

STUDENT MENTORING AND DISCIPLINE IN UGANDAN UNIVERSITIES: CASE OF THE CENTRAL REGION

BY

Namutebi Edith¹

P.O Box 8151Kampala, Uganda

E-mail: edithnamutebi29@gmail.com

Mobile Phone: +256 (0)776080220 ; +256 (0)703654421

Corresponding Author: Kasule George Wilson²

Department of Educational Planning and Management, Kyambogo University

P.O Box 1 Kyambogo-Kampala, Uganda

E-mail: gwkasulem@gmail.com; gwkasule@kyu.ac.ug

Mobile Phone: +256 (0)781 300 476 ; +256 (0)759 574 713

Abstract

Student indiscipline is rising in Ugandan universities. It is however, not clear how this indiscipline is committed in these universities when they are differentiated as public, private and religiously founded, and secular private institutions. The indiscipline has also led to questioning whether the students are mentored or not. This paper seeks to answer this question based on a comparative cross sectional study. Data was collected using self-administered questionnaires administered to 18 deans of students, 266 lecturers and 349 students conveniently selected from 18 randomly selected Ugandan universities. Data was analysed using descriptive statistics, ANOVA, correlation and regression methods of analysis. Findings show that the level of student indiscipline significantly differs in such a way that it is very frequent in public universities, occurs irregularly in private secular universities and is infrequent in private universities with a religious background. The level of mentoring relates significantly though negatively with the level of student indiscipline. Formal mentoring relates with this indiscipline more significantly. However, while no formal mentoring is conducted in public universities on matters of discipline, it is carried out in religious-founded universities at a low level and negligibly conducted in private secular universities. These findings suggest that increasing formal mentoring of students translates into significant reduction in student indiscipline in Ugandan universities. Managers of these universities are therefore strongly advised to design and encourage formal mentoring programmes in their institutions.

Keywords: Students, Mentoring, discipline, Ugandan Universities

1.0 Introduction

Universities have long been recognised as institutions that play a crucial role in the development of a disciplined society and in ensuring that its moral fabric does not disintegrate (Halstead, 2010; Cohen & Cohen, 1987). As institutions at the pinnacle of the educational ladder, universities are expected to play this role by training their students to observe the highest level of discipline not only at their campuses but also in their neighbouring communities and society at large (Tannenber, 2014). Unfortunately, a number of universities in Uganda are critically challenged as far as playing

this role is concerned. The kind of discipline displayed by their students is the direct opposite of how the students are expected to behave.

Voluminous literature show that a significant number of Ugandan university students engage in various forms of indiscipline, including truancy, abusing alcohol and drugs, exposing fellow students to assault and sexual coercion, using multiple sexual partners, and getting unwanted pregnancies and abortions, amongst others (Agardh et al. 2011). This phenomenon need urgent mitigation measures. Accordingly, this study set out to answer the ensuing questions: Do Ugandan universities provide mentoring programmes to students towards building good discipline? If no, can mentoring programmes help Ugandan university students to stop engaging in acts of indiscipline?

2.1 Theoretical Review

This paper is theoretically guided by a combined rationale developed from the behavioural and cognitive theories. B.F. Skinner's behaviour modification theory is invoked in particular. Essentially, this theory posits that while desired discipline is promoted through positive reinforcement of appropriate behaviour, indiscipline is eliminated through negative reinforcement of unacceptable behaviour (Halper, 2015). Positive reinforcement involves rewarding individuals whenever they behave in an acceptable manner (Schacter & Gilbert, 2011). The rewards vary over a wide spectrum ranging from recognition, appreciation and tokenism in general (Halper, 2015). The specific rewards include saying words like 'thank you', 'well done', 'good of you'; or giving material rewards such as gifts or money (Solter, 2014). Negative reinforcement involves discouraging unacceptable behaviour either by ignoring it, not rewarding it, or meting out non-punitive punishment to students involved in it (Kaiser & Rasminsky, 2010).

Not only do cognitive theories focus on mental processes that trigger behaviour, whether desirable or undesirable; they also seek to explain how desired discipline can be promoted and undesired discipline discouraged by understanding how students' mental processes work and how this working translates into behaviour (Glenn, 2013). Generally, these theories assume that if students are made aware of the discipline expected of them, and if they are involved in drawing up the rules and a schedule of consequences faced for not adhering to the rules, they behave in a disciplined manner. Of particular relevance to this paper are two cognitive theories i.e. Glasser's (1999) educational transformation theory and Curwin and Mendler's (1997) model of discipline with dignity.

Glasser's (1999) theory consists of three distinct models and practices by which each can be implemented. These include choice theory, quality management, and reality therapy. Choice theory is based on the biological interpretation of the cognitive connection between human needs and behaviour. Besides, it is incontestable that all behaviour is motivated by the desire to satisfy needs that are genetically encoded in and aroused and directed by the brain (Glasser, 1999). The needs include love, belongingness, power, competence, survival, fun diversion, and freedom to choose options. The desire to satisfy each of these needs is aroused depending on how the brain interprets, accommodates and manages reality or how the brain makes sense of the external world and the disturbances therein using its perceptual ability (Glasser, 1999).

In general, the rationale of Glasser's (1999) theory suggests that students choose the way they behave by making choices based on their quality worlds. Indiscipline arises when students' quality worlds translate into acting in inappropriate ways and desired discipline occurs when students' quality worlds translate into acting in acceptable ways. Consequently, university authorities have to

keep in mind that it is better to constantly use persuasive communication to encourage students to form quality worlds that are in conformity with desired discipline and to convince the students that they have to take full responsibility for the kind of discipline they display. This can be done when university authorities manage crises on an ongoing basis. This theory is however, criticised for being too lengthy in practice. It requires a sufficient amount of time to combat student indiscipline by merely persuading them to change their quality worlds to suit what the authorities' quality worlds. Moreover, persuasion alone may not work as students may pay little attention to it, thereby continuing to misbehave whenever they feel inclined to do so. It is against this backdrop that Curwin and Mendler's (1999) theory of discipline with dignity was considered appropriate to supplement Glasser's theory. In brief, Curwin and Mendler's (1997) theory advance that student discipline can be improved by respecting students and maximising their dignity and hope.

2.1.1 Student Indiscipline

Discipline is differently conceived. In educational institutions, it tends to be described as a control process by which students' adherence to a given set of rules or code of behaviour is promoted and maintained (Boyd, 2012). Student discipline is also described in terms of behaviour that students demonstrate either in accordance with a code of behaviour prescribed for them by their institutions or contrary to this code (Asare & Adzrolo, 2013). These conceptions suggest that discipline can be a training process or behaviour judged according to a given code of student conduct. The second conception is used in this paper. Based on this understanding, student indiscipline can be described as any student behaviour that is contrary to the code of conduct prescribed by a university. It therefore represents student behaviour deemed inappropriate as per the prescribed code of conduct of an educational institution (Mbabazi & Bagaya, 2013). This behaviour can be academic or non-academic (Ford, 2013).

The academic behaviour is depicted in form of deliberate truancy, lateness rather than punctuality for classroom and school activities, irregularity in attending lectures, and poor quality of school work as reflected by low grades, retakes, and failure to do coursework (Parker *et al.*, 2010). Kumar (2008) indicates that student engage in indiscipline by copying and cheating examinations, insulting their lecturers and principals, and tempting them with subtle sexual provocations. Kumar (2008) continues to report that students tear away pages from library books or pictures from the magazines, and write vulgarity on library and lecture room walls. According to Singh (2010), students demonstrate non-academic indiscipline by going on violent strikes instead of using peaceful means communicating and resolving their grievances with school administrations. Kumar (2008) indicates that student indiscipline involves indulging in many kinds of mischief, including clashing with the police, throwing stones and brickbats at the police and practicing violence at any pretext. According to Karanja and Bowen (2012), students' non-academic indiscipline is also manifested in form of damage to instructional property, arson, bullying, drug taking, killing of other students, and boycotting school activities. Other acts of student indiscipline include disrespect for school administrators, teachers, fellow students and community members, failure to be in the right place at the right time, lack of self-control, and involvement in quarrelling, stealing, and misusing other students' property (Guider & Olrich, 2012). Other measures appearing in the work of Atuhire (2014) include offences students commit against fellow students, school administrators, teachers and other school staff members and members of the surrounding community; students' involvement in sexual immorality and in the use of abusive language (such as alcoholism and abusing drugs).

While acts of indiscipline similar to those cited above have been reported in universities in Uganda, no attempt has been made to establish the level of their occurrence according to these universities'

types. This gives an impression that same level of student indiscipline takes place all the universities. Is this the case? The level of student indiscipline can be established based on the number of acts of indiscipline students commit or extent of the occurrence of indiscipline, or even the effects of indiscipline (Karanja & Bowen, 2012). This paper uses the extent of indiscipline as perceived by respondents to determine this level in Ugandan universities to their types.

2.1.2 Student Mentoring

Student mentoring is derived from the general concept of mentoring, which can be defined as a one-to-one informal and supportive relationship, as a reflective technique, as a formalised teaching-learning modus operandi, career guidance and development method, or even as a job in which a more experienced, wiser and understanding person (called a mentor) provides essential information and emotional support, listening attentively, engaging, guiding, counselling, correcting and giving feedback to a less experienced person called a mentee or a protégé (Pita *et al.*, 2013). These definitions indicate that mentoring carries different meanings depending on the context under which it is carried out as well as its purpose and how it is organised. Based on the definitions provided above, student mentoring can be described as any one-to-one informal or formal technique by which a mentor (who may be a university councillor, lecturer, student leader or senior student) interacts with a mentee (who in this case is a fresh university student) with the intention of guiding, teaching, counselling, providing advice, wisdom and support, or instilling a desired 'quality world picture' or behaviour while discouraging an undesired quality world picture or behaviour.

Student mentoring involves engaging students to understand their interests and quality world pictures and persuading them to align these pictures to fall in line with desired discipline (Johnson, 2007). This mentoring focuses on persuasive provision of mentees with knowledge they need to develop the world quality deemed appropriate to produce desired discipline (Andrews & Chilton, 2000). Student mentoring also involves supporting students' adjustment to university life and academic changes that take place along the way (Benson *et al.*, 2003). Student mentoring further involves facilitating students' personal emotional development by treating them with respect, encouraging them to make wise choices and providing them with opportunities to develop social capital by establishing beneficial networks and relationships as opposed to exploitative contacts (Chitiyo, 2012), and giving them constant parental advice and skills regarding how to use the freedom they get at the university productively instead of getting involved in unacceptable behaviour (Coppock, 2005). Practically, student mentoring can be provided formally using well-planned and scheduled mentoring programmes by which lecturers (or university counsellors) are assigned a specific number of fresh students to provide them not only with guidance on desired discipline but also with necessary coaching, and reading materials (memos, written guidelines and illustrations) on university discipline (Whiston & Quinby, 2009). The assigned mentors can also teach and give testing exercises to students for the purpose of assessing the level of discipline that students have gained from mentoring (Kuyper-Rushing, 2001). Some studies have shown that mentoring also involves supervision of student research for purposes of mutual enhancement of critically reflective and independent thinking (Johnston, 2013). This mentoring is however, not necessarily for discipline purposes; it is for helping students accomplish their research projects with guidance from their lecturers. It should be noted that while the literature cited above specifies a number of practices by which students can be mentored to behave in a discipline manner, it is not clear whether the practices are used in Ugandan universities. Even the level at which the practices are used is also not clear. This is because none of the studies from which the practices are cited was conducted about these universities.

Literature further indicates that mentoring can also be provided to university students informally or in a causal manner. In this case, Inzer and Crawford (2005) show that mentoring is provided naturally but not as a formal university programme. Informal mentoring is distinguished from formal mentoring in that it is based on trust and friendship and can be initiated either by the mentor or the mentee, but not the university (Brockbank & McGill, 2006). Informal mentoring can take place anywhere—in office, lecture room, or any place on the campus compound as long as it is convenient to the mentor and mentee. It involves informal provision of educative information, exposing the mentee to desired behavioural demonstrations and positive psychosocial activities, facilitating their social interactions, emotional development, attitude change, and role modelling for them (Garvey, 2011). It also involves providing friendship, and informal counselling (corrective advice), career guidance, constructive conversations, informal coaching, and encouraging mentees to make intelligent decisions (Colley, 2009; Johnson, 2007).

Other informal mentoring practices include acting as a good example or in an exemplary manner by demonstrating the behaviour a mentee is expected to emulate by engaging in activities that illustrate the behaviour, and discouraging deviation of the behaviour (Hart, 2010). Another practice involves problem-solving, which focuses on encouraging a mentee to face challenges inevitably met in life with a positive attitude of overcoming them instead of encouraging them to continue happening (Patterson & Korf, 2013). For instance, students can be encouraged to avoid the bandwagon effect such as joining a strike which does not solve any problem. Another practice is to encourage excellence by setting high discipline expectations and encouraging mentees to pursue the expectations (Patterson & Korf, 2013). Zachary (2000) indicates active and astute listening to the doubts, concerns and needs of a mentee while encouraging him/her to open up, reading between the lines and avoiding to interrupt and to stress him/her up along the way as another informal mentoring practice that can help mentor students. This practice helps to understand the mentees' needs deeply, which leads to provision of solutions to the tabled problems, issues and troubles either by the mentor or by encouraging the mentee to do so by him or herself (Patterson & Korf, 2013). This practice involves patience, compassion, and understanding. Another informal practice involves confronting an unacceptable or undesirable behaviour by discouraging inappropriate behaviour while encouraging desired behaviour. This practice does not involve confronting the person of the mentee, it focuses on confronting the behaviour itself through acknowledging and naming it and pointing out the need for the mentee to reflect on and change it (Hart, 2010).

Generally, literature reveals a number of mentoring practices by which desired student discipline can be promoted in universities. The practices can be formal or informal, depending on how mentoring is organised and provided to students. This paper however, focuses on formal mentoring since this is the form of mentoring that universities can officially promote. The paper is particularly about clarifying whether there are any formal mentoring practices applied to students in Ugandan universities as none of the studies cited above was conducted in the universities in question.

3.0 Methodology

The study was designed as a comparative cross sectional survey in order to facilitate establishing and comparing levels of student mentoring and indiscipline in the different types of Ugandan universities based on quantitative questionnaire data collected from different respondents who included university deans of students, lecturers and students. The size of the study population, expected sample and of the actual sample are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Sample Size Determination

Respondent category	Population	Expected Sample as per Krejcie & Morgan	Actual sample	Response rate (%)
Universities	36*	35*	18*	51.4
Deans of students	36	35	18	51.4
Lecturers	7676	367	266	72.5
Students	140087	384	349	90.0
Total	148493	786	630	80.2

* Not included in the total

Source of population figures: National Council for Higher Education, 2014 and Uganda Bureau of Statistics (2014).

All respondents were selected to provide data on the level of student indiscipline in their universities as measured by the perceived extent of students' involvement in behaviours that were unacceptable to the universities. In addition, university deans of students and lecturers were expected to provide data on whether they formally mentored their students; and the students were expected to provide corroborative data on whether they were indeed mentored. Convenience sampling was used to facilitate selection of all the respondents, implying that were selected according to their availability and accessibility in their offices (for lecturers and deans) or lecture rooms (for students) at the selected universities. The universities were selected using stratified and simple random sampling techniques. Stratified sampling was used to divide all the 36 universities that were operational in Uganda at the time of data collection into three categories, namely (i) public universities, (ii) private universities with a religious background and (iii) secular private universities. Thereafter, simple random sampling was used to select universities from each stratum. This was intended to give each of the universities in each category an equal chance of participating in the study. While 35 universities (appropriately 12 per category) were expected to participate in the study, 18 (51.4%) universities responded at a rate of six universities per category.

Data were collected from all the respondents using self-administered questionnaires, since being university administrators, lecturers and students implied that they were literate enough to read and respond to the questions in writing. The questionnaires were tested for validity using the Content Validity Method. The validity indices were .819, .932 and .910 for the questionnaire of university administrators, lecturers and students, respectively. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the administrators' questionnaire was 0.876, that of the lecturers' questionnaire was .821 and that of students was .810. These validity indices and reliability coefficients were all greater than the 0.7, the minimum acceptable threshold (Amin, 2005). The questionnaires were therefore capable of collecting valid and reliable data. The data was analysed using descriptive, ANOVA, factor, correlation and linear regression techniques using the SPSS programme.

4.0 Findings

The first objective of the paper was to establish the level of student indiscipline displayed in Ugandan universities according to their types. This level was established by asking the selected respondents to use Very often (5), Often (4), Sometimes (3), Rarely (2) and Very rarely (1) to give their opinion on the extent to which the various indicators of student indiscipline occurred in their universities. Descriptive and ANOVA results obtained from the responses are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Perception of Level of Student Indiscipline by University Types in Uganda

Student Indiscipline indicators	Respondents	Mean perception by University Type			F	Sig.
		Public	Religious private	Secular private		
Deliberate dodging of lectures	Deans	4.60	3.54	3.64	4.010	.000
	Lecturers	4.65	3.55	3.61		
	Students	3.60	3.54	3.64		
Not doing coursework and testing exercises deliberately	Deans	4.57	3.50	3.51	5.022	.000
	Lecturers	4.61	3.53	3.64		
	Students	4.63	3.49	3.66		
Involvement in cheating exams	Deans	3.77	2.34	2.14	11.981	.000
	Lecturers	3.62	1.56	1.61		
	Students	3.65	3.04	2.34		
Deliberate vandalizing of instructional materials	Deans	4.60	2.24	1.62	11.888	.000
	Lecturers	4.63	1.57	2.24		
	Students	4.61	3.34	1.67		
Abusing drugs	Deans	4.69	2.20	3.66	9.180	.000
	Lecturers	4.55	2.14	3.68		
	Students	4.68	1.52	3.61		
Abusing alcohol	Deans	4.62	1.51	3.63	6.891	.000
	Lecturers	4.65	1.54	3.61		
	Students	4.67	1.33	3.62		
Deliberate involvement in sexual coercion	Deans	4.60	3.57	4.60	12.128	.000
	Lecturers	4.61	3.59	4.61		
	Students	4.68	3.53	4.65		
Involvement in wilful immoral sexual intercourse	Deans	4.70	4.53	4.66	1.091	.316
	Lecturers	4.88	4.57	4.68		
	Students	4.89	4.56	4.66		
Getting unwanted pregnancies	Deans	3.30	3.04	3.01	1.087	.346
	Lecturers	3.10	3.10	3.34		
	Students	3.60	3.59	3.69		
Carrying out abortions deliberately	Deans	3.30	3.14	2.84	1.077	.356
	Lecturers	3.20	3.18	3.24		
	Students	3.62	3.55	3.68		
Deliberate vandalizing of instructional infrastructure when students go on strike	Deans	4.77	3.50	3.04	8.777	.000
	Lecturers	4.63	3.74	3.34		
	Students	4.78	3.04	3.44		
Deliberate burning of university property when students go on strike	Deans	1.61	2.22	1.67	1.567	.206
	Lecturers	2.63	1.53	1.60		
	Students	1.66	1.51	1.63		
Shouting vulgarity whenever students demonstrate	Deans	4.77	1.24	2.24	13.012	.000
	Lecturers	4.69	1.34	2.11		
	Students	4.68	1.51	1.65		
Theft of merchandise from shops students come by whenever they go on strike	Deans	4.60	2.24	1.44	12.345	.000
	Lecturers	4.64	1.84	1.34		
	Students	4.65	1.53	1.14		
Disrespecting university administrators, lecturers and community members	Deans	3.69	2.26	1.58	13.667	.000
	Lecturers	3.65	2.33	1.56		
	Students	3.61	2.42	1.54		
Overall assessment	Deans	4.50	2.34	2.64	7.673	.000
	Lecturers	4.53	1.84	2.74		
	Students	4.54	2.34	2.64		

Most of the levels of significance (Sig.) in Table 2 were equal to zero, implying that the corresponding F-values were significant at the .01 level of significance. This implies that for most of the indicators, the level of student indiscipline differed significantly across the university types. The overall assessment reveals that the means corresponding to deans (mean = 4.50), lecturers (mean = 4.53) and students (mean = 4.54) from public universities were close to '5'. Those corresponding to the same respondents but from religiously-founded private universities were close to '2' and those corresponding to similar respondents from secular private universities were close to '3'. These findings imply that while student indiscipline occurred in public universities very often, it occurred in secular private universities sometimes; and rarely occurred in religiously-founded

private universities. So, indiscipline occurred very frequently in public universities, occasionally in secular private universities and infrequently in religiously-founded private universities. The only form of indiscipline that very frequently occurred in all universities and without a significant difference was involvement in wilful immoral sexual intercourse (all means were close to '5'). A glance at the indicators reveals that students got involved all most of the indiscipline deliberately.

The second objective of the paper was to establish the level of student mentoring conducted formally in Ugandan universities according to their types. This level was established in much the same way as the level of student indiscipline was ascertained. Findings are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Perception of Level of Students' Mentoring by University Types in Uganda

Student mentoring indicators	Respondents	Mean perception by University Type			F	Sig.
		Public	Religious private	Secular private		
Students are respected and persuasively convinced to observe their code of conduct	Deans	1.60	3.50	2.67	3.917	.000
	Lecturers	1.65	3.51	2.61		
	Students	1.61	3.51	2.62		
Lecturers are assigned students to provide guide about expected behaviour	Deans	1.07	2.50	1.51	5.626	.000
	Lecturers	1.01	2.53	1.64		
	Students	1.13	2.61	1.66		
University dignifiedly involves students in drawing up rules and consequences faced for not adhering	Deans	1.07	2.54	2.14	9.984	.000
	Lecturers	1.02	2.56	1.61		
	Students	1.15	3.14	2.34		
Students are given training materials and guidelines to help them learn to observe expected behaviour	Deans	1.50	3.24	1.32	7.869	.000
	Lecturers	1.33	3.37	2.23		
	Students	1.31	3.38	1.37		
Students Dean organises scheduled meetings to deeply understand students' needs so as to help them adjust well to university life	Deans	1.69	3.20	1.61	5.158	.000
	Lecturers	1.55	3.13	1.18		
	Students	1.68	3.42	1.21		
Students are parentally advised to use their freedom and free time at university productively	Deans	3.44	3.31	1.63	3.877	.000
	Lecturers	2.65	3.44	1.61		
	Students	1.64	3.33	1.62		
Students are tested to establish how their discipline improves by reading the code of conduct given to them	Deans	1.10	3.57	4.60	12.128	.000
	Lecturers	1.21	3.59	4.61		
	Students	1.48	3.53	4.65		
Students choose lecturers who can mentor them	Deans	2.70	3.53	1.36	7.074	.000
	Lecturers	2.88	3.57	1.28		
	Students	1.89	3.56	1.62		
Lecturers assigned to students as mentors behave in an exemplary manner.	Deans	3.40	4.04	1.01	8.004	.000
	Lecturers	3.30	4.10	1.34		
	Students	3.45	4.29	1.29		
Students use their peers to get help out of challenging situations	Deans	4.30	4.14	4.84	1.227	.359
	Lecturers	4.20	4.18	4.24		
	Students	4.62	4.55	4.68		
Overall assessment	Deans	1.40	2.83	1.64	4.223	.000
	Lecturers	1.39	3.84	1.74		
	Students	1.44	2.88	1.64		

From Table 3, the level of significance corresponding to the overall assessment of mentoring was significant at the .01 level of significance. This implies that the level of mentoring differed significantly in the different types of universities. The analysis of the mean values reveals that those corresponding to public universities were all close to '1', those corresponding to private secular universities were close to '2' while those corresponding to religious-founded universities were close to '3' for all the respondents. This suggests that student mentoring was sometimes carried out in religious-based universities, rarely conducted in secular private universities and very rarely implemented in public universities. Accordingly, while the level of mentoring was low in religious-founded university, it was negligible in both public and private secular universities. The only

student mentoring practice that occurred in all the universities at a high level and without a significant difference involved students using their peers to get help out of challenging situations (all means were close to ‘5’).

The third objective of the paper was to establish the relationship between the level of student indiscipline and level of mentoring in Ugandan universities according to their types. This relationship was established after identifying significant and global components of these variables of using factor analysis aided by the SPSS programme. The relationship was established using the Pearson’s method of correlation analysis based on cross-tabulation of level of mentoring and level of student indiscipline and their significant components. Findings are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Relationship between level of mentoring and level of student indiscipline in Ugandan universities by types

Independent variables	University types	Correlation (r) with dependent variables		
		Level of academic indiscipline	Level of non-academic indiscipline	Overall level of student indiscipline
Level of formal student mentoring	Public	-.482**	-.714**	-.652**
	Religious private	-.472**	-.554**	-.369*
	Secular private	-.461**	-.668**	-.397*
Level of informal mentoring	Public	-.414**	-.624**	-.606**
	Religious private	-.447**	-.456**	-.306*
	Secular private	-.286*	-.615**	-.332**
Overall level student mentoring	Public	-.677**	-.769**	-.675**
	Religious private	-.512**	-.714**	-.452**
	Secular private	-.461**	-.668**	-.437**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The correlations (r) in Table 4 were all significant and negative either at the .05 or the .01 level of significance. Those that were between the overall level of student mentoring and overall level of student indiscipline were all significant and negative at the .01 level of significance. Specifically, the correlation between the overall level of student mentoring and the overall level of student indiscipline was $r = -.675$ for in public universities, $r = -.452$ for religious-based private universities and $r = -.437$ for secular private universities, and all the correlations were negative and significant at the .01 level of significance. Therefore, the relationship between the level of student mentoring and level of student indiscipline was negative and significant. After establishing a significant relationship, further analysis was conducted to determine whether the relationship was predictive. This involved the use of linear regression analysis. Findings are summarised in Table 5.

Table 5: Prediction of student indiscipline by student mentoring by types of universities in Uganda

Predictor: Level of student mentoring	Type of university	Predicted Statistics on the Dependent variable (Level of student indiscipline)								
		Std Error	Beta	t	Sig.	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	Sig.	Std. Error of Estimate
(Constant)		.635		15.854	.000	.541	.539	87.37	.000	.011
Level of formal mentoring	Public	.033	-.532	-9.795	.000					
	Secular	.032	-.426	-5.267	.000					
Level of informal mentoring	Public	.122	-.393	-3.625	.000					
	Secular	.099	-.211	-2.409	.009					

The level of significance in Table 5 indicates the corresponding F-value ($F = 87.305$) was significant at the .01 level of significance ($Sig. = .000 < .01$). Therefore, the corresponding Adjusted

R-Square value of .539 indicates that the level of student mentoring predicted the level of student indiscipline in all types of universities by a significant 53.9%. These findings indicate that the negative and significant relationship established in Table 4 is predictive. Therefore, a positive change in the level of student mentoring leads to a significant decline in student indiscipline in all the universities, irrespective of their types. Comparative numerical analysis of the magnitudes of the Beta coefficients reveals that formal mentoring was a better predictor of student indiscipline in all the types of universities. For instance, while formal mentoring negatively predicted 53.2% of student indiscipline in public universities (Beta = -.532, $t = -9.795$, Sig. = .000), informal mentoring predicted this indiscipline by 39.3% (Beta = -.393, $t = -3.625$, Sig. = .000). The same applies to the remaining types of universities.

5.0 Discussion and conclusions

The negative and significant relationship established in Table 4 between the level of student mentoring and indiscipline implies that these two variables varied in opposite directions. The fact that the relationship was predictive (Table 5) implies that increasing the level of student mentoring decreases the level of student indiscipline significantly. In other words, the more students in Ugandan universities are mentored, the more their indiscipline is eliminated. In fact, predicting 53.2% implies that mentoring can help eliminate over a half of the degree of indiscipline that occurs in Ugandan universities. These findings support the argument made in the work of Ford (2013), Chitiyo (2012), Parker et al. (2010), Shepard (2009), and Whiston and Quinby (2009) that student mentoring is one of the remedies that can help combat student indiscipline in a significant and sustainable manner. Comparative numerical analysis of the correlations responding to the specific types of universities in Table 4 reveals that the absolute values of the correlations corresponding to public universities were greater than the values corresponding to other types of universities. This suggests that increasing student mentoring decreases student indiscipline more significantly in public universities. Since the highest level of student indiscipline was in public universities (Table 2), these results suggest that these universities can eliminate a significant level of this indiscipline when they mentor their students. The findings in Table 4 and Table 5 reveal that formal mentoring negatively predicted student indiscipline more significantly than informal mentoring did. This suggests that universities can combat student indiscipline more significantly when they focus more on promoting formal than informal student mentoring.

Comparative numerical analysis of the magnitudes of the correlations in Table 4 and the beta coefficients in Table 5 reveals that while all the universities reduce student indiscipline significantly when they promote student mentoring, especially when they focus more on formal mentoring, still it is public universities that get the lion's share of this reduction. The same analysis of the findings in Table 4 reveals that increasing student mentoring while putting more emphasis on formal mentoring reduces non-academic student indiscipline more significantly than it reduces academic indiscipline in all the universities. Since non-academic indiscipline was more committed than academic indiscipline, especially in public universities, the need to promote this kind of student mentoring cannot be overemphasised, more so in public universities. This need is inevitable because Table 3 indicates that while no formal mentoring was conducted in public universities, the level at which it was conducted in private universities with a religious background was low and negligible in private secular universities.

It should be noted that students got involved in most forms of indiscipline deliberately (Table 2). This suggests that they premeditated on their indiscipline before getting involved in it. The findings therefore, support Karanja and Bowen's (2012) observation that most students' unrests are planned.

This suggests that combating student indiscipline in Ugandan universities requires using more of the combined rationale of Glasser's (1999) and Curwin and Mendler's (1997) cognitive theories than the rationale of B.F. Skinner's behavioural modification theory. This means that the student mentoring programme that Ugandan universities need to promote has to adopt the use of persuasive communication to convince the students about how they are expected to behave; ensure that the students are respected and treated with dignity; brought on board when drawing up the rules and a schedule of consequences faced for not adhering to the rules; and ensure that students' needs are deeply understood so as to align them with the quality worlds based on which students can use their freedom and free time at the university as expected by university authorities. These mentoring practices need to be encouraged, since findings in Table 3 indicate that their use is generally negligible, especially in Uganda's public and secular private universities.

6.0 Recommendations

To combat student indiscipline, especially the non-academic indiscipline in a significant manner, the management of all the types of universities in Uganda should promote student mentoring while putting more emphasis on formal mentoring. In particular, the management of public universities should introduce and support formal mentoring programme for their students. The adopted and promoted student mentoring programme should not miss the following:

- a) Persuasive communication of students' code of conduct
- b) Giving students parental advice on how to productively use their freedom and free time at university
- c) Organising and scheduling meetings to deeply understand students' needs so as to help them adjust well to university life

7.0 References

- Agardh, A., Odberg-Pettersson, K. & Ostergren, P. O. (2011). Experience of sexual coercion and risky sexual behaviour among Ugandan university students. *BMC Public Health*, 11:527-545.
- Ahimbisibwe, P. (2015). 13,000 Makerere transcripts held. *Daily Monitor*.
- Andrews, M., & Chilton, F. (2000). Student and mentor perceptions of mentoring effectiveness. *Nurse Education Today*, 20: 555-68.
- Andy, M. (2005). *Student revolt over fee increase at Ugandan university*.
- Asare, K. B. & Adzrolo, B. (2013). *Lecturers', students', and administrators' perception of discipline in the faculty of education, University of Cape Coast, Ghana*.
- Atuhire, T. (2014). *The effectiveness of nuns in the moral formation of girls in catholic founded secondary schools: A case study of Kampala diocese*. Makerere University. M.A Education.
- Bath, T. (2015). *Suspended Nkumba University students in court*. [Online].
- Bear, G. (2011). *Positive psychology and school discipline: Positive is not simply the opposite of punitive*. Available at: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/859022400?accountid=12085>
- Benson, C. A., Morahan, P. S, Richman, R.S., & Sachdeva, A. K. (2002). Effective faculty preceptoring and mentoring during reorganization of an academic medical center. *Medical Teacher*, 24(5), 550-557.
- Byaruhanga, F. K. (2013). *Student power in Africa's higher education: A case of Makerere University*. New York: Routledge
- Charles, C. M. (2008). *Building classroom discipline* (9th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Chitiyo, G. (2012). An assessment of the evidence-base for school-wide positive behaviour support. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 35(1): 1-24.

- Choudhry, V., Agardh, A., Stafström, M., & Östergren, P. O. (2013). Patterns of alcohol consumption and risky sexual behavior: a cross-sectional study among Ugandan university students. *BMC Public Health*, 14:128-143 Available at: <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/14/128>
- Cohen. L. & Cohen. H. (1987) *Disruptive behaviour*. London: Harper & Row.
- Colley, H. (2009). A rough guide to the history of mentoring from a Marxist feminist perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 28 (3): 247-263
- Coppock, M. (2005). Mentoring at-risk Hispanic students in self-esteem, academic growth, and citizenship. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 28: 19-23.
- Curwin, R. L. (2010). Meeting students where they live: Motivation in urban schools. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Curwin, R. L. & Mendler, A. N. (1997). Discipline with dignity: Beyond obedience. *The Education Digest*, 63(4): 11-14.
- Curwin, R. L., Mendler, A.N, & Mendler, B. (2008). *Discipline with dignity: New challenges, new solutions* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Devries, K. M., Allen, E., Child, J.C., Walakira, E., Parkes, J., Elbourne, D., Watts, C., & Naker, D. (2013). *The good school's toolkit to prevent violence against children in Ugandan primary schools: study protocol for a cluster randomised controlled trial*. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3734010/>
- Edwards, O.W. (1998). Helping grankin-grandchildren raised by grandparents: Expanding psychology in the schools. *Psychology in the Schools*, 35: 173-181.
- Etukuri, C. & Mutesi, N. (2012). *Uganda: Who is burning schools?* [Online]. Available at: <http://allafrica.com/stories/201211030011.html>
- Ford, B. (2013). *The relationship between student mentoring programs for at-risk students and discipline referrals and academic achievement*. Goucher College (M.Ed Unpublished dissertation).
- Fulkerson, M. (2007). Description of the intensive in-home family service program. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 26: 31-32.
- Garvey, F. (2011). *What is mentoring and what is coaching?* [Online]. Available at: http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/42873_Garvey.pdf
- Glasser, W. (1999). *Choice theory: A new psychology of personal freedom*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Glenn, C.W. (2013). Cognitive free will learning theory. The 9th International Conference on Cognitive Science. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Science*, 97: 292–298.
- Gottesman, G. & Baer, D. (2004). *College survival*. London: Thomson/Peterson's, 2004
- Guider, J. & Olrich, J. (2012). *Student welfare, good discipline and effective learning policy*. Available at: <http://farrer.nsw.edu.au/files/uploaded/file/Welfare%20&%20Discipline%20%20policy%20update%202012.pdf>
- Halper, E. (2015). *What is behaviour modification?* Available at: <http://www.livestrong.com/article/105661-behavior-modification/>
- Halstead, J. M. (2010). *Debating moral education: Rethinking the role of the modern university*. Available at: <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/411037.article>
- Inzer, L .D. & Crawford, C.B. (2005). A review of formal and informal mentoring: Processes, problems, and design. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 4(1): 31-50.

- Johnson, W.B. (2007). *On being a mentor: A guide for higher education faculty*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Johnston, J. (2013). *Mentoring graduate students*. [Online]. Available at: <http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/mentoring-graduate-students/>
- Kafeero, S. (2014). *Nkumba University closed over students' strike*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.monitor.co.ug/News/National/Nkumba-University-closed-over-students--strike/-/688334/2527800/-/o83bavz/-/index.html>
- Kaiser, B. & Rasminsky, J.S. (2010). *Time-out, punishment, and time-away*. Available at: <http://www.education.com/reference/article/time-out-punishment-time-away/>
- Karanja, R., & Bowen, M. (2012). *Student indiscipline and academic performance in public schools in Kenya*. CRP Working Paper No. DU/2012/002. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.daystar.ac.ke/downloads/working-papers/Working%20Paper%20002.pdf>
- Kimuli, P. (2011). Freshers brace yourselves. *The Observer*. [Online]. Available at: <http://observer.ug/lifestyle/humour-sp-683169036/14738-pablo-freshers-brace-yourselfes>
- Kiyonga, D. (2015). *Court halts suspension of striking Nkumba University students*. Available at: from <http://www.observer.ug/education/85-education/36187--court-halts-suspension-of-striking-nkumba-university-students>
- Kumar, A. (2008). *Indiscipline among the students*. Available at: <http://www.articlesfactory.com/articles/education/indiscipline-among-the-students.html>
- Kuyper-Rushing, L. (2001). A formal mentoring program in a university library: Components of a successful experiment. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 27(6): 77-93.
- Kwagala, M. (2014). Challenges faced by working students: Balancing career development with marriage, family life and job demands. *Ndejje University Magazine*, 5: 7-8.
- Loyd, B. (2005). The effects of reality therapy/choice theory principles on high school students' perceptions of needs satisfaction and behaviour change. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 25: 5-9.
- Mbabazi, G. K. & Bagaya, J. (2013). Guidance-counselling strategies and conformity with code of conduct in secondary schools in Gulu municipality, Uganda. *International Journal of Education*, 5(2): 39-53.
- Mehra, D., Agardh, A., Stafstrom, M. & Ostergren, P. (2014). Is drinking alcohol associated with sexual coercion among Ugandan university students: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Reproductive Health*, 11(7): 33-57.
- Mwesigwa, F. S. (2015). *University students should use dialogue, not violent strikes*. Available at: <http://www.monitor.co.ug/OpEd/Commentary/University-students-dialogue-violent-strikes/-/689364/2670090/-/vbm9j/-/index.html>
- Ninsiima, R. (2013). *Uganda: Drug use on the rise - health experts*. [Online]. Available at: <http://allafrica.com/stories/201301151322.html>
- Njoroge, P. M., & Nyabuto, A. N. (2014). Discipline as a factor in academic performance in Kenya. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 1(4): 289-208
- Nsereko, N. D., Musisi, S., Nakigudde, J. & Ssekiwu, D. (2014). Psychosocial problems and development of psychopathology among Ugandan university students. *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology*, 3(3): 3-16.
- Oliver, K. (2006). *Choice theory central*. Available at: <http://www.choicetheorycentral.com/>
- Olley, R. I., Cohn, A. & Cowan, K.C. (2010). *Promoting safe schools and academic success: Moving your school from punitive discipline to effective discipline*. Available at: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/751876316?accountid=12085>

- Osher, D., Bear, G. G., Sprague, J. R. & Doy, W. (2010). *How can we improve school discipline?* Available at: <http://www.isbe.state.il.us/learningsupports/climate/pdfs/imp-discipline-osher.pdf>
- Parker, D. C., Nelson, J. S. & Burns, M. K. (2010). Comparison of correlates of classroom behaviour problems in schools with and without a school-wide character education program. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(8): 817-827.
- Patterson, T. A. & Korf, M. J. (2013). *The power of informal mentoring programs*. Available at: <http://home.innsofcourt.org/for-members/current-members/the-bencher/recent-bencher-articles/marchapril-2013/the-power-of-informal-mentoring-programs.aspx>
- Peterson, J. (2001). Successful adults who were once adolescent underachievers. *The Gifted Child Quarterly*, 45(4): 236-250.
- Pita, M., Ramirez, C., Joacin, V., Prentice, S., & Clarke, C. (2013). Five effective strategies for mentoring undergraduates: students' perspectives. *CUR Quarterly*, 33(3): 10-15
- Poehlmann, J. (2005). Children's family environments and intellectual outcomes during maternal incarceration. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67: 1275-1285.
- Rozakis, L. (2001). *The complete idiot's guide to college survival*. London: Alpha Books.
- Saasi, M. (2015). *Nkumba eats humble pie! Rescinds the 8 students' suspension as court adjourns case*. Available at: <http://campusbee.ug/campus-news-in-uganda-makerere-university-kyambogo-university-iuiu-ucu-nkumba-university-mbarara-university/nkumba-eats-humble-pie-rescinds-8-students-suspension-court-adjourns-case>
- Schacter, D. L., & Gilbert, D. (2011). *Psychology*. (2nd Ed.). New York: Worth Publishers
- Shepard, J. (2009). Campus kids mentoring program: Fifteen years of success. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 18(3): 38-43.
- Solter, A. (2014). *The disadvantages of time-out*. Available at: <http://www.awareparenting.com/timeout.htm>
- Tannenberg, M. (2014). *Role of universities in the fight against corruption*. Issue No. 343. Available at: <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20141113110707222>
- Taylor, C. P. (2013). The need for redemptive discipline in the Christian school. *Christian Perspectives in Education*, 6(1): 1-9.
- Walukamba, A. G. (2015). *Busoga University students strike*. [Online]. Retrieved on April 12, 2015 from <http://ugandaradionetwork.com/a/story.php?s=72072>
- Wamai, M. (2013). *Inter-university dialogue on strikes calls for calm*. [Online]. Available at: <http://news.mak.ac.ug/2013/12/inter-university-dialogue-strikes-calls-calm>
- Whiston, S. C. & Quinby, R. F. (2009). Review of school counselling outcome research. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46 (3): 267-272.
- Zachary, L.J. (2000). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating learning relationships*. London: Jossey-Bass.