Headteachers' Leadership Practices and Students' Discipline in Government Aided Secondary Schools in Bushenyi-Ishaka Municipality, Uganda

Abstract: This study examined the relationship between headteachers' leadership practices and students' discipline in secondary schools in Bushenyi-Ishaka Municipality, Uganda. Particularly, the study tested the relationship between headteachers' collaborative culture practice and students' discipline, the relationship between headteachers' distributed leadership practice and students' discipline, and the relationship between the headteachers' interpersonal relationships leadership practice and students' discipline. The cross-sectional design was adopted using the quantitative and qualitative approaches. Data were collected on a sample of 310 teachers using a questionnaire survey. The findings revealed that while the collaborative culture and interpersonal relationship had a positive and significant relationship with students' discipline, distributed leadership had a negative and insignificant one. Therefore, it was concluded that the collaborative culture leadership practice is imperative for promoting students' discipline in secondary schools, distributed leadership practice is not an essential practice for promoting students' discipline, and headteachers should prioritise enhancing interpersonal relationships in secondary schools to promote students' discipline.
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1. Introduction

Students' discipline is imperative if a positive school climate necessary for academic excellence is to be created. The concept of discipline derives from two Latin words: “discipulus” (pupil) and “disciplina” (teaching), which means to follow instructions and to be obedient to authority (Hammarfelt, 2018). Therefore, discipline is the ability to follow instructions and obey authority. Student discipline is a multiple-dimensional concept describing students' social competence, autonomy, and compliance (Chiesi et al., 2020; Epps et al., 2003). Social competence describes how an individual assesses social circumstances and chooses the most suitable social behaviours to follow in a given situation (Challita, 2018). Social competence is the behaviour exhibited by students in dealing with others, often judged by peers, teachers, and parents, among others (Kennedy, 2018). Autonomy is the feeling of independence and motivation towards handling personal matters, including learning independence of students (Abuhassna et al., 2020). Compliance is the extent to which the young do what parents, school authorities, or those older than them require them to do and refrain from doing what they have not been asked to do (Leijten et al., 2018). Student discipline has been a problem of ongoing interest for scholars, school administrators, and policy makers for a long time (Salgong et al., 2016). Far back in the 1960s in Britain increase in students' indiscipline forced school administrators to use out-of-school suspension to reduce student misbehaviour (Fefer & Gordon, 2020). In 1989, the British government launched the Elton Enquiry into schools' discipline due to increased indiscipline reports in the media (Sullivan et al., 1989).
2016). Studies done in the USA since the 1990s show that indiscipline challenges plaguing schools include being found with or using dangerous weapons, including firearms, having and distributing or using alcohol and other drugs such as tobacco and cocaine, besides being involved in physical fights (Morgan, 2018). Surveys carried out in the last two decades by the National Centre for Education Statistics in the USA indicate that physical aggression, insubordination, and the possession of firearms or other explosive devices have been rampant (Little, 2020). In African countries such as South Africa, reported cases of indiscipline include sporadic incidences of chaos, ill-discipline, and students attacking teachers (Segalo & Rambuda, 2018). It has been reported that physical and psychological violence account for 85 and 50 per cent indiscipline cases respectively in Nigerian schools (Fawole et al., 2018). Drug abuse, including substance abuse and taking of alcohol have also been reported in many Nigerian schools (Idowu et al., 2018). Cases of arson with students burning school buildings and rape have been reported in Kenyan schools (Salgong et al., 2016).

In Ugandan schools, the commonly reported indiscipline cases include selling and consuming drugs, stealing, disobeying school rules and regulations, and destroying school infrastructure through vandalism and arson (Awor, 2016; Abbo et al., 2016). In Bushenyi-Ishaka Municipality in Uganda where this study was carried out, cases of indiscipline included substance abuse such as alcohol, cigarettes, miraa, heroin, Hashish, sedatives, hypnotics, and cocaine (Akinbo et al., 2016; Bashaija & Rukundo, 2018; Ekanem, 2015). Students also engaged in physical violence with others, stole the properties of fellow students, and engaged in sexual immoralities (Nuwagaba, 2019). There were also sporadic cases of students getting involved in strikes and damaging school infrastructure (Amanyisa, 2016). Cheloti et al. (2014) reported that in some instances, inexperienced headteachers or deputy headteachers administered cruel punishments to students as well as mismanaged schools agitating students to become indisciplined and sometimes resort to violence. Therefore, it was deemed necessary to examine the leadership practices employed in Ugandan schools and how they related to students' discipline. This study thus examined the relationship between headteachers’ leadership practices and student discipline in secondary schools in Bushenyi-Ishaka Municipality. Based on Salfi (2011), who indicated that leadership practices of successful headteachers included collaborative culture, distribution of leadership tasks, and establishment of interpersonal relationships, this study tested the hypotheses to the effect that:

H1: There is a relationship between the headteachers’ collaborative culture practices and student discipline in secondary schools.

H2: There is a relationship between headteachers’ distributed leadership and student discipline in secondary schools.

H3: There is a relationship between the headteachers’ interpersonal relationships, leadership practices and student discipline in secondary schools.

2. Literature Review

This section of the literature review involves analysis of the theory underpinned the study and the review of related literature on headteachers' leadership practices variables and student discipline. The theory reviewed is Leader-Member Exchange, followed by related literature on collaborative culture practices, distributed leadership, and interpersonal relationships in relation to students’ discipline.

2.1 Theoretical Review

The Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory by Dansereau et al. (1975) was the basis for relating the study variables. LMX explains dyadic relationships between leaders and their subordinates (Munshi & Haque, 2017). LMX posits that the quality of relationships between leaders and subordinates greatly influences their attitudes and behaviours. Quality leader-subordinate relationships are characterised by extra-ordinary behaviours, and low-quality relationships are solely defined by expected behaviours (Cooper et al., 2018). The way leaders treat subordinates determines the relationship between them. Good leadership practices such as ensuring a collaborative culture, distributing leadership tasks, and establishing interpersonal relationships are reciprocated with positive attitudes such as good discipline (Murphy & Louis, 2018). Subordinates
that perceive high-quality LMX believe that their superiors have faith in them and have a close relationship with them. Conversely, low-quality LMX relationships are characterised by low levels of trust and counterproductive behaviours (Lovingood, 2021). LMX tendencies suggest that the leader’s high-quality exchanges foster discipline because when subordinates perceive high-quality exchange, they reciprocate with positive behaviours. As a result, subordinates such as teachers and students become more altruistic and conscientious, which results in positive discipline (Croppanzo et al., 2017). Therefore, LMX suggests that reciprocal relationships between leaders and subordinates shape individual discipline (Bedi, 2020). This study examined how positive leaders’ exchanges including the promotion of collaborative culture, distribution of leadership responsibilities, and establishment of interpersonal relationships related to student discipline in schools.

2.2 Collaborative Culture Practices and Students Discipline

Collaborative culture is about interdependence built on respect, trust, and understanding (Kucharska, 2017; Omodan, 2021; Omodan & Ige, 2021). Collaborative culture is anchored on the belief of being people-oriented through togetherness, mutual trust, and a sense of belonging (Ahmed et al., 2016). In a school setting, collaborative cultures involve working relationships that are sporadic, voluntary, recurring, and development-focused, where the tendency to work together becomes a norm in the school. In a collaborative culture, teachers deliberate, share knowledge and experiences, mentor one another and work jointly to achieve school goals (Meredith et al., 2017). This enables teachers to enforce school discipline. Le et al. (2018) in a study involving university teachers and students at a university in Vietnam, established that collaborative practices related to effective student collaboration and hence good student discipline. In a study involving Swedish teachers, Löfgren and Karlsson (2016) revealed that collaborative culture characterised by collegiality impacted teachers’ professional work, contributed to school development, and enhanced students’ discipline.

In a study done on public middle schools in Central Java, Melliferina et al. (2019) revealed that if headteachers promote a collaborative culture, teachers’ involvement in managing student discipline increases enhancing students’ discipline. In a meta-analytic review, Okereke (2016) revealed that a collaborative approach was strongly associated with decreased problem behaviour among students. Further, Xhomara (2019) in a study involving headteachers, teachers, and students in schools in Albania found out that collegial school management increased the prevention of disruptive behaviours. However, the context of the studies was outside the African context hence differences in school environments. Thus, it remained imperative for this study to test the relationship between collaborative culture practices and students’ discipline in the context of schools in Uganda.

2.3 Distributed Leadership and Student Discipline

Distributed leadership is the view that leadership emerges through complex interactive processes and is not a preserve of superiors in organisations (Woods & Roberts, 2016). Emphasis is on interactions, and leadership tasks are not just limited to those with formal leadership offices but are shared with all individuals in the organisation (Harris & DeFlaminis, 2016). In schools, the rationale behind distributed leadership is the harnessing of shared wisdom and developing collaboration among the staff for the achievement of the school goals (Göksoy, 2015). Under appropriate conditions, distributed leadership can boost school transformation and advancement (Harris & DeFlaminis, 2016). Distributed leadership will thus lead to student discipline because transformed and improved schools are characterised by disciplined students. In a study done in schools in a rural district in south-western Uganda, Ayebare (2018) revealed that democratic leadership which obliquely pointed to distributed leadership reduced student arrests in schools. Relatedly, Njami (2018) in a study involving public secondary schools in Nakuru County, Kenya, reported that the principals’ transformation and democratic leadership styles had a significant positive relationship with students’ discipline.

Gómez-Hurtado et al. (2020) in a study involving Spanish secondary schools established that headteachers who incorporated all staff members in leadership through meetings improved the day-to-day running of schools and solved discipline problems. In a study done in schools in Kenya,
Kibaka (2019) revealed that headteachers’ involvement with staff attracted their support which made them enforce discipline. In a study done in Indonesian schools, Purwanto et al. (2019) reported that the application of participative leadership led to character education implementation hence good student discipline. However, as all the studies suggest, none directly studied distributed leadership as conceptualised by Barattucci et al. (2020) as referring to task distribution, participation in change, and social relations which is the operational definition that this study adopted. This thus made it necessary for this study to further test the relationship between distributed leadership and student leadership.

2.4 Interpersonal Relationships and Student Discipline

Interpersonal relationships are reciprocal interactions and tendencies experienced at different levels, from mere acquaintances to close relationships arising from various needs between different people (Koçak & Önen, 2014). Interpersonal relationships describe mutual willingness to communicate in a way that is accompanied by emotions in the context of communication and other shared activities (Kleptsova & Balabanov, 2016). Interpersonal relationships include superior-subordinate and peer worker interaction, workplace bonds, and customer relationships which in a school setting refer to interaction with students (Abe & Mason, 2016). High-quality relationships result gainfully into among others; positive work attitudes, teamwork, organisational citizenship conduct, resilience to negative events and working hard to ensure organisational success (Szostek, 2019). Therefore, in a school where there are good interpersonal relationships, teachers will work hard to promote students’ discipline. In their study done in high-performing schools in Quetta in Pakistan, Bahadur et al. (2017) and Rajbhandari et al. (2016) in a study involving Finnish schools reported that relation-oriented leadership contributed to school performance including students’ discipline. In a study involving Kenyan schools, Kasivu (2020) found out that interpersonal relationships had a significant positive relationship with levels of students’ discipline in public secondary schools. Koula (2015) in a study done in Greek schools established that friendly relations between teachers and principals led to good conduct among students. However, the literature search did not reveal the situation in Ugandan schools. Still, literature search showed that limited studies related to interpersonal relationships and student discipline. This thus attracted this study to be carried out in the context of schools in Uganda.

3. Methodology

This section discusses the methods that guided data collection and analysis. Specifically, the methods discussed include the research design and sample, measurement of the constructs, and data analysis methods.

3.1 Research Design and Sample

The study was guided by the cross-sectional design which involved collecting data representing what is going on at a particular point in time. This helped to obtain useful data in a relatively short period saving time. Therefore, the cross-sectional research design enabled quick collection of data making it easy and cheap to conduct the study using a questionnaire survey (Wang & Cheng, 2020). The data collected related two variables because cross-sectional studies enable collecting data on one or two variables leading to the testing of relationships between the variables (Spector, 2019). The data collected related headteachers’ leadership practices and students’ discipline. Based on the questionnaire survey, the study adopted the quantitative approach in analysing numerical data. The sample that provided data included 310 teachers from Government Aided Secondary Schools in Bushenyi-Ishaka Municipality in south Western Uganda.

3.2 Measures of Constructs

The dependent variable was students’ discipline measured in terms of social competence (SC), autonomy (AUT), and compliance behaviours (COM). The independent variable of headteachers’ leadership practices was measured in terms of collaborative culture practice (CC), distributed leadership (DL), and interpersonal relationships (IR). The indicators of students discipline were adapted from Epps et al. (2003) while the indicators of the constructs measuring headteachers’ leadership practices were adapted from two sources that were collaborative culture practice and distributed leadership (Salfi, 2011) and interpersonal relationships (Biggs et al., 2016; Salfi, 2011).
The variables were measured on a five anchor Likert Scale (Where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = agree & 5 = strongly agree).

4. Data Analysis Method

To analyse the data, partial least square structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM), specifically SmartPLS 3 software was used. This was because it could generate higher-order constructs and interaction terms and estimate complex models with many latent variables. SmartPLS reports predictive relationships between variables with a significant theoretical basis for revealing causal relationships. With SmartPLS, links (paths) between the constructs examined were illustrated, and measurement models displayed relationships between the constructs and the indicator variables (Hair Jr et al., 2021). PLS-SEM method involving SmartPLS was suitable for this study and helped to test the causal-effect relationships planned in this study since the sample exceeded 100 (n = 310) (Yang et al., 2021). Hence, using SmartPLS, the relationship between headteachers' leadership practices and student discipline in government-aided secondary schools was revealed.

4.1 Findings

This section consists of the results for headteachers' leadership practices and student discipline in government-aided secondary schools. The results include demographic profiles of the teachers that participated in the study, the measurement, and structural models.

4.1.1 Demographic Profiles of the Teachers

Table 1 shows that the modal percentage (63.9%) was of males while the females were 36.1%, 48.7% were aged between 30-40 years with 34.8% aged below 30 years, and 16.5% were 40 years and above. On the level of education, the modal percentage (71.9%) was of those with bachelor's degrees, followed by 19.4% who had diplomas, and 8.7% had postgraduate qualifications. The results for responsibilities of teachers participating in the study showed that the model percentage (33.9%) was of subject teachers followed by 32.6% who were class teachers, 30.3% were heads of departments, and 3.2% held other responsibilities such as senior teachers, club patrons, and housemasters and mistresses among others. The results for teaching experience show that the modal percentage (44.8%) was of teachers who had served 5-10 years, 30.3% had served for less than five years, and 24.8% had served for 11 years and above.

Table 1: Demographic Profiles Teachers (Total Sample [n] = 310)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 30</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 40</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate qualifications</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibilities of teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Teachers</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class teachers</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Departments</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10 years</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years and above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 Measurement Models

The measurement models (Table 2 and 3) comprise test results that are, namely, reliability (Cronbach's alpha and composite reliabilities), average variance extracted, Collinearity assessment, and validity (discriminant validity). Cronbach's alpha (α) and composite reliability (CR) measured internal consistency, which indicates the inter-relatedness between indicators or items measuring
the same construct (Kalkbrenner, 2021). The Cronbach's alpha coefficients and composite reliability values for the different constructs were above 0.70, which is the minimum level in exploratory research. Nevertheless, since Cronbach's alpha has a weakness of assuming that indicator loadings are similar in the population decreasing reliability values, Composite Reliability was also calculated. This was because composite reliability is more tolerant and considers the various outer loadings of the indicator variables (Hair Jr et al., 2021). Average Variance Extracted (AVE) measuring convergent validity revealed that variations in the indicators were explained by the constructs because AVE values were above the acceptable level of 0.5, confirming convergent validity (Franke & Sarstedt, 2019). The Collinearity test revealed a low correlation between the constructs. Therefore, Collinearity was not prevalent because the variance inflation factor (VIF), which is its standard measure, revealed values less than 5, which is the recommended level (Kim, 2019). VIF values indicated independence between the constructs measuring the independent variables.

Table 2: Reliability, Average Variance Extracted and Collinearity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headteachers' Leadership Practices</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Culture Practice</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>1.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Leadership</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>1.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>1.715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Heterotrait Monotrait (HTMT) Discriminant validity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headteachers' Leadership Practices</th>
<th>Collaborative Culture Practice</th>
<th>Distributed Leadership</th>
<th>Interpersonal Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Culture Practice</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Leadership</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discriminant validity was measured using the Heterotrait–Monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations because it assesses a reflectively measured construct's discriminant validity with other constructs measured in the same model. This helped to ascertain whether the indicators of the constructs measured them. The results indicated that the Heterotrait–Monotrait ratio (HTMT) correlations satisfied its condition as the values did not exceed 0.90 (Hair Jr et al., 2021). The HTMT results suggested that the measures were discriminately valid (Table 3). With the results in Tables 1 and 2 conforming to the reliability and validity requirements, they qualified for further analyses as indicated in the models that follow.

Table 3: Heterotrait Monotrait (HTMT) Discriminant validity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headteachers' Leadership Practices</th>
<th>Collaborative Culture Practice</th>
<th>Distributed Leadership</th>
<th>Interpersonal Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Culture Practice</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Leadership</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.3 Structural Equation Model

Since the measurement model established the suitability of the constructs, a structural model indicating factor loadings and illustrating the association between the constructs was developed. The model findings comprise the path coefficients between constructs, coefficient of determination ($R^2$) and related t-statistics and p-values. $R^2$ showing the model's predictive power was determined after testing the three hypotheses to the effect that there is a relationship between the headteachers' collaborative culture practice and students discipline in secondary schools (H1), there is a
relationship between headteachers' distributed leadership practice and students discipline in secondary schools (H2), and there is a relationship between the headteachers' interpersonal relationships leadership practice and students discipline in secondary schools (H3). Figure 1 and Table 4 illustrate the association between the constructs.

Figure 1: Headteachers' Leadership Practices and Students Discipline Structural Equation Model

Figure 1 reveals that Factor Loadings for the independent variables (collaborative culture practice, distributed leadership, and interpersonal relationships) confirmed that the indicators of the constructs were appropriate measures because they were all retained (compared with Appendix A). However, for the dependent variable comprising students' autonomy, compliance behaviours, and social competence, the factor loadings showed that only the indicators for autonomy were all confirmed, but for compliance behaviours, the second indicator was dropped, and for social competence, the fourth one. The retained indicators for both the independent and dependent constructs loaded highly above the minimum validity value of 0.50, which is the recommended level when using Factor Analysis (Hair Jr et al., 2021).

Table 4: Structural Equation Model Estimates
### Table 1: Correlation Coefficients and Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STDEV</th>
<th>T Statistics</th>
<th>P Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative culture practice Students Discipline</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>8.737</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Leadership Students Discipline</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>2.141</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations Students Discipline</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>4.463</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R^2 = 0.307
Adjusted R^2 = 0.300

Test results in Figure 1 and Table 4 reveal that collaborative culture practice (β = 0.429, t = 8.737, p = 0.000 < 0.05) and interpersonal relations leadership practices (β = 0.269, t = 4.463, p = 0.000 < 0.05) had a positive and significant relationship with students discipline in secondary schools. However, distributed leadership (β = -0.115, t = 2.141, p = 0.033 > 0.05) had a negative significant relationship with students discipline in secondary schools. R^2 shows that the three factors, namely collaborative culture practice, distributed leadership, and interpersonal relationships contributed 30.7% (R^2 = 0.307) to students' discipline in secondary schools. Therefore, the coefficients of determination implied that 69.3% of the variation in students' discipline was accounted for by those factors not considered in the models above. However, the significant factors, namely collaborative culture practice and interpersonal relations, contributed 30.0% (adjusted R^2 = 0.300). This implied that the contribution of the insignificant factor (distributed leadership) was only 0.7%. Therefore, to promote students' discipline, collaborative culture practice and interpersonal relations should be emphasised in secondary schools.

5. **Discussion**

The results revealed that while the collaborative culture and interpersonal relations leadership practices positively and significantly related to student discipline in secondary schools, distributed leadership had a significant negative relationship. The finding to the effect that collaborative culture practice had a positive and significant relationship with student discipline in secondary schools was consistent with the findings of previous scholars. For example, Le et al. (2018) revealed that collaborative practices were related to effective student collaboration. Closely, Melliferina et al. (2019) reported that if headteachers promoted a collaborative culture practice, it led to the involvement of teachers in the school student discipline enforcement promoting discipline in schools. Also, Okereke (2016) indicated that the collaborative approach was strongly associated with decreased problem behaviour among students. Further, Löfgren and Karlsson (2016) and Xhomara (2019) reported that collegiality in schools reduced conflicts and led to consensus, which impacted teachers' professional work and contribution to school development, enhancing students' discipline and preventing disruptive behaviours. With the findings of the study consistent with the findings of all previous, it can be inferred that collaborative leadership practices are related to students' discipline.

The finding to the effect that distributed leadership had a significant negative relationship with students' discipline was inconsistent with the findings of previous scholars. For instance, inconsistent with the finding of the study, Ayebare (2018) and Njami (2018) reported that distributed leadership which was implied in democratic and transformational leadership styles, promoted student discipline in schools. Relatedly, Gómez-Hurtado et al. (2020) reported that headteachers who incorporated all the members in leadership through meetings improved the day-to-day running of the schools and solved problems such as indiscipline. On their part, Kibaka (2019) and Njami (2018) revealed that headteachers' involvement of staff or participative leadership, which alluded to distributed leadership, attracted their support which made them enforce discipline in schools. The discussion above indicates that the finding of the study was inconsistent with the findings of all previous scholars. Therefore, it can be surmised that in the
context of schools in Uganda, distributed leadership was not of importance in promoting students' discipline in secondary schools.

The finding that interpersonal relationship leadership practice had a positive and significant relationship with students' discipline agreed with the findings of previous schools. In agreement, Bahadur et al. (2017) established that relation-oriented leadership behaviours contributed to school performance, including students' discipline. Also, Rajbhandari et al. (2016) reported that relations-oriented behaviours led to the development of schools, including modelling students' discipline. Relatedly, Kasivu (2020) reported that interpersonal relationships had a significant positive relationship with levels of students' discipline in public secondary schools. Likewise, Koula (2015) found out that the existence of friendly relationships between principals and teachers in most schools led to good conduct among students. With the findings of the study agreeing with the findings of previous scholars, it can be confirmed that interpersonal relationships had a significant positive relationship with levels of students' discipline.

6. Conclusions

The discussion above led to the conclusion that collaborative culture practices are imperative for promoting students' discipline in secondary schools. Based on the indicators of the construct, this involves developing a positive, caring, and supportive school culture, building collaborative structures for working together, developing confidence, respect, trust, and encouragement among staff, and promoting collaborative, cooperative, and consultative practices in the making of decisions. The collaborative culture practice also involves creating a climate of teamwork and commitment to working collectively, working with and through teams as well as individuals, trusting others and requiring trust from others, and acknowledging the good work of others.

Concerning distributed leadership practice, it was concluded that it is not an essential factor for promoting student discipline in secondary schools. Therefore, in promoting student discipline, distributing leadership responsibility among staff members, and sharing authority do not guarantee the promotion of students' discipline. Also, fostering shared decision making, empowering staff to get involved in the decision development processes, providing support for distributed leadership processes and practices, encouraging subordinates to undertake leadership tasks, and working with and through others do not make students' discipline apparent in secondary schools. In addition, recognising expertise rather than formal offices in the school, assigning tasks to teachers in lieu of their abilities, supporting and monitoring efforts for assigned tasks, and maintaining coordination among assigned tasks do not necessarily lead to students' discipline.

Regarding the interpersonal relationship leadership practice, it is vital for the promotion of students' discipline in secondary schools. This is when it is ensured that staff work easily with each other, there is a harmonious working environment, teachers feel valued, and everybody is treated with respect. Also, this is when teachers find it easy to work with the headteacher, the headteacher encourages positive working relationships, and effort is made to treat all teachers equally. In addition, interpersonal relationship leadership practice leads to student discipline as there is the building of positive and trusting relationships, caring for the well-being and development of all teachers and students, communicating properly with teachers and students, listening to subordinates' problems, and trying to solve them, and maintaining good relationships among the different staff of the school community.

7. Recommendations

This study recommends that headteachers should promote collaborative culture practices in schools to promote students' discipline. This should involve developing a positive, caring, and supportive school culture, building collaborative structures for working together, developing confidence, respect, trust, and encouragement among staff, and promoting collaborative, cooperative, and consultative practices in making decisions. The collaborative culture practice should also be promoted by creating a climate of teamwork and commitment to working collectively, working with and through teams and individuals, trusting others and requiring trust from others, and acknowledging the good work of others.
It is also recommended that headteachers should not over-emphasise distributed leadership in implementing measures for promoting student discipline. Therefore, priority should not be given to distributing leadership responsibility among staff members, sharing authority, fostering shared decision making, and empowering staff to participate in the decision-making process. Also, emphasis should not be put on providing support for distributed leadership processes and practices, encouraging others to undertake leadership roles, and working with and through others does not guarantee the promotion of students' discipline. In addition, priority should not be given to recognising expertise rather than formal position within groups, assigning tasks and duties to teachers according to their abilities, supporting and monitoring efforts for tasks assigned, and keeping coordination among different assigned tasks in promoting discipline.

Further, it is recommended that headteachers should prioritise enhancing interpersonal relationships in secondary schools to promote students' discipline. This should involve ensuring that staff can work easily with each other, there is a harmonious working environment, teachers feel valued, everybody is treated with respect, and teachers find it easy to work with the headteacher. Headteachers should also encourage positive working relationships, make an effort to treat all teachers equally, build positive and trusting relationships, and care for the well-being of teachers. Headteachers should also ensure the development of all teachers and students, communicate properly with teachers and students, give an ear to their problems, make an effort to solve them, and ensure good relationships among different stakeholders of the school.
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Appendix A

Appendix A: Study Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A: Demographics Profiles</td>
<td>DP1</td>
<td>Sex (1 = Male, 2 = Female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DP2</td>
<td>Age group (1 = Less than 30 years, 2 = 30-40 years, 3 = 40-50 years, and 3 = 50 years and above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DP3</td>
<td>Education level (1 = Diploma, 2 = Bachelor’s Degree, and 4 = Postgraduate qualifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP4</td>
<td>Responsibility (1= Subject Teacher, 2= Class teacher, 3 = Head of Department, and 4 = Indicate other responsibility)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP5</td>
<td>Teaching Experience (1 = Less than 5 years, 2 = 5 - 10 years, and 3 = 11 years and above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section C: Dependent Variable: Students Behaviour

#### Autonomy (AUT)
- AUT1: Most students I interact with do their school activities without having to be told
- AUT2: The majority of students I interact with work hard to excel and promote the school
- AUT3: Students I interact with show a desire to learn
- AUT4: Most students I interact with stick out and are assertive
- AUT5: Most students are independent; do their work without waiting to be helped by others

#### Compliance (COM)
- COM1: Most students I interact with are willing to wait for their turn during activities
- COM2: Few of the students I interact with are less impulsive
- COM3: Most students I interact with usually do what they told to do by teachers and other seniors
- COM4: The majority of the students I interact with concentrate or focus on their activities
- COM5: Most of the students I interact with are obedient and follow rules
- COM6: The majority of the students I interact with are calm and easy-going
- COM7: Most of the students I deal with are eager to please teachers and other seniors

#### Social Competence (SC)
- SC1: The majority of students I interact with are cheerful and able to relate with others
- SC2: Most of the students I interact with within this school are warm and loving
- SC3: The majority of the students I interact with in school get along well with other students
- SC4: Few of the students I interact with vent out their anger on fellow students and staff
- SC5: The majority of students I interact with within this school are admirable
- SC6: Students I interact with show that they are always concerned about other people’s feelings
- SC7: Most students I interact with are helpful and cooperative

### Section B: Independent Variable: Leadership Practices

#### Collaboration Cultures Practices (CC)
- CC1: The headteacher has developed a positive, caring, and supportive school culture
- CC2: The headteacher has built collaborative structures for working together
- CC3: The headteacher has developed confidence, respect, trust, and encouragement among staff
- CC4: In the making of decisions, the headteacher promotes collaborative, cooperative, and consultative practices
In this school, the headteacher has created a climate of teamwork and commitment to work collectively.

In this school, the headteacher encourages and promotes teamwork.

In this school, the headteacher works with and through teams as well as individuals.

The headteacher trusts others and requires trust from others.

The headteacher acknowledges the good work of others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distributed Leadership (DL)</th>
<th>DL1</th>
<th>The headteacher in this school distributes leadership responsibility among staff members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL2</td>
<td>Our headteacher shares authority and promotes mutual respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL3</td>
<td>The headteacher fosters shared decision making to motivate and empower others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL4</td>
<td>In this school, the headteacher has empowered staff to participate in the decision-making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL5</td>
<td>The headteacher provides support for distributed leadership processes and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL6</td>
<td>The headteacher encourages others to undertake leadership roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL7</td>
<td>Our headteacher works with and through others to improve his/her school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL8</td>
<td>The headteacher recognises expertise of staff rather than formal position within groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL9</td>
<td>The headteacher assigns tasks and duties to teachers according to their abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL10</td>
<td>Our headteacher supports and monitors efforts for tasks assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL11</td>
<td>The headteacher keeps coordination among different assigned tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this school, the headteacher has made it possible for staff to work easily with each other.

The headteacher creates a harmonious working environment in this school.

I find it easy to work with every individual in this school.

I feel that am valued by the headteacher.

My headteacher treats everybody with respect.

I find it easy to work with the headteacher.

The headteacher encourages positive working relationships in this school.

The headteacher of this school makes effort to treat all teachers equally.

The headteacher has built positive and trusting relationships with staff and the community.

The headteacher cares for the well-being and development of all teachers and students.

Our headteacher communicates properly with teachers and students.
IR12  The headteacher listens to subordinates’ problems and tries to solve them

IR13  The headteacher maintains good relationships among the different staff of the school community

Measurement Scale: All the items in Sections B and C were scaled from a minimum of 1 to a maximum of 5, where 1 = strongly disagree (SD), 2 = disagree (D), 3 = not sure (NS), 4 = Agree (A) and 5 = SA (SA).