CAUSES OF STUDENTS’ UNREST IN RIVERS STATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A CASE STUDY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GIRLS’ COLLEGE, ABULOMA, NIGERIA

By

Kate U. Ambrose Ph.D
National Open University of Nigeria
Ikom Community Study Centre, Ikom,
Cross River State, Nigeria
GSM: +2348033371691
E-mail: kuambrose2016@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Rivers state students are notorious for unrest due to series of students demonstrations recorded in the state. It appears bearable if it is a public school but becomes a grave concern when a federally funded college took to the streets on rampage. The study investigates the root causes of students’ unrest in Rivers State Secondary schools with Federal Government Girls’ College, Abuloma as a case study as well as highlight counselling implications. A 25 item instrument titled “Assessment of causes of students’ unrest questionnaire” and oral interviews were used for data collection. A total of 175 students and 25 staff were selected through stratified random sampling. Frequency counts and percentages were used for statistical analysis with 50% and above as statistical significance. From results remote causes were students’ dissatisfaction over Acting Principal’s off-handed administration, low emphasis on academics, low morality, and ill advice of parents. Immediate causes were the chastisement of students over complaints of poor feeding and arbitrary transfer of staff. It was recommended that an organised and more effective use of the college Press club should be encouraged for students to make constructive criticisms within the college, the school authority should apply strict measures to uphold school rules and regulations, and management should endeavour to make effective use of Guidance Counsellors. The study concluded with conviction that causes of the students’ riot were both remote and immediate.
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INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background to the problem

A common terminology used to describe a state of uncontrolled behaviour or unrestrained indulgence in something by a group of people is unrest, rioting or rampage. It is an act of indiscipline, disorder, lawlessness and strike. Makinde (1984) says unrest, revolt and demonstration denote frequent agitation of students arising from unattended biogenic and political needs or from frustrations and punishment. Thus, the revolts or demonstrations are usually against established authorities in an attempt to earn recognition or achieve the desired need. Unrest is a state of discontent bothering on riotousness or anger (Chambers 21st century dictionary). Rampage is defined as storming about or behaving wildly and violently in anger (Chambers 21st century dictionary). Riot is described as a loosely or noisy public disturbance or disorder usually by a large group of people (Chambers 21st century dictionary). From the above, students unrest can be described as a violent action taken by a group of angry students seeking recognition or an outlet to voice out their grievances to the management. In this study, unrest, rampage and rioting shall be used interchangeably.

Students’ unrest in Nigeria is more frequent in the universities than in any other institution. Since after the civil war in 1970, educational institutions found themselves either agitating for better welfare condition or participating in the management of their institutions. For example, Kalabari National College, Kalabari witnessed a riot in 1973. The boys refused to take exams until their demands were met. They carried palm fronts in protest against the staff. During the second republic (1979-1983), the country witnessed the emergence of upstarts who found themselves at the helm of affairs and had no self control, but devoured the national economy at their disposal. Consequently, the financial resources of the nation were grossly mismanaged with little to show for it. The consequence was that State Governments found it difficult to pay civil servants’ salaries especially the teachers (Ososanya, 1986). In the same vein, school facilities were in a sorry shape.

Schools have experienced a state of instability and disruption as a result of students’ unrest. To cite examples, Government Boys Secondary School –Ogbakiri, Elelenwo Girls Secondary School, Elelenwo and Holy Rosary College, Port Harcourt students singly staged riots in their schools in 1982. In January 1983, the students of Okrika Grammar School, Okrika launched a violent demonstration with an attempt to take the Principal’s life. Two months later (March), the Principal of Buabom Community Secondary School, kono in Bori local Government Area (L.G.A) who went to visit his wife – a staff of Birabi Memorial Grammar School also in Bori local Government Area was unlucky to be beaten up by the rioting students. In the same year, the students of Akpor Grammar School, Akpor held the Principal and a staff hostage during their rampage. 1986 was the turn of Government Girls Secondary School, Bane. Their reason for the riots varied from illegal collection of levies by the school authorities, refusal of the Principal to grant students desires, lack of portable water, poor feeding, bullying of junior students, to refusal of the senior students to participate in manual labour. Consequently, the schools concerned were closed down temporarily. Towards the end (the second half) of 1987,

The following schools went on rampage at varying degrees.

1. Community Secondary School, OkoroOdo – Phalga
2. Community Secondary School, Igboene – Yelga
3. Government Secondary School, Òyigbo – Otelga,
(7) Rivers state Polytechnic rioted over maltreatment of a final year student by the police (2014).  
(9) Federal Government Girls college (F.G.G.C) Abuloma _ Phalga  

Apart from the examples cited above, the National newspapers carry captions such as ‘The unqueenly issues “– the case of Queens College – Lagos. “Schools closed down”, “Cracks in Ivory Tower”, “After math of riot”, “The ordeal of Nigerian students”, Students’ unrest: intractable national calamity (Nlemoha, 1988). Rivers state is a fertile ground for student frequent rampage. Students’ activism is not peculiar to Nigerian schools alone. In Kenya students embarked on a mission of activism for anxiety over mock exams, leadership wrangles and discontent among teachers over the school calendar, which has reduced their free time and who are believed to be behind the unrest. The rioting students burnt down the school dormitories. The news went round Kenya. About ten other schools followed suit and burnt down school structures within 24 hours. The reason behind this was traced to examination cheating cartels (Oduor & Kajilwa, 2016).

In the study of “School factors associated with student violence in secondary schools in Kenya”, Oduor and Kajilwa (2016) established that the presence of drugs, lack of enough facilities and food, students’ negative attitude towards their schools, who do not do well in exams, who feel teachers do not understand their behaviour, who receive peer influence and often resort to violence to express their dissatisfaction are all causal factors of violence in schools. Moreover, students who have a negative attitude towards head teachers in terms of leadership styles, communication and rules and regulations turn violent to express dissatisfaction. Students also resort to violence to react against shortage, transfer, teaching methods and emphasis on exams by teachers Kiplagat & Amadi (2014).

More often than not, the inability of the governing authorities to yield to the demands of the students which most of the time are patriotic, does result in some violent demonstrations that could be avoided (Editorial – Time International May 2nd 1988). Recently, the country witnessed a spate of students protests leading to the loss of lives and institutions shut down. The frequent shut downs of institutions in this country, is fast becoming a national culture. During the unrest of F.G.G.C, Abuloma students, the Principal was held hostage for over 12 hours and was seriously humiliated and dehumanized. Structures were damaged school gate was shut against all staff.

A lot has been said and written about unrest in institutions. The factors which give rise to these rampages are varied. Frequency of unrest, demonstrations and campus tension in institutions of higher learning has got to a stage where many national leaders all over the world have started demanding accountability for the cost of education. Students are not equally involved both in the planning and demonstration (Ajayi, 1983). While some students will completely or partially dissociate themselves from the acts, the activists are found right in the fore-front of the demonstration even in the planning.  
The activists (students) view the administration as a group of evil sorts who have no business at all in making any kinds of policies dealing with education, theirs or anyone else’s (Sampson and
Corn, 1970). They tend to see each action of the administration as being calculated to stifle their freedom and to deny them access to any important decision-making roles. They feel the administration does not trust or respect them and looks upon them as highly impressionable youth, easily manipulated by outside influence.

Student activists come from the upper segment of the society. The parents of activists were found to be higher in income, occupational status and education than the parents of non-activists. These parents were politically more liberal. Their child rearing practices were more permissive, and they had closer relationships with their children than parents of non-activists. Disagreement was also expressed more openly in the homes of student activists.

Many activists seem to be acting in conformity with their parents’ values, but they want to express these values in power, less compromising, and in an energetic way than they think their parents do. Lawlessness is rampant in a school where students are head bound to put laws into their hands. This is evidenced in a study which investigated teachers’ perception of adolescents’ violence in secondary schools in Awka Education zone of Anambra State, Obikeze (2009) found that such forms of violence as destruction of school property, fighting, kicking, bullying, pushing, breaking and destruction of other students’ lockers and personal belongings, cultism, riots, beating teachers, flogging the junior students by the senior ones are prevalent in secondary schools.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The growing incidents of unrest in the secondary schools in Rivers State and more especially the thrilling case of F.G.G.C. Abuloma inspired the writer to carry out this investigation. A thrilling case because the school had been held in high esteem in Rivers State with regards to discipline, academic and co-curricular performances. Besides the school has Federal Government financial support and otherwise being a Federal Government school. The writer wonders why such a school should go on rampage. One will naturally feel that the students are so sensitive to changes in the systems they are used to that such changes are followed by rioting or demonstration.

Rampage disrupts the planned curriculum and in many cases renders the school properties damaged. The lives of both staff and students are at stake as students grow so wild that no regard is accorded the Principal or staff. To be able to benefit from all the educational opportunities which have been made available to today’s adolescent, typical negative behaviours such as rampage should be nipped in the bud.

Education is seen as one of the sure ways to achieve rapid socio-economic development. In that respect, the National Policy on Education, (1977) declared that education has been accepted as an instrument par excellence for affecting development. It is seen as the key that unlocks the door to modernization. Education is seen as an effective channel for eradicating ignorance, illiteracy and inequality. Rioting has no positive impact on a school system. A school that indulges in this can hardly achieve the educational objectives. To the best of the knowledge of the writer, there is no literature documenting F.G.G.C. Abuloma students’ unrest. Hence the need for this empirical study.

Generally, an attempt is being made in this study to identify the root causes of students’ unrest in Rivers state Secondary Schools with focus on F.G.G.C. Abuloma.

1.2 Purpose of the study

- Generally, the purpose of the research was to investigate immediate and remote causes responsible for students’ unrest in F.G.G.C. Abuloma.
Specifically, the study aims to investigate home and school factors responsible for the students unrest as well as proffer counselling intervention and make useful suggestions regarding the prevention and remedies to future occurrences. The school related factors were classified as academic, sociological, medical, administrative and biogenic.

1.3 Research questions

- What are the causes remote or immediate responsible for students rampage in F.G.G.C. Abuloma?
- Is the school responsible for the students’ unrest?
- Has the home any contributory influence over students’ unrest?

It is envisaged that knowledge of the outcome of this study will equip the school in prevention of subsequent attempts to go on rampage and hold the school to ransom.

2.0 Research Methods

2.1 Research Design

The descriptive survey design was adopted for this study. Rivers State has over Two hundred and fifty (250) secondary, comprehensive, technical and commercial schools (public and private) including the two unity schools (Nnachi, 2014). The population of Federal Government Girls College, Abuloma at the time of this study was about Two thousand two hundred (2200). One hundred and seventy five (175) students and twenty five (25) staff of the school were selected through stratified random sampling. J.S.3 to S.S.3 students between the ages of 12 and 18, were used in this study. Sixty (60) S.S.3 students, fifty (50) S.S.2 students, forty (40) S.S.1 students, twenty five (25) J.S.3 students and twenty five staff were sampled. It is a boarding and an all girls’ school.

Oral interviews of students and staff and a 25 item structured questionnaire titled Assessment of causes of students’ unrest questionnaire” (AOCOSUQ) were used for data collection. The validity of the instrument was established. A total of two hundred (200) copies of the questionnaire were distributed among the students and staff of F. G. G. C. Abuloma; twenty five (25) to the staff and one hundred and seventy five (175) copies to the students. All were filled and collected on the spot. The questionnaire items were responded to on the basis of ‘Agree’ and ‘Disagree’, and ‘Yes’ and ‘No’. 50% was used as high positive response. Thus, anything less than 50% was regarded a low response. Data was analysed deductively. The percentage was used as statistical technique for data analysis.

3.0 Results

3.1 Research Question 1

*Is the school responsible for students’ rampage in F. G. G.C Abuloma?*

Tables 1 to 4 provide answers to this question.
### 3.1.1 Academic Factors

#### Table 1: Students Response to the Academic Factors Responsible For the unrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagreed</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Staff/Principal’s partiality</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>65.70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34.30</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Insufficient/unqualified Staff</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>70.90</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Narrow curriculum</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Too many co-curricular activities</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Staff Transfer</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>85.70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Sub-Standard Academic Facilities</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) 20% Continuous Assessment Marks</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>74.30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Staff response to the academic factors responsible for the unrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Staff/principal’s partiality</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Insufficient/unqualified staff</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Narrow curriculum</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Too many co-curricular activities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Staff Transfer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vi) Sub-Standard Academic Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.C.E.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A., B.Sc., B.Ed., H.N.D.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A., M.Sc., M.Ed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Staff Academic Qualification

Of the 175 students studied, 115 (65.70%) agreed that both staff and Principal are partial in their dealings with the students. Additional information obtained through oral interview revealed that the Principal of the F.G.G.C. Abuloma was showing favour towards a particular group of students for example, students from Rivers and Anambra states – her marital and mother states respectively. 20 (80%) of the staff studied shared the same view with the students. 60 (34.30%) of students and 5 (20%) of the staff disagreed.

51 (29.10%) of the students are of the opinion that the school has insufficient and unqualified staff; but 124 (70.90%) of the students and 25 (100%) of the staff hold the view that the school has adequate and qualified staff. No staff indicated the school curriculum was narrow but 35 (20%) of the students did. All the staff under study 100% and 140 (80%) of the students disagreed that the school curriculum was narrow. 110 (63.90%) of the students and 25 (100%) of the staff agreed that too much emphasis was laid on co-curricular activities: 65 (37%) of the students disagreed to the proposal that too much emphasis was laid on co-curricular activities which is likely to be a contributing factor to the riot.

150 (85.7%) of the students and 20 (80%) of the staff responded positively that mass staff “transfer” was responsible for the riot. 25 (14.30%) of the students and 5 (20%) of the staff disagreed to the proposal.

110 (63%) of the students and 15 (60%) of the staff share the view that sub-standard academic facilities played a part in the unrest; but 65 (37%) of the students and 10 (40%) of the staff disagreed.

130 (74.3%) of the students and 18 (72%) of the staff indicated that 20% continuous assessment marks for S.S.2 students led to the riot while 45 (25.7%) of the students and 7 (28%) of the staff disagreed to this.
3.1.2 Social Factors

Tables 4 and 5 show both students and staff responses respectively to the items on the possible social factors that could incite students to riot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Over restriction</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Excessive Intrusion into students privacy</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) High-Handed discipline</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Lack of diplomacy in handling students’ affairs</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Low morality-spying/night parties</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Staff response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Over Restriction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Excessive intrusion into students affaires</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) High-handed discipline</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Lack diplomacy in handling students’ affaires</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of the one hundred and seventy five students used, 90 (51.4%) agreed that over restriction was a causal factor while 85 (48.6%) disagreed. On the part of the staff, only 10 (40%) were in support of this issue while a greater percentage 15 (60%) disagreed to it. 121 (69%) of the students agreed that the school excessively intrudes into their privacy, while the rest 54 (31%) have a different opinion. Staff response showed that only 11 (44%) feel that the school is excessively intruding into students’ private affairs while 14 (56%) hold a contrary view.
High-handed discipline was another factor alleged to be responsible for the riot. To this, 114 (65%) of the students agreed. 15 (60%) of the staff under study saw this as a causal factor to the riot, whereas, 38 (21.7%) of the students and 10 (40%) of the staff disagree to it.

The last item on this table is “low morality”. Only 31 (17.7%) of the students and 8 (32%) of the staff did not see low morality as one of the factors responsible for unrest. Nevertheless, 144 (82.3%) of the Students and 17 (68%) of the staff were in support of the proposal.
Table 6 shows the response of students and 7, the staff responses over questions on political/medical problems that could be responsible for students’ riot.

### 3.1.3 Administrative/Medical Factors

**Table 6: Administrative/Medical Factors : Students’ Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Poor Medical Care</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Change of uniform</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Administrative/Medical factors (Staff Response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Poor Medical Care</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Change of uniform</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Lateness to duty/absenteeism by the Principal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Off-handed administration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 35 (20%) of the students and 9 (36%) of the staff under study disagreed that poor medical care was responsible for the riot but 140 (80%) of the students and 16 (64%) of the staff saw poor medical care as a causal factor to the riot.

From the table, 113 (64.6%) of the students and 10 (40%) of the staff agreed that change of uniform was responsible for the riot whereas 35 (20%) of the students and 15 (60) of the staff disagreed. On the issue of lateness and absenteeism to school, 21 (84%) of the staff under study agreed that it was a factor while 4 (16%) disagreed. 17 (68%) of the staff were in support that off-handed administration caused the riot while 8 (32%) did not agree.

3.1.4 Biogenic factors

Table 8: Students’ response to the biogenic factors responsible for the riot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Poor Feeding</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Late service of food</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Staff response to the biogenic factors responsible for the riot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Poor Feeding</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Late service of food</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

112 (64%) of the students and 14 (56%) of the staff agreed that poor feeding was responsible for the unrest: but 63 (36%) of students and 11 (44%) of the staff did not agree.
On the issue of late service of food 112 (64%) of the students and 15 (60%) of the staff agreed that it was responsible for the riot: but 63 (36) of the students and 10 (40%) for the staff disagreed to it.

### 3.1.5 Students’ pursuit of their request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Did you channel your grievances to the school authority</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Through what means? E.g Letter/verbally</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Was your request/appeal honoured?</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Would you have rioted if your request/appeal was not turned down?</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

141 (80.6%) students admitted their grievance were channeled to the school authority while 34 (19.4%) responded negatively. The result further indicated that 130 (74.3%) of the students agreed that an appeal was made to the school authority both by letter and verbal communication but 45 (25.7%) of this did not agree to it. All the students 175 (100%) agreed that their request was turned down. Also all the students agreed they would not have rioted if their appeal was looked into.

### Research Question 2

“Has the home any contributory influence over students’ riots?”

#### 3.2 Home related factors

### 3.2.1 Students’ response to home influence over the unrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total p %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Students wanted the school authorities to pamper them as their parents do</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Unrest sparked off as a result of students’ previous knowledge of it</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students had been involved in rampage previously

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of film</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War/Revolutionary/Detective</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comic/Comedies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 11, 78 (44.6%) agreed they wanted to be pampered while 97 (55.%) disagreed. 63 (36%) agreed that the rampage was a result of their previous knowledge of rioting. 50 (28.6%) agreed that riot was staged because they had been previously involved in a riot but 125 (71.4%) disagreed. 100 (57.1%) of the students agreed that their parents advised them to go on rampage while 75, (42.9%) disagreed to it.

From table 12, 4 (2.3%) of the students under study love horror films, 59 (33.7%) love watching religious film; 91 (52%) have war/revolutionary and detective films as their favourites; and 21 (12%) love comic/comedies most.

4.0 DISCUSSION

Factors responsible for the unrest (from the findings of the study) are discussed and in fact, as applied to F.G.G.C Abuloma.

4.1 Academic Factors

A lot of factors or events associated with academics were identified as causal factors of the crisis under study. Such factors range from staff/Principal’s partiality, too many co-curricular activities... to non-reflection of 20% continuous assessment (CA) marks. The non-synchronization or the divergence of opinion between the students’ response with the staff response to some of these factors could be interpreted as mainly psychological, as the staff would almost always talk on the issues of transfers, facilities, co-curricular and continuous assessment, as these directly affect them. The issue of 20% CA has been reported in this work for the first time.
4.1.1 Social Factors
Some of the social problems identified as causal factors responsible for the unrest ranging from over restriction…to low morality such as spying and students’ participation in night parties at the Principal’s house, could be attributed to lack of social awareness and mean morality on the part of both the Principal and the students.

The disparity in the opinion of the students (51.4%) and staff 10(40%) on over “restriction”, and 69% of the students and 11(44%) of the staff on high-handed discipline is a matter of lack of insight into youth on the part of the school authority and inability to recognize individual differences of these adolescents and their needs of dignity and recognition. These findings are in agreement with the findings of Selpher, Cheloti, Obae and Kanori(2014) that high handedness of principals was a factor in sparking off students’ unrest in Kenya.

Spying (students) and invitation from the Principal to the students to attend night parties at her house are being reported for the first time.

4.1.3 Medical Factors
The fact that poor medical care was a factor responsible for the students’ riot could be seen in the high positive response of both staff (64%) and the students (80%). Lack of drugs or dispensation of a particular drug say Panadol or payment of a token by students for a syringe (oral interview) before taking a prescribed injection – a practice both alien and obnoxious to the college, will always raise a question in students’ hearts. The presence of an unsympathetic and suspicious school Nurse at the “Sick Bay” could be attributed to the students’ sentimentality or instrumentality. This finding is similar to the work of Hill (1973).

4.1.4 Administrative Factors
The administrative factors identified as Principal’s frequent lateness to school, absenteeism and off-handed administration uncovers her inability to provide leadership and supervision. Off-handed administration is fresh discovery by the researcher and being reported for the first time: but lack of serious commitment of the Principal towards providing the needed leadership in instructional supervision to particular function which justifies the existence of principalship agrees with the view of the Editor of the African Guardian (1988) and Selpher, Cheloti, Obae and Kanori(2014) who found that principal’s management style influences students’ unrest in secondary schools.

4.1.5 Biogenic Factors
From the positive percentage response of the students 112(64%) for both poor feeding and late service of food gives the impression that both went simultaneously. Staff response of 56% for poor feeding and 15 (60%) for the late service of the food is similar to students response of 64% but the disparity could be attributed to the fact that staff had less awareness than the students since the students are directly involved in the eating of the food. The food problem is in line with the finding of Makinde (1984) who remarked that students’ unrest students’ frequent agitation arising from unattended biogenic needs. From table 10, when the students appeal was turned down, there was discontentment which led to the writing of placards such as “give us our rights”, “Acting Principal, you have acted enough, step down, go for administrative course” “Fat fool, fat liar” “Mass oppression by a mass body” “20% continuous assessment marks” “Acting Principal Must go” “Staff, steer clear”.
4.2 Home Factors

Generally, from the results obtained, students wanting to be pampered in school 78 (44.6%), their previous knowledge of rioting 63 (36%) and previous involvement in riots 50 (28.6%) did not reflect factors responsible for the crisis. 100 (57.1%) as high positive response indicates that activists seem to be acting in conformity with their parents’ values. The film taste test according to the result on table 11 indicates that 91 (52%) of the students have war, revolutionary and detective film as their favourite films. The Cinema and television are seen as means of educating the child. All manner of things are learnt which he puts into practice. This result is similar to the findings of Sugut and Mugasia(2014) who opined that students behaviour are largely influenced by the kind of books and magazines they read, peer pressure (from within and without), mass media and poor parenting.

In the study of the causes of students’ unrest in Rivers State F. G.G. C. Abuloma being a case study, it was discovered that two institutions are responsible for the behaviour of the students. These are the school and the home. It was seen that the students did not wake up one day to riot but was due to long suffering - repression. The study further revealed that students’ grievances were mainly against the Acting Principal (A.P) of the school. The tutorial staff was out of the “show”.

5.0 Counseling Implications

This study undoubtedly has serious counselling implications. Adolescence is a period when people begin to assert themselves in various ways by throwing away tradition in general and questioning the teachings of parents, teachers and other authority figures. The adolescent wishes to control his own life but finds life full of frustrating obstacles. He may be aggressive or rebellious today and co-operative and affectionate at another time (Obikeze, 2009). It is important therefore, that Counsellors should understand the pubertal stress which influences adolescents’ behaviour. Some of these students are battling with unresolved family challenges which greatly affect their behaviour as well as performance at school.

Sugut and Mogasia(2014) remarked that some of these students go through some difficult moments. Such students need support and counselling to understand what ails them. Teachers should also be trained on social behaviour, emotional intelligence and leadership, to help shape their students (Kiplagat & Oruko, 2015). Many of the post secondary institutions lack the services of Guidance Counsellors since they are unavailable. Even where they are available, the Principals convert them to pure academic staff neglecting the importance of the affective domain in education. It takes only a sound mind to accommodate teachers’ stuff. The Teaching Service Commission ought to post professionally trained counsellors to schools as full time Counsellors to handle counselling matters. Principals therefore should receive them as such. Counsellors should frequently organise both individual and Group counselling in the school. Through the outcome of the counselling programme the Counsellor receives early warning signals by which organised unruly behavior can be forestalled.

6.0 Conclusion

From results, the causes of the students’ unrest were both remote and immediate.

6.1 Remote Causes

The remote causes of the riot were dissatisfaction amongst students over administrative style, that is, high-handedness, off handedness, open abuse of students’ parents, threats and favouritism
towards selected staff and Students by the Acting Principal. There was low morality such as spying, and invitation of students to night parties in town when they were supposed to be reading. Administratively, there was no diplomacy in addressing and handling students’ affairs. The degree of staff victimization was high and many were living in fears and medical attention was very poor. Academically, there was low emphasis on academics but rather on co-curricular activities. There was deficiency in academic facilities, 20% Continuous Assessment marks for the S.S.2 students did not reflect on record and students’ requests were turned down. Parents ill advised their children to take to rioting instead of appeal to the school authority.

6.2 Immediate causes
The immediate causes were the chastisement of students over complaints of poor feeding. The senior students planned and spear-headed the riot when their requests were turned down. There was frequent interrogation of students over relationship with “enemy” staff. These and the punitive and arbitrary transfer of academic staff were the last strokes that broke the camel’s back. Consequently, there was break down of law and order. Peace and harmony could be restored when the generation of the senior students, who are now always in a riot mood, has passed out.

7.0 Recommendations
Based on the results of the study, the following recommendations are being made to fore stall students’ future unrest.

- The school authority should apply strict measure to uphold school rules and regulations.
- More effective use of the House mistresses should be made to disseminate policy information to students.
- Instead of only House mistresses, other staff should be involved in the process of the selection of college prefects. This will allow for more constructive assessment.
- The Teaching Service Commission should post professionally trained Counsellors to schools as full time Counsellors to handle counselling matters. Principals therefore should receive them as such.
- Counsellors should frequently organise both individual and Group counselling in the school
- Students should be dealt with as human beings and given a sense of direction bearing in mind their adolescent stage of development.
- Punishment (when need be) commensurate to the offence committed should be given for corrective measures.
- A well organized and more effective college press club should be encouraged whereby students could err their view and make constructive criticism within the college.
- Students’ information in the information box/suggestion box should not be neglected but acted upon. Also writers should not be victimized as this will discourage them.
- There should be frequent staff meetings to discuss school problems. Free flow of information between the staff and the authority should be encouraged by allowing staff to err their views during staff meeting or through other avenues.
- Staff accused in the riot should be transferred, students activities suspended and a firm and new Principal set in.
- The school social life should improve. The students should have more organized social evening at weekends, and one “outing” Saturday or Sunday monthly.
- Federal Government should increase the students’ meal subsidy in view of the inflation in the country.
- Interruption and sudden changes in programmes should be minimized and followed with long notice.
- Parents should help in giving their children the proper home training that they require.
- Students should no longer be used as spies nor be unnecessarily interrogated.
- Use of students to serve night parties outside the school compound should cease.
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