
- Van Wyk, N. (2001) Perceptions and Practices of Discipline in Urban Black Schools in South Africa. In R. Joubert, E. De Waal and J. P. Rossow (2004) *Discipline: Impact on Access to Equal Educational Opportunities. Perspectives in Education. Volume 22 (3), pp, 77-87.*
- Watkins, C. and Wagner, P. (2003) *Improving School Behaviour*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Wolhuter, C. C. and Steyn, S. C. (2003) Learner Discipline at School: A Comparative Educational Perspective. *Koers 68 (4), pp, 521-538.*
- Wynne, E. A. (1990) 'Improving Pupil Discipline and Character'. In O. C. Moles (Ed.) *Student Discipline Strategies. Research and Practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2003) *Case Study Research. Design and Methods*. Third edition. London: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX A: Namibia's Discipline Policy

This appendix summarises the two key Namibia's discipline policy documents. These are Discipline from Within: Alternatives to Corporal punishment, and the Education Act, 2001 (Act No.16 of 2001).

1.1 Discipline from Within: Alternatives to Corporal Punishment, 1992.

Although this is a very short document, it is believed that it is one of the documents that prepared the ground for the development of the new discipline approach in Namibian schools; therefore, it deserves to be discussed first. The document serves as a directive on school discipline. It targets those who are responsible for education — principals, teachers, learners, parents and communities.

The document has four main aims:

- To look at the problems of school discipline in a democratic society;
- To examine the role each member of the community can play in the educative process;
- To recommend measures to improve cooperation in schools; and
- To recommend alternatives to corporal punishment.

Concerning the first aim, the document highlights the main causes of discipline problems in Namibian schools. It appears that there are five factors which are responsible for discipline problems, and they are as follows:

At Home

It is believed that if a child is experiencing problems at home, it is difficult for that child to cope with the demands of the school. According to the document or guide, as the Ministry of Education and Culture prefers to call it, home problems can cause learners a great deal of tension and emotional problems. These problems can be as a result of *inter alia* poverty; poor home supervision; unhappy parents and alcohol abuse.

It is noticed that a child who experiences these problems can feel afraid, abandoned, confused, guilty and angry. Furthermore, these feelings can cause the child to be less interested in school work, and start to miss classes or even leave school.

Outside school

The document claims that circumstances outside the school have also a great impact on school discipline. For instance, the violence in society, as a result of the war for independence, is brought into school; fear for the future; uncertainty for those returning from war service; the mob psychology which takes over in uncertain situations and overrules individual commonsense; and abuse of alcohol and other intoxicating substances.

This implies that if the school is surrounded by the above conditions, its boundaries need to be re-enforced to prevent them from entering. In other words, the school should have strict rules to ensure that learners do not bring along unwanted practices to school that they picked up from the society. Therefore, the school required to work harder if it really wants to remain a true learning institution which attempts to prepare learners for the future.

At school

The school itself can also cause discipline problems. It is noted that too many learners per room; too few desks; lack of textbooks or teaching materials; poor lighting and; inadequate ventilation in hot classrooms can trigger learners to challenge the school authority.

The teacher

Although the teacher is also part of the school, it is believed that most of the misbehaviour, especially in the classroom, is a direct consequence of the teacher's practices. According to the document, the following practices by teachers can lead to discipline problems: not properly prepared for the lesson; poor classroom management skills; negative attitude towards learners; unsound teaching methods; lack of interest in the learner and/ or the lesson; lack of respect for time and; lack of proper conduct inside and outside school.

It is widely believed that in most cases learners behave towards teachers based on how teachers behave towards them and how they teach. As it is repeatedly said, good teaching and classroom management skills form the basis for discipline in the classroom.

The document also looks at who is at the core of discipline — the learner.

The learner

The document indicates that poor health and malnutrition can make learners tired and sleepy with little energy left for learning. This can be mistaken for laziness or disobedience.

The other things include poor eyesight or hearing that can also be mistaken for disobedience or lack of interest; some learners do not know the purpose of education and what is required from the learner to obtain an education; in an attempt to divert attention away from their inability to learn, some learners can disrupt class and school deliberately; lack of respect for school authorities in learning situation; lack of respect for school property, e.g. vandalism, breaking of school property; poor attitudes of learner's peer group towards school and learning can lessen a learner's interest in education; the learner sometimes cannot distinguish between pleasing their peer group and acting in their own interest and; interest in matters other than education can distract learners from school work and school attendance.

These are some of the factors which the Ministry of Education and Culture believed to be responsible for disintegration of discipline in the schools.

The second aim of the document concerns the role which each member of the community can play in learner's education. The document claims that maintenance of order and discipline in the school community rests with everyone who is determined to promote learning and achievement. These include the principal, teachers, learners, parents and community members.

The principal is expected to execute the following duties:

- Establish a clear set of rules and regulations for the school that have been discussed and agreed on by all members of the staff;
- Make sure the rules and regulations are in a written form which is easily understood by all;
- Establish a disciplinary committee to ensure that school rules are respected and obeyed;
- Establish a special sub-committee to deal with discipline problems of teachers;
- Meet regularly with teachers;
- Ensure teachers are in school and at their classes on time;
- Make sure that lesson plans are submitted and reviewed regularly;
- Organise Parent/Teacher conferences throughout the year and;
- Organise meetings with community leaders to discuss school issues.

The document emphasises that the whole success of the school relies heavily on the principal. This means that the principal sets the standards by which the school operates, and he/she is responsible for whatever goes on in the school.

Concerning the teacher, he/she is expected to:

- Discipline from, in and through a spirit of love, and should be firm but also sympathetic;
- Show respect and trust towards learners as well as other teachers;
- Maintain a dialogue with the learner;
- Be strict and firm but also be tactful, understanding and sympathetic;
- Be clear and consistent in discipline policy;
- Discuss rules and regulations during the first week of class, and reach agreement as to why rules are necessary, as well as the consequences of breaking the rules;
- Act more democratically, e.g. make more suggestions, allow more questions, and encourage discussions and the exchange of ideas;
- Provide a positive, disciplined role model for learners, e.g. be well-organised, arrive at class on time, have a well-prepared lesson, stay after class or allow

time after class to deal with any problems, and come to school sober and rested;

- Learn the students' names as soon as possible;
- Be supportive, e.g. praise good efforts as well as good work;
- Communicate effectively, e.g. be polite, listen to understand the learner, and use moderate language to discuss problems quietly;
- Never show favouritism;
- Reprimand an offender privately;
- Use humour as a regular part of teaching methods — not sarcasm or ridicule, but good humour and laughter; and
- Never molest learners for sexual purposes.

The document has also stipulated what learners should do. They are expected to:

- Work to understand the purpose of schooling;
- Come to class rested and prepared to learn;
- Understand that teachers are there to help learners achieve their goals;
- Have homework done and books ready;
- Treat teachers and other learners the way you expect to be treated;
- Discuss problems with teachers and should not keep them to themselves;
- Encourage other learners to participate fully in lessons;
- Play an active part in pair or group work;
- Behave in a dignified way;
- Tell no untruths; and
- Remember that the country needs their contribution.

When it comes to parents, the document suggests that they should:

- Provide a good home environment;
- Support school rules at home;
- Establish a code of conduct in the home;
- Make sure child is fed and rested before leaving for school;
- Ask child about the day's activities at school;
- Have child read homework assignments aloud;
- Take an interest in all school work;

- Go to school meetings and express opinions and concerns; and
- Encourage children to co-operate with the school authorities and to be positive in their attitude to learning.

The document did not leave out the community members. The followings are expected from them:

- Establish School Boards;
- Hold regular meetings with teachers and learners;
- Campaign to get parents involved in education;
- Support the establishment of radio programmes to address important issues like discipline and the value of education;
- Attend school meetings;
- Watch for acts of indiscipline outside of school and communicate them to school;
- Help with fundraising activities to improve school facilities;
- Be prepared to visit the school, give short talks about community issues and concerns, sit on panels and committees to contribute ideas about developing the school; and
- Help protect school property.

The document ends with some criticisms on the use of corporal punishment in schools, and suggests the following alternatives for the teacher:

- When all attempts to correct learner's behaviour have failed and punishment is a last resort, punishment must be specific; proportionate to the offence, and understood by the learner;
- Use clearly stated words of disapproval, warning admonition and reprimand;
- Remind the learner of the rules and consequences of breaking the rules;
- Remove any objects which may be the source of a problem and return them only when the class is over;
- Deprive the offending learner of a privilege;
- Move the learner away from the problem situation;
- Set some additional duties. Do not give mindless tasks like lines or writing-out book pages. Never give school work as a punishment;

- Refer the offending learner to a disciplinary committee or to the deputy principal or principal, depending on the severity of the offence;
- Suspend the offending learner;
- In extreme cases, sanction the exclusion of the offender from class (for severe offences) where the continued presence of the offender threatens the maintenance of class control.

The document acknowledges the fact that sometimes the above alternatives can fail. If this happens, the school should apply more drastic measures guided by the school rules to maintain discipline.

Having familiarised themselves with *discipline from within* document, schools are expected to develop their own discipline policy, which should be done within the framework of Education Act which follows below.

1.2 The Education Act, 2001 (Act No.16 of 2001)

As indicated earlier, this Act crystallised from various directives that were issued after the country's independence. Under section 55 (1) and (2) of this Act, the Minister of Basic Education, Sport and Culture, as it was called at the time, is expected to make general rules of conduct which must be incorporated into the learner's code of conduct of all state schools, and a School Board of a state school must, after consultation with the school parents, learners and teachers of the school, draft and adopt a learners' code of conduct respectively.

The general rules of conduct for learners at state schools were officially passed in the Government Gazette of 28 October 2002, the date in which the Education Act, 2001(Act No, 16. of 2001) came into operation.

According to the code of conduct, a learner at a state school:

- Must regularly and punctually attend school, class sessions on the school timetable, study sessions and other compulsory activities as determined by the school;

- Must carry out and obey all lawful instructions of the principal, teachers, staff members and learners of the school or hostel;
- Must dedicate himself or herself to his or her studies and complete all legitimate curriculum tasks and assignments;
- Must respect the dignity, person and property of teachers, learners and members of the public;
- Must accept and respect the multi-cultural diversity of learners and teachers of the school;
- Must abide by and comply with the rules of the school or hostel as approved by the School Board;
- Must maintain a high standard of personal hygiene and a clean, decent and neat appearance;
- May not behave himself or herself in a disgraceful, improper or indecent manner;
- May not bring onto the school or hostel premises, or have in his possession any firearm, bow and arrow, panga, knife or any other dangerous weapon;
- May not, on or off the school premises, use intoxicating liquor or narcotic substances without the written prescription of a registered medical practitioner;
- May not have in his possession, or bring onto the school or hostel premises, distribute or sell to another person in the school or hostel premises, intoxicating liquor, or narcotic substances without the written prescription of a registered medical practitioner;
- May not have access to the sleeping quarters or hostel dormitories of learners of the opposite sex without the permission of the hostel superintendent;
- May not wilfully damage, destroy or vandalize the property of government, the school or another person;
- May not act in such a manner that is disruptive to normal school programmes or detrimental to the good discipline and learning progress of other learners;
- May not practice or participate in any form of initiating ceremonies of new learners that may cause physical harm or emotional distress to such new learners; or
- May not, by his actions or behaviour encourage or influence other learners to disobey the rules of the school;

As the overall manager of the school activities, the principal of a state school must make sure that the learners' code of conduct is 1) prominently displayed on the school and hostel premises, and 2) is effectively communicated to all learners and parents.

Where a School Board of a state school deem it necessary, may establish a disciplinary committee to advise on cases of misconduct of learners or serious contravention of school rules. Once established, the disciplinary committee must consider cases of misconduct or contravention of school rules referred to the committee and advise the principal or the School Board on appropriate disciplinary action or measure to be taken. Furthermore, according to the code of conduct, it is a sole responsibility of a School Board to make sure that written record is kept of the conduct, contravention of rules, and disciplinary action and measure taken regarding each learner of the school.

The code of conduct further indicates that, depending on the record of previous contravention of a learner, a disciplinary action or measure in minor cases which do not warrant a disciplinary action or measure by the School Board may take the form of:

- A reprimand of the learner by a teacher;
- Giving a learner specific additional tasks related to the contravention;
- Referring the learner to the head of department, deputy principal or principal;
- Consultation of the principal with the learner and the parent regarding the learners' conduct; or
- First, second and third written warning to the learner, a copy of which must be given to the parent.

Finally, the code of conduct made it clear that if, after a disciplinary hearing, a learner is found guilty for contravention of any of the aforementioned rules, a School Board, apart from a recommendation it may make to the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry to expel a learner from school or hostel, may impose any of the following disciplinary measures:

- A final written warning;
- A deprivation of a privilege of a learner for a specified period; or

- Suspension of a learner from school.

What has been stated up to this point deals with an effort that the government made to make sure that order prevails in state schools. And as the document *discipline from within* and the *code of conduct for learners* demonstrate, the government tried its best to provide a 'tool kit' on how learner discipline should be managed. Perhaps the question will be whether this 'tool kit' has reached all the state schools, and whether it is used as it is meant for.

University of Cape Town

APPENDIX B: Instruments Used to Collect Data and a Letter of Permission

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

School:.....

Date of Observation:.....

Time (start) of Observation:.....

1. TIME USE AT THE SCHOOL

Days	Actual Teaching Start Time	Actual Closing Time	Total Actual Breaks (Minutes)	Length of Actual School Day
Monday				
Tuesday				
Wednesday				
Thursday				
Friday				
Total (hours/minutes)				

1a. Is there a special event which shortens the school day e.g. sports, early closing for religious reasons, staff meetings, etc.

.....

1b. What is happening during periods? (i.e. are the learners/ teachers out of class during scheduled periods? Where are they and what are they doing?)

.....

2. ATTITUDES TOWARDS TIME

Statement	Early	On time	Late
The principal arrived...			
The majority of teachers arrived...			
The majority of learners arrived...			

(Note: majority refers to 75% +)

2a. Do teachers take registers?

.....
.....

2b. Are the upper grades treated differently from the lower grades concerning late coming to school?

.....
.....
.....
.....

2c. What action taken by teachers and principal to deal with late comers?

By Teachers:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

By the principal:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2d. Overall impression about attitudes towards punctuality and use of time.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. ASSEMBLY

3a. Was the school assembly conducted, and at what time?

Yes	
No	
Time	

3b. Where was the school assembly held?

Assembly venue	
School hall	
In the open (e.g. court yard)	
Other	
.....	

3c. Which language was used during assembly?

Language used in assembly	
English	
Afrikaans	
Other	
.....	

3d. Was discipline mentioned during assembly? What were the issues about discipline?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3e. How did the learners behave during assembly?

.....
.....
.....
.....

3f. Who conducted the assembly?.

.....
.....

4. INTERVAL (BREAK)

- 4a. At what time was the first break?.....
- 4b. How long was the first break?..... minutes
- 4c. At what time was the second break?.....
- 4d. How long was the second break?..... minutes

Total break time:..... minutes

5. ACTIVITIES DURING BREAK

5a. What activities are the majority of the following people doing during break?

Principal

.....
.....
.....

Teachers

.....
.....

Learners

.....
.....
.....

6. AFTER SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

6a. Is there study after school, and is it supervised?

.....
.....
.....

6b. What are the extra-mural activities taking place after school? (Any supervision?)

.....
.....
.....
.....

6c. Who stays behind after school, and for what reason?

Principal

.....
.....

Teachers

.....
.....

Learners

.....
.....
.....

6d. Are the school facilities used after school hours by other community members? (e.g. for literacy classes, etc.)

.....
.....
.....

7. GENERAL STAFF/ LEARNER RELATIONS

Statement	Not at all	Some of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
Learners are treated with respect by the staff				
Staff are treated with respect by learners				

8. LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Statement	Not at all	Some of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
The principal is visible in the school				

9. THE SCHOOL RESOURCES

Statement	Not at all	Some of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
The school buildings are clean, e.g. floors.				
Looking after the school's resources is a shared responsibility				

School Board interview schedule

Questions	Key indicators
<p>Strategy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who were involved in the development of the school rules? 2. What are the major disciplinary problems do you experience in the school? 3. What are the minor disciplinary problems do you experience in the school? 4. What strategies does the school use to maintain discipline? 5. Do you think those strategies are effective? 6. What kinds of punishments does the school administer to the learners who violate the school rules? 7. As a School Board member, what problems do you experience as you try to enforce school rules? 8. Who do you think have a responsibility to maintain discipline in the school? 9. What do you think is the main cause of discipline problems in the school? 10. How often do you evaluate your discipline policy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear rules developed with input from learners ▪ Rules made known to everyone in the school ▪ A shared responsibility of maintaining discipline in the school ▪ Available and up-to-date data on the nature and extent of discipline in the school ▪ Clear sanctions which are accepted by all ▪ Punishment as a last resort after several attempts have failed ▪ A school discipline policy which is frequently evaluated
<p>Structures and procedures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is your role in maintaining discipline in the school? 2. Tell me about the structures in place to deal with discipline. 3. What procedures does the school follow in dealing with disciplinary cases? 4. Who makes disciplinary decisions in the school? 5. What guides these decisions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appropriate structures for discipline are in place, e.g. disciplinary committee, Learners' Representative Council, etc. ▪ Each committee member knows his/her responsibilities ▪ Clear disciplinary procedures ▪ Disciplinary decisions guided by the ministerial policy
<p>School identity and purpose</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How would you describe learner discipline as a School Board member? 2. What is your perception about the state of discipline in the school? 3. What is the vision of the school? 4. What is the mission statement of the school? 5. How was the mission statement developed? 6. What is your view concerning the purpose of education in the school? 7. Do you think you are working towards that purpose? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A clear vision of the school ▪ A school's vision is shared by all members ▪ A mission statement is developed by all role-players ▪ A common understanding of the purpose of education in the school ▪ Understanding of learner discipline ▪ The state of discipline in the school ▪ An ordered atmosphere

<p>School resources (technical and human)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What human resources do you have in the school to help maintaining discipline? E.g. a school counsellor 2. What kinds of physical resources does the school have to help maintaining discipline? 3. Who takes care of the physical resources? 4. Have you attended any course on how to manage learners' discipline? 5. Do you think professional development assists to curb indiscipline in the school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of a school counsellor and other persons needed to maintain discipline ▪ Enough physical resources at school ▪ A shared responsibility of looking after the school's resources ▪ A great emphasis on professional development in relation to managing learners' discipline
<p>Parents/Community involvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you inform the parents when you make changes in the discipline policy? 2. What role do you think the parents and community have in maintaining discipline in the school? 3. Do you experience any problems concerning parents and community involvement in the school activities? 4. How does the school communicate with the parents and community? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Informing parents when changes are made in the discipline policy ▪ Effective channels of communication with the parents/community are in place ▪ Expressing the significance of parents/community involvement
<p>Leadership and management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What kind of support do you get from the principal's office in dealing with disciplinary problems? 2. Are you allowed to make key disciplinary decisions in the school? 3. How does the principal enable you to develop skills in managing learners' discipline? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A visible and supportive principal ▪ Delegates appropriate discipline authority to disciplinary structures where possible ▪ Arranges for staff development opportunities in relation to managing learners' discipline
<p>School culture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you describe this school? 2. How do you feel about being a School Board member? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A school is described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork

Principal interview schedule

Questions	Key indicators
<p>Strategy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who were involved in the development of school rules? 2. What are the major disciplinary problems do you experience in the school? 3. What are the minor disciplinary problems do you experience in the school? 4. What strategies do you use to maintain discipline in your school? 5. Do you think those strategies are effective? 6. What kinds of punishments does the school administer to the learners who misbehave? 7. What problems do you experience as you try to enforce school rules? 8. Who do you think have a responsibility to maintain discipline in the school? 9. What do you think is the main cause of discipline problems in the school? 10. How often do you evaluate your discipline policy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear rules developed with input from learners ▪ Rules made known to everyone in the school ▪ A shared responsibility of maintaining discipline in the school ▪ Available and up-to-date data on the nature and extent of discipline in the school ▪ Clear sanctions which are accepted by all ▪ Punishment as a last resort after several attempts have failed ▪ A school discipline policy which is frequently evaluated
<p>Structures and procedures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As a principal, what is your role in maintaining discipline in the school? 2. What structures are in place to deal with discipline in the school? 3. What procedures does the school follow in dealing with disciplinary cases? 4. Who makes disciplinary decisions in the school? 5. What guides these decisions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appropriate structures for discipline are in place, e.g. disciplinary committee, Learners' Representative Council, etc. ▪ Each committee member knows his/her responsibilities ▪ Clear disciplinary procedures ▪ Disciplinary decisions guided by the ministerial policy
<p>School identity and purpose</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How would you define learner discipline? 2. What is your perception about the state of discipline in the school? 3. What is the vision of the school? 4. What is the mission statement of the school? 5. How was the mission statement developed? 6. What is your view concerning the purpose of education in this school? 7. Do you think you are working towards that purpose? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A clear vision of the school ▪ A school's vision shared by all members ▪ A mission statement developed by all role-players ▪ A common understanding of the purpose of education in the school ▪ Understanding of learner discipline ▪ The state of discipline in the school ▪ An ordered atmosphere

<p>School resources (technical and human)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What human resources do you have in the school to help maintaining discipline? E.g. a school counsellor 2. What kinds of physical resources does the school have to help maintaining discipline? 3. Who takes care of the physical resources? 4. Have you attended any course on how to manage learners' discipline? 5. Do you think professional development assists to curb indiscipline in the school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of a school counsellor and other persons needed to maintain discipline ▪ Enough physical resources at school ▪ A shared responsibility of looking after the school's resources ▪ A great emphasis on professional development about managing learner's discipline
<p>Parents/Community involvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you inform the parents when you make changes in the discipline policy? 2. What role do you think the parents and community have in maintaining discipline in the school? 3. Do you experience any problems concerning parents and community involvement in the school activities? 4. How does the school communicate with the parents and community? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Informing parents when changes are made in the discipline policy ▪ Effective channels of communication with the parents/community are in place ▪ Expressing the significance of parents/community involvement
<p>Leadership and management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What kind of support do you provide to your staff and learners in relation to discipline? 2. Are the disciplinary structures allowed to make decisions? 3. How do you enable your staff to develop skills in managing learners' discipline? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A visible and supportive principal ▪ Delegates appropriate discipline authority to disciplinary structures where possible ▪ Arranges for staff development opportunities in relation to managing learners' discipline
<p>School culture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you describe this school? 2. Are you happy to be the principal of this school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A school is described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork

Head of Department interview schedule

Questions	Key indicators
<p>Strategy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who were involved in the development of school rules? 2. What are the major disciplinary problems do you experience in the school? 3. What are the minor disciplinary problems do you experience in the school? 4. What strategies do you use to maintain discipline in the school? 5. Do you think those strategies are effective? 6. What kinds of punishments does the school administer to the learners who violate the school rules? 7. What problems do you experience as you try to enforce school rules? 8. Who do you think have a responsibility to maintain discipline in the school? 9. What do you think is the main cause of discipline problems in the school? 10. How often do you evaluate your discipline policy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear rules developed with input from learners ▪ Rules made known to everyone in the school ▪ A shared responsibility of maintaining discipline in the school ▪ Available and up-to-date data on the nature and extent of discipline in the school ▪ Clear sanctions which are accepted by all ▪ Punishment as a last resort after several attempts have failed ▪ A school discipline policy which is frequently evaluated
<p>Structures and procedures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. What is your role as head of department in maintaining discipline? 7. What structures are in place to deal with discipline in the school? 8. What procedures does the school follow in dealing with disciplinary cases? 9. Who makes disciplinary decisions in the school? 10. What guides these decisions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appropriate structures for discipline are in place, e.g. disciplinary committee, Learners' Representative Council, etc. ▪ Each committee member knows his/her responsibilities ▪ Clear disciplinary procedures ▪ Disciplinary decisions guided by the ministerial policy
<p>School identity and purpose</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How would you define learner discipline? 2. What is your perception about the state of discipline in the school? 3. What is the vision of the school? 4. What is the mission statement of the school? 5. How was the mission statement established? 6. What is your view concerning the purpose of education in this school? 7. Do you think you are working towards that purpose? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A clear vision of the school ▪ A school's vision shared by all members ▪ A mission statement developed by all role-players ▪ A common understanding of the purpose of education in the school ▪ Understanding of learner discipline ▪ The state of discipline in the school ▪ An ordered atmosphere

<p>School resources (technical and human)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. What human resources do you have in the school to help maintaining discipline? E.g. school counsellor? 7. What kinds of physical resources does the school have to help maintaining discipline? 8. Who takes care of the physical resources? 9. Have you attended any course on how to manage learners' discipline? 10. Do you think professional development assists to curb indiscipline in the school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of a school counsellor and other persons needed to maintain discipline ▪ Enough physical resources at school ▪ A shared responsibility of looking after the school's resources ▪ A great emphasis on professional development about managing learners' discipline
<p>Parents/Community involvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you inform the parents when you make changes in the discipline policy? 2. What role do you think the parents and community have in maintaining discipline in the school? 3. Do you experience any problems concerning parental and community involvement in the school activities? 4. How does the school communicate with the parents and community? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Informing parents when changes are made in the discipline policy ▪ Effective channels of communication with the parents/community are in place ▪ Expressing the significance of parents/community involvement
<p>Leadership and management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What kind of support do you get from the principal's office in dealing with discipline problems? 2. Are you allowed to make key disciplinary decisions in the school? 3. How does the principal enable you to develop skills in managing learners' discipline? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A visible and supportive principal ▪ Delegates appropriate discipline authority to disciplinary structures where possible ▪ Arranges for staff development opportunities in relation to managing learner's discipline
<p>School culture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you describe this school? 2. Are you happy to be head of department in this school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A school is described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork

Teacher interview schedule

Questions	Key indicators
<p>Strategy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were you involved in the development of school rules? 2. What are the major disciplinary problems do you experience in the school? 3. What are the minor disciplinary problems do you experience in the school? 4. What strategies does the school use to maintain discipline? 5. Do you think those strategies are effective? 6. What kinds of punishments does the school administer to the learners who misbehave? 7. As a teacher, what problems do you experience as you try to enforce school rules? 8. Who do you think have a responsibility to maintain discipline in the school? 9. What do you think is the main cause of discipline problems in the school? 10. How often does the school evaluate the discipline policy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear rules developed with input from learners ▪ Rules made known to everyone in the school ▪ A shared responsibility of maintaining discipline in the school ▪ Available and up-to-date data on the nature and extent of discipline in the school ▪ Clear sanctions which are accepted by all ▪ Punishment as a last resort after several attempts have failed ▪ A school discipline policy which is frequently evaluated
<p>Structures and procedures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is your role as a teacher in maintaining discipline? 2. Tell me about the structures in place to deal with discipline. 3. What procedures does the school follow in dealing with disciplinary cases? 4. Who makes disciplinary decisions in the school? 5. What guides these decisions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appropriate structures for discipline are in place, e.g. disciplinary committee, Learners' Representative Council, etc. ▪ Each committee member knows his/her responsibilities ▪ Clear disciplinary procedures ▪ Disciplinary decisions guided by the ministerial policy
<p>School identity and purpose</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How would you define learner discipline? 2. What is your perception about the state of discipline in the school? 3. What is the vision of the school? 4. What is the mission statement of the school? 5. Did you take part in the establishment of the mission statement of the school? 6. What is your view concerning the purpose of education in this school? 7. Do you think you are working towards that purpose? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A clear vision of the school ▪ A school's vision shared by all members ▪ A mission statement developed by all role-players ▪ A common understanding of the purpose of education in the school ▪ Understanding of learner discipline ▪ The state of discipline in the school ▪ An ordered atmosphere

<p>School resources (technical and human)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What human resources do you have in the school to help maintaining discipline? E.g. school counsellor. 2. What kinds of physical resources does the school have to help maintaining discipline? 3. Who takes care of the physical resources? 4. Have you attended any course on how to manage learners' discipline? 5. Do you think professional development assists to curb indiscipline in the school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of a school counsellor and other persons needed to maintain discipline ▪ Enough physical resources at school ▪ A shared responsibility of looking after the school's resources ▪ A great emphasis on professional development about managing learners' discipline
<p>Parents/Community involvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you inform the parents when you make changes in the discipline policy? 2. What role do you think the parents and community have in maintaining discipline in the school? 3. Do you experience any problems concerning parental and community involvement in the school activities? 4. How does the school communicate with the parents and community? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Informing parents when changes are made in the discipline policy ▪ Effective channels of communication with the parents/community are in place ▪ Expressing the significance of parents/community involvement
<p>Leadership and management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What kind of support do you get from the principal's office in dealing with disciplinary problems? 2. Are you allowed to make key disciplinary decisions in the school? 3. How does the principal enable you to develop skills in managing learners' discipline? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A visible and supportive principal ▪ Delegates appropriate discipline authority to disciplinary structures where possible ▪ Arranges for staff development opportunities in relation to managing learner's discipline
<p>School culture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you describe this school? 2. Are you happy to be a teacher in this school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A school is described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork

Learners' Representative Council interview schedule

Questions	Key indicators
<p>Strategy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were you involved in the development of the school rules? 2. How does the school make rules available to you? 3. Do you think the school rules are fair, and why? 4. What are the major disciplinary problems in the school? 5. What are the minor disciplinary problems in the school? 6. What strategies does the school use to maintain discipline? 7. Do you think those strategies are effective? 8. What kinds of punishments does the school administer to the learners who misbehave? 9. What problems do you experience as you try to maintain discipline? 10. Who do you think have a responsibility to maintain discipline in the school? 11. What do you think is the main cause of discipline problems in the school? 12. How often does the school evaluate discipline policy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear rules developed with input from learners ▪ Rules made known to everyone in the school ▪ A shared responsibility of maintaining discipline in the school ▪ Available and up-to-date data on the nature and extent of discipline in the school ▪ Clear sanctions which are accepted by all ▪ Punishment as a last resort after several attempts have failed ▪ A school discipline policy which is frequently evaluated
<p>Structures and procedures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the role of a Learners' Representative Council in relation to discipline? 2. What structures are in place to deal with discipline in the school? 3. What procedures does the school follow in dealing with disciplinary cases? 4. Do you think the procedures the school follows to deal with offenders are appropriate? 5. Who makes key disciplinary decisions in the school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appropriate structures for discipline are in place, e.g. disciplinary committee, Learners' Representative Council, etc. ▪ Each committee member knows his/her responsibilities ▪ Clear disciplinary procedures ▪ Disciplinary decisions guided by the ministerial policy
<p>School identity and purpose</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you define learner discipline? 2. What is your perception about the state of discipline in the school? 3. What is the vision of the school? 4. What is the mission statement of the school? 5. Were you involved in the development of the mission statement of the school? 6. What is your view concerning the purpose of education in this school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A clear vision of the school ▪ A school's vision shared by all members ▪ A mission statement developed by all role-players ▪ A common understanding of the purpose of education in the school ▪ Understanding of learner discipline ▪ The state of discipline in the school ▪ An ordered atmosphere

<p>School resources (technical and human)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What human resources do you have in the school to help maintaining discipline? E.g. a school counsellor 2. What kinds of physical resources does the school have to help maintaining discipline? 3. Who takes care of the physical resources? 4. Have you attended any course on how to maintain discipline in the school? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of a school counsellor and other persons needed to maintain discipline ▪ Enough physical resources at school ▪ A shared responsibility of looking after the school's resources ▪ A great emphasis on professional development about managing learners' discipline
<p>Parents/Community involvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the school inform the parents when it makes changes in the discipline policy? 2. What role do you think the parents and community have in maintaining discipline in the school? 3. When does the school invite your parents? 4. How does the school communicate with the parents and community? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Informing parents when changes are made in the discipline policy ▪ Effective channels of communication with the parents/community are in place ▪ Expressing the significance of parents/community involvement
<p>Leadership and management</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What kind of support do you get from the principal's office as you try to maintain discipline? 2. Are you allowed to make disciplinary decisions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A visible and supportive principal ▪ Delegates appropriate discipline authority to disciplinary structures where possible ▪ Arranges for staff development opportunities in relation to managing learner's discipline
<p>School culture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you describe this school? 2. Are you happy to be a member of Learners' Representative Council? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A school is described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork

Learner interview schedule

Questions	Key indicators
<p>Strategy</p> <p>13. Were you involved in the development of the school rules? 14. How does the school make rules available to you? 15. Do you obey the school rules, and why? 16. Do you think the school rules are fair, and why? 17. What are the major disciplinary problems in the school? 18. What are the minor disciplinary problems in the school? 19. What strategies does the school use to maintain discipline? 20. Do you think those strategies are effective? 21. What kinds of punishments does the school administer to the learners who misbehave? 22. Who do you think have a responsibility to maintain discipline in this school? 23. What do you think is the main cause of discipline problems in the school? 24. How often does the school evaluate discipline policy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear rules developed with input from learners ▪ Rules made known to everyone in the school ▪ A shared responsibility of maintaining discipline in the school ▪ Available and up-to-date data on the nature and extent of discipline in the school ▪ Clear sanctions which are accepted by all ▪ Punishment as a last resort after several attempts have failed ▪ A school discipline policy which is frequently evaluated
<p>Structures and procedures</p> <p>6. What structures are in place to deal with discipline in the school? 7. What procedures does the school follow in dealing with disciplinary cases? 8. Do you think the procedures the school follows to deal with offenders is appropriate? 9. Who makes key disciplinary decisions in the school?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appropriate structures for discipline are in place, e.g. disciplinary committee, Learners' Representative Council, etc. ▪ Each committee member knows his/her responsibilities ▪ Clear disciplinary procedures ▪ Disciplinary decisions guided by the ministerial policy
<p>School identity and purpose</p> <p>7. How do you define learner discipline? 8. What is your perception about the state of discipline in the school? 9. What is the vision of the school? 10. What is the mission statement of the school? 11. Were you involved in the development of the mission statement of the school? 12. Do you think it is important for the school to have a mission statement, and why? 13. What is your view concerning the purpose of education in this school?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A clear vision of the school ▪ A school's vision shared by all members ▪ A mission statement developed by all role-players ▪ A common understanding of the purpose of education in the school ▪ Understanding of learner discipline ▪ The state of discipline in the school ▪ An ordered atmosphere

<p>School resources (technical and human)</p> <p>5. What human resources do you have in the school to help maintaining discipline? E.g. a school counsellor</p> <p>6. What kinds of physical resources does the school have to help maintaining discipline?</p> <p>7. Who takes care of the physical resources?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of a school counsellor and other persons needed to maintain discipline ▪ Enough physical resources at school ▪ A shared responsibility of looking after the school's resources ▪ A great emphasis on professional development about managing learners' discipline
<p>Parents/Community involvement</p> <p>5. Does the school inform your parents when it makes changes in the discipline policy?</p> <p>6. What role do you think the parents and community have in maintaining discipline in the school?</p> <p>7. When does the school invite your parents?</p> <p>8. How does the school communicate with the parents and community?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Informing parents when changes are made in the discipline policy ▪ Effective channels of communication with the parents/community are in place ▪ Expressing the significance of parents/community involvement
<p>Leadership and management</p> <p>3. What kind of support do you get from the principal's office?</p> <p>4. Are you allowed to take part in disciplinary decision making?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A visible and supportive principal ▪ Delegates appropriate discipline authority to disciplinary structures where possible ▪ Arranges for staff development opportunities in relation to managing learner's discipline
<p>School culture</p> <p>1. How do you describe this school?</p> <p>2. Are you happy to be a learner in this school?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A school is described as a 'happy school' with an emphasis on teamwork

A letter of permission



REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION KHOMAS REGION

Tel: (+264 61) 2934356
Fax: (+264 61) 231367

Private Bag 13236
Windhoek

File No.:12/2/4/4/2

June 2, 2008

Mr Oiva Hipondoka
WINDHOEK

Sir

REQUEST TO CONDUCT RESEARCH ON HOW SCHOOLS MANAGE LEARNER'S DISCIPLINE IN GRN SCHOOLS IN KHOMAS REGION

Your letter of 28 May 2008 on the above topic has reference.

You are hereby given permission to conduct research at any two secondary schools of your choice on condition that:

- o you contact the principal of the school to make logistical arrangements
- o the research should not disrupt the normal school programme
- o anyone who will participate in the interview should do so on voluntary basis
- o the final report should be made available to us.

We wish you all the best of luck in your studies.

Yours faithfully

MS C.U. TJIKUUA
DIRECTOR

ALL OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE MUST BE ADDRESSED TO THE DIRECTOR, KHOMAS REGION

APPENDIX C: Schools Teaching Staff Profile

TEACHING STAFF PROFILE: SCHOOL A

Teaching Staff	Gender	Years at the present School	Years of Experience	Subject Specialisation	Qualifications
Principal	M	03 yrs	19 yrs	English, History, Library Science	HED BEd (Hons) <i>University of Namibia</i>
Heads of department					
1	F	02 yrs	04 yrs	Business Studies, Economics	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
2	M	03 yrs	08 yrs	Physical Science	BETD <i>Caprivi College of Education</i> ; Dip Ed <i>University of Namibia</i>
3	F	04 yrs	25 yrs	Biology, Geography, Physical Education	MEd <i>University of Zululand</i>
4	F	09 yrs	09 yrs	German, Physical Education	D.k
Teachers					
1	M	03 months	05 yrs	Accounting, Economics	BETD <i>Ongwediva College of Education</i>
2	M	04 months	08 yrs	Physical Science, Maths	BSc <i>University of Lagos</i>
3	F	06 months	06 months	Geography, History	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
4	F	06 months	01 yr	Computer Science, Economics	BSc <i>University of Namibia</i>
5	F	06 months	04 yrs	Geography, Biology	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
6	F	07 months	04 yrs	Geography, Maths	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
7	M	07 months	17 yrs	History, Geography, Development Studies	Cert Ed <i>Belvedere Teachers College</i> ; BEd MA <i>University of Zimbabwe</i>
8	F	01 yr	09 yrs	English	BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i>

9	M	01 yr	10 yrs	Computer Science, Maths	BSc <i>University of KwaZulu-Natal</i>
10	M	01 yr	17 yrs	Accounting, Business Economics	HED BEd (Honours) <i>University of Namibia</i>
11	F	02 yrs	02 yrs	German, English	BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i> ; ACE <i>University of Johannesburg</i>
12	M	02 yrs	02 yrs	Maths	Dip Ed <i>University of Zimbabwe</i>
13	F	02 yrs	03 yrs	Geography, History	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
14	F	02 yrs	05 yrs	Geography, English	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
15	F	02 yrs	06 yrs	Biology, Geography	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
16	M	02 yrs	35 yrs	Afrikaans	BA SOD <i>University of the Western Cape</i> ; BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
17	M	03 yrs	13 yrs	History, Agriculture	Dip Ed <i>University of Namibia</i> ; BA <i>University of South Africa</i>
18	M	03 yrs	14 yrs	Geography, History	HED BA <i>University of the Western Cape</i> ; BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
19	M	04 yrs	06 yrs	Maths, Physical Science	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
20	M	04 yrs	07 yrs	Accounting, Economics	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
21	M	04 yrs	11 yrs	Geography, History	HED <i>Institute of Open Learning</i>
22	M	05 yrs	35 yrs	Afrikaans, English	BA HED <i>University of Fort Hare</i> ; BEd MEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
23	F	06 yrs	06 yrs	Maths, Life Skills	BSc <i>University of Namibia</i>
24	F	06 yrs	06 yrs	English, History	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
25	M	06 yrs	06 yrs	English, Physical Education	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
26	M	06 yrs	07 yrs	English, Maths	BETD HED <i>North-West University</i>
27	F	06 yrs	11 yrs	Business Studies, Physical Education	BA BEd (Hons) PG Dip in Ed <i>University of Namibia</i>
28	F	10 yrs	10 yrs	Business Management, Accounting	BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i>
29	M	10 yrs	10 yrs	Life Science	BETD <i>Caprivi College of Education</i>
30	F	10 yrs	12 yrs	Physical Science, Maths	BETD <i>Ongwediva College of Education</i>

TEACHING STAFF PROFILE: SCHOOL B

Teaching staff	Gender	Years at the present School	Years of Experience	Subject Specialisation	Qualifications
Principal	M	05 yrs	22 yrs	Biology	HED <i>Wellington Teacher's College</i> ; BEd (Hons) <i>University of Namibia</i>
Heads of department					
1	F	04 yrs	14 yrs	English	Nat Dip Info Tech <i>Tech Orange Free State</i> ; HDE BEd (Hons) <i>Potchefstroom University</i>
2	M	04 yrs	18 yrs	English, Development Studies	HED <i>Potchefstroom University for CHE</i>
3	F	05 yrs	19 yrs	Accounting, Economics, Business Studies	HED <i>Academy</i> ; BEd (Hons) <i>University of Namibia</i>
4	M	11 yrs	24 yrs	Biology, Physical Science, Maths	HED <i>University of the Orange Free State</i>
Teachers					
1	M	02 months	02 months	Geography, Life Science	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
2	F	04 months	14 yrs	English, History	HED <i>North-West University</i> ; BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
3	M	06 months	02 yrs	English, Afrikaans	BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i>
4	M	06 months	03 yrs	Physical Science, Maths	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
5	M	06 months	23 yrs	English, History	HED <i>University of Namibia</i>
6	F	01 yr	01 yr	Accounting, Economics	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
7	F	01 yr	07 yrs	Physical Science, Maths, Computer Studies	BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i> ; BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
8	M	01 yr	07 yrs	Physical Science, Maths	BETD <i>Rundu College of Education</i>
9	M	01 yr	07 yrs	Physical Science, Maths, Biology	HNDAP <i>Napier University</i> ; DT <i>Moray House College</i>
10	M	01 yr	07 yrs	English, Otjiherero	BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i>
11	F	01 yr	11 yrs	Biology, Geography, Life	HED <i>University of Namibia</i> ; BEd (Hons) <i>University of South</i>

				Skills	<i>Africa</i>
12	M	01 yr	15 yrs	Biology, Maths	HPEC <i>University of Namibia</i>
13	F	01 yr	28 yrs	English	HED <i>Academy</i> ; PG Dip <i>University of Warwick</i>
14	M	02 yrs	03 yrs	Geography, History	BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i>
15	F	02 yrs	06 yrs	Geography, History	BEd <i>University of Namibia</i>
16	F	02 yrs	10 yrs	English	HED BA BA (Hons) <i>Potchefstroom University for CHE</i>
17	F	03 yrs	03 yrs	Accounting, Business Studies, Maths	BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i>
18	F	03 yrs	03 yrs	Accounting, Business Management	BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i>
19	M	03 yrs	19 yrs	English, History	Cert in Ed <i>Academy</i> ; BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i>
20	F	04 yrs	05 yrs	Accounting, Computer Studies	BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i>
21	F	04 yrs	11 yrs	History, Geography	HED <i>University of Namibia</i>
22	M	04 yrs	26 yrs	Biology, Life Science	HED <i>Windhoek College of Education</i> ; Adv Dip Ed <i>Rand Afrikaans University</i>
23	F	06 yrs	06 yrs	Afrikaans	HED <i>University of Namibia</i>
24	M	06 yrs	14 yrs	English, Otjiherero	BETD <i>Windhoek College of Education</i>
25	F	08 yrs	18 yrs	Maths	HED <i>Khomasdal TC</i> ; BA <i>University of the Western Cape</i>
26	F	16 yrs	21 yrs	Business Studies	HED <i>Windhoek College of Education</i>
27	F	17 yrs	25 yrs	Geography, Maths, Life Skills	HED <i>Windhoek College of Education</i> ; BEd (Hons) <i>Open Learning Group</i>

APPENDIX D: Schools Mission Statements

School A Mission Statement

School A will strive at all times to ensure an environment which will be safe and conducive for the learning process and where merit in academic, sport, cultural and leadership spheres will have pride of place. We aim to achieve this through the following objectives:

- Aim for a 100% pass rate.
- Encourage learners to appreciate and respect the values of social and cultural customs other than their own.
- Teach learners to respect democratic principles and to understand that democracy requires self-respect, self control, a responsibility for the community as well as an acceptance of authority.
- Satisfy the needs of parents, teachers and learners on all levels through dedication and hard work.
- By adopting a policy of social awareness through sport, cultural and academic achievements.
- Create a desire amongst learners to serve the community.
- Create and foster a sense of loyalty, pride and personal involvement towards the school within parents, teachers and learners.

School B Mission Statement

School B's mission is to be the best academic school and to be known for exceptional achievements on all levels. We aim to achieve this through the following objectives:

- Aim for a 100% pass rate.
- Satisfy the needs of parents, teachers and learners on all levels through dedication and hard work.
- Strengthen and expand our presence in the community.
- Optimise the performance and potential of learners by creating a caring, listening and learning environment.
- Successfully manage diversity in our work to enhance optimal development in all spheres of a learner's life.
- Create and foster a sense of loyalty, pride and personal involvement towards the school within parents, learners and teachers.
- Develop a quality top structure that will monitor and evaluate overall performance and serve as motivation for staff members.

Appendix E: Schools Physical and Educational Resources

School A Physical and Educational Resources

Facility	Number	Condition of facilities		
		Poor	Fair	Good
Classroom Facilities				
Classrooms (permanent) (number)	32		✓	
Classrooms (temporary) (number)	1		✓	
Administrative Facilities/ Resources				
Staff room	1			✓
Principal's office	1			✓
Secretary's office	2			✓
School Hall	1			✓
Educational Facilities				
Library	1		✓	
Science laboratory	4		✓	
Computer laboratory	3			✓
Recreational Facilities				
Sports fields/ courts	3		✓	
Infrastructure (availability)				
Toilets			✓	
Electricity			✓	
Water				✓

School B Physical and Educational Resources

Facility	Number	Condition of facilities		
		Poor	Fair	Good
Classroom Facilities				
Classrooms (permanent) (number)	24		✓	
Classrooms (temporary) (number)	-			
Administrative Facilities/ Resources				
Staff room	1			✓
Principal's office	1			✓
Secretary's office	1		✓	
School Hall	1			✓
Educational Facilities				
Library	1		✓	
Science laboratory	3		✓	
Computer laboratory	1		✓	
Recreational Facilities				
Sports fields/ courts	3	✓		
Infrastructure (availability)				
Toilets			✓	
Electricity			✓	
Water			✓	