FACTORS INFLUENCING STUDENTS UNREST IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON THE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS IN UNIVERSITY OF UYO, AKWA IBOM STATE, NIGERIA

Abstract: Nigerians have for some time been disturbed by the alarming rate at which students’ unrest in Nigerian institutions of higher learning have led to destruction of lives and property and untimely interruption of the planned academic programmes. On the basis of the above exposition, the project examined the concept of students’ unrest, factors that influence students’ unrest and its implication on the academic performance of students. A survey research design was adopted and a fifteen items questionnaire entitled "Factors Influencing Students’ Unrest in Institutions of Higher Learning Questionnaire" (FISUIHLQ), was used to collect the data needed for analysis. Percentage, frequency count, and mean model were used to analyze the data collected. Items that fall between 0.50-1.49 mean score were considered Very Low, items that fall between 1.50-2.49 mean score were considered Low, items that fall between 2.50-3.49 mean score were considered Moderate, Items that fall between 3.50-4.49 mean score were considered High, while items that fall between mean scores of 4.50-5.00 were considered Very High. The study, therefore, discovered that breaking of rules and regulations, lack of social amenities and students involvement in cultism were seen as 'High' with mean scores of 2.60, 3.71 and 4.16 respectively, that is, they are serious factors that can influence students unrest in institutions of higher learning. While effective students’ union body and periodic strike by staff of the institution were seen as 'Low' with mean score of 2.21 and 1.96 respectively, that is, they are less serious factors that can influence students’ unrest. Also, it was discovered that disrupts of academic programmes, closure of schools, lecturers not unable to cover syllabus, and brain drain syndrome are the implications of students unrest with mean scores of 3.70,2.84,4.06,2.96 respectively were seen as ‘High’, that is, they are serious implication of students’ unrest. The best practices that should be observed by school authorities for effective control of students unrest were the use of dialogue, training of school administrators on crisis management, and presence of adequate infrastructure on campuses. Institutional heads would find the proposed recommendations as effective antidotes for effective control of students' unrest in Nigerian institutions of higher learning.
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Introduction

Students unrest has become a common phenomenon in institutions of higher learning since independence, even though it earliest manifestation was pre-independence (Aluede, 1999). The phenomenon has come to be a receiving socio-political problem in Nigerian history. In recent times, students' unrest has acquired national scale and mobilization capacity that they constitute serious threat to the political authority and national security. (Ikelegbe, 1992 and Onwuejeogwu, 1992)

Students' unrest in the institutions of higher learning is prevalent in recent years. In the words of Aluede and Aluede (1999), students' unrest is caused by many factors such as welfare problems which arises in the form of lack of electricity and pipe borne water, inadequate facilities for learning lack of proper motivation on the part of lecturers and facilitators. This unrest occurs in the form of riot demonstration, protest, boycotts, harassment, strike etc. Today students' unrest has been recognized as one of the most visible perennial problems of significance in Nigerian institutions of higher learning. Thus if there is anything predictable among students of higher institutions of learning, it is the fact that they will riot in any academic session. As a result, there is incessant closure of schools, which adversely affect the coverage of the curriculum in a given academic session.

In Nigeria, there was the grand heritage of the activities and ideas of Solanke’s West African Students' Union (WASU) and the nationalist anti-imperialist stance of the union of Nigerian students' in Great Britain and Ireland against colonial rule in Nigeria. This was before Nigeria gained independence but immediately after independence, Nigeria witnessed a lot of students' unrest which is still ongoing sporadically, Aluede and Aluede (1999).

The factors that influence students unrest in institutions of higher learning and its implications on academic performance of students is a topic that should attract the attention of well-meaning Nigerians and managers of education in particular. Davies (1999) asserted that between the years 1990 and 2000, not less than one hundred students' unrest were recorded in the various institutions of higher learning in the country. By this time, the situation of students' unrest in the higher institutions had become more intolerable. The drive to leave Nigerian educational institutions for foreign ones and even the local private institutions of higher learning had become for many the solution to the decay of the institutions and the demoralization of students. According to Davies, most students derive joy in such unrest for some reasons thus:

In the first instance, some students see the unrest as an opportunity to go on a holiday in order to ease academic tension. Furthermore, some other students view the unrest as an ample opportunity to escape from the tight economic situation on the campuses, restraining their feeding habit to a coded expression of 1-0-1, 0-1-1, and 1-1-0 as the case may be. Again, others see it as an avenue to settle scores and to vent their anger on those lecturers whose courses they are “carrying over”.

In most cases, the resultant implications of students' unrest are usually drastic. In the process, innocent lives are lost, properties worth millions of naira are destroyed and the welled planned academic calendar is usually sadly and untimely interrupted.
Worse still, when institutions are open for academic activities, they often implore crash academic programme approach in order to cover the course outline for the semester. It must be noted that the crash academic programme which often follows the re-opening of the institutions after the students’ unrest has raised a lot of suspicious questions about the value and the creditability of academic certificates obtained in any Nigerian institutions of higher learning in the view and perspective of scholars in the developed countries. (Albatch, P.G and R. Cohen 1990)

It is on the basis of the above exposition that the project proposes to further explore the factors that influence students’ unrest in Nigerian institutions of higher learning and propose measures to curtail them.

**Statement of the Problem**

Over the years the general performance of graduates in Nigerian universities has been on the decline (Ahmed, 1998). Employers of labor often times do not consider them employable. They tend to refer to them as ‘half baked’ graduate because they have to undergo series of training and teaching to be able to perform up to standard. This trend continues to pose a lot of challenges to these institutions of higher learning as their competence continues to be questioned. Often times, the above situation result from several factors among which is students’ unrest and its attendant problems.

This study attempts to determine what factors influence students' unrest in Nigerian institutions of higher learning and how this phenomenon leads to decline in the academic performance of students.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this research is to investigate into the factors that cause students unrest in institutions of higher learning and its implications on the academic performance of students.

The fact remains that students' unrest is an educational problem facing the Nation today; more problems have been created in an attempt to solve this unhealthy phenomenon.

This study is therefore significant in that it will examine and hopefully reveal the factors that influence student’s unrest and its implications on academic performance of students and make recommendations on how best to reduce their occurrences so as to create a conducive atmosphere for learning.

This study did not in any way investigate the problems that lead to student’s unrest in the primary and secondary schools in Uyo rather it is restricted to an institution of higher learning in Uyo. Indeed the University of Uyo is selected to be the case study.

**Research Questions**

1. What factors influence students' unrest in institutions of higher learning?
2. What are the implications of students' unrest on the academic performance of students in institution of higher learning?
3. What measures can be put in place to minimize the occurrence of students’ unrest in institutions of higher learning?

**Theoretical Framework: The Theory of Cognitive Dissonance**

According to Festinger (1957), people strive to achieve a state of equilibrium among various attitudes (or learned predisposition to persons, situations or things) and behavior. This is because people prefer consistency or consonance to inconsistency or dissonance. Therefore, wherever people have a thought that is not consistent with their behavior, they experience cognitive dissonance and are motivated to seek means of restoring equilibrium (Sprint Hall and Sprint Hall, 1997).

Cognitive dissonance is considered to be a motivating force that gives rise to behavior designed to reduce dissonance. Cognitive dissonance begins with dislike for inconsistency between attitudes and behaviors (Le François, 1996). When such conditions (inconsistency between behaviors and attitudes arise, people experience an unpleasant state known as dissonance.

Festinger (1997) reasoned that one’s perceptions of one’s own state of fear could be a cognitive element analogous to one’s knowledge of some outside objectives (Buck 1996). To him, dissonance exists between two cognitive elements if considering these two alone; the obverse of one element could follow from the other. Thus if one cognitive element implies the other, they are said to be consonant with one another. If one cognitive element implies nothing about the other, they are said to be irrelevant to one another.

Broadening this theory, Iglitzin (cited in Ehiametalor, 1999) Keniston (1968) opined that students' perception of themselves reflect cultural values of their parents. Reinforcing this position, Ehiametalor (1979), Keniston (1998) and Wood (1994) maintained that for those from radical families, the process of radicalization involves a return to the fundamental values of the family.

A critical look at the incidents of student’s unrest in Nigerian universities shows that student’s unrest results from the conventional cultural values of parents and the society. Activism therefore arises because of the inconsistency between students’ belief and the roles they are made to perform in the home, schools and society.

**The Theory of Relative Deprivation**

Relative deprivation is a gap between what people get (value capability, such as, social status, welfare etc) and what they perceive they should get (value expectations). The essence of this theory according to Davies cited in Onwuejeogwu, 1992 is that once people’s standards of living have started to improve, their level of expectation rises. If improvement in actual condition deepens, the urge to revolt emerges because of expectations that are not met and frustration sets in. This theory assumes that once deprivation is removed; a state of normalcy will emerge.

To social psychologists, relative deprivation can be so intensively felt and widespread that it can degenerate with little catalysis into mass demonstration, violence and political instability. Relative deprivation according to Dollard cite in Ikelegbe, 1992 is particularly so when the
rising expectations coincide with the falling socio-economic capabilities to satisfy them. This problem is further compounded when a period of economic and social development accompanied by subsidies, high standard of living, is also followed by economic hardship that destroys previous gains. Such a situation provides a fertile ground for social unrest, riot and even revolution (Ikelegbe, 1992).

As posited by the theorists of relative deprivation, it is not changes and deteriorations in socio-economic conditions that bring about riots, but the widespread individuals or group perception of deteriorating economic conditions. When the perception begins to give rise to frustration, mass discontent, disillusionment, etc, then the possibility of public uprising or protest is heightened (Ikelegbe, 1992). It is along this line that Aluede (1995), Aluede and Aluede (1999) and Onyejiaku (1991) provided a picture of what triggers students’ unrest in Nigerian universities. According to them the self is highly vulnerable to the frustrations of life obstacles and threats in the environment may cause an individual’s frustration. Whether these obstacles are in the form of persons or objects, the individual reacts to some external figures directly in other to ward them off and reduces anxiety of feeling of guilt. In other situations, the individual may not be capable enough or it may not be convenient for him/her to express his/her aggressive behavior satisfactorily against the source of this frustration.

A cursory look at the antecedent factors in students’ unrest in Nigerian universities reveals that most entering freshmen have extremely high hopes regarding the freedom of speech and actions which they will be able to exercise during their university life. These hopes according to Ehiametalor (1999) can be explicated as follows;

I. Students expect that they participate in the governance of their institution; and
II. Students expect that they may be provided with good learning/ teaching facilities, improved living conditions and other welfare amenities (provided by school authorities).

These beliefs remain in the student throughout campus life. Since activists are particularly responsive to these issues; they are apt to tolerate dissolution less highly and to take to unconventional means to concretize their dashed hopes (Keniston, 1997).

The Theory of Campus Ecology

The concept of campus ecology was popularized by Banning (1998) to describe the interaction between the college students and the campus environment. It is devoted to promoting maximum personal growth (Banning, 1980). It does not rule out or even de-emphasize the concern for the individual student, but it does bring to focus the concept of campus environment.

A major contribution of campus ecological perspective to the analysis of students’ unrest is a systematic and comprehensive consideration of the campus environment (Banning and Mckinley, 1998; Brown, 1992). Banning and Mckinley (1998) in applying Moo’s system of environmental analysis dimensions;

i. Geographical, meteorological, architectural and physical design element;
ii. Institutional and organizational structures;
iii. Combined personal and behavioral characteristics of community members;
iv. Setting within the environment that shape behaviors;
v. The relationship between the psycho social characteristics of faculty, staff and students and
vi. A functional analysis of the environment.

A quick look at the factor in campus unrest in Nigerian universities reveals that some are ecological in nature. In Nigeria for example, the introduction of the structural adjustment programme in 1986, the withdrawal of subsidy from petroleum and allied products in 1988, 1994 and 2012, and the deregulation of the currency in 1992, are among the emerging values that have influenced students unrest in Nigerian universities in recent years (Aluede, 1995; Aluede and Aluede 1999; Nwokwule, 1992).

METHODOLOGY

This section deals with the description of the procedure used in conducting this study and in analyzing the data collected. This includes the design of the study, population, sampling techniques, description of instruments used and method of data analysis.

Research Area

The study was carried out in the University of Uyo. The University of Uyo was founded in 1991 by the Federal Government of Nigeria. At the time, there existed in Uyo the University of Cross River State which was established in 1983 by the then Cross River State Government. The University is located in the heart of Uyo, capital of Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Uyo is accessible by road and there are two International Airport within 100km radius - the Margaret Ekpo International Airport, Calabar, Cross River State and the Ibom International Airport in Uyo, Akwa Ibom State. The University of Uyo has 12 faculties which are: Agriculture, Art, Basic Medical Science, Business Administration, Clinical Science, Education, Engineering, Environmental, Law, Pharmacy, Science, Social Science. The University runs a multi-campus system namely: the Main Campus, the Town Campus and Annex Campus, the College of Health Sciences Campus and the Ime Umanah Campus.

Research Design

The design of this study was a survey design in which the factors that influence students’ unrest in institutions of higher learning and its implication on the academic performance of students were investigated. An instrument was developed which contained 15 items and was used for gathering information from respondents. The responses from the questionnaire were analyzed using Simple Percentage and Frequency Distribution and Mean Model with a view to answering the three research questions as stated above in order to achieve the objectives of the study.

Study Population and Sampling Techniques

The population of the study consisted of students from Faculty of Social Science, Education and Business Administration in University of Uyo. The total numbers of students in these faculties were 15000, out of which 450 students were sample. The method of sampling applied in this case was simple random sampling. This is a process whereby every member of the population has an equal chance of being selected in order to eliminate the possibility of being biased.
Research Instrument

The tool employed for this research study was a questionnaire titled "Factors Influencing Students’ Unrest in Institution of Higher Learning Questionnaire" (FISUIHLQ). The questionnaire had 15 items. The instrument was written in a simple language in order to facilitate comprehension by the respondents. The respondents were required to tick (√) the one that best represents their views as it applies to them in each of the item. There were five alternatives, the alternatives are; Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Indifferent (I), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). Expert in this area namely lecturers, supervisors etc validated the instrument. The questionnaires were designed to find out the factor that influence students' unrest in institutions of higher learning and its implication on the academic performance of students. The questionnaire was divided into two parts namely; part one which is the demographic-data and part two which had three sections with five items each. Each section was therefore used to answer the three research question raised above.

Data Collection

In the course of this research, the questionnaire was used to enable the researcher obtain information needed. However secondary data such as text books, academic journals, information booklets, etc, were used to supplement the so data collected. The questionnaire was administrated personally and the researcher collected the completed questionnaire. In situation where the respondents could not provide answers on the spot, the researcher had to go back to collect them while in some other cases they were collected and never returned.

Method of Data Analysis

Data collected from the field survey were descriptively analyzed using simple percentage and frequency distribution models to measure demographic factors of the respondents while research questions one to three were analyzed using mean model with a five – point rating scale structured questionnaire with options of (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Indifferent (2) Disagree and (1) Strongly Disagree was used to elicit responses from the respondents.

The simple percentage and frequency distribution model was computed using the formula thus;

\[
\frac{X \times 100}{Y} \times \frac{1}{1}
\]

Where 
- X= Total number of respondents per – option (question)
- Y= Total number of respondents.

While the mean was computed using the formula below;

\[
\bar{X} = \frac{\sum x}{n}
\]

Where 
- X = Mean
- \sum = Summation
- x = Nominal Value (Variable)
- n = Total number of respondents
Table 1: Mean Interpretation guideline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMINAL VALUE</th>
<th>RANGE OF MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>SCALING STATEMENT (Remark)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.50 – 5.00</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50 – 4.49</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50 – 3.49</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50 – 2.49</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50 – 1.49</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATA ANALYSIS

This section presents the data analysis and interpretations gathered from the field survey. Four hundred and fifty (450) questionnaires were distributed to respondents. Only three hundred and sixty seven (367) questionnaires were filled and returned representing 81.5% response rate.

Demographic Factors of the Respondents

Gender of Respondents

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents Based on Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency (n=367)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field survey, November 2014.

Table 2 indicates that 189(51.5%) of the respondents were male while 178(48.5%) of the respondents were female. This implies that majority of the respondents were male.

Age of Respondents

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents Based on Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency (n=367)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 25 years</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30 years</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 years and above</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field survey, November 2014.

Table 3 shows that 133(36.2%) of the respondents were between the ages 16 - 20 years old. 108(29.4%) of the respondents were within the age range of 21 – 25 years, while 91(24.9%) of the respondents were within the age range of 26 – 30 years and 35(9.5%) of the respondents were 31 years and above. This implies that majority of the respondents’ age ranges from 16 – 20 years.
Faculties of Respondents

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents Based on their Faculties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency (n=367)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>367</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: field survey, November 2014.*

Table 4 reveals that 201(54.8%) of the respondents were from Faculty of Education. 50(13.6%) of the respondents were from the Faculty of Social Sciences, while 116(31.6%) of the respondents were from the Faculty of Business Administration. This implies that the majority of the respondents were from the Faculty of Education.

Class Level of Respondents

Table 5: Distribution of Respondents Based on Class Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency (n=367)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 Level</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Level</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Level</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Level</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>367</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: field survey, November 2014.*

Table 5 reveals that 101(27.5%) of the respondents are in 100 level in their respective faculties. 126(34.3%) of the respondents are in 200 level from their respective faculties, while 78(21.3%) of the respondents are in 300 level from their respective faculties and 62(16.9%) of the respondents are in 400 level from their respective faculties. This implies that the majority of the respondents are in their second year in school and will therefore tend to understand the questions and answer them very well.

Research Question One

Determinant Factors that Influence Students’ Unrest in Institutions of Higher Learning

Table 6: Mean calculation of respondents based on factors that influence students’ unrest in institutions of higher learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>FX</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student union is a very effective body in your institution.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Breaking of acceptable rules and regulations cause students’ unrest in institutions of higher learning.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The lack of social amenities on</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the campus can be responsible for students’ unrest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Periodic strike by staff creates an atmosphere for students’ unrest.</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>161</th>
<th>147</th>
<th>718</th>
<th>367</th>
<th>1.96</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cultism can lead to students’ unrest.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field survey, November 2014.

Table 6 clearly shows determinant factors that influence students’ unrest in institutions of higher learning. In the Table above, it is observed that the tendency of Students Union as an effective body that influences students’ unrest on campus is ‘low’ with a mean score of 2.21.

Breaking of rules and regulations by the students was observed on the Table above as oftentimes not to cause or influence students unrest on campus with a mean score of 2.60 ‘Moderate’.

Table 6 shows that the tendency to influence/cause students’ unrest by lack of social amenities on campus is ‘high’ with a mean score of 3.71.

The Table above also reveals that periodic strikes by staff of higher institutions does not constitute a factor influencing students’ unrest on campus with a mean score of 1.96 ‘low’.

Table 6 clearly reveals that the tendency of cultism to influence students’ unrest on campus is ‘high’ with a mean score of 4.16.

Research Question Two

The Implications of Students’ Unrest on the Academic Performance of Students in Institutions of Higher Learning

Table 7: Mean calculation of respondents based on implications of students’ unrest on the academic performance of students in institutions of higher learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>FX</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students’ unrest disrupts academic programmes and causes students to spend longer time with less zeal to pursue their programmes.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Closure of schools as a result of students’ unrest causes students to loose interest in their studies.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>As a result of students’ unrest, lecturers may not cover the syllabus leading to poor academic performance of students.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students’ unrest encourages brain drain which may cause</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the unrest, student may not have the zeal to go back to school which affects their academics aspirations.

Table 7 reveals that students’ unrest actually disrupts academic programmes and causes students to spend longer time with less zeal to pursue their programmes with a mean score of 3.70 ‘high’.

It also shows that the level of effect on students’ performance by closure of schools as a result of students’ unrest is ‘moderate’ with a mean score of 2.84.

The Table above further reveals that the level of effect on students’ performance by the inability of the lecturers to cover the syllabus as a result of students’ unrest is ‘high’ with a mean score of 4.06.

It was also observed that brain drain among lecturers is not completely but partially caused by students’ unrest on campus with a mean score of 2.96 ‘moderate’.

Table 7 indicates that the aftermath of students’ unrest on campus does not attribute to students failure to return back to school which oftentimes affects their academic performance with a mean score of 2.36 ‘low’.

Research Question Three

Measures that can be put in Place to Minimize the Occurrence of Students’ Unrest in Institutions of Higher Learning

Table 8: Mean calculation of respondents based on measures that can be put in place to minimize the occurrence of students’ unrest in institutions of higher learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>FX</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Using dialogue can solve the problem of students’ unrest.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rustication of erring students after unrest helps in solving the problem that brought about the crisis.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training of school administrators on crisis management can reduce the occurrence of unrest in institutions of higher learning.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presence of adequate infrastructure on campuses can reduce students’ unrest in institutions of higher learning.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adequate funding by the government and corporate bodies can reduce students’ unrest.

Table 8 indicates that dialogue remains the best measure by which students unrest can be checked or prevented with the mean score of 4.01 ‘high’.

The Table above also shows that training of school administrators on crisis management and provision of adequate infrastructures on campus cannot completely, but partially aid in minimizing students’ unrest on campus with mean scores of 2.99 and 3.09 ‘moderate’ respectively.

Table 8 further reveals that the tendency of minimizing students’ unrest on campus through rustication of erring student(s) and adequate funding by the government is ‘low’ with mean scores of 2.17 and 2.49 respectively.

Discussion of Findings

The discussion of findings is based on the research questions earlier formulated for this study.

Research Question 1

What Factors Influence Students’ Unrest in Institutions of Higher Learning?

The data from the study revealed that determinant factors that influence students’ unrest in institutions of higher learning are often attributed to breaking of rules and regulation by the students, lack of social amenities on campus and students involvement in cultism. This is seen as ‘high’ with mean scores of 2.60, 3.71 and 4.16 respectively.

This is reaffirmed by the earlier studies of Ekundayo and Alowye (2010), Alabi (2002) and Chinyere (2003) that concluded that students’ unrest on campus happened as a result of drastic and obnoxious rules and regulation, non provision of basic amenities on campus and, pervasive and unchecked high level of students’ involvement in cult activities on campus.

Research Question 2

What are the Implications of Students’ Unrest on the Academic Performance of Students of Higher Learning?

The data from the study revealed that students unrest on campus affect their academic performance which include disruptions of academic programmes and causes them to spend longer time with less zeal to pursue their programmes, inability of the lecturers to cover the syllabus and brain drain among lecturers.

This result however, is reinforced by Adeyemi (2009) and Chinyere (2003), studies which concluded that the consequences of students’ crisis include loss of lives and properties; the disruption of University programmes and inability of the lecturers to cover the syllabus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate funding by the government and corporate bodies can reduce students’ unrest.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field survey, November 2014.
Research Question 3

What Measures can be put in Place to Minimize the Occurrence of Students’ Unrest in Institution of Higher Learning?

The result from this study also revealed that some measures can be put in place to check students’ unrest on campus among which are dialogue with respective students unions or bodies concerned, training of school administrators on crisis management and provision of adequate infrastructures on campus.

The result above revalidated the earlier study of Odu (2014) which concluded that consistent dialogue between the authority of Universities and Students representatives will go a long way to breach the communication gap and thereby encourage harmonious relationship between students’ representatives and authority which will ultimately curb frequent and avoidable students’ unrest on campuses of most Universities.

Conclusion

Having examined the concept of students’ unrest in institution of higher learning, the factors influencing the students’ unrest and its implication in the academic performance of students; it was evident that it has been a lingering and a reoccurring issue in the Nigerian educational sector, caused by factors such as cultism, drastic and obnoxious rules and regulation, non provision of basic amenities in campus, poor funding, government policies and actions etc. It is paramount to state that if relevant authorities give more attention to the issues stated above and employ strategies like dialogue in resolving issues of students’ unrest, much success will be achieved in tackling the problem of students’ interest.

Recommendation

- The Federal Government should fund the universities well so as to enhance managerial capacity in the following spheres of institutional administration, financial administration, student’s administration, welfare administration etc.
- The Federal Government of Nigeria should look into the working conditions of lecturers because they need to be motivated to put in their best so that students are fully equipped. This is of great importance because students are the future leaders.
- A standing committee that is made up of conflict management and resolution experts be set up in the school for immediate intervention into conflict situations in the school.
- Peace education programmes should be introduced into school curriculum and environment for students and staff to understand the beauty of resolving their differences through peaceful means rather than violent ways.
- Basic facilities should be provided for students to make learning and teaching exciting and the environment conducive for such activities.
- Active student’s union bodies should be encouraged in the campuses in order to enhance student participation in some aspects of decision making as well as create effective communication network between students and managers of higher institution.
- A stiffer punishment should be meted out to students carrying out actions leading to students’ unrest. Students caught in examination malpractice should be severely punished according to the University law. Also, Proper records of such students should be kept circulated to other institutions.
There should be ways of monitoring expelled students such that they are not re-admitted into other institutions. This measure will greatly deter other students from getting involved in actions that can lead to students’ unrest.

There is need to deter students from cultism, either inhibiting identified members through punishment or by using the example of punishment by threats to deter in advance other potential members. Deterrence as penalty philosophy is more effective when punishment is certain.

Academic staff should be encouraged to work in relevant peace and tranquility, not to dissipate all their energies in preparing papers to persuade the government to fulfill their role by funding institution appropriately and agitating for better conditions of service.

Six month training on leadership strategies and conflict management should be provided for those willing and interested in becoming school administrators for effective productivity.

On the whole, the Nigerian police should be constantly reminded that they are supposed to be friendly to citizens. They are meant to maintain peace in the community and not to complicate the crises situation. Most Nigerian police are confused and ignorant of what is expected of them when students are on protest. In view of this, there is a need for Nigerian police to be properly trained on human relation and to avoid brutality against students.
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