# STUDENTS' MALFEASANCE ACTS, CONSEQUENCES AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPROACHES IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS, DELTA STATE, NIGERIA

**Nkedishu, Victor Chukwubueze[i]**
Department of Educational Management and Foundations,
Delta State University,
Abraka, Nigeria

**Abstract:**

This study examined students' malfeasance acts, consequences and administrative approaches in public secondary schools, Delta State. It was guided by four research questions and four hypotheses. The study design was ex-post-facto of the descriptive survey technique. A sample of 238 was selected from a population of 476 principals in Delta State secondary schools applying stratified sampling method. Instrument entitled 'Students' Malfeasance Acts, Consequences and Administrative Approaches Questionnaire (SMACAAQ) was utilized in the study and its validity was established though face and content validity. Data gathered were analysed with the use of mean rating, standard deviation, ranking and t-test at significance level of 0.05. Findings revealed that perpetual lateness to school, inviting their friends to create conflict in school, oppressing fellow students, coming to school with dangerous weapon were some profiles of malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State. Letting students know the consequence of malfeasance acts on their academic achievement and society, use well-behaved students to give example, let students know the rewards for being well-behaved were some administrative approaches to curb students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State. It is recommended that upon admission, students should be issued a handbook which contains rules and regulations of the school, this will help students understand what constitute malfeasance behaviour and avoid them. Orientation should be organised for students from time to time where they will be informed on consequence of malfeasance acts on their academic achievement and society at large.

**Keywords:** students, malfeasance acts, consequences, administrative approaches, Delta State

---

[i] Correspondence: email chuksjp@gmail.com, vcnkedishu@delsu.edu.ng

## 1. Introduction

Over the years, students are described as the pride of the society as well as wealth of a nation (Ali, Dada, Isiaka, and Salmon, 2014). A nation's future is therefore dependent upon the youths who make up the prospective human resources necessary for the progressiveness of the society. Thus, the majority youths must be disciplined as well as preserved in order to attain sustainable improvement of a society. Malfeasance acts is a problem that affects all schools regardless of school type and gender although it varies from school to school in degree and magnitude. Students' malfeasance acts have become a widespread problem that grossly affected moral upbring (Muxiddin, 2020). According to Ali *et al.* (2014), students malfeasance acts has been over the years been an issue of distress for instructors, policy makers and the society in general, which is as a result of hostility between peer groups, vandalism, violence within teacher – student relationship as well, which in turn leads to unending presence of problem of examination malpractice, drop out, lateness deviant behaviours and poor academic achievement among students. Schools in line with overall educational objectives aimed at producing integrated citizens to help themselves and the society at large (Odebode, 2019) and in order to achieve this, school's ought to product students with good practice and conduct.

The above implies that the school system is not only charged with the responsibility of training students in diverse field of study, but also to train their moral values to be responsible people who can add to the advancement of their society (Odebode, 2019). Good conduct among students is inevitable in order to achieve academic success. Managing an effective learning environment that is devoid of any student's malfeasance acts to a great extent determine the success of school administrators (Chirkina, and Khavenson, 2018). Failure to achieve the above may create a threat to students' academic performance and also impeding effectiveness of school management (Adeniyi, 2012), because it may give rise to fear and frustration to school ethics and conduct if the situation is not adequately checked (Adeniyi and Akinola, 2020). Malfeasance acts can tarnish a student's future and may also lead to several negative outcomes and will make students more likely to harm themselves and others through the negative behaviours (Bhavika, 2016).

Malfeasance acts offshoot of an adolescent's maturity stages. Adolescents start acquiring new set of characters, skills, attitudes and beliefs, that is believed to make them become effective members of their society as they enter into new stage of rapid, physical, mental, emotional and social changes (Garcia and Santiago, 2017). The kind of people that teenagers come across has a great effect on their behaviour and personality. In line with the ongoing, Belle (2014) identified the causes of students' malfeasance acts to include existence of relational challenges of those students with their friend, educator, parents and other people they value in their lives. Adolescents habitually manifest identity crisis in their stage (Nealis, 2014). During this identity crisis period, their attitudes and perception toward people and their surrounding environment are affected. And this in

turn affects their relationships with the school administrative when they eventually get to the school environment (Kumari and Kumar, 2017).

Students have turned irrepressible and extremely insolent to teachers, parents, school administrators as well as the society at large. Muxiddin (2020) reported that students portray diverse types of malfeasance acts which include violence, disobedient to teacher and prefects as well as administrators, boycotting of lessons, dishonesty, watching/practicing pornography, alcohol consumption, vandalism, rapping school/classmates, opposing and stabbing teachers in schools, lateness to school, stealing, cultism, rioting, drug abuse, insulting/assaulting, among others. This is all as a result of the fact that student hail from diverse culture and values, family backgrounds and economic status. Most prevalent malfeasance acts as those involving the collective misconduct of students were destruction of school facilities and mass protest, also, common cases of malfeasance acts pertaining to students' poor habits like fighting, speaking of pidgin language, wearing dirty or wrong uniforms, gum chewing in classroom and examination malpractice (Muxiddin, 2020). Researchers have identified lateness to school, disruption/vandalization of school amenities, bullying, thuggery, drug and alcoholism, assault, non-compliance, wearing the wrong school uniform, use of the mobile phone to be rampant secondary school students (Jeeroburkhan, 2016; Ngwokabuenui, 2015; Rigby, 2014). Students also get involved in sexual offences, smoking, wilful demolition of school properties, drug abuse and of currently, armed robbery (Jacob and Adeboyega, 2017). Ramharai, Curpen and Mariaye (2012) identified prevalent malfeasance acts to include stealing, smoking verbal aggression, writing or use vulgar language in school, class bunking and disruption among students. These malfeasance acts as exhibited by students because of their childish enthusiasm or a way of displaying their dissatisfaction to school policies (Naganandini, 2017; Johnson, 2012). Malfeasance acts have saturated all aspects of a man's life and has led to men's downfall (Ngwokabuenui, 2015). If these acts are allowed to nurture under current conducive circumstances by education providers and consumers could birth a monster that will be hard to eradicate (Idu and Ojedapo, 2011). In the society today, there are slight samples of the foreseen problems are already being encountered and many believe malfeasance acts originating from schools are the progenies of present economic distresses arising from robbery, corruption, assassination, pipeline vandalization and smuggling (Ngwokabuenui, 2015). Those who swore to defend the law as well as law interpreter are indiscriminately violating court injunctions and orders. All these acts in our societies today likely began as a mustard seed of malfeasance acts in the school. The procedures taken to pact with insubordination are barely satisfactory since there exist no administrative/legal guidelines which might be referred to in such instance. Actions taken are often ad-hoc and uncoordinated both within and across schools of the same type. Teachers most conspicuously feel disempowered to address cases of disorderliness because they lack backing from appropriate authorities, political interfering and an inexperienced school administration (Ali *et al.*, 2014). Gyan, Baah-Korang, McCarthy, and McCarthy, (2015) in their study, considered collaboration between the teachers and the

parents as an essential means for curbing malfeasance acts in schools and this can be done through Parent-Teacher Association, making school rules and regulations clearly stated, involving students in decision-making process, this in turn will make the employments of such guidelines easy because the students took part in the procedure, giving corporal punishment to offenders, sending tough students to the counselling unit for counsel, expelling ruthless students from the school, reducing intake of students and finally making very stubborn students pledge to be of good conduct.

Adeniyi and Akinola (2020), recommended that for any administrator to deal with students' malfeasance acts, such an administrator must be highly effective in exercising his official duties. Effectiveness depends on capabilities, expertise, knowledge and ability of an individual to create solutions to problems (Ibukun, Oyewole and Abe, 2011). Administrative effectiveness can also be seen as the extent to which administrators are able to accomplish the defined school's goals (Bottery, 2016). Oyeike and Nwosu (2018) also revealed that the administrators who are the schools' forerunner execute some authoritative functions and expertise that could help attain a favourable school environment and encouraging school-community relations, without any uncertainty, school is viewed as a fundamental part of the community where it's situated, therefore, a collaborative relationship between the community and school is necessary in curbing malfeasance behaviour among students (Adeniyi and Akinola, 2020). It is the duty of a good administrator to visualize school goals that achieves the community needs (Hoerr, 2008).

The school cannot function alone because it is situated in a community. Therefore, the need for cooperative relationship between host community and school (Okorie, Ememe and Egu, 2009). It is therefore relevant to note that, community would likely collaborate actively with school administrators in dealing with student's malfeasance when they are involved in the school's administration (Seegopaul, 2016). Bates and Weighart (2015) posed that the administrators need to develop collaboration with other school personnel to fight students' malfeasance acts. If the administrators are able to develop trust and good interactions with all stakeholders, such an interaction could help build a productive relationship and favourable school environment devoid of students' malfeasance acts (Chirkina and Khavenson, 2018). Ali *et al.*, (2014) posed that approaches like expulsion, corporal punishment, stigmatization. are not appropriate to curb the acts of malfeasance among student and as such, it should be dejected. They however recommended that identification of the students' biography should be first process of managing students' malfeasance acts because when the students' personal psychological makeup is known, one can device the appropriate methods of managing them to the desirable standard. In addition, substitute to discharge various corporal punishments, behaviour modification techniques should be adopted to curb unruly acts of the students, each school may also recommend an active disciplinary team that checkmate every cases of malfeasance of the students and this team should be led by a trained guidance counsellor, all the school administrators and managers should employ a wholesome method to manage students' malfeasance acts, and finally each school should constantly

read to students the set of rules and regulations that will guide all actions during school hours.

## 2. Statement of Problem

Malfeasance acts in schools has become a disparaging force that has tainted students' moral upbringing. Students have become uncontainable and extremely rude to teacher, parents, school administrator and to the larger society. Research have revealed that students display diverse malfeasance acts and the extent to which these acts are connected are not yet known by the researcher, whether their consequences originate from the perceptions of their school culture, parents' attitude, peer group influence, teachers' attitude, their parents' socioeconomic achievements, climate and environment are yet uncertain; and the consequences it elicits in school and what approaches should be taken to curb these acts calls for investigation. These trends may arise from malfeasance acts among students, therefore moved the researcher to find out profiles, consequences and administrative approaches to students' malfeasance acts among secondary school students in Delta State. Thus, this study aimed at identifying profile of students' malfeasance acts, consequences on academic achievement/society and administrative approaches to curb the acts.

### 2.1 Research Questions

The following research question were raised to guide this study:

1) What are the profiles of students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State?
2) What consequences does students malfeasance acts have on their academic achievement?
3) What consequences does students malfeasance acts have on society?
4) What administrative approaches can be applied to curb students' malfeasance acts?

### 2.2 Hypotheses

The following mull hypotheses will be tested in this study:

1) Principal's sex does not differ on their responses to profile of students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State.
2) Principals' location does not differ on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on their academic achievement.
3) Principals' location does not differ on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on society.
4) Principal's experience does not differ on their responses to administrative approaches to curb students' malfeasance acts.

## 3. Method

### 3.1 Study Design

The study design was ex-post-facto of the descriptive survey technique. The technique helps to describe the situation which has occurred, and the researcher has no power to manipulate any variable.

### 3.2 Population and Sample

Targeted population consists of 476 principals in Delta State public secondary schools. Sample of 238 principals were drawn from the population employing stratified sampling method and represented 50% of the whole population.

### 3.3 Instrument

Instrument entitled 'Students' Malfeasance Acts, Consequences and Administrative Approaches Questionnaire (SMACAAQ)' was self-constructed by the researcher and utilized to obtain responses from study participants. The instrument was structured into two sections of parts A and B. while part A focused on variables of respondents, part B dealt with profile of students' malfeasance acts, consequences of students' malfeasance acts on academic achievement, consequences of students' malfeasance acts on society and administrative approaches to curb students' malfeasance acts. Items in the instrument were designed such that the purpose of the study was captured.

### 3.4 Validity and Reliability

The instrument was subjected to validity using experts who established face and content validity of the instrument. The instrument was further subjected to split-half reliability test employing 20 respondents omitted from the real study, scores were correlated using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Statistics and a Co-efficient of 0.69 was obtained, However, this co-efficient was stepped up with Spearman Brown formula and 0.82 was obtained which showed high reliability, thus the instrument was used for the study.

### 3.5 Data Analysis

Data gathered were analysed with the use of mean rating, standard deviation and ranking for answering research questions with mean benchmark of 2.50 and above for agreeing and below for disagreeing. Also, hypotheses were tested with the use of independent t-test at significance level of 0.05.

## 4. Results Presentation

**Research Question 1:** What are the profiles of students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State?

**Table 1:** Mean rating, standard deviation and
ranking analysis on profile of students' malfeasance acts

| S/N | Profiles of students' malfeasance acts | Mean | SD | Ranking | Remark |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Perpetual lateness to school | 3.11 | 1.02 | 1st | Agree |
| 2. | Inviting their friends to create conflict in school | 2.98 | 1.07 | 2nd | Agree |
| 3. | Oppressing fellow students | 2.95 | 1.03 | 3rd | Agree |
| 4. | Coming to school with dangerous weapon | 2.92 | 1.08 | 4th | Agree |
| 5. | Distracting teachers during lesson | 2.80 | 1.05 | 5th | Agree |
| 6. | Use their ill-wealth to cause problem in school | 2.77 | 1.09 | 6th | Agree |
| 7. | Smoking within the school premises | 2.76 | 1.13 | 7th | Agree |
| 8. | Wandering around during classes | 2.70 | 1.12 | 8th | Agree |
| 9. | Leaving school at will | 2.64 | 1.16 | 9th | Agree |
| 10. | Luring fellow students into disrespecting teachers | 2.63 | 1.08 | 10th | Agree |
| 11. | Disrespecting school staff | 2.59 | 1.09 | 11th | Agree |
| 12. | Come to school on mufti | 2.55 | 1.15 | 12th | Agree |
| 13. | Ready to fight teachers | 2.54 | 1.06 | 13th | Agree |
| **Benchmark: 2.50** | | | | | |

**Source:** Fieldwork**.**

Data in Table 1 revealed that respondents agreed on all items ranging from 1st to 13th with mean scores above benchmark mean score of 2.50. In specific, perpetual lateness to school was ranked 1st with mean score of 3.11, inviting their friends to create conflict in school was ranked 2nd with mean score of 2.98, oppressing fellow students was ranked 3rd with mean score of 2.95, coming to school with dangerous weapon was ranked 4th with mean score of 2.92, distracting teachers during lesson was ranked 5th with mean score of 2.80, use their ill-wealth to cause problem in school was ranked 6th with mean score of 2.77, smoking within the school premises was ranked 7th with mean score of 2.70, wandering around during classes was ranked 8th with mean score of 2.70, leaving school at will was ranked 9th with mean score of 2.64, luring fellow students into disrespecting teachers was ranked 10th with mean score of 2.63, disrespecting school staff was ranked 11th with mean score of 2.59, come to school on mufti was ranked 12th with mean score of 2.55 and ready to fight teachers was ranked 13th with mean score of 2.54.

Thus, profiles of students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State include; perpetual lateness to school, inviting their friends to create conflict in school, oppressing fellow students, coming to school with dangerous weapon, distracting teachers during lesson, use their ill-wealth to cause problem in school, smoking within the school premises, wandering around during classes, leaving school at will, luring fellow students into disrespecting teachers, disrespecting school staff, come to school on mufti and ready to fight teachers.

**Research Question 2:** What consequences does students malfeasance acts have on their academic achievement?

**Table 2:** Mean rating, standard deviation and ranking analysis
on consequences of students' malfeasance acts on their academic achievement

| S/N | Consequences of students' malfeasance acts on their academic achievement | Mean | SD | Ranking | Remark |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|---------|--------|
| 1. | Loss lesson materials | 2.98 | 1.10 | 1st | Agree |
| 2. | Examination failure | 2.81 | 1.13 | 2nd | Agree |
| 3. | Dropout of school | 2.72 | 1.14 | 3rd | Agree |
| 4. | Lose their studentship | 2.68 | 1.09 | 4th | Agree |
| 5. | Lack of concentration | 2.60 | 1.11 | 5th | Agree |
| 6. | Low intellectual development | 2.58 | 1.17 | 6th | Agree |
| 7. | Obtain low grades | 2.57 | 1.10 | 7th | Agree |
| 8. | Engage in academic dishonesty | 2.56 | 1.15 | 8th | Agree |
| 9. | Suspension/expulsion from school | 2.53 | 1.10 | 9th | Agree |
| 10. | Seek ways to obtain better grades at all cost | 2.51 | 1.13 | 10th | Agree |
| **Benchmark: 2.50** | | | | | |

**Source:** Fieldwork.

Data in Table 2 revealed that respondents agreed on all items ranging from 1st to 10th with mean scores above benchmark mean score of 2.50. In specific, loss lesson materials was ranked 1st with mean score of 2.98, examination failure was ranked 2nd with mean score of 2.81, dropout of school was ranked 3rd with mean score of 2.72, lose their studentship was ranked 4th with mean score of 2.68, lack of concentration was ranked 5th with mean score of 2.60, low intellectual development was ranked 6th with mean score of 2.58, obtain low grades was ranked 7th with mean score of 2.57, engage in academic dishonesty was ranked 8th with mean score of 2.56, suspension/expulsion from school was ranked 9th with mean score of 2.53, and seek ways to obtain better grades at all cost was ranked 10th with mean score of 2.51.

Thus, consequences of students' malfeasance acts on their academic achievement include; loss lesson materials, examination failure, dropout of school, lose their studentship, lack of concentration, low intellectual development, obtain low grades, engage in academic dishonesty, suspension/expulsion from school and seek ways to obtain better grades at all cost.

**Research Question 3:** What consequences does students malfeasance acts have on society?

**Table 3:** Mean rating, standard deviation and ranking analysis
on consequences of students' malfeasance acts on society

| S/N | Consequences of students' malfeasance acts on society | Mean | SD | Ranking | Remark |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------|------|------|---------|--------|
| 1. | Destroy societal values | 2.84 | 1.10 | 1st | Agree |
| 2. | Constitute threat to the society | 2.65 | 1.09 | 2nd | Agree |
| 3. | Threaten peace in the society | 2.64 | 1.14 | 3rd | Agree |
| 4. | Reduce work-force | 2.62 | 1.12 | 4th | Agree |
| 5. | Disrespect constituted authority | 2.57 | 1.14 | 5th | Agree |
| 6. | Amplified risk of participation in crime | 2.56 | 1.14 | 6th | Agree |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. | Limit employment opportunity | 2.55 | 1.11 | 7th | Agree |
| 8. | Low self-esteem | 2.51 | 1.14 | 8th | Agree |
| 9. | Destroy the image of the society | 2.50 | 1.15 | 9th | Agree |
| 10. | Lowers societal goals | 2.50 | 1.12 | 10th | Agree |
| **Benchmark: 2.50** | | | | | |

**Source:** Fieldwork.

Data in Table 3 revealed that respondents agreed on all items ranging from 1st to 10th with mean scores above benchmark mean score of 2.50. In explicit, destroy societal values was ranked 1st with mean score of 2.84, constitute threat to the society was ranked 2nd with mean score of 2.65, threaten peace in the society was ranked 3rd with mean score of 2.64, reduce work-force was ranked 4th with mean score of 2.62, disrespect constituted authority was ranked 5th with mean score of 2.57, amplified risk of participation in crime was ranked 6th with mean score of 2.56, limit employment opportunity was ranked 7th with mean score of 2.55, low self-esteem was ranked 8th with mean score of 2.51, destroy the image of the society was ranked 9th with mean score of 2.50, and lowers societal goals was ranked 10th with mean score of 2.50.

Consequences of students' malfeasance acts on society include; destroy societal values, constitute threat to the society, threaten peace in the society, reduce work-force, disrespect constituted authority, amplified risk of participation in crime, limit employment opportunity, low self-esteem, destroy the image of the society and lowers societal goals.

**Research Question 4:** What administrative approaches can be applied to curb students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State?

**Table 4:** Mean rating, standard deviation and ranking analysis
on administrative approaches to curb students' malfeasance acts

| S/N | Administrative approaches to curb students' malfeasance acts | Mean | SD | Ranking | remark |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Let students know the consequence of malfeasance acts on society | 2.84 | 1.18 | 1st | Agree |
| 2. | Use well-behaved students to give example | 2.69 | 1.12 | 2nd | Agree |
| 3. | Let students know the rewards for being well-behaved | 2.66 | 1.09 | 3rd | Agree |
| 4. | Let students know the consequence of malfeasance acts on their academic achievement | 2.65 | 1.15 | 4th | Agree |
| 5. | Let students know the punishment associated with malfeasance acts | 2.63 | 1.08 | 5th | Agree |
| 6. | Employ ways to make teaching interesting | 2.60 | 1.06 | 6th | Agree |
| 7. | Inculcate sense of belonging to students | 2.56 | 1.12 | 7th | Agree |
| 8. | Checkmate students' activities within the school | 2.55 | 1.14 | 8th | Agree |
| 9. | Creating counselling centre for students | 2.53 | 1.12 | 9th | Agree |
| 10. | Explain the risk of malfeasance acts to students | 2.52 | 1.09 | 10th | Agree |
| 11. | Discipline students who break rules/regulations | 2.51 | 1.12 | 11th | Agree |
| **Benchmark: 2.50** | | | | | |

**Source:** Fieldwork.

Data in Table 4 revealed that respondents agreed on all items ranging from 1st to 11th with mean scores above benchmark mean score of 2.50. In specific, letting students know the consequence of malfeasance acts on society was ranked 1st with mean score of 2.84, use well-behaved students to give example was ranked 2nd with mean score of 2.69, let students know the rewards for being well-behaved was ranked 3rd with mean score of 2.66, let students know the consequence of malfeasance acts on their academic achievement was ranked 4th with mean score of 2.65, let students know the punishment associated with malfeasance acts was ranked 5th with mean score of 2.63, employ ways to make teaching interesting was ranked 6th with mean score of 2.60, inculcate sense of belonging to students was ranked 7th with mean score of 2.56, checkmate students' activities within the school was ranked 8th with mean score of 2.55, creating counselling centre for students was ranked 9th with mean score of 2.53, explain the risk of malfeasance acts to students was ranked 10th with mean score of 2.52 and discipline students who break rules/regulations was ranked 11th with mean score of 2.51.

Administrative approaches can be applied to curb students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State include; letting students know the consequence of malfeasance acts on society, use well-behaved students to give example, let students know the rewards for being well-behaved, let students know the consequence of malfeasance acts on their academic achievement, let students know the punishment associated with malfeasance acts, employ ways to make teaching interesting, inculcate sense of belonging to students, checkmate students' activities within the school, creating counselling centre for students, explain the risk of malfeasance acts to students and discipline students who break rules/regulations.

**Hypothesis 1:** Principal's sex does not differ on their responses to profile of students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State.

**Table 5:** t-test analysis of principal's sex on their responses to profile of students' malfeasance acts

| Variables | N | Mean | SD | Df | t-cal. | t-crit. | Remark |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male Principals | 127 | 33.08 | 3.59 | 236 | -1.25 | +1.96 | Not Significant |
| Female Principals | 111 | 31.99 | 3.86 | | | | |

Sig. 0.05 level

Data in Table 5 shows t-test analysis of principal's sex on their responses to profile of students' malfeasance acts. The result shows that male principals were 127, mean = 33.08 and SD = 3.59 while female principals were 111, mean = 31.99 and SD = 3.86. t-calculated value was -1.25, t-critical was +1.96 with df of 236 at sig. level of 0.05, the hypothesis which states that principal's sex does not differ on their responses to profile of students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State was retained.

**Hypothesis 2:** Principals' location does not differ on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on their academic achievement.

**Table 6:** t-test analysis of principal's location on their responses
to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on their academic achievement

| Variables | N | Mean | SD | Df | t-cal. | t-crit. | Remark |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principals in Urban Areas | 131 | 24.85 | 3.30 | 236 | -2.07 | +1.96 | Significant |
| Principals in Rural Areas | 107 | 25.76 | 3.45 | | | | |

Sig. 0.05 level

Data in Table 6 shows t-test analysis of principal's location on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on their academic achievement. The result shows that principals in urban areas were 131, mean = 24.85 and SD = 3.30 while principals in rural areas were 107, mean = 25.76 and SD = 3.45. t-calculated value was -2.07, t-critical was +1.96 with df of 236 at sig. level of 0.05, the hypothesis which states that principals' location does not differ on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on their academic achievement was rejected. Therefore, principals' location differs on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on their academic achievement.

**Hypothesis 3:** Principals' location does not differ on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on society.

**Table 7:** t-test analysis of principal's location on their responses
to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on society

| Variables | N | Mean | SD | Df | t-cal. | t-crit. | Remark |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principals in Urban Areas | 131 | 25.17 | 3.78 | 236 | 2.39 | +1.96 | Significant |
| Principals in Rural Areas | 107 | 23.97 | 3.95 | | | | |

Sig. 0.05 level

Data in Table 7 shows t-test analysis of principal's location on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on society. The result shows that principals in urban areas were 131, mean = 25.17 and SD = 3.78 while principals in rural areas were 107, mean = 23.97 and SD = 3.95. t-calculated value was 2.09, t-critical was +1.96 with df of 236 at sig. level of 0.05, the hypothesis which states that principals' location does not differ on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on society was rejected. Therefore, principals' location differs on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts on society.

**Hypothesis 4:** Principal's experience does not differ on their responses to administrative approaches to curb students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State.

**Table 8:** t-test analysis of principal's experience on their responses
to administrative approaches to curb students' malfeasance acts

| Variables | N | Mean | SD | Df | t-cal. | t-crit. | Remark |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experienced Principals | 142 | 27.04 | 3.77 | 236 | 1.32 | +1.96 | Not Significant |
| Less Experienced Principals | 96 | 27.72 | 4.12 | | | | |

Sig. 0.05 level

Data in Table 8 shows t-test analysis of principal's experience on their responses to administrative approaches to curb students' malfeasance acts. The result shows that experienced principals were 142, mean = 27.04 and SD = 3.77 while less experienced principals were 96, mean = 27.72 and SD = 4.12. t-calculated value was 1.32, t-critical was +1.96 with df of 236 at sig. level of 0.05, the hypothesis which states that principal's experience does not differ on their responses to administrative approaches to curb students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State was retained.

## 5. Discussion of Results

Finding revealed that profiles of students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State include; perpetual lateness to school, inviting their friends to create conflict in school, oppressing fellow students, coming to school with dangerous weapon, distracting teachers during lesson, use their ill-wealth to cause problem in school, smoking within the school premises, wandering around during classes, leaving school at will, luring fellow students into disrespecting teachers, disrespecting school staff, come to school on mufti and ready to fight teachers. Hypothesis tested shows that principal's sex does not differ on their responses to profile of students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State. The finding entails that irrespective of principal's sex, students will still display malfeasance acts in school. In most cases, students who display malfeasance acts could have been influenced by peers, home school or even unforeseen situations. This finding collaborated with Muxiddin (2020) reported that students portray diverse types of malfeasance acts which include violence, disobedient to teacher and prefects as well as administrators, boycotting of lessons, dishonesty, watching/practicing pornography, alcohol consumption, vandalism, rapping school/classmates, opposing and stabbing teachers in schools, lateness to school, stealing, cultism, rioting, drug abuse, insulting/assaulting. This finding also collaborated with Jeeroburkhan, (2016); Ngwokabuenui, (2015) and Rigby, (2014) who discovered that lateness to school, disruption/vandalization of school amenities, bullying, thuggery, drug and alcoholism, assault, non-compliance, wearing the wrong school uniform, use of the mobile phone to be rampant secondary school students as an act of malfeasance. This finding agrees with Jacob and Adeboyega, (2017) who revealed that students also get involved in sexual offences, smoking, wilful demolition of school properties, drug abuse and of currently, armed robbery. This finding also agrees with Ramharai, Curpen and Mariaye (2012) who identified prevalent malfeasance acts to include stealing, smoking verbal aggression, writing or use vulgar language in school, class bunking and disruption among students.

Finding revealed that consequences of students' malfeasance acts on their academic achievement include; loss lesson materials, examination failure, dropout of school, lose their studentship, lack of concentration, low intellectual development, obtain low grades, engage in academic dishonesty, suspension/expulsion from school and seek ways to obtain better grades at all cost. Hypothesis tested revealed that principals' location differs on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts have on their academic achievement. This finding arises since principals in different school have alteration in their perception of students' malfeasance acts on their academic achievement it could be that principals in different location may have experienced diverse malfeasance acts from students which may or may not influence their academic achievement. This finding supports Koomson et al (2005); Etsey (2005) who blamed inadequate teaching/learning in schools on malfeasance acts of diverse forms. This finding also supports Ofori et. Al., (2018) who found that malfeasance acts influence students' academic achievement through; inability of students to concentrate during lesson, loss of study materials due to nonattendance of school and increase rate of drop-out.

Finding revealed that consequences of students' malfeasance acts on society include; destroy societal values, constitute threat to the society, threaten peace in the society, reduce work-force, disrespect constituted authority, amplified risk of participation in crime, limit employment opportunity, low self-esteem, destroy the image of the society and lowers societal goals. Hypothesis tested revealed that principals' location differs on their responses to consequences of students' malfeasance acts on society. This finding could be that some principals do not believe that students' malfeasance acts could have influence on the society since they (principals operate of administer their schools from different location. This finding is in line with Ngwokabuenui, (2015) who revealed that in today's society there are slight samples of the foreseen problems are already being encountered and many believe malfeasance acts originating from schools are the progenies of present economic distresses arising from robbery, corruption, assassination, pipeline vandalization and smuggling.

Finding revealed that administrative approaches can be applied to curb students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State include; letting students know the consequence of malfeasance acts on society, use well-behaved students to give example, let students know the rewards for being well-behaved, let students know the consequence of malfeasance acts on their academic achievement, let students know the punishment associated with malfeasance acts, employ ways to make teaching interesting, inculcate sense of belonging to students, checkmate students' activities within the school, creating counselling centre for students, explain the risk of malfeasance acts to students and discipline students who break rules/regulations. Hypothesis tested revealed that principal's experience does not differ on their responses to administrative approaches to curb students' malfeasance acts in public secondary schools, Delta State. This finding could be that before a principalship position was confirmed, they were once a teacher who have taught in different school where students' malfeasance acts most have been displayed. Thus, they expect that the same administrative approaches could help curb

student's malfeasance acts. This finding concurs with Ali *et al.,* (2014) who posed that approaches like expulsion, corporal punishment, stigmatization, etc. are not appropriate to curb the acts of malfeasance among students. This finding also concurs with Bates and Weighart (2015) who posed that the administrators need to develop collaboration with other school personnel to fight students' malfeasance acts. This finding also concurs with Chirkina and Khavenson, (2018) who recommended that administrators should develop trust and good interactions with all stakeholders, such an interaction could help build a productive relationship and favourable school environment devoid of students' malfeasance acts. This finding also concurs with Adeniyi and Akinola (2020), recommended that for any administrator to deal with students' malfeasance acts, such an administrator must be highly effective in exercising his official duties.

## 6. Conclusion

Conclusively, student's malfeasance acts take diverse sharps in public secondary schools with special references to Delta State. These malfeasance acts include but not limited to perpetual lateness to school, inviting their friends to create conflict in school, oppressing fellow students, coming to school with dangerous weapon, distracting teachers during lesson, use their ill-wealth to cause problem in school, smoking within the school premises, wandering around during classes, leaving school at will, luring fellow students into disrespecting teachers, disrespecting school staff, come to school on mufti and ready to fight teachers. These malfeasance acts directly or indirectly have influence of students' academic achievement and society at large. Respondents who participated in this study proposed some administrative approaches which will help curb or reduce malfeasance acts display by students.

### 6.1 Recommendations
Thus, it is recommended that;
1) Upon admission, students should be issued a handbook which contains rules and regulations of the school, this will help students understand what constitute malfeasance behaviour and avoid them.
2) Orientation should be organised for students from time to time where they will be informed on consequence of malfeasance acts on their academic achievement and society at large.
3) Students who are well-behaved should be used as an example to other students to emulate.
4) Rewards should be attached to positive behaviour while sanction should be attached to negative behaviour.
5) Punishment associated with malfeasance acts should be placed at strategic positions where all students could have access to, this could help remind the students of the implications for breaking rules.

6) Principals should encourage teachers to employ ways to make teaching interesting, this could help retain students' attention to teaching.

7) Principals should empower teachers to checkmate students' activities within the school, this could help deter students who have the intent of displaying malfeasance acts.

8) Principals should try to establish functional counselling centre to help students having difficulties in school.

## Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

## About the Author

Nkedishu, Victor Chukwubueze (PhD) is a lecturer with Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria. He obtained his B.Sc. (Ed.) Degree in Social Studies, M.Ed. Degree in Educational Administration and PhD Degree in Educational Administration, from Delta State University, Abraka. He is seasoned researcher and has interest on school administration, facilities management, teachers job productivity, students' malfeasance acts, institutional climate and staff welfare.

## References

Adeniyi, W. O. and Akinola, O. B. (2020). Behavioural Problems Among Secondary School Students in Osun State: A Nexus of Principals' Administrative Effectiveness, *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioural Sciences*, 10(1): 17-23

Adeniyi, W. O. (2012). *Personality traits and emotional intelligence as determinants of administrative effectiveness of secondary school principals in Southwestern, Nigeria*, Unpublished PhD (Dissertation) submitted to the Faculty of Education, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

Ali, A. A., Dada, I. T., Isiaka, G. A. and Salmon, S. A. (2014). Types, Causes and Management of Indiscipline Acts among Secondary School Students in Shomolu Local Government Area of Lagos State. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, 8(2):254-287.

Bates, S. and Weighart, S. (2015). Demystifying executive presence: Defining and measuring how leaders influence. *Leadership Excellence Essentials*, 32(1): 41-42.

Belle, L. J. (2014). *Learner Discipline Management*. Reduit: Open University of Mauritius.

Bhavika, C. (2016). *Growing Indiscipline Among Students: A burning issue in the society nowadays*. Retrieved from https://medium.com/bhavikas-corner/growing-indiscipline-among-students-13619d7c534c 25th March, 2021.

Bottery, M. (2016). *Educational leadership for a more sustainable world.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Chirkina, T. A. and Khavenson, T. E. (2018). School climate: A history of the concept and approaches to defining and measuring PISA questionnaires. *Russian Education and Society*, 60(2): 133-160.

Etsey, Y. K. A. (2005). *Causes of Low Academic Performance of Primary School Pupils in the Shama Sub-Metro of Shama Ahanta East Metropolitan assembly (SAEMA) in Ghana*; A paper presented at Regional Conference on Education in West Africa, Dakar – Senegal, 1st – 2nd November, 2005.

Garcia, Q. P. and Santiago, A. B. (2017). Parenting styles as correlates to self-esteem of students. *International Journal of Advanced Education and Research*, 2(5): 27-35.

Gyan, E., Baah-Korang, K., McCarthy, P. and McCarthy, P. (2015). Causes of Indiscipline and Measures of Improving Discipline in Senior Secondary Schools in Ghana: Case Study of a Senior Secondary School in Sunyani. *Journal of Education and Practice,* 6(11):19-25.

Hoerr, T. R. (2008). What is instructional leadership? *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 65(4), 56-64.

Ibukun, W. O., Oyewole, B. K. and Abe, T. O. (2011). Personality characteristics and principal leadership effectiveness in Ekiti state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(2), 248-262.

Idu, A. P. and Ojedapo, D. O. (2011). Indiscipline in secondary schools: a cry to all stakeholders in education. Proceedings of the 2011 International Conference on Teaching, Learning and Change. *International Association for Teaching and Learning* (IATEL), 729-735.

Jacob, O. A. and Adeboyega, L. O. (2017). Perceived causes and incidences of deviant behaviour among secondary school students in Kwara State. ATBU, *Journal of Science, Technology & Education (JOTE).* 5(2).

Jeeroburkhan, F. (2016). *Indiscipline in schools.* Le Mauricien, Retrieved. p.5-6.

Johnson, E. L. (2012). *Parenting styles, peer pressure and the formation of antisocial behaviour.* Honours Thesis 2012; Paper 101.

Koomson, A. K., Brown, P., Dawson-Brew, E., Ahiatrogah, P. D. & Dramanu, B.Y. (2005). *Psychology of Adolescence*. Cape coast: Catholic Mission Press.

Kumari, S. and Kumar, P. Student alienation among college students in relation to leadership effectiveness in Ekiti state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Leadership Education and Research*, 2(3): 204-211.

Muxiddin, M. (2020). Students' Indiscipline: Types, Causes and Possible Solutions in Secondary School. *"Oriental Art and Culture" Scientific-Methodical Journal -* (SI) II/: 135-137

Naganandini, R. (2017). Self-esteem among adolescents. *International Journal of Advanced Education and Research*, 2(4):198-199

Nealis, L. (2014). Safe and supportive school discipline: Promoting positive student mental health. *Principal Leadership*, 12-16.

Ngwokabuenui, P. Y. (2015). Students' Indiscipline: Types, Causes and Possible Solutions: The Case of Secondary Schools in Cameroon. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(22):64-72.

Odebode, A. (2019). Causes of Indiscipline Among Students as Viewed by Primary School Teachers in Nigeria. *Mimbar Sekolah Dasar*, 6(1), 126-140.

Ofori, K. N., Tordzro, G., Asamoah, E., and Achiaa, E., (2018). The Effects of Indiscipline on Academic Performance of Junior High School Students in the Fanteakwa District of Ghana, *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(21), 2018.

Okorie, N. C., Ememe, O. N. and Egu, R. H. N. (2009). School-community relations in the development of secondary schools: A focus on Aba Educational Zone. *African Journal of Education and Development Studies*, 6(1): 22-38.

Oyeike, V. C. and Nwosu, C. M. (2018). Principals' administrative and supervisory roles for teachers 'job effectiveness in secondary schools in Rivers State. *British Journal of Education*, 6(6): 38-49.

Ramharai, V., Curpen, A. and Mariaye H. (2012). *Discipline/ indiscipline and violence in secondary schools in Mauritius.* Rose Hill: Mauritius Research Council.

Rigby, K. (2014). *How teachers address cases of bullying in schools: A comparison of five reactive approaches, Educational Psychology in Practice:* Theory, Research and Practice in Educational Psychology.

Seegopaul, R. (2016). *An analysis of the causes and types of discipline problems faced by a school; the strategies used by the school administrator to improve discipline: A case study in a model school in Mauritius*. Masters' dissertation. Reduit: Open University of Mauritius.