Roles of Lecturers in Managing Students’ Behaviour in Rivers State Tertiary Institution

Dr. Allagoa, Inara

Department of Education Management,
Faculty of Education,
Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

ABSTRACT
The study examined the roles of lecturers in managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions. The research adopted a descriptive survey design. Two research questions were posed to guide the study and two hypotheses tested. The population for the study was 1,558 lecturers drawn from the four Rivers State tertiary institutions. The systematic random sampling technique was used to derive a sample size of 350 lecturers used for the study. The instrument used for data collection was a structured questionnaire titled “Roles of Lecturers in Managing Students Behaviour Questionnaire” (RLMSBQ). The instrument was validated by two experts from the Department Education Management and one from Measurement and Evaluation, all of Faculty of Education, Rivers State University. Data retrieved were analyzed using mean for the research questions and t-test for the hypotheses. The results obtained indicated that lecturers poorly perform their roles of planning and controlling academic activities for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions. Thus, the study recommended that government and other regulating bodies should ensure that lecturers are effectively performing their supervisory role over students as this will in turn rob off positively on student’s behaviour.
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INTRODUCTION
Behaviour management is similar to behaviour modification. It is a less intensive version of behaviour therapy. While behaviour modification deals with changing behaviour, behaviour management deals with maintaining order. Behaviour management skills are of particular importance to teachers in the education system. The act of managing behaviour includes all actions and conscious inactions that enhances the probability that people, individually and in groups, choose behaviours which are personally fulfilling, productive and socially acceptable (Elemukan & Umeh, 2015). In achieving this great feat of acceptable change or managing behaviour, the teacher is required to play a major role. It is expected that the teacher brings to bear his wealth of experience in order to manage student’s behaviour.

Lecturers are academic staff of universities and other post-secondary institutions. They are responsible for teaching students and are often referred as teacher. The teacher in the education process occupies an indispensable position and is a recognized academic leader with potentials to determine the nature, scope and content of learning (Koko, 2001). Azizah (2015) opined that a good teacher is one who helps the student to learn; He or she contributes to this in a number of ways. The teacher’s role goes well beyond information giving, with the teacher having a range of key roles to play in the education process. Victor, Victor, Noelia, Almudena and Anabel (2016) asserted that lecturers are key players when it comes to helping or hindering students throughout the teaching/learning process. The roles of teachers as recounted by Koko (2001) include;
1. Director of learning: Teachers must have a thorough understanding of the nature and principles of learning; effective teaching methods; curriculum development; testing techniques as well as measurement of learning outcomes.

2. Counsellor and Confidant: Teachers must understand the psychology of learners and play parental roles in order to motivate learners to participate in earning.

3. Role Model: Teachers should be disciplined and be good role models worthy of emulation to the extent that their good character should rob off on learners.

Teacher roles state the position that teachers have in a society, schools, classrooms and the ways they are expected to behave in a relationship with students and other related persons. Azizah (2015) identified twelve roles of lecturers, which are grouped into six categories: the information provider, the role model, the facilitator, the assessor, the planner and the resource developer. In achieving the set objective of any education process, the lecturer/teacher must ensure active implementation of their roles putting into consideration that managing a classroom is a challenge. Many factors have to be taken into consideration while planning and preparing for a new class of students. Priya, Srikumar and John (2016) asserted that having a clear and consistent classroom management plan with an understanding of how the teacher will behave, the beliefs, the rules and strategies, are crucial in the running and organization of a classroom in order for all children to learn and succeed to the best of their ability. According to Wong and Wong (2009) an effective teacher often becomes a professional leader who thinks, reflects and implements; this leadership role has several qualities that will help to oversee the running of a classroom. Some of these qualities might include having plans, goals and vision, motivates and inspires others, works well with others, well prepared, passionate about what they are doing and focused.

**Statement of the Problem**

Lecturers play important role in the process of education. Thus it is important that lecturers are effectively trained so that they can facilitate student’s behaviour in the best possible manner. For this purpose, lecturers undergo different teacher training programmes as they are continually been confronted with several challenges especially in managing students behaviour. In real classroom situations, teachers come across numerous behaviour problems. Observations show that students in most Rivers State tertiary institutions put up several unacceptable behaviours and it lies in the onus of the lecturer to guide and build students towards positive behaviour. Tiwari and Pawar (2014) asserted that there are various behaviour problems which includes; bullying, fighting, teasing, stealing, truancy, disobedience and insubordination, lying, cheating, lateness, rudeness, destructiveness, drug or alcohol addiction, etc. These are common behaviour problems amongst students of Rivers State tertiary institutions. Does this mean lecturers are poorly performing their roles?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the roles of lecturers in managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions. Specifically the study sought to:

1. Ascertain the extent to which academic activities are planned by lecturers for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions.
2. Ascertain the extent to which academic activities are controlled by lecturers for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

1. To what extent are academic activities planned by lecturers for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions?
2. To what extent are academic activities controlled by lecturers for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions?

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the respondents on extent to which academic activities are planned for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the respondents on extent to which academic activities are controlled for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions.
METHODOLOGY
The descriptive survey research design was adopted for this study. The population for the study was 519 lecturers of Rivers State University, 439 lecturers of Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, 350 lecturers of Kenule Benson Polytechnic and 250 lecturers of Port Harcourt Polytechnic; Thus, a total population size of 1,558 lecturers drawn from the four Rivers State tertiary institutions were used for the study. The systematic random sampling technique was used to derive a sample size of 350 lecturers used for the study. The instrument used for data collection was a structured questionnaire titled “Roles of Lecturers in Managing Students Behaviour Questionnaire” (RLMSBQ). The instrument provided response to the two research questions with 10 items; Item 1-5 answering research question one and item 6-10 answering research question two in a 4-point rating scale weighted, “Very High Extent” (VHE) – 4 points, “High Extent” (HE) – 3 points, “Low Extent” (LE) – 2 points and “Very Low Extent” (VLE) – 1 point for all items. To establish the validity of the instrument, the questionnaire was subjected to face and content validity by three experts; two from the Department of Educational Management and one from Measurement and Evaluation, all of Faculty of Education in Rivers State University. To ensure the consistency of the instrument, the Cronbach alpha method was used to establish a reliability coefficient of .82. 275 copies of the questionnaire only, were retrieved and used for the study. This represents 73 per cent of the total distributed. The data analysis was done using the mean to analyze the research questions while t-test was used to test the hypothesis. The mean was obtained by the summation of all responses as assigned to a rating scale in an item divided by the total number of responses: 4+3+2+1/4 = 2.50. The mean score of 2.50 and above was accepted, while those below 2.50 were rejected.

RESULTS
Research Question 1
To what extent are academic activities planned by lecturers for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions?

Table 1: Mean rating on extent to which academic activities are planned by lecturers for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/n</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>University (N=150)</th>
<th>Polytechnic (N=125)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Class activities are regularly planned by lecturers.</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Extra-curricular activities are planned by lecturers.</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Student’s accommodations are planned by lecturers.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Student’s facility usage is planned by lecturers.</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Student’s time schedules are planned by lecturers.</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total mean/SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand mean/SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2019

The data in Table 1 shows that the respondents rated the 5 items in the table low in terms of planning academic activities for managing student’s behaviour. Thus, it indicates that class activities, extra-curricular activities, student’s accommodation, student’s facility usage and time scheduling in Rivers State tertiary institutions are poorly planned by lecturers to an extent. The grand mean of 1.48 for
university lecturers and 1.60 for polytechnic lecturers is a clear indication that academic activities for managing student’s behaviour are poorly planned in the tertiary institutions studied.

**Research Question 2:** To what extent are academic activities controlled by lecturers for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions?

**Table 2:** Mean rating on extent to which academic activities are controlled by lecturers for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/n</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>University (N=150)</th>
<th>Polytechnic (N=125)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Students who cause disturbance are punished by lecturers.</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Lecturers checkmate/regulate student’s social functions.</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Lecturers inspect and supervise student’s lodges.</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Student’s use of social networking sites and other facilities are regulated by lecturers.</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Lecturers discipline students for failure to keep to scheduled time.</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total mean/SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand mean/SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.92</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey Data, 2019*

The data in Table 2 shows that the respondents rated the 5 items in the table low in terms of controlling academic activities for managing student’s behaviour. Thus, it indicates that the respondents did not agree that students who cause disturbance are punished by lecturers; lecturers checkmate/regulate student’s social functions; lecturers inspect and supervise student’s lodges; student’s use of social networking sites and other facilities are regulated by lecturers and that lecturers discipline students for failure to keep to scheduled time in Rivers State tertiary institutions. The grand mean of 1.54 for university lecturers and 1.69 for polytechnic lecturers is a clear indication that academic activities for managing student’s behaviour are poorly controlled in the tertiary institutions studied.

**Hypothesis 1**

There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the respondents on extent to which academic activities are planned for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions.

**Table 3:** t-test result of the difference in mean ratings of the respondents on extent to which academic activities are planned by lecturers for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$Df$</th>
<th>L/Significance</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>t-tab</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey Data, 2019*
The data in Table 3 shows that at 5% level of significance with 273 degree of freedom, the calculated t value of 1.24 is less than the table value of 1.96. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, meaning that there is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the respondents on extent to which academic activities are planned for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions.

Hypothesis 2
There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the respondents on extent to which academic activities are controlled for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions.

Table 4: t-test result of the difference in mean ratings of the respondents on extent to which academic activities are controlled for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>L/Significance</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>t-tab</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2019

The data in Table 4 shows that at 5% level of significance with 273 degree of freedom, the calculated t value of 1.73 is less than the table value of 1.96. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, meaning that there is no significant difference in the mean ratings of the respondents on extent to which academic activities are controlled for managing student’s behaviour in Rivers State tertiary institutions.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS
One of the findings of this study was that planning of academic activities by lecturers for managing student’s behaviour is low which indicates that class activities, extra-curricular activities, student’s accommodation, student’s facility usage and time scheduling in Rivers State tertiary institutions are poorly planned by lecturers to an extent. This finding does not align with that of Azizah (2015) who see a teacher as one who helps the student to learn and contributes to this in a number of ways. The teacher’s role goes well beyond information giving, with the teacher having a range of key roles to play in the education process. Teachers, especially in public tertiary institutions must leave up to expectation and fulfill their roles as guardians.

The study also revealed that the controlling of academic activities by lecturers for managing student’s behaviour is low which indicates students who cause disturbance are rarely/not punished by lectures; lecturers rarely/do not checkmate/regulate student’s social functions; lecturers rarely/do not inspect and supervise student’s lodges; student’s use of social networking sites and other facilities are rarely/not regulated by lecturers and that lecturers rarely/do not discipline students for failure to keep to scheduled time. This finding agrees with Tiwari and Pawar (2014) who asserted that there are various behaviour problems which includes; bullying, fighting, teasing, stealing, truancy, disobedience and insubordination, lying, cheating, lateness, rudeness, destructiveness, drug or alcohol addiction, etc. which these students exhibit as a result of lack of control.

CONCLUSION
Lecturers play important roles in the process of education and needs to be effectively trained to perform their duties. A lecturer is an information provider, role model, facilitator, assessor, planner and the resource developer. However, lecturers in Rivers State tertiary institutions ignore most of the roles they are expected to play; putting up the “Laissez-faire” attitude.
RECOMMENDATION
Based on the findings above, the researcher recommended that government and other regulating bodies should ensure that lecturers are effectively performing their supervisory roles over students as this will in turn rob off positively on student’s behaviour.
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