

Lecturers', Students', and Administrators' Perception of Discipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Kwame Bediako Asare and Ben Adzrolo

SAGE Open 2013 3:

DOI: 10.1177/2158244013494208

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/3/2/2158244013494208>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>



Additional services and information for *SAGE Open* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://sgo.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://sgo.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Lecturers', Students', and Administrators' Perception of Discipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

SAGE Open
April-June: 1-8
© The Author(s) 2013
DOI: 10.1177/2158244013494208
sgo.sagepub.com


Kwame Bediako Asare¹ and Ben Adzrolo¹

Abstract

This study examined some dimensions of discipline as perceived by lecturers, administrators, and students in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast. It sought to find out whether differences exist in their perceptions regarding the importance of discipline, forms of indiscipline, and causes of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education. We adopted a cross-sectional descriptive survey for the study involving 358 students, 11 lecturers, and 8 administrators. A customized Likert-type questionnaire was used for data collection to help answer the research questions and hypothesis formulated to guide the study. We found that there was no statistically significant difference in the perceptions lecturers, students, and administrators hold about disciplinary issues in the Faculty of Education. The need for university authorities to continuously use learning dialogue to engage students in decision making was highlighted so as to continue to achieve and enjoy a conducive environment for learning—as efforts are made to focus on students' learning.

Keywords

(in)discipline, university, perception, decision making, education, student, faculty of education

Introduction

Discipline is an important aspect of university management. The university serves as an instrument for molding the character and behavior of students and this prepares them to take up their future careers as well as the mantle of leadership. Also, it is generally accepted that education constitutes the single most important instrument for the acquisition of knowledge and skills that are indispensable for the building of manpower base to promote socioeconomic advancement. Indeed, university discipline is more important especially when education is said to be the bedrock of national development. Discipline is a prerequisite for the successful conduct of any undertaking. Thus, to Tettey-Enyo (1995), “discipline is a necessary condition for university work and no university can afford to work in an atmosphere of indiscipline” (p. 33). He added, “discipline not only sets the tone of work but also determines the rate of achievement.”

According to Dinkmeyer (1995), discipline is a virtue that inculcates courage into the individual for him to function effectively. Discipline is loving fairness, it is direction, it is prevention before a problem arises, it is harnessing and channeling for great performance (Kissiedu, 2004). A necessary condition for any meaningful academic work in university settings is discipline; therefore, the importance of discipline in universities cannot be overemphasized.

Orderly behavior is essential to the achievement of institutional objectives. Thus, without an atmosphere conducive for teaching and learning, the objective of progressively molding the character of students and equipping them with the relevant knowledge and skills to enable them play their rightful roles in national affairs cannot be achieved (Charles, 1981).

Without discipline, no educational enterprise can prosper. Unfortunately, some students, lecturers, and administrators in universities engage themselves in acts regarded as indiscipline, which negatively affects the socioeconomic development and academic work in Ghana with particular focus on the Faculty of Education of the University of Cape Coast. Evidence of this has included the following. According to the Executive Committee of the Academic Board of the University of Cape Coast (2008), on the early hours of March 31, 2008, an event captioned “Disturbance during Hall week celebration” revealed that some members of Casely Hayford (CASFORD) Hall including five students of the Faculty of

¹University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Corresponding Author:

Kwame Bediako Asare, Institute of Education, University of Cape Coast, PMB, University Post Office, Cape Coast, Ghana.
Email: asbii2002@yahoo.co.uk

Education marched to Atlantic Hall and caused serious damage to life and property. In another instance, an event captioned “Withdrawal of Offer of Admission” indicated that during the matriculation ceremony on Saturday October 1, 2005, in the University of Cape Coast, two fresh students of the Faculty of Education were withdrawn from the University. This was as a result of gross disrespect shown to the officials of the matriculation program on the matriculation day (Executive Committee of Academic Board, University of Cape Coast, 2005).

During 2005/2006 academic year, an incident captioned “Illegal Registration” also indicated that an administrator at the Faculty of Education illegally managed to register two students in a department under the Faculty of Education. As a result, the registration officer was suspended for 1 academic year. A recent report titled “Destruction of Hall Property” in the University of Cape Coast (Executive Committee of Academic Board, 2009) indicated that there was an open street fight between two Halls: Atlantic Hall and CASFORD Hall in 2009. Out of this fight, some property of Atlantic Hall was destroyed by some members of CASFORD Hall. This led to the withdrawal of nine students including three students of the Faculty of Education. The above issues are clear indications of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast.

According to Denga (1981), indiscipline is a “plague” that can destroy the very fabric of university organization if left loose. To him this awareness should prompt and galvanize university authorities to protect their universities from the highly inflammable effects of indiscipline. Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) said that indiscipline may be manifested in the form of strikes, riots, sit-ins, and protest to authorities inside and outside the university. These strikes, he asserted, took the form of boycotting classes, refusing to take meals served in the dining hall, deserting the university compound, damaging university property such as windows, doors, buildings, books, burning cars, and sometimes making personal attacks on university personnel who they considered to be the cause of the maladministration against which they are protesting.

According to Cudjoe (1996), students’ indiscipline experienced by the university is in relation to petty issues like disrespect, stealing as well as verbal and physical assaults. To him, over the years, these have gradually degenerated into the use of drugs, rape, and armed robbery. These social problems, more often than not, give rise to strike actions in the universities.

Statement of the Problem

Indiscipline, which is defiance and resistance to rules and regulations, has been a serious canker in the educational enterprise in Ghana mainly perpetrated by students. In recent times, the viewpoint is switching to recognition that students are not the only source of indiscipline and that the behavior of some lecturers and administrators is either

indiscipline or induced indiscipline in students (Tamakloe, Amedahe, & Atta, 1996). Tamakloe et al. (1996) cited three examples of lecturers’ misbehaviors that include inappropriate use of physical strength such as grabbing, hitting, spanking, shaking, or other extreme forms of punishing students; verbal abuse such as yelling, scolding, belittling, or ridiculing of students; and facial expression such as frowning and grimacing. Adentwi (1998) added absenteeism, lateness to class, flirting with the opposite sex, autocratic behavior, improper dressing, and drunkenness, among others on the part of lecturers as acts of indiscipline that make students misbehave.

If the desired condition is to exist to promote academic work in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, then lecturers, administrators, and parents need to have the right attitude, insight, and understanding about the nature, causes, and remedies of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education. Similarly, students are required to recognize and appreciate their proper roles in maintaining effective discipline in the Faculty.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the perception that exists among students, lecturers, and administrators about discipline in the Faculty of Education. This study sought to find out the perception that students, lecturers, and administrators hold about importance of discipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape. Second, it looked at the forms of behaviors that were regarded as indiscipline in the Faculty. Third, the study dealt with the environmental causes of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education.

Research Questions

Research Question 1: What perceptions do students, lecturers, and administrators hold about importance of discipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast?

Research Question 2: What forms of behaviors are regarded as indiscipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast?

Research Question 3: What are the environmental causes of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast?

Statement of Hypothesis

The argument about discipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, tends to establish a relationship among lecturers, students, and administrators.

Hypothesis H0: There is no difference in perception among students, lecturers, and administrators about indiscipline in the Faculty of Education.

Hypothesis H1: There is a difference in perception among students, lecturers, and administrators about indiscipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast.

Literature Review

Gestalt's psychology sees perception and behavior from the standpoint of the organisms' response to configuration wholes with stress on the identity of psychological and physiological events and rejections of atomistic or elemental analysis of stimulus, precept, and response (Artkinson & Hellard, 1983). Thus, an organism's psychological environment is crucial in self-development.

People experience reality as they perceive it and according to their own private logic. Thus, the theory of individual psychology is focused on understanding of individuals in relation to their social environment (Adler, 1992). The environment thus remains the facet of an individual's lifestyle, which greatly influences his behavior. Thus, any analysis based on perception of individuals would be subjective.

Discipline relates to a principled mind, a mind much more focused, goal-directed, and above all, strict in itself. It is loving fairness, direction, prevention before a problem arises. It is harnessing and channeling energy for great performance (Kissiedu, 2004). It can thus be said that discipline is a training that is expected to produce a desired specific character or pattern of behavior resulting from such training.

According to Tettey-Enyo (1995, p. 33), "discipline is a necessary condition for education and no educational institution can afford to work in an atmosphere of indiscipline." He stressed that "discipline not only sets the tone of work but also determines the rate of achievement." Charles (1981) affirmed the necessity of discipline in educational institutions. He said, "discipline is the key to learning, sanity and joy in educational institutions" (p. 209). Indeed "discipline allows students to do the best in their academic work and also leads to the effective achievement of the goals of the educational institutions in the community" (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978, p. 133).

The interaction between lecturers, administrators, and students in the context of the University environment is where the acts of discipline and indiscipline are situated. Fontana (1986) considered the fact that all the problems that occur in educational institutions are not all of equal importance. What is one lecturer's problem of discipline may not be a problem to another lecturer. To Charles (1983), lecturers exhibit three kinds of misbehavior, namely, behavior that affronts their sense of morality, behavior that is defiant and aggressive, and behavior that disrupts attention. Adentwi (1998) arrived at three main types of indiscipline, which have gained roots in the second cycle and tertiary institutions. Adentwi pointed out studies-related behavior, interpersonal relation behavior, and self-compartment behavior.

Disciplinary problems in the universities are many and different in nature. Fontana (1986) observed that "what is one lecturer's problem may to another be more than a minor irritation and to another, simply a sign of [students'] high spirits" (p. 7). Several authors indicate talking out loudly, hindering other students, making unnecessary noise, work avoidance, not being punctual and getting out of class without permission, inattention, lying, cheating during tests/quizzes, careless dressing and throwing debris on the corridor, and truancy as misbehaviors (Adentwi, 1991; Charlton & David, 1993; Danso, 2010; Goldstein, 1997; Millan, Schaefer, & Cohen, 1980; Saddler & Saddler, 1994; Willson & Petersilia, 1995). Other areas mentioned include substance abuse such as smoking weed, cocaine, and other drugs; bullying, defiance, threats and fighting; and personal brawl that results in physical injury and ragging, sexual abuse, occultism, drug abuse, rape, armed robbery, abortion, and even murder as forms of indiscipline.

Causes of Indiscipline in Universities

The causes of indiscipline in universities are many and varying. Charlton and David (1993) attributed the causes of indiscipline in educational institutions to two major factors: biological and environmental. Biological causes of indiscipline, they said, include problems due to the malfunctioning of the central and peripheral nervous system and the endocrine gland disorder in hereditary characteristics of the individual chromosomal abnormalities and genetic defects. Hyperactivity, epilepsy, and asthma were also listed. The environmental factors, according to Charlton and David (1993), include family factors such as parental deprivation, separation of young children from their parents, child abuse, and overpermissiveness. Charlton and David further claimed that lack of or ineffective communication among parents, children, and teachers cause indiscipline in the society. The mass media and the community one lives in can exert much influence on individuals as these reflect the system found in the broader society.

Too many rules and regulations of the education systems and their enforcement can be a source of indiscipline problems in educational institutions (Asiedu-Akrofi, 1978). These writers believed that rules should be few, simple, and consistently enforced. They cautioned that youth is a period of self-education and does not need rigid control, which has been nursed into our educational system by our cultural beliefs. Where the educational institutions have the necessary facilities and dynamic leadership and very good interaction among administrators, lecturers, and students, there will be discipline, which is a necessary condition for academic work (Fontana, 1986). Fontana indicated that if the university is not properly organized and lacks good leadership and the necessary facilities to operate, indiscipline will occur. Tettey-Enyo (1995) opined that the issue of indiscipline arises when students and sometimes staff lack strength of mind and

self-control to find positive and constructive means to solve problems they face. For Sackey (1995), the list seems not only endless but incomplete without mentioning the weak personality of the head of the institution. By implication, lack of appropriate leadership skills of heads of educational institutions can be a source of indiscipline among students.

Lecturers' mood can cause disciplinary problems. Mankoe (2002) listed the following as some of the lecturer-related causes of indiscipline in educational institutions: lecturers' lack of good professional qualities such as bad lesson delivery, having sexual affair with their students, intolerance, dishonesty, not being reliable and humorous, lecturers' lack of concern for the well-being of the students, lecturers being autocratic, dispensing punishment carelessly, giving grades to undeserving students, and not allowing students to have a say in matters pertaining to discipline.

To deal with disciplinary problems, parents are encouraged to be collaborators in efforts to instil discipline through the use of rewards (Springthall & Springthall, 1990). Parents must assure their wards' thoughts, desire, and needs that are valuable to them (Goldstein, 1997). Communities must pull resources and be part of collective response to meet the needs of students. They can use social peer groups to promote norms of the society (Springthall & Springthall, 1990). Leadership of educational institutions is important in establishing a climate that supports discipline. Institutional leadership must create conducive environment for learning and treat all with dignity (Curwin & Mender, 1988).

Crispin (1966/1968) suggested that students' participation in formulation of educational rules have great positive influence on students' behavior. The rules should be student-centered where great emphasis is placed on the learner and also ensure good interpersonal relationship among teachers and their students. Lecturers have to be rational and judicious in applying punishment because it may only suppress unacceptable behavior. It may also prompt students to device secretive ways for their misbehavior so that they do not get caught (Springthall & Springthall, 1990). What is necessary is exemplary life that authorities must live for the students to emulate.

Rewards keep students involved and interested in their work, and in helping build upon their current achievement by raising their confidence and their beliefs in their own abilities (Fontana, 1986). So rewards must be emphasized on good behavior while more or less ignoring bad behaviors. Rewards however must be good enough for the standard of work or behavior expected of students. Rewards must also be consistently used to reinforce good performance of students.

The lecturers and administrators are responsible for the students' welfare, guidance, and supervision (Fontana, 1986).

Research Design

Cross-sectional descriptive survey was used for the study to determine and report the way things were at the study time. It involved data collection at one point in time (Babbie, 2007).

Participants

Krejcie and Morgan (1970) showed that beyond a certain point ($N = 5,000$), the population size is almost irrelevant and a sample size of 400 will be adequate. Therefore, the sample size for the study was 400. This number comprised 380 students (selected through stratified sampling technique from Level 100 to Level 400), 12 lecturers (chosen through quota sampling technique) and 8 administrators selected through purposive sampling. However, there were 377 data-producing respondents representing 94.25% return rate after we had personally distributed and collected the questionnaire in May 2011.

Instrument

Self-developed questionnaire, based on reviewed literature, was used for data collection as the population was literate. It consisted mostly of close-ended (4-point Likert-type) in which a score of "1" indicated strong agreement and a score of "4" showed strong disagreement. The options ranged from strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) to strongly disagree (SD). Section A was on background information of respondents. Section B focused on importance of discipline. Items in Section C sought respondents' views on the forms of indiscipline while Section D had items on causes of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education.

On validity of the questionnaire, items strictly followed the research questions. The developed instrument was given to 2 experts in the fields of educational administration and teacher education. These experts made important corrections by reconstructing some items. Other suggestions contributed to modifying some items to achieve face and content validity. The questionnaire was pretested using 29 respondents comprising 6 lecturers, 5 administrators, and 18 students from the University of Education, Winneba. Internal consistency of the items was ascertained by establishing the Cronbach's alpha value. The following output was obtained: Cronbach's alpha = .749; standardized items = 0.752; $n = 29$; number of items = 55.

Results and Discussion

Data obtained were edited and coded. They were fed into the SPSS software for analyses. Various items were scored according to the following key values: strongly agree (SA) = 1, agree (A) = 2, disagree (D) = 3, and strongly disagree (D) = 4. Tables of frequencies, percentages, and means were used in presenting the data to help answer the research questions. To determine the differences in perception among students, lecturers, and administrators, we used one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Research Question 1: What perception do students, lecturers, and administrators hold about importance of discipline?

Eight statements were used to find out lecturers', administrators', and students' opinion about importance of discipline. Respondents ranked discipline as being necessary for academic work as most important for the need for discipline to thrive in the Faculty of Education. All lecturer-respondents indicated their extent of agreement ($M = 1.09$), with more than 90% of them strongly agreeing to that. Three out of every four of the sampled administrators ($M = 1.25$) also strongly agreed that discipline is a sine qua non for effective academic work. Furthermore, 80.4% of the 380 students sampled ($M = 1.22$) strongly agreed that discipline is necessary for academic work. This observation agrees with Tettey-Enyo's (1995) assertion that "discipline is a necessary condition for education and that no educational institution can afford to work in an atmosphere of indiscipline" (p. 33). Other items that were also ranked high included "disciplined environment promotes good relationship among students, lecturers, and administrators" ($M = 1.18, 1.38, 1.35$, for lecturers, administrators, and students, respectively) and "discipline is a prerequisite for the successful conduct of any undertaking" ($M = 1.18, 1.50, 1.70$, for lecturers, administrators, and students, respectively). The statement "disciplined students are always happy" was rated the lowest ($M = 1.91, 1.38, 1.78$, for lecturers, administrators, and students, respectively).

It can be inferred from the analysis above that lecturers, students, and administrators of the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast have positive perception that discipline is a hallmark for academic work as majority of the respondents endorsed the statements. This answers Research Question 1.

Research Question 2: What forms of behaviors are regarded as indiscipline in the faculty of education, university of cape coast?

Fourteen items were used to gather information on the forms of indiscipline found in the Faculty. The responses of the respondents indicated that most often occurring form of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast is "stealing in halls of residence." Ninety-one percent (10) of the 11 lecturers ($M = 1.73$) showed that they agreed to that statement whereas all 8 (100%) of the administrators indicated so ($M = 1.38$). Some 90% (specifically 89.6%) of the student respondents ($M = 1.66$) confirmed what the lecturers and administrators indicated by agreeing that stealing is endemic in the halls of residence and that some students of the Faculty of Education were involved in it, though 10.4% of them disagreed.

The second most common form of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education is "making and receiving calls in the library and lecture theatre." This information was endorsed by 72.8% of lecturers ($M = 1.91$), 100% of the administrators ($M = 1.75$), and 89% of the students ($M = 1.78$). Destruction of university property and examination malpractices were

similarly highly identified as prevailing forms of indiscipline in the Faculty. Drug abuse was regarded as the least form of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education by students (77.2% of the 380; $M = 1.88$). However, lecturers (100%; $M = 2.27$) and administrators (100%; $M = 2.38$) disagreed with them.

Research Question 3: What are the environmental-related causes of indiscipline in the faculty of education, university of cape coast?

Respondents' opinion was sought to determine the environmental factors that contribute to students' misbehavior. Views expressed are found in Table 1.

From Table 1, it is observed that the commonest environmental-related cause of indiscipline is negative peer influence ($M = 1.45, 1.50, 1.55$, for lecturers, administrators, and students, respectively). This finding is in conformity with Curwin and Mender's (1988) opinion that negative peer pressure is a breeding ground of indiscipline. The second commonest environmental-related cause of indiscipline is the mass media ($M = 1.64, 1.88, 1.76$, for lecturers, administrators, and students, respectively). This finding is in conformity with Blair, Steward, and Simpson's (1975) assertion that the media promotes violence.

The statement, "replacement of extended family by nuclear family" was rated the least environmental factor causing students to misbehave in the Faculty of Education ($M = 2.45, 2.50, 2.18$, for lecturers, administrators, and students, respectively). This observation does not harmonize with Curwin and Mender's (1988) assertion that lack of secured family environment as in the case of replacement of the extended family system by the smaller nuclear family system causes indiscipline.

Hypothesis Testing

A major part of the study concerned whether differences exist in the opinion of lecturers, administrators, and students regarding their views on indiscipline in the Faculty of Education. Therefore, it was hypothesized that

Hypothesis 0: There is no difference in perception among lecturers, administrators, and students about the importance of discipline, forms, and causes of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast.

Hypothesis 1: There is a difference in the perception among lecturers, administrators, and students about the importance of discipline, forms, and causes of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast.

In order not to increase the probability of falsely rejecting the null hypothesis (wrong decision), we decided to use one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test the hypotheses. As the hypotheses involved multiple testing, it was

Table 1. Respondents' Views on Environmental-Related Causes of Indiscipline.

Items	Status	SA	A	D	SD	M
Broken homes	Lecturer	5 (45.5%)	4 (36.4%)	2 (18.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1.73
	Administrator	4 (50.0%)	1 (12.5%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)	2.00
	Student	151 (42.2%)	150 (41.9%)	32 (8.9%)	25 (7.0%)	1.81
Media (TV, radio, and newspaper)	Lecturer	5 (45.5%)	5 (45.5%)	1 (9.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.64
	Administrator	2 (25.0%)	5 (62.5%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.88
	Student	139 (38.8%)	172 (48.0%)	41 (11.5%)	6 (1.7%)	1.76
Lack of communication among administrator, student, and lecturer	Lecturer	1 (9.1%)	5 (45.5%)	4 (36.4%)	1 (9.1%)	2.45
	Administrator	2 (25.0%)	3 (37.5%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)	2.25
	Student	95 (26.5%)	178 (49.7%)	68 (19.0%)	17 (4.7%)	2.02
Negative peer pressure influence	Lecturer	6 (54.5%)	5 (45.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.45
	Administrator	5 (62.5%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1.50
	Student	176 (50.0%)	161 (45.0%)	17 (4.7%)	1 (0.3%)	1.55
Replacement of extended family by nuclear family	Lecturer	1 (9.1%)	5 (45.5%)	4 (36.4%)	1 (9.1%)	2.45
	Administrator	2 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)	2.50
	Student	78 (21.8%)	161 (45.0%)	94 (26.3%)	25 (7.0%)	2.18

Source. Field Survey, May 2011.

Note. SA = strongly agree, A = agree, D = disagree.

Table 2. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Lecturers', Students', and Administrators' Perception of Discipline.

Dimension of discipline	Status/groups	n	M	SD	df1	df2	F	p
Importance of discipline	Lecturer	11	1.3409	0.39564	2	374	1.919	.148
	Administrator	8	1.3750	0.37796				
	Students	358	1.5286	0.37722				
Forms of indiscipline	Lecturer	11	1.8636	0.51750	2	374	1.537	.216
	Administrator	8	1.5625	0.38454				
	Students	358	1.8414	0.44714				
Causes of indiscipline	Lecturer	11	2.0000	0.25985	2	374	1.113	.330
	Administrator	8	1.7750	0.22316				
	Students	358	1.9036	0.32793				

* $p < .05$.

appropriate to use ANOVA for comparing the three status groups (Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2005). An output of Levene's test of equality of variances shows that the assumptions of homogeneity of variance have not been violated as the significant values (.834, .603, .319, and .123) for the Levene's test were greater than .05. Table 2 presents the details.

Table 2 shows that there was no statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in the perceptions of lecturers, administrators, and students regarding the importance of discipline, $F(2, 374) = 1.919$, $p > 0.05$, forms of indiscipline, $F(2, 374) = 1.537$, $p > 0.05$, and causes of indiscipline, $F(2, 374) = 1.113$, $p > 0.05$, among students in the Faculty of Education.

Post hoc comparisons using Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) test indicated that there was no significant difference in the means and standard deviations among lecturers, administrators, and students on the same issues. With

respect to importance of discipline, the test indicated that the mean score for the lecturers ($M = 1.34$, $SD = 0.40$) was not significantly different from administrators ($M = 1.38$, $SD = 0.38$) and students ($M = 1.53$, $SD = 0.38$). The same post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the lecturers ($M = 1.86$, $SD = 0.52$), in relation to forms of indiscipline, was not significantly different from administrators ($M = 1.56$, $SD = 0.38$) and students ($M = 1.84$, $SD = 0.45$). With causes of indiscipline, the test again indicated that the mean score for the lecturers ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.26$) was not significantly different from administrators ($M = 1.78$, $SD = 0.22$) and students ($M = 1.90$, $SD = 0.33$).

The results have shown that there is no statistically significant difference among the three groups with respect to the dimensions of discipline looked at. Therefore, we failed to reject the null hypothesis (H_0) as the mean for each of the groups was approximately the same.

Conclusion

Lecturers, students, and administrators of the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast hold similar views about importance of discipline, forms of indiscipline, and causes of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education of the University of Cape Coast. We failed to reject the null hypothesis. However, slight difference exists in respondents' perception on drug use among members of the Faculty of Education. Students agreed that drug use was common in the Faculty ($M = 1.88$), whereas lecturers ($M = 2.27$) and administrators ($M = 2.38$) disagreed.

Lecturers, administrators, and students in the Faculty of Education regard discipline being necessary for academic work as the foremost reason for them to eschew indiscipline.

The commonest form of indiscipline among students in the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast is stealing in the halls of residence. Also, students in the Faculty of Education are not disciplined when it comes to use of cell phones. They use the phones in lecture theatres and library to disturb others. Furthermore, negative peer influence is the most common cause of indiscipline among education students in the University of Cape Coast.

Recommendations

The fact that students, lecturers, and administrators hold similar opinions on disciplinary issues is a good indication that together they can attain a good measure of university discipline if they painstakingly work at it. Learning dialogue, shared leadership, and shared accountability need to be pursued by university-wide authorities and leadership in the Faculty of Education in particular to actively engage students in decision making while building consensus on issues that affect students' well-being and their learning. Any gaps must be closed to strengthen the collaboration between students' front and university authorities.

The counseling center of the University of Cape Coast must be resourced in all aspects to enable them be able to offer and strengthen student counseling services. This can go a long way to help prepare students to properly handle issues relating to peer influences and drug use. When properly and effectively counseled, students can make well-informed decisions to stem any unwarranted peer pressure. This can contribute to minimizing the negative influence of peer pressure on innocent students who otherwise would be good ambassadors of the Faculty and the University at large.

As the study has shown that stealing by students in the halls of residence is the commonest form of indiscipline in the Faculty of Education, stringent measures need to be adopted to deter education students from engaging in theft. If tomorrow's teachers are allowed to freely steal from colleagues while in training, their negative influence on the learners they would be teaching after completing their

programs of study will be indescribable. Students found to be stealing in the University of Cape Coast must be summarily dismissed and handed over to the law enforcement agencies. Hall authorities need to do more to sensitize students on the repercussions of stealing. Alternative programs that can help students to channel their useful exuberance to beneficial ends must be pursued. Again, it is necessary that guidance and counseling services are intensified to help students overcome the temptation to steal in and/or outside of the halls of residence in the University.

Use of cell phones in lecture theatres and libraries must be seriously looked at. Drastic measures need to be taken to prevent members of the Faculty from disturbing and distracting others from fully enjoying and participating in learning activities—the very reasons why they are in the University. This will be in line with the Road Traffic Regulation (L. I. 2180) of Ghana (2012), which makes it illegal for drivers to operate vehicles and use hand-held communication devices such as mobile phones—beginning July 6, 2012—as it prevents them from concentrating on the driving. University authorities must engage students to identify strategies to deal with this disruptive behavior.

The counseling center of the University of Cape Coast must come out with schedule for each semester as to how, where, and when counseling services can be accessed freely, which should be able to help people recognize, adjust, and accomplish goals through appropriate decision making. Radio talk shows, university-wide outreach program counseling services, peer counselors program among others can be projects that can be implemented to help education students and others understand themselves, chart a clear, responsible path for themselves as well as identifying ways of achieving feasible targets set.

The common perceptions that students, lecturers, and administrators have about discipline in the Faculty of Education should serve as a platform to bring all these people together to help with the academic and professional development of education students. Resource persons—including members of the security forces, ex-convicts, people who have gone through ups and downs of life, etc.—can be brought together to share experiences with students. Such programs and people can help students reexamine their career paths, mend broken edges and carve fruitful, workable, and attainable future developmental plans that will take their minds off misbehaviors into productive ends.

Suggestions for Further Research

The current study was limited in scope because it was based on the responses of students, lecturers, and administrators of only the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast. To generalize the observations made, it is suggested that the study be replicated in other faculties in the University of Cape Coast and also among other universities and populations.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

References

- Adentwi, K. I. (1991). *Classroom disciplinary problems: Their nature, causes and remedies: The case of Aggrey Memorial Zion Secondary School* (Unpublished Dissertation). University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana.
- Adentwi, K. I. (1998). *Teachers' and students' perception of classroom indiscipline in selected Senior Secondary Schools in Cape Coast Municipality* (Unpublished Thesis). University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana.
- Adler, A. (1992). *Industrielle Psychologie in der schule* [Industrial psychology in the school]. France: Leipzig. S. Hirzel.
- Artkinson, L. R., & Hellard, E. R. (1983). *Introduction to psychology*. London, England: Harcourt Brace.
- Asiedu-Akrofi, K. (1978). *School organization in modern Africa*. Tema, Ghana: Ghana Publishing Corporation.
- Babbie, E. (2007). *The practice of social research* (11th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Blair, G. M., Steward, R., & Simpson, J. (1975). *Educational psychology*. New York: McMillan.
- Charles, D. (1981). *Building classroom discipline from models to practice*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Charles, C. M. (1983). *Elementary classroom management* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman Inc.
- Charlton, S., & David, P. (1993). *Managing misbehavior in schools* (2nd ed.). London, England: Routledge.
- Crispin, D. (1968). Discipline behavior of different teachers. *Contemporary Education*, 39, 164-67. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=ED027237>. (Original work published 1966)
- Cudjoe, S. (1996). *Classroom control: A sociological perspective*. London, England: George Allen and Unwin.
- Curwin, R. L., & Mender, A. N. (1988). *Discipline with dignity*. New York, NY: Association for Supervision Curriculum Development.
- Danso, Y. (2010, July 5). High rate of indiscipline and acts of lawlessness in educational institutions. *Daily Graphic* (No.175810), p. 3.
- Denga, D. I. (1981). Juvenile delinquency among polygamous families in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 114, 3-7.
- Dinkmeyer, D. L. (1995). *Child development: The emerging self*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Executive Committee of Academic Board. (2005). *Withdrawal of offer of admission*. Cape Coast, Ghana: University of Cape Coast.
- Executive Committee of Academic Board. (2008, March 31). *Disturbance during hall week celebration*. Cape Coast, Ghana: University of Cape Coast.
- Executive Committee of Academic Board. (2009, March 8). *Destruction of hall property*. Cape Coast, Ghana: University of Cape Coast.
- Fontana, D. (1986). *Classroom control: Understanding and guiding classroom behaviour*. London, England: McMillan.
- Goldstein, A. (1997). *School violence intervention*. London, England: McMillan.
- Kissiedu, S. (2004). *Basic principles of successful parenting*. Accra, Ghana: Asempra Publishers.
- Krejcie, R. N., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). *Educational and psychological measurement*. New York, NY: SAGE.
- Leech, N. C., Barrett, K. C., & Morgan, G. A. (2005). *SPSS for intermediate statistics: Uses and interpretation* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mankoe, J. (2002). *Educational administration and management in Ghana*. Accra, Ghana: Afram Publishing.
- Millan, H. L., Schaefer, C. E., & Cohen, J. J. (1980). *Therapies for school behaviour problems*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Road Traffic Regulation of Ghana. (2012). *Legislative instrument number 2180*. Accra, Ghana: GoG.
- Sackey, C. B. (1995). *Class control and behavior problems*. London, England: Routledge.
- Saddler, D., & Saddler, M. B. (1994). *Teachers, school and society*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Springthall, A., & Springthall, L. C. (1990). *Educational psychology*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Tamakloe, E. K., Amedahe, F. K., & Atta, E. T. (1996). *Principles and methods of teaching*. Accra, Ghana: Black Mask Publishers.
- Tettey-Enyo, A. (1995). School discipline. *CHASS Journal: The Educator*, 1, 33-36.
- Willson, E. L., & Petersilia, D. (1995). *Discipline, achievement and mental health*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Author Biographies

Kwame Bediako Asare is a lecturer at the Institute of Education of the University of Cape Coast, Ghana. His research interests include educational administration, school effectiveness, and teacher education. He is a professional development leader (PDL) of the Leadership for Learning (LfL) Ghana team involved with professional development of head teachers in leading schools to promote student learning.

Ben Adzrolo is a high school teacher. He was a graduate student at the Institute of Education, University of Cape Coast, Ghana, at the study time. His interest area is teacher education.