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Introduction

Universities all over the world have experienced one or two crises which are not limited to social and organisational unrests between the university staff unions and university authorities, students unions and university authorities, student to students’ groups, among others (Yammnjoh, Konings, 2012; Pitan&Akindele, 2016; Manderson, 2016; Omodan&Dube, 2019). Many of these unrests have been linked to university management styles with various accusations that university authorities are mostly autocratic in dealing with their subordinates (Omodan, 2016). Prominent among are pockets of protests staged by students and their leaders, whommost of the time perceive the university management as being indifferent to their plight and must be confronted in order to make their voices and agitations heard. Student unrest in Nigerian universities – of which many examples abound – is as a result of the crisis between the students and university authorities in the University of Ado Ekiti, in 2009, 2011 and 2014; ObafemiAwolowo University in 2009 and 2014; LadokeAkintola University; University of Ibadan; Lagos State University and University of Lagos, among others (Etadon, 2013; Odu, 2013; Premium Times, 2017; Omodan, 2019). These perpetual unrests caused by students as a result of one or more disagreements and dichotomies with institutional authorities have resulted into the loss of lives, destruction of properties and undue elongation of academic sessions (Fomunyam, 2017; Akparep, 2019).

From my observations, following intensive research, studies have shown that student-oriented crisis, unrest and protests, continue unabated in the university system due to the improper management of such crises. This view is corroborated by Akeusola, Viatonu and Askhia (2012); Etadon (2013); Davies, Ekwere and Uyang (2015) that, despite them any solutions that have been provided by the universities, scholars and government, student unrest is still at its peak in Nigerian tertiary institutions. From this, one can see that there are concerted efforts by the university authorities, government and concerned stakeholders to put an end to this
imbroglio. Sadly, it appears they are not cognizant of the social and human factors that are needed to ameliorate the problem. This position supports Sousa and Moço (2017) assertion that organisational management is not only meant to take care of people but also their environment and way of life. In other words, there are many social and university climatic factors affecting the management, control and prevention of students’ unrest in the system. Identifying these factors will provide effective and efficient management and avoid future occurrences. These factors are not disconnected from the university environment and the shenanigans of its occupants who are mainly students. Thus, Omodan (2019) and Omodan, Kolawole and Fakunle (2016), posit that the university climate which is synonymous with environmental factors has a great influence on the behaviours of stakeholders in the school system.

From the above, one can agree that the university management team when responding to cases of students' unrest might have disregarded the threat environmental and social factors pose which are capable of influencing the behaviour of the stakeholders among themselves. Simply put, when social and climatic influencers are unpleasant or antisocial, this will lead to the antisocial behaviour of students, which is tantamount to crisis and/or unrest. The above line of thought makes direct reference to the theory of Campus Ecology which corroborates this assertion. According to this theory, the relationships between organisms and their environment predict to a large extent the understanding of the behaviour of the organism (Banning & McKinley, 1998). This theory was propounded by Banning in 1990 who predominantly described the consequences of the interactions between college students and the campus environment.

Hence, one of the major contributions of campus ecological perspective to students' unrest is the systematic and comprehensive consideration of the campus environment as a factor that can threaten the peace of the university if not controlled (Davies, Ekwere & Uyanga, 2015). On the other hand, several social vices on campuses, such as campus cult activities, drug abuse and addiction, and examination malpractice, among others, are the resultant effect of the environmental influences found within the student population on campus (Aluede, Jimoh, Agwinede & Omorogbe, 2015). All these, if taken with levity, can constitute a huge deficit to the management of crises in universities because when there is lack of adequate security, the presence of environmental hazards, unpleasant classroom ecology, unprofessionalism in the quality of personnel services, and undesirable external interferences will likely propel negative behaviour. This is tantamount to the breaking down of law and order since the environment and individuals are determinants of human behaviour (Lewin, 1936). In other to inject good and productive behaviour into students and other stakeholders in the university system, the place of ubuntu as a relational theory will help to unpack the trajectories of managing student unrest in the universities.

Ubuntu as a theoretical framework for this study

This study is underpinned by ubuntu. Ubuntu as a philosophy of oneness and humanity (Omodan & Tsotetsi, 2019), is traceable to some African Languages such as IsiXhosa, IsiZulu, IsiNdebele and IsiSwati which, in a broader sense, means unity and humanness (Tutu, 2004; Bolden, 2014). In Omodan's (2019) claim, Ubuntu emanated from Africa. This was the era when people lived together in harmony without recourse to their diversities. From the Zulu language, Lefa (2015) claims that Ubuntu is associated with the words; “umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu” which means “a person is a person through other people.” In the same vein, the Zulu word “simunye” which could be interpreted as “we are one in unity” (Marunda, 2015; Bangura, 2017; Variri and Variri 2019) or “we are united.” Ubuntu is also called an African philosophy likened to oneness, unity, brotherhood, love and compassion (Bondai & Kaputa, 2016; Omodan, 2020). Ubuntu was identified by Tutu (1999) as a mutual way of doing things, generosity, empathy, honesty and communal commitment. From the foregoing, it is right to say that Ubuntu principled towards humanness, oneness, solidarity, strength in unity, resilience, compassion, and empathy is not out of place.

The principle of ubuntu was categorised into three by Mogadime, Mentz, Armstrong and Holtam (2010), they are spirituality, interdependence and unity. They argued that spirituality is the idea that people must live in harmony with one another and that this is a call from the Supreme Being. The second principle which is interdependence means that, people are dependent on one another that no one exists in isolation. That is, the seniors, subordinates, and equals can only survive in their unity and combined strength. And the third is
unity, they believe that unity in diversity will enhance the progress and development of people who share the same mission and vision. This could be likened to a university community where different sets of stakeholders work together for one purpose which is to produce high-quality graduates for economic sustainability (Daniela, Salvadori & Raffaella, 2017). Reflecting on the aspect of spirituality, the university authorities who are assumed to be privileged must utilize all the available resources in their power to selflessly serve and protect those that are assumed powerless which in this case could mean students. This is because spatiality according to Njunji (2016), is when one provides selfless services to protect and benefit the underprivileged. This theory is, therefore, relevant to this study because its principles can inject good organisational and human behaviour most especially in the university system. Adding to this, Brydon-Mille and Coghlan (2014) reiterate that Ubuntu propels ethics and commitment into people which is meant to change their behaviour for good. That is, when the spirit of Ubuntu is adopted in the university community, the people and environmental behaviours will likely reflect love, unity, oneness, commitment, collaboration and connectedness which in my argument, is tantamount to the actualisation of the university's goals and objectives devoid of friction and social unrest between students and university authorities.

Research Question
To achieve the above, as postulated by Ubuntu, the following research question guided the study:

1. How can the threat associated with the management of student unrest in the university system be unmasked to pave way for smooth university operation devoid of social unrest?

Research Objectives
By responding to the above research question, the following research objectives were raised to pilot the study:

1. The study examined the threats associated with the management of student unrest in the university system in Nigeria.
2. The study also investigated the possible implication for the effective management of threats.

Methodology

Research Paradigm
This study falls under Transformative Paradigm (TP) because its aims and objectives are to transform the university community from the state of social instability as a result of student unrest into a state of stability devoid of social unrest. TP, based on its axiology, promotes moral, cultural respect, social justice and human rights (Mertens, 2010). It equally addresses inequities and reciprocity (Mertens, 2017). From its ontological views, the reality that shaped social issues such as crisis management in the university community is politically inclined, and socially, historically and culturally embedded. This is to confirm the notion that reality exists outside the mind (Elshafe, 2013). The epistemological stance of this paradigm, in line with this study, is based on the social relationships, reality, sociality and power differential among the researched. This is why the establishment of interactive relationship is needed to be able to understand and deal with power differentials within community members (Mertens, 2012). This paradigm is appropriate because it further gives hope to the theory of ubuntu in its mission to transform the university community. In the same vein, the methodical design of TP also falls within the purview of participatory action researchers (Mertens, 2005) which also focuses on the dynamics of emancipation (Dube, 2016). This is why this study adopted Participatory Action Research (PAR) as its research design.

Participatory Action Research as a Research Design
Since this study is hoping to provide a solution to social issues; student unrest in the university system, it is expedient to involve all the stakeholders in the system to jointly share their experience in solving the problem. Participatory Action Research then becomes relevant. PAR is traceable to radical tradition towards participation, action and development of knowledge to respond to social injustices, inclusivity and above all, it empowers and emancipates the marginalised (Khan & Chovanec, 2010:34). In my argument, PAR requires equal participation between the researchers and the researched who are enlightened, to identify, analyse and address the issues at hand. This definition shows that PAR is a bundle of activities that encompasses investigation (research), and educationally works and acts towards changing the status quo. Subjecting this
research process into PAR allows the people to face their problems jointly and provides solutions using their experience, actions and inactions. Tshelane (2013) confirms the above view that PAR values the indigenous and local knowledge of the marginalised groups as a basis for a revolutionary action which can improve the lives of people. Therefore, using PAR to design this study, enables me to get into the stakeholders of the university, bring them together within the principle of fairness, equal participation and dismantled power play to ensure a lasting solution to the problem of students’ unrest in the system.

Method of Data Collection
To implement PAR, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was used to collect data from the participants and this is appropriate because it speaks to bringing people together, talking together, sharing experiences and views for problem-solving purposes. Romm (2015) opines that the use of FGD, interviews, surveys and threaded discussions are practical ways of ensuring the free participation of people while providing a solution to their problems. In complementing the above, this data generation method according to Escalada and Heong (2014), enables the research group to obtain insights into participants’ perceptions, needs, problems, beliefs and reasons for certain practices. The researcher then engaged the participants in three different meetings; the first meeting was to inform them about the research and the method used. In the second meeting, we discussed the research question and objectives. The last meeting was made to cross-check the interpretation of data. This enabled the participants to know the meanings given to their utterances as to whether the interpretation and analysis represent their original views.

Participants and the Selection of Participants
The population of this study comprised eight stakeholders in the university community in Nigeria. The stakeholders include two student leaders, two university lecturers, two members of university authority, two external and two internal security personnel, saddled with the protection of lives and properties in the university community. These stakeholders were selected using convenient sampling techniques. The technique was used because it is less time-consuming as the subject is quick and easy to approach. It was expedient to use this kind of sampling because some set of participants are highly placed individuals who are not easily accessible because of the restrictions placed around their offices. They can only be reached strictly on their invitation. Hence, the main assumption associated with convenience sampling is that all the members of the target population are capable of providing the needed information because they are homogenous (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, 2016:3). Therefore, considering the nature of their experiences, actions and inactions in terms of student unrest and its management, this technique is considered appropriate because it enables researchers to make use of easily accessible participants (Alvi, 2016:23) among the targeted population.

Method of Data Analysis
The study adopted Socio-thematic Analysis (StA) to interpret the data. This method of analysis was propounded by Omodan (2019), as the best method of dealing with social issues in research. This, according to him, enables the researcher to study and understand the sociality of the participants. That is, it gives more light into how the participants’ relationships are framed and what might be responsible for the social unrest between the university authority and the students. This method, according to him, is a combination of Braun & Clarke (2006)’s the thematic analysis and Conversational Analysis that was described by Omodan (2019) and Nordquist(2019) as doing things with words to perform social actions such as describing, agreeing, questioning offering, and talking, assumed to be understood when people act out their sociality through conversation. Therefore, StA takes cognizance of the six steps of thematic analysis by familiarising with data, generating code or coding, identifying the themes, reviewing the themes, defining and or naming the themes, and producing the reports/analysis using conversationality (Omodan, 2019). That is, all the categorised statements under the respective themes are interpreted with the sociality test to uncover the social dependency and independency among the participants. This method, therefore, helps me to break down the data into relevant themes according to the objectives of the study with an analytical understanding of the power differentials and the kind of relationships that exist among them.
Ethical Consideration
This research is part of a bigger project and it received ethical approval with ethical clearance number UFS-HSD2018/1105 from the University of the Free State, South Africa. All the prescribed directives in terms of ethics were observed. The consent of the participants was obtained and they were allowed to either accept or reject participation. They were given the freedom to withdraw at any point they feel uncomfortable with the research process. They were assured of the non-disclosure of their identities to any third party without their notice or prior approval from them. Based on this, their identities were represented with pseudonyms during data presentation and analysis. They were represented as follow; University Authority (UA1&2), Student Leader (SL1&2), University Lecturer (UL1&2), Security Personnel (SP1&2).

Data Presentation and Analysis
Data gathered with the use of PAR is presented and analysed below using socio-thematic analysis. The data were categorised based on the two objectives raised above: the threats associated with the management of student crises in the university system and the possible success associated with effective management of crisis between students and university authorities.

Threats Associated with Management of Student Crises in the University System

This section deals with the analysis of data as thematised according to those conversations that fall under the likely threats that could hinder the management of the student-oriented crisis in the university system. Data was rationalised under the following sub-headings: Campus environmentalism and Drug abuse.

Campus Environmentalism
University environmentalism, in this study, refers to the factors that fall under school climate and environmental ecology of which the external and internal relationships of the university are not an exemption. That is, a pleasant environment is likely to produce a peaceful environment and if otherwise, has become a threat to the existence of such an organisation. These are factors that influence the behaviours of students and other stakeholders in the university system (Hodgetts & Altman, 2078). Since this is confirmed to have a significant influence on the behaviours of students, then it becomes a threat where the university environment is disposed negatively to the university community. Besides, the discussion with participants revealed that when these environmental factors are not well-controlled, they are capable of threatening the peaceful relationships and coexistence of university stakeholders, more especially students and university authorities. The evidence is shown in the conversations below:

**UA1:** Environment is an influential factor that cannot be under-carpeted. If the environment is not favourable, the expected results will be negatively inclined and vice versa.

**SP1:** The ability of the government to decode or interpret signs coming from the environment goes a long way in ensuring stability in that system.

**SP2:** Crisis don’t just assume, it starts with grumbling and probably with just a minor protest as it has been in Nigeria.

From the above conversations, it is confirmed that factors of university environment are as important as the university itself. If those factors such as adequate security, hazards and pollution, classroom ecology, university and community relationships, external and internal interference are not positively discharged or dispensed, they will lead to negative outcomes. Such outcomes include, but are not limited to protest, crises, and misunderstanding among the university stakeholders. The inability of the university to manage all these factors according to Lewin (1936) is detrimental to human behaviours, which is tantamount to the breaking down of law and order. This is not an exemption in a university environment. The second statement also confirms how detrimental campus environmentalism could be to the university’s peaceful existence by recommending to the governing council, which is the top management body of the university, to devise means to which these threats can be controlled. By so doing, this will enable them to detect any likely
occurrence of resistance coming from the students. It is confirmed by this statement that crisis do not just happen. They start from grumbling and protest as a result of environmental dissatisfaction. Hence, environmentalism is not only restricted to just the physical environment but is also concerned with the culture of the university, individual differences based on experiences and the knowledge of applications to issues. This is explained as follows:

SL2: The culture that the students and management will somehow be different but need to be blended as much as possible or else this becomes a big threat to the establishment.

UL1: The view of each party differs and if not ameliorated to consider environmental factors, crisis is inevitable.

The above statements show that both the university authorities and students view issues from different perspectives which could be regarded as students’ culture and management culture. This culture tends to be in opposition to each other. It refers to the way students respond to issues from management and the way management responds to issues from students. This diversity in stakeholders’ culture in the system needs to be ameliorated or else it will spell doom for the existence of the university. On the second statement, it shows that judgment should be assigned based on the background of the participants because each social background affects the way they behave. That is, students, appear to be too demanding based on their level of understanding and youthfulness, while the school management is usually elderly persons who as a result of cultural values, demand to be respected and be listened to. If these are not done following the principle of cultural background and individual difference, it becomes a huge environmental threat to the system. Therefore, it is logical and socially acceptable to conclude that campus environmentalism is a threat to student-management relationships in the university system.

**Drug Abuse**

Drug abuse is a general phenomenon which may not only be attributed to the university community alone, but the trajectory is that it is common among the youth and youths constitute at least 70 per cent of the members of a university community. Various crises happening in the universities have been in one way or the other linked to substance addiction and drug abuse in the system (Aluede, Jimoh, Agwinede & Omoregie, 2015). The substances that are usually misused on campus are narcotics, cannabis, hallucinogens, alcoholic beverages, tobacco, inhalants, caffeine beverages, and all forms of stimulants (Amayo & Wangai, 1994). This is adjudged to be responsible for violence and crisis in the university community. The misuse of these substances is synonymous to the violent and criminal behaviour of students (Sugut & Mugasia, 2014:127). This was also confirmed during our discussion. See below:

UL2: Alcoholism is a general phenomenon that society is battling with. It is now a major threat to organisations including schools.

UA2: Students become difficult to manage most especially when they are under the influence of drug and other substances.

SL1: When we drank too much back then, it gave us the strength to fight on. This no doubt leads to negative social influence.

The first statement buttresses the fact that drug abuse is not only peculiar to university students alone but the entire society. From the social perspective, one can see that the menace is beyond the control of a singular organisation and it is a huge threat to the university system because students under the influence of any substances will be difficult to manage. Such a person or student will not be in control of their thinking faculty and may behave abnormally, hence, prone to violence and other anti-social vices. This is confirmed by the second statement and buttressed by bodies of existing literature that drug abuse has a significant correlation on university riots and students’ violence (Florence, 2010:127). According to the last statement, this participant confirmed that even students’ leaders at some point drink excess alcohol to enable them to fight to a standstill. Therefore, the use or the abuse of drugs is not only peculiar to unserious students, but leaders and other students also engage in such possibly to give them unrelenting strength of resistance. Therefore, it is appropriate to logically and socially conclude that drug abuse is a threat in managing the university system.
**Possible implication associated with effective management of student unrest**

This section will focus on the analysis of participants’ statements under the possible implication that will be recorded by the entire university if the issues of student unrest are nipped in the bud by the university management. This was done under the sub-themes as follows: University productivity and students’ academic performance.

**Productivity and students’ academic performance**

Productivity and effectiveness form the goals and objectives of the university system. This is why the stakeholders strive to ensure that they do not just graduate students, but ensure that they produce quality and worthwhile graduates who would be impactful and contribute to the development of the society and the economic development of the nation at large. In achieving this comes the importance of peace and relative tranquillity. The presence of peace is a point of motivation to the members of the university community to unanimously work together to achieve their target objectives. According to Yaya, Uzohue, and Akintayo (2016), this is expedient because motivation has a significant contribution to the productivity of the subordinates. Hence, the discussion conducted with the research participants also showed that when there is relative peace and tranquillity, more especially an amicable relationship between the students and university authorities, it will enhance optimum productivity in the system. See below:

**SL2:** *When there is peace on campus, properties will not be destroyed; new students will want to come and study here, and there will be a smooth running of the academic calendar which will encourage parents to bring their wards to the school leading to more financial increase.*

This statement shows that the absence of conflict in the university community is socially synonymous to lack of vandalism, which will protect the campus from any kind of anti-social behaviour. This impression will also attract more parents and prospective university students to have a positive mindset towards university education. In addition to this, students know that they will graduate at the nick of time, unlike my own experience as an undergraduate where I spent six years for a four-year programme. This was not because I failed but as a result of unanatable academic calendar and disruptions. This shows that the university, at that time, was unable to achieve its aims and objectives. Moreover, students were also affected as these disruptions put their personal and academic achievement in jeopardy. Therefore, it is socially logical to conclude that peace among stakeholders is synonymous with productivity.

**UA1:** *A crisis-free university community gives a certain level of assurance nationally and internationally. It promotes good morals and quality academic standard.*

**SP1:** *When there is relative peaceful coexistence in the university system, the university itself will be productive and have a brighter societal future for its graduates.*

The first statement equates peace to a good name. This means that the absence of crisis in the university will create a good name for the university, both nationally and internationally. This could also be interpreted that such a university is operating under presupposed morals and international academic standards (UNESCO, 2002). This is not enough as the second statement revealed that the presence of peace ensures productivity. This means that, when the university stakeholders enjoy harmonious teamwork and relationships, it will not only affect the university positively, but the students will also be guaranteed a brighter future in society. This is in line with Eneh’s (2015) view that a high level of productivity can only be obtained in a violence-free environment.

**Students’ Academic Performance**

Students’ academic performance in no small measure is one of the objectives of university management because this defines whether the university is productive or not. It is generally believed that staff efficiency if not translated to students’ academic performance is of no use. Therefore, students are expected to showcase the academic quality dispensed in them by having good academic achievement (Karimi, 2008). Many factors are responsible for this. These factors, according to Ohiwerei and Onimawo (2016), are not only limited to the intelligence and socio-political background of students but also determined by the levels of anti-social behaviour of students, of which protest is one of them. Such as protest among others. This does not only
appear in literature, as the discussion conducted with my research participants also revealed that relative peace and tranquillity are significant to students’ academic performance and achievement. This is shown below:

**SL2:** When all indices are put in place for the sake of peace, students understand they have lesser challenges other than how to study hard and make the society work.

**UL2:** My brother, when there is peace, students will be happy to take learning to a higher level then there will be productivity and student academic performance will increase.

The sociality of the above statement is not far from the fact that the availability of all peace apparatus becomes a motivation for students to study hard for their development and also the development of the society, which is the outward target of all education systems according to the National Policy on Education (Federal Government of Nigeria, 2013). The second statement also predicts the mutuality in the conversation without any power play among the conversant. Irrespective of their classes and positions, the call for peace is unanimously agreed to be the propeller of students’ academic performance. Moreover, it was also confirmed that both social and psychological stability of all stakeholders in the university is related positively to academic performance as shown in the conversation below:

**UL1:** Peace of mind to study, psychological stability, stable lecture and examination time which in turn reflects on students’ academic performance and university output.

This implies that the psycho-social state revolves around students including the physical factors such as stable lecture time and examination time, which are all predictors of academic performance. Therefore, from these inferences, one can logically and socially conclude that the internal and outward states of existence have a significant correlation with students’ academic behaviour. Hence, to ensure students’ effectiveness in the university system, there must be relational peace between the students and the university authority.

**Presentation of Findings based on the objectives**

This section presents findings as it relates to the constructs on the likely threats that may hinder the effective management of crisis between the students and the university authorities. The threats highlighted in the findings are campus environmentalism and drug abuse. Also, from the findings related to academic success, we can envisage when crises in the university system are well and adequately controlled and managed. These possible successes are discussed under the following themes: University productivity and students’ academic performance.

**Campus Environmentalism**

It was discovered that adequate security, hazards and pollution, classroom ecology, university and community relationships, external and internal interference that contribute to what makes campus environmentalism are some of the factors that threaten the management of crisis between the students and the university authorities. This is to say that if these factors are not positively discharged, they are capable of leading to negative outcomes such as protests, crises, and misunderstanding among the university stakeholders. It was also revealed that diversity in stakeholders’ culture in the system needs to be ameliorated because this affects the behaviours of stakeholders. That is, students, appear to be too demanding based on their level of understanding and youthfulness, while the school management is usually elderly persons, who as a result of cultural values, demand to be respected and be listened to. From the findings of Omodan et al., (2016) they hold that academic environmental climate is positively related to the overall effectiveness of schools among which are universities. This view is related to the theory of Ubuntu that states that when there is love, oneness, unity, compassion and collaboration among the stakeholders, it predicts to a large extent, the display of productive behaviour of the organism (Mogadime, et al., 2010). On the other hand, when the environment is negative, the result will be negative. This, if not controlled, becomes a great threat to the existence of university management (Davis, Ekwere & Uyangas, 2015). Hence, it is rational to conclude that campus environmentalism is a threat mitigating against students-management relationships.

**Drug Abuse**
Drug abuse is found to be another threat to the management of students’-related issues in the university community. This is not found solely by the university system, but it is found to be a general problem affecting the entire society. It was found that the abuse of drugs such as narcotics, cannabis, hallucinogens, alcoholic beverages, tobacco, inhalants, and caffeine beverages are not only consumed by the unserious students but in some cases taken by students and even students’ leaders. If this continues, then it becomes dangerous for peace to reign in the university community. Florence in her (2010) study on students’ violence submits that drug abuse has a great influence on riot and students’ violence. Her claims are justified by Sugut and Mugasia in their (2014) findings where they state that drug abuse is highly significant with high-reliability co-efficient to university violence. This is where Ubuntu comes to play because of its principles of cultural acceptance and value. On the part ofubuntu when these students are well-taken care of, and the university authorities show them, love, listen to their complaints and grievances, and make them feel included and likethat they are part of the system when the students are provided with all they need to be successful, they may resist any act of drug abuse and other social vices. Therefore, the misuse or abuse of substance remains a threat to the management of the university system.

**University Productivity**

From the above discussion, it was revealed that when there is absolute peace and tranquillity in the university system, it is tantamount to the speedy actualisation of the set and predetermined goals and objectives. This, in turn, will positively reflect in the general productivity of the system. It was also deduced that the presence of peaceful coexistence will enable the students to graduate punctually. All these are elements of productivity with evidence for societal development. This will not only motivate university authorities for performance but also stand as a point of conformability to students. Motivation, according to Yaya et al., (2016) will significantly contribute to a subordinates’ performance for productivity. Eneh (2015) accepts that a high level of productivity can only be guaranteed in a violence-free environment. It was, however, confirmed, that the university system will record uninterrupted successes when there are peace and relative tranquilility.

**Students’ Academic Performance**

The findings showed that when there is no rancour or crisis in universities, it will positively affect the academic performance of students. This is deduced from the fact that a positive reflection of both the psychosocial states of the students, as well as physical factors such as stable lecture times and examination time, will motivate students towards more academic achievement. This agrees with the philosophy of Ubuntu that describes the essence of motivation on stakeholders’ unity (Variri & Variri 2019). That is, a peaceful environment is a pointer to students’ motivation to study hard for better academic performance. Ohiwerei and Onimawo’s research in (2016) indicates that factors such as strike actions, students’ protest and other antisocial activities are also accountable for the performance of students. This is to say that when there is no peace, there may not be a record of dependable academic performance. This is also supported by the conclusion of Ajayi (2014) that incessant strike actions in universities have inadvertently affected the academic calendar of university students and this poses a lot of challenges to their study duration, performance in examinations, and their final grading. From this, one can conclude that the presence of peace and relative tranquilility will lead to a spike in the quality of students’ academic performance.

**Conclusion and Recommendation**

This study has successfully explored and opened up waysin which the social space of the university system can be transformed. Among these transformation process is the practice of Ubuntu as an input, process, and output remedy for the management of student unrest. Campus environmentalism such as classroom ecology, the provision of conducive teaching and learning space for students, university and community relationships, internal-external interference, and drug abuse are the major factors that threaten the relationships between students and university authority thereby making the system unpleasant and out of control. The bright side is that when these threats are effectively managed, the resultant effect will ensure uninterrupted university productivity and a high standard in students’ academic performance. In summary, campus environmentalism and drug abuse are the catalyse student unrest in the university and if effectively controlled, prevented, and managed, will promote university goals and objectives. Based on this, this study recommends that the
university authorities must take cognizance of not only the people and the facilities available in the system but also ensure that university environmental factors are taken into consideration. This is because it was campus environmentalism, as well as drug abuse, are the major social threats militating against the management prowess of the university. To achieve a conducive environment for the good of all, the university management must take a stand and deal with these issues accordingly. This is the only way to ensure the safety and peace of the university community.
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