Violence among Nigerian Students: A Doom to Nigerian Educational System

Abstract

The study examined different types of violence prevalent among Nigerian students. It also examined the major causes, the damages caused, and effects of violence in the Nigerian tertiary educational system. It finally examined the effect of violence as perceived by undergraduates based on gender, academic level and age. These were with the view to providing information on how violence could be curbed among students in higher institutions of learning. The study employed survey research design. The population consisted of students of the Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State. Proportionate Stratified sampling technique was employed in selected samples size of 200 respondents from the 13 faculties in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife. An instrument was used for the collection of data. Data collected were analyzed using frequency counts, simple percentages and ANCOVA. The results among others showed that overt physical assault of one on others representing 87.5% is the most prevalent type of violence. Result also showed that there is no significant difference in the effect of violence as perceived by students on the basis of gender, academic level and age at (F=0.056, p>0.05). The study concluded that violence should be discouraged as much as possible among undergraduates.

Keywords: Violence, Student, Nigerian, Educational system

Introduction

The classical Greek word for force or violence was 'bia'. According to Homer in Eze (2015), insolence and violence reach the iron heaven. The Latin verb from which 'violent' is derived, 'violare' is clearly normative. It means to dishonour, to outrage, to violate or to profane'. There is another possible derivation from the Latin adjective 'violentus', which means 'forcible, vehement, violent, impetuous, boisterous'. Since times immemorial, man has learned to intimidate, dominate, exploit, coerce, and terrorize his fellow-men by means of violence or the threat of violence in the pursuit of power, material gain, or in order to impose a particular doctrine or ideology. Violence has been used in the name of the established sacrosanct order, in the name of justice and righteousness, of fear, anguish, despair and indignation. Human institutions have been founded, consolidated, and destroyed by violence. The present political and socioeconomic state of the world is predominantly the outcome of violence, built on the agonies of peoples.

Violence can be defined as the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, which either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, mal-development or deprivation. The inclusion of "the use of power" in its definition expands on the conventional meaning of the word. A profound ambivalence toward violence is easily discernible in most, if not all, individuals. Violence is loathsome, disgusting, yet it is fascinating. Violence is terrifying, yet it is attractive, spectacular, and glorious. Violence is destructive, lethal, mutilating, atrocious, yet inseminating, generating and germinal. According to Hamby (2017), a definition of violence should be fully capable of accounting for the exclusion of behaviours such as accidents and self-defense, and the inclusion of behaviours such as child abuse, sexual offenses, and manslaughter. Therefore, a comprehensive definition of violence includes four essential elements: behavior that is intentional, unwanted, nonessential and harmful.

That is, the performance of violence requires relatively little by way of specialized equipment or knowledge. The practice of violence is highly visible to the sense. Therefore violence as such is unlikely to be mistaken. Nevertheless, violence is inherently liable to be contested on the question of legitimacy. In one of the most ambitious attempts at understanding and preventing violent behaviour, the Amnesty International (2012) defined violence simply as behaviours by individuals that intentionally threaten, attempt, or inflict physical harm on others. The panel limited its considerations to intentional, physical, interpersonal violence such as, those inflicted by intimidation and emotional abuse) resulting in non –physical harm as well as forms of violence in the institutional and structural spheres. However, while the definition seems to effectively restrict violence to behaviours that are interpersonal, inflicted or threaten physical harm, and are motivated by harmful intent, these restrictive criteria are relaxed on an ad-hoc basis when they become inconvenient for the inclusion of features that have come under scrutiny in a specific line of research e.g. Psychological injuries in the context of family.

This definition is exemplified by Garver (2013) who considers the core meaning of violence to be the act of violating a basic right of the human being. Violation of these rights implies that violence has been done. Garver defines four types of violence:(a) personal overt violence(overt physical assault of one person on the body of another, e.g. assault ,mugging, rape, murder, police brutality); (b) overt institutional violence (people obeying orders: the

extreme manifestation being war, but the category includes both riots and war campaigning-types policies of law enforcement agencies); (c) Quiet personal violence (a human being deprives another person of autonomy, dignity, or the right of self-determination through the manipulation of symbols; one person driving another to suicide (psychological violence); Quiet institutional violence, operates when people are systematically denied access to social options open to others. Garver notes that denial of options is an attack on autonomy therefore, constitutes violence, an example is minority repression.

It is widely known across the world that violence is a way in which anger is easily expressed. Violence is a great instrument and strategy to force enemies, rebels to yield to request or demand. Violence as well is "the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual against oneself, another person, against a group or community which either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, mal-development or deprivation" (World Health Organization (2013).

By this definition of violence, it must be acknowledged that the use of power in this definition has explained and expanded the conventional meaning of the word violence. It must be noted that the social content of understanding the central importance of violence is extreme aggressive (Soler, Vinayak, and Quadagno, 2000). However, violence in different forms and in nature surface as a reaction to anger and individual, group or persons dissatisfaction towards reality of life, event, circumstances, policies and politics. Violence has caused many evil than good across the world. It must be pointed out that people easily yield to violence and destruction rather than peaceful process in the world today among the youths and able bodies. It must be noted that youths, students and able bodies across the world are all subject to violence acts. "In the world, violence among youths and students is a syndrome of doom that requires immediate attention. Though the youths and students use tools and weapon of destruction and carrier of violence features" (Nelson, 2014).

In Nigeria to be precise, violence among youths and students is increasing than ever. At this point, it must be noted that there is no universal definition for it, but according to an individual perception and definition. Some people may define youth by diversity of age while others by stature and others by maturity. But among international agencies, young people are perceived and conceived as age range between 12 and 25 years. The World Health organization conceived young people as being between 10 and 25 years and others view 18 as "adolescent" (Akinbode and Ayodeji, 2018).

Statement of the Problem

Violence among Nigerian youths has caused a lot of problems to the society in terms of killing, vandalism, etc. Many researches have been made on Violence among youths or Nigerian students. While many of them have stated the causes and effect of it to the society and the Nation at large, this research will go further in investigating whether violence has caused doom or progress to the Nigerian Educational System.

Objective of the Study

The main objective of the study is to identify the level of violence and how it can be minimized and among undergraduates of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria.

Specific objectives of this study are to:

- examine different types of violence prevalent among Nigerian students
- examine the factors that cause violence among Nigerian tertiary education students
- assess the damages caused by violence to Nigerian tertiary educational system
- determine the effects of violence to Nigerian students
- examine the differences in the perceived effect of violence on Nigerian youth on the basis of age, gender and academic levels

Research Questions

1. What are the different types of violence prevalent among Nigerian students?
2. What are the causes of violence among Nigerian tertiary education students?
3. What are the damages caused by violence to Nigerian Educational system?
4. What are the effects of violence to Nigerian students?

Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the perceived effect of violence on Nigerian youth on the basis of age, gender and students' academic levels.

Methods

The research design adopted in this study is survey design which aimed at identifying violence among Nigerian students; a doom to Nigerian educational system. The target population of this study is the students of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife. Proportionate Stratified sampling technique was employed in the selection of samples size of 200 respondents from the 13 faculties in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife. An instrument titled: "Violence among Nigerian Students Questionnaire" (VNSQ) was developed by the investigator to elicit information from the respondents. It has two sections; Section A was on bio data of the respondents which consisted of sex, level, age, faculty and family background while section B consisted of 30 items that elicited information from the respondents on variables of interest related to violence. Data collected were coded and interpreted with the use of frequency counts, simple percentages and ANCOVA.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the socio demographic information of the respondents.

S/N	Variables	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1	**Sex**		
	Male	53	26.5
	Female	147	73.5
2	**Level**		
	Part 1	32	16.0
	Part 2	50	25.0
	Part 3	50	25.0
	Part 4	44	22.0
	Part 5	24	12.0
3	**Age**		
	15-20	60	30.0
	21-25	108	54.0
	26-30	27	13.5
	31-35	5	2.5
4	**Faculty**		
	Administration	21	10.5
	Agriculture	26	13.0
	Art	39	19.5
	Clinical Sciences	19	9.5
	Dentistry	2	1.0
	Social Sciences	16	8.0
	Environmental Design and	7	3.5
	Management	20	10.0
	Education	12	6.0
	Law	7	3.5
	Pharmacy	17	8.5
	Science	14	7.0

	Technology		
5	**Family Background**		
	Nuclear	161	80.5
	Polygamy	39	19.5

Results in Table 1 showed the descriptive statistics of socio demographic information of the respondents. It can be observed from the table that 53(26.5%) of the respondents are male while 147(73.5%) of them are female. On level, 32(16.0%), 50(25.0%), 50(25.0%), 44(22.0%) and 24(12.0%) are in part 1, part 2, part 3, part 4 and part 5 respectively. Moreover, 60(30.0%) of the respondents were in the age range of 15-20 years, 108(54.0%) were in the line of 21-25 years, 27(13.5%) were also in the range of 26-30 years and only 5(2.5%) were in the range of 31-35 years. On faculty, 21(10.5%), 26(13.0%), 39(19.5%), 19(9.5%), 2(1.0%), 16(8.0%), 7(3.5%), 20(10.0%), 12(6.0%), 7(3.5%), 17(8.5%) and 14(7.0%) are in Faculties of Administration, Agriculture, Arts, Clinical Sciences, Dentistry, Social Sciences, Environmental Design and Management, Education, Law, Pharmacy, Science and Technology respectively. Considering family background, 161(80.5%) are from nuclear family while the remaining 39(19.5%) of the respondents are from polygamous family.

Research Question One: What are the different types of violence prevalent among Nigerian students?

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of different types of violence prevalent among Nigerian students.

S/N	Items	Agree		Disagree	
		Frequency	**Percentage**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
1	Overt physical assault on others.	175	87.5	25	12.5
2	Students disobeying constituted authorities in various schools.	171	85.5	29	14.5
3	Do you deprive other students' autonomy, dignity or right of self determination?	32	16	168	84.0
4	Is vandalism good among students demonstration in schools?	160	80.0	40	20.0

Results in Table 2 revealed the different types of violence prevalent among Nigerian students. From the table, 175(87.5%) of the respondents agreed while 25(12.5%) of them disagreed on overt physical assault of one person on the body of another. In the same vein, 171(85.5%) of the respondents agreed that students disobeying constituted authority in various schools happened to be one of the violence prevalent among Nigeria students. 160(80.0%) of the respondents also agreed that vandalism is another form of violence among students in tertiary institutions.

Research Question Two: What are the causes of violence among Nigerian tertiary education students?

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of the causes of violence among Nigerian tertiary education students.

S/N	Items	Agree		Disagree	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Mis-information from media sometimes cause violence among students in higher institution.	170	85.0	30	15.0
2	Lack of cultural understanding or tolerance causes violence among student.	185	92.5	15	7.5
3	Moral decadence leads to violence among youth.	180	90.0	20	10.0
4	Can disagreement cause violence among students?	189	94.5	11	5.5
5	Can self-interest lead to violence among students?	182	91.0	18	9.0
6	Can oppression lead to violence?	182	91.0	18	9.0
7	Does increment in school fee inflate violence among students?	184	92.0	16	8.0

Results in Table 3 seek to provide causes of violence among Nigerian tertiary education students. From the table, 170(85.0%) of the respondents agreed that mis-information from media cause violence among students in higher institutions. Also, 185(92.5%) of them were of the opinion that lack of cultural understanding or tolerance cause violence among students. Moral decadence leads to violence among youths, 180(90.0%) representing majority termed

it as one of the causes. 189(94.5%) of them also said that disagreement is another factor that cause violence among youths. It could be revealed from the table that 182(91.0%) each agreed that selfish interest and oppression bring about violence among students. Moreover, 184(92.0%) of the respondents agreed that increment in school fees could cause violence among students in tertiary institutions.

Research Question Three: What are the damages caused by violence to Nigerian tertiary educational system?

Table 4: Descriptive statistics of the damages caused by violence to Nigerian tertiary educational system.

S/N	Items	Agree		Disagree	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Act of violence can lead to academic weakness.	188	94.0	12	6.0
2	Violence leads to partial or total academic shut-down.	184	92.0	16	8.0
3	Act of violence sometimes lead to elongation of academic shut-down.	186	93.0	14	7.0
4	Violence may lead to strike action.	182	91	18	9.0

Considering results in Table 4, 188(94.0%) of the respondents agreed that act of violence can lead to academic weakness, 184(92.0%) agreed that violence lead to partial or total academic shut-down, 186(93.0%) also agreed that act of violence lead to elongation of academic shut-down and 182(91.0%) of the respondents agreed that violence leads to strike action which could be the damaged done by violence to Nigerian educational system.

Research Question Four: What are the effects of violence to Nigeria students?

Table 5: Descriptive statistics of the effects of violence to Nigeria students.

S/N	Items	Agree		Disagree	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Violence usually cause injury both to perpetrator and innocent citizens.	188	94.0	12	6.0

2	Violence leads to vandalism, looting and stealing.	191	95.5	9	4.5
3	Violence sometimes cause death.	193	96.5	7	3.5
4	Violence can later result to burglary.	185	92.5	15	7.5

Results in the table above showed that 188(94.0%) of the respondents agreed that violence cause injury to both perpetrators and innocent students, 191(95.5%) of the students termed with the fact that violence brings about vandalism, looting and stealing, 193(96.5%) said that it also lead to death, 185(92.5%) of the respondents agreed that violence leads to burglary which happened to be effect of violence to Nigerian students.

Testing of Hypothesis

Hypothesis: There is no significant difference in the effect of violence as perceived by students based on gender, academic level and age.

Table 6: Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) of the difference in the effect of violence as perceived by students on the basis of gender, academic level and age.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Violence as perceived by students

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	1609.167[a]	11	146.288	4.594	.000	.268
Intercept	20029.004	1	20029.004	629.027	.000	.820
Gender	10.451	1	10.451	.328	.568	.002
Academic Level	111.429	2	55.715	1.750	.178	.025
Age	1101.880	2	550.940	17.303	.000	.200
Gender*Academic Level	26.391	2	13.196	.414	.662	.006
Gender*Age	13.596	1	13.596	.427	.515	.003
Academic Level *Age	12.096	2	6.048	.190	.827	.003
Gender * Academic Level * Age	1.793	1	1.793	.056	.813	.128
Error	4394.093	178	31.841			
Total	195467.000	200				
Corrected Total	6003.260	199				

a. R Squared = .268 (Adjusted R Squared = .210)

9

Inferentially, results in Table 6 revealed that there is no significant difference in the effect of violence as perceived by students on the basis of gender, academic level and age at (F=0.056, p>0.05). Hence, the null hypothesis that states that there is no significant difference in the effect of violence as perceived by students on the basis of gender, academic level and age is hereby not rejected. A partial eta squared value of 0.128 showed that 12.8% of the variance in gender, academic level and age of the students' effect of violence perceived is accounted for. This result implies that there could be difference in the effect of violence as perceived by students based on gender, academic level and age but not significant.

Conclusion

The study concluded that overt physical assault, disobeying constituted authority as well as vandalism are among the prevalent violence among Nigerian tertiary education students. Also, misinformation from media, lack of cultural understanding, moral decadence, selfish interest and oppression are the major causes of violence among students. In the same vein, academic weakness, partial or total academic shutdown as well as strike actions are some of the damages caused by violence. The study also concluded that difference in the effect of violence as perceived by students based on gender, academic level and age is not significant.

Consent

As per international standard or university standard, respondents' written consent has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

Recommendations

- Students should discard negative attitude, perception and notion towards crisis, conflicts and violence. Students of today should also know that they are the leaders of tomorrow and should take up the mantle of fulfilling the role.
- Students should inculcate the spirit of peace and make it realistic.
- University authorities should establish an efficient and effective guidance unit in schools so that students would be tutored against violence.

References
Akinbode, G. A. & Ayodeji, F. (2018). Sexual Harassment: Experiences, Prevalence and Psychopathology in some selected Higher Institutions in Lagos, South-West Nigeria. *African Journal for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues*, 21(3), 112-136.

Amnesty International (2012). The state of the world's human rights. Geneva: Switzerland. http://www.amnestyusa.org/sites/default/files/air12-report-english.pdf

Eze, B. N. (2015). The Eclipse of Dialogue and the Culture of Death. International Journal of Theology and Reformed Tradition, 7, 159-171.

Garver, G. (2013). The Rule of Ecological Law: The Legal Complement to Degrowth Economics. *Sustainability,* 5(1), 316-337.

Hamby, S. (2017). On defining violence, and why it matters. *Psychology of Violence,* 7(2), 167–180.

Nelson, R. (2014). Tackling violence against health-care workers. *World Report*, 383(9926), 1373-1374.

Nwabunike C, Tenkorang E. Y. Domestic and Marital Violence among Three Ethnic Groups in Nigeria. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2017; 32(18):2751-2776. doi:10.1177/0886260515596147

Soler, H., Vinayak, P. & Quadagno, D. (2000). Biosocial aspects of domestic violence. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 25, 721-739.

World Health Organization (2013). Global and Regional Estimates of violence against women: prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence. Geneva: Switzerland.