



MANAGEMENT OF INSECURITY AND QUALITY EDUCATION DELIVERY IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN THE SOUTH-EAST NIGERIA

DR. OKONKWO BERNADETTE NGOZI¹

&

NWOKORIE GODSON CHIDI²

Department of Educational Foundation^{1&2}

BenjaniUwajumogu (State) College of Education,
Ihitte Uboma, Imo State, Nigeria.

Abstract

This study on management of insecurity and quality education delivery in public universities in South-east Nigeria stems from the researcher's concern on the increasing cases of insecurity in Nigerian public universities which undoubtedly can have adverse effect on quality academic delivery. This study used the descriptive survey research design with four research questions as guide for the study. The population of this study is 265,548 people, made up of 10,548 academic staff and 255,000 students in three federal and three state public universities in South-east Nigeria. A purposive random sampling technique was used to select 300 teaching staff and 540 students. One hundred and forty (140) samples were drawn from each of the selected public universities in order to generate a total of 840 respondents for the study. Researchers' 40 item questionnaire with a four point Likert rating scale- Management of Insecurity and Quality Education Delivery in Public Universities in South-east Nigeria (MIQEPUSEN) was used for data collection. Data generated were grouped according to the research questions and analyzed with mean scores while t-test was used to test two null hypotheses. The findings of the study revealed that kidnapping of students, theft and burglary in students' hostels and offices, violent demonstrations by students and student cult clashes are the most significant prevailing security challenges in public universities in Southeast, Nigeria. Based on the findings of the study, it was recommended that administrators of public universities should not only employ competent security men to deter security threats against staff and students and university facilities but also expel students who engage in cultism and other vice, among other things.

Keywords: Management, Insecurity, Quality Education Delivery, Public Universities and South East Nigeria

Introduction

University education is central to any nation's manpower growth and development and it is globally acknowledged as the cornerstone for social, economic and technological advancement. In recognition of the crucial role of higher education, the National Policy on Education designates university education as that level of education after secondary school which seeks to achieve the objectives of inculcating professional training, skill acquisition and stimulating the physical and intellectual capacity of individuals to enable them to develop into useful members of their communities (FRN, 2014). Over the years, the Federal Government

of Nigeria, Federal agencies like Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFUND), the 36 state governments and the private sector have made huge financial commitments to public universities which run into trillions of naira to provide infrastructures, facilities and human resources to improve the quality of education to meet up with the desired standards which can compete with the global benchmark (Offor, Offia and Nwaru, 2023). Despite the huge investment in university infrastructure the quality of education has continued on a downward slide as observed by (Mailuno and Mimi, 2019; Atsumbe, 2020). More importantly, the huge investment on educational infrastructure /



equipment and even the staff and students are facing insecurity challenges which have implications for quality education delivery. This state of affairs places an additional burden on university management to create an orderly environment for academic activities to attain the required standards.

Currently, incidents of insecurity such as banditry, kidnaping, abduction, violent students protest, rioting etc. are widespread across Nigeria. This was buttressed by Ogunbunmi and Olaoye (2024) who observed that Nigeria has been witnessing unprecedented insecurity. Obeta, (2019) also noted that there has been a spike in the waves of insecurity in many parts of the five states that make up the South East and this has been evident in the spate of killings, arson, and other forms of violent criminal activities in the region. Similarly, in the Northern part of Nigeria and the middle belt, insurgencies have led to large scale destruction of infrastructure in public universities. No wonder in the 2024 Global Peace Index (GPI), Nigeria ranked 147th out of 163 countries. This ranking places it as one of the least peaceful nations globally and also the 37th most peaceful country in Africa (Institute for Economics and Peace, 2024).

A university is an important level of education designed to meet the manpower needs of the society. In the views Nnorom, Ezenwagu and Nwankwo (2020) a University is a unique and well organized environment meant to encourage and promote research and other intellectual activities for the benefit of its attendants, host communities and the nation at large. Nevertheless, a university cannot be completely immune from the insecurity prevalent in Nigeria's social life. Every university exists in a community or locality and just like the activities of a university can influence its environment, events and activities in the society also have an impact on the university. In a university, the Vice-chancellor is the Chief Executive and Chief Academic Officer of the university and the management of insecurity rests on his or her shoulders. Apart from being the Chief Accounting Officer, the Vice-chancellor

provides leadership for the university and directs its affairs towards the actualization of its vision, mission and objectives. In the performance of his duties, the Vice-Chancellor is usually assisted by other members of the senior management team such as the Registrar, the Bursa and the Librarian. The protection of university infrastructures and the staff and students are the duties of the university management. Therefore every university's management has the primary duty to ensure that the prevalent insecurity in the society is reduced to the barest minimum in the campus. The implication of this is that every university's management must not only be proactive in managing insecurity by protecting existing educational infrastructure but also put adequate measures in place to safeguard the lives of students and staff.

According to Offor et al (2023) daylight robbery, rape, kidnaping for ransom and stealing by hoodlums in students' lodges and hostels are common occurrences in public universities in Southeast, Nigeria. These hoodlums are known to have robbed students of their belongings like phones, television, laptops etc. Abdullahi and Orukpe (2016) argued that insecurity in universities assume various forms such as cultism, vandalism of university facilities; stealing, theft, rape, money rituals, hostels/office burglary, mobile phone/laptop snatching, violent protests by students and sexual abuse perpetrated by staff and students. They stressed that cultism especially cult rivalry is one form of insecurity in Nigerian universities which has a profound negative effect in running of academic activities. Other forms of insecurity which students might copy are organ harvesting, egg harvesting and drug addiction.

Effective teaching and learning process is achieved in a secured, supportive and peaceful environment and this create room for quality education. In this regard, the input processes must meet set criteria so that the output of the system can compare favourably with the set standards. There is no gainsaying that insecurity in public universities could affect the quality of university education and positive students' outcome. The constant closure of public



universities and the atmosphere of fear which pervades our universities could affect optimal academic interaction between lecturers and students. This scenario calls for the management of insecurity on the part of university administrators to ensure the security of lives and properties in the campuses so that both students and staff could engage in the academic processes and interact in an atmosphere of peace and orderliness. Therefore, management of insecurity in public universities would not only entail having a functional security department but also ensuring that adequate measures are put in place to forestall security breaches within the campuses. This could involve promoting safety awareness among students and staff as well as working with community stakeholders to address broader security issues that may impact the university negatively. Therefore insecurity management is a comprehensive administrative function, process, procedures and policies to ensure the safety of staff, students and other facilities and assets of the University, investigating and detecting crimes, reducing the incidence of reported crimes and the apprehension and prosecution of offenders. This view was buttressed by Nnorom et al (2020) when they asserted that security management is the identification of an organization's assets (human and material resources) and the development, documentation and implementation of policies and procedures for protecting those assets.

However, research efforts on how insecurity is affecting the delivery of quality education in public universities in the South-east of Nigeria is scanty despite the increasing instability in the region. Most research efforts are concentrated on insecurity in the Northern part of Nigeria where the activities of the Boko Haram Islamic sect has been most prominent for more than a decade. An area that seems to have been neglected by past researchers is the effect of insecurity on quality education especially in the Southeast region of Nigeria which had hitherto been relatively peaceful (Ogunbunmi and Olaoye, 2024). It is therefore expected that this current research effort will close this gap in research and also act as a precursor for further research effort in other

regions of Nigeria.

Statement of Problem

Nigerian public universities were setup with the objective of providing quality education and to train high level manpower which will bring about the overall development of the society. Over the years huge financial investments have been made in public universities by the federal and state governments in order to achieve the noble objectives of university education but the persistent cases of insecurity in our universities are becoming a threat to this huge investment and also an obstacle to the realization of quality education delivery. In Nigeria today, the ability of universities to act as the pivot of growth and development is being seriously threatened by rampant cases of insecurity within our campuses. The high rate of security threats and breaches in our universities which are evident in kidnaping, abduction, killings, violent protests, secret cult activities, drug addiction, egg harvesting and other anti-social crimes raise a big question mark over the capacity of university management to provide security for their university. Lecturers, students and university staff are often victims of violence within the universities and this has a wider implication for quality educational delivery. This is because in an atmosphere of insecurity, the teaching and learning process could be disrupted or operate at suboptimal level and this can negatively affects students' outcome. It is against this background that this study sought to examine how insecurity is managed to ensure quality education delivery in public universities in Southeast Nigeria.

Purpose of the study

The general purpose of this study is the management of insecurity and quality education delivery in public universities in the south-east Nigeria. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. find out the prevailing state of insecurity in the public universities in Southeast, Nigeria
2. Ascertain the impact of insecurity on quality education delivery in public universities in South-east Nigeria.
3. ascertain the management strategies adopted in the management of insecurity



in public universities in Southeast, Nigeria

4. Ascertain how the insecurity management strategies used influences quality education delivery.

Research questions

The following research questions guided this investigation:

1. What is the prevailing state of insecurity in public universities in Southeast, Nigeria?
2. What are the impacts of insecurity on quality education delivery in public universities in Southeast Nigeria?
3. What management strategies can be adopted in the management of insecurity in public universities in Southeast, Nigeria?
4. How do the insecurity management strategies adopted influence quality of education delivery?

Hypothesis

The null hypotheses below were tested at 0.05 level of significance:

Ho1: There is no significant impact of insecurity on the quality education delivery in public universities in South East Nigeria

Ho2: Insecurity management strategies does not significantly influence the quality of education delivery in public universities in South East Nigeria

Theoretical framework

Systems theory

This work is anchored on systems theory propounded by Ludwig von Bertalanffy, a biologist who is considered the founder of General Systems Theory. Systems theory in education views educational organizations as complex, interconnected systems where various components (students, teachers, administrators, parents, community, etc.) interact and influence each other. It emphasizes that the whole is more than the sum of its parts, and that changes in one part of the system can affect the entire system. This perspective encourages educators to

consider the broader context and relationships when addressing challenges and implementing changes. The systems theory posits that all parts of the educational system are interdependent and interconnected and depend on each other to function effectively. Due to the interconnectedness of the parts events, information and results from one part of the system influence other parts, creating cycles of interaction and change. Educational systems receive inputs (e.g., students, resources), process them through various activities, and produce outputs (e.g., graduates, knowledge). Also the educational systems interact with their environment (e.g., community, society) and are influenced by external factors. The system theory has a highly predictive explanatory power because it sees the entire system as a whole and it permits a broader view of the entire system. For instance the insecurity in the Nigerian larger society spills over as insecurity in the universities while the insecurity in the universities can influence the quality of educational process. Therefore the usefulness of the system theory is seen in the way it perceives and explores the interconnectedness of the various variables at stake in a study.

State of insecurity in public universities

Insecurity in Nigerian public universities is evident in kidnapping, cultism, violent student protests, destruction of university facilities and other forms of violence which create a climate of fear for staff and students. Insecurity can be referred to as a condition in which lives and properties are not safe. In a state of insecurity there is disorderliness, violence or imminent violence that will lead to injury, anxiety or conflict. Therefore, the term insecurity signifies the state of being under threat or danger. It is a condition of fear and threat of attack which is often characterized by anxiety and uncertainty (Ike, cited in Abubakar and Bashir, 2024). In the views of Ukwu, Ojonta and Manasseh (2024) on the other hand security is the absence of threats to life, and property. Mustapha, Salee and Adaramaja (2023) observed that the increasing rate of insecurity in Nigerian tertiary institutions has heightened concern among stakeholders in the educational sector because qualitative education hinge largely on a peaceful learning



atmosphere.

Insecurity is characterized by escalating threats, crime, injustice, and public disorder within society. Achumba, Ighomeroho and Akpor (2013) define insecurity as the state of being exposed to danger or threat of danger which could result into bodily harm. An atmosphere of insecurity is characterized by heightened anxiety, uncertainty as to safety and general fear in anticipation of violence against lives and properties. It is pertinent to note that security threats to a university environment can emanate from inside the campus or perpetrated by strictly outside elements or by connivance between those inside and those outside. Insecurity in public universities has been a source of concern among stakeholders in the educational sector.

Quality Education

Quality education refers to education which conforms to set standards of teaching and learning so that the outcome of the educational process can be acceptable to members of the society as that which complied with the basic requirements. In this regards, the input processes must meet set criteria so that the output of the system can compare favourably with the set standards. One of the objectives of Nigeria's educational system is quality education delivery. This implies that the inputs of the educational process must produce the expected output. In terms of the inputs students must have the capacity and motivation to learn while the teachers must have the required competence to teach. In addition the educational environment should be conducive for the teaching and learning process to take place. This is in consonance with the views of Saleh, Uwaleke and Allahnana (2019) who asserted that a quality university education is supported by three key pillars namely quality teachers, quality learning tools and professional development and the establishment of safe and supportive quality learning environment.

The input and output variables contribute to the level and extent of quality education delivery. One of the important index for assessing the quality of education is the evaluation of students'

performance overtime. This is often referred to as summative evaluation where evaluation is conducted at the end of a study. This evaluation is cumulative, comprehensive, valid and reliable. The implication of this is that the quality of educational delivery can be seen from students' performance over a period of time, Longe cited in Esenea, Obinwa, Amaefule, (2014). Thus, in examining quality educational delivery both the input and output processes must be taken into account. Any variable that affects the input and output variables could affect quality education delivery either positively or negatively. According to Bamisaiye (1983) inputs indices for quality education include the following,

- Quantity and quality of inputs to education Relevant curriculum
- Appropriate teaching methods and the quality of teaching aids
- Adequate and suitable infrastructural facilities
- Students-teacher ratios and students-classroom ratios
- Planning, administration and efficiency of inspection and supervision
- Availability of suitable textbooks, well equipped library and resource centers for teachers and students
- The proportion of the trained men and women in the teaching force
- Continuous assessment of learning activities and experiences
- Reliability of examinations in use
- The quality of learning that is achieved
- Parents' positive or negative attitudes to education

The aim of quality education is to empower students with knowledge, practical skills and the capacity for continuous learning and development. This in line with the views of Agazuma and Mochi (2021) who asserted that quality education is that which is pedagogically and developmentally sound and educates the student in becoming an active and productive member of society.

The constant closure of public universities and the atmosphere of fear which pervades our universities can affect optimal academic



interaction between lecturers and students. This is in consonance with the views of Saleh et al. (2019) who asserted that a quality university education is supported by three key pillars namely quality teachers, quality learning tools and professional development and the establishment of safe and supportive quality learning environment. It is worthy to note that effective teaching and learning is achieved in a secured and peaceful environment. This brings to fore the views of Jacob, Ahaotu and Obi-Ezenekwe (2021) that insecurity in schools has led to poor quality of academic delivery due to uncertainty and disruptions in the school calendar, and closure of educational institutions.

Prevailing state of insecurity in universities

Forms of insecurity affecting educational delivery in the public universities as noted by Afu, Oguche, Usman, and Gimba (2023) physical, verbal and sexual abuse perpetrated by staff and students. These forms of violence could have significant detrimental effects on the university environment, lecture attendance and academic attainment of students. Offor, Offia and Nwaru (2023) observed that kidnapping is on the high side and that some students of University of Nigeria, Nsukka (UNN) have been kidnapped severally. In the same vein, Yusuf and Idoghor cited in Mustapha et al (2023) revealed that some lecturers of the University of Maiduguri were abducted in 2017 and this led to the closure of the institution. The kidnaping of staff and students can lead to fear and anxiety amongst members of the university community and such act can jeopardize the objective goals of the university. Okpe and Igwebuikwe (2019) noted that various forms of security challenges in federal universities in North East Nigeria include secret cult activities, students' unrest kidnaping and Boko Haram crisis among others.

Manga (2019) observed that nonchalant attitude of school administrators on security and lack of comprehensive school security policy to guide action, causes insecurity in the school system. Akor, Abubakar, and Ogunode (2022) identified various causes of insecurity in Nigerian universities to include university's

administrators' poor approach to security matters, the lack of a university security policy which is known to every member of the university community, incompetent security guards, and remote school locations without proper security measures,. Ogwudile (2020) asserted that the activities of cultists are detrimental to peace and stability in our universities and that despite drastic policies and laws against cultists; they continue to operate illegally in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. The implication of this is that efforts made so far to stamp out cultism in universities have been unsuccessful.

Impact of insecurity on quality education delivery

Insecurity in public universities could have consequences to staff, students and academic activities. One of the very noticeable effects of insecurity which could have impact on quality education delivery in universities is the disruption of academic programmes and activities. Violent student unrest can lead to the closure of a university. The implication of this is a complete cessation of teaching and learning because once a university is closed down; students are expected to stay away from the campus. This view was buttressed by Adelakun and Olorunsola (2024) that conflict within and outside the immediate locality can disrupt the curricular and extracurricular activities of universities. Another negative effect of insecurity on quality education delivery is brain drain. In this case academic staff seeks for employment elsewhere where they perceive as safe enough for them to lecture. Some academic staff also seeks for employment abroad where their services are better rewarded (Adelakun and Olorunsola, 2024). The migration of lecturers and skilled professionals from one institution to the other or to abroad often leads to a shortage of qualified staff and disruptions of academic activities. In addition, Ojukwu (2017) in his findings revealed that unsafe school environment can make the students to be afraid, feel insecure, be absent from school and classes; and this affects their performance during assessments. Insecurity in public universities leads to the destruction of school facilities such as lecture



halls, laboratories and offices. Otu (2019) in congruence observed that the burning down of university buildings during insurgency or violent student protests lead to the state of inadequacy of these facilities, which in turn affects the teaching-learning processes in Nigerian universities. When students are not well taught, the system churns out half-baked graduates who may not be able to attain the societal needs. Afu, Oguche, Usman, and Gimba (2023) suggested that all stakeholders in education should intensify efforts to enlighten students on the need to avoid violent behavior. There is also the need for the government to step up its efforts on security. This view was buttressed by Olowonefa (2024) who argued that government should immediately address all issues breeding insecurities in Nigeria.

Management of insecurity for effective education delivery

In the management of insecurity the role of the Vice-chancellor as the head of the university management team is very vital and important. In every university, the Vice-chancellor's office is at the apex of the university's management. In the management of insecurity in a university, the Vice-chancellor plays a crucial and prominent role. The university's chief security officer who is directly in charge of security department reports directly to the Vice-chancellor. Likewise other members of the management team such as the bursar, the registrar and the chief librarian report to the Vice-chancellor.

One of the duties of a university's Vice-chancellor is to manage the human and material resources available to ensure adequate quality and standard of university education. In this regard, the safety of teaching /non-teaching staff, students; and the safeguarding of infrastructures and facilities come under the management functions of the university management team headed by the Vice-chancellor. In the management of a university, the security of the environment is important in order to ensure an effective education delivery. A similar view was expressed by Ukwu, Ojonta, and Manasseh (2024) who asserted that optimal teaching-learning environments have the potential to

enhance educational outcomes.

In the management of insecurity, the Vice-chancellor can adopt some measures and policies to curb insecurity. Udeorah (2006) is of the view that Vice- Chancellors of Universities in order to avert insecurity could employ the services of experienced retired security officers; administer disciplinary measures on erring staff and students. He stressed that some Vice-chancellors ensure that identification cards are issued to staff and students which serve as entry pass at designated entrance and exit gates of the university. Nwakpa (2015) stressed that in managing insecurity university management often take the form of immediate closure of the campus with an ultimatum to students to vacate the campus within a stipulated time. In some cases student unionism is banned or dissolved while students identified as the leaders of students protest are suspended or expelled from the university, in extreme case the Nigeria police and other paramilitary organizations are invited to quell violent protests and maintain law and order. Despite these measures cases of insecurity are still witnessed in the universities. Okpe and Igwebuike (2019) stated that school administrators should manage insecurity through the use of patrol vans in the school, expulsion of students who engage in anti -security activities, employment of secret agents to monitor students' activities in the campus, dismissal of any staff that engage in anti-security activities, locking all entries to the university premises at 8.00pm, use of metal detectors, use of security cameras, use of random dog sniffs to check for drugs, wearing of identity card by staff and students, control access to buildings during school hours. In this regard Mustapha , Sallee and Adaramaja (2023) in their study found that if security measures like school fence, gate, ICT surveillance, provision of CCTV to monitor movements of persons are provided in schools, the quality of service delivery in educational institutions will improve. They also advocated that capacity building on security should be periodically organized for staff and students and CCTV should be strategically placed in the school environment for safety purpose. Nwankwo and Olu (2021), observed that if more security personnel are available



within the universities insecurity will be reduced. They argued that more emphasis should be paid to intelligence gathering, security networking and crime prevention. Collaborative efforts between the security personnel in the university and law enforcement agents in terms of joint patrols and exchange of sensitive information is very necessary.

Methodology

This research was carried out in South- Eastern Nigeria which comprises five states namely Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo states. The five states are Igbo speaking and are usually counted as among the educationally advantaged states in Nigeria due to their high school enrolment figures and the number of university applicants from the area. The people are predominantly Christians and they are noted for trading and commerce. The five states collectively boast of eleven public universities namely Abia state university, Uturu; Michael Okpara University Agriculture, Umudike; Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam; Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka; Enugu State University of Science and

Technology, Enugu. University of Nigeria, Nsukka; Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki; Alex Ekwueme university, Ndifu Alike; and David Umahi Federal University of Health Sciences, Uburu. From these eleven universities six public universities (three public universities owned by state governments and three universities owned by the federal government) were selected for the study.

This study used the descriptive survey research design. Four (4) research questions guided this study while two(2) null hypotheses were posed for the study. The population of this study is 265,548 people made up of 10,548 academic staff and 255,000 students across all the 10 public universities in South-east Nigeria.

A purposeful sampling technique was used to select three state and three federal universities respectively in the South-east region. A random sampling method was used to select 300 lecturers and 540 students. One hundred and forty (140) respondents were selected from each of the selected public universities in order to generate a total of 840 respondents for the study.

Table1: sample distribution for teaching staff and students in Federal and State Universities

S/N	Name	Ownership	lecturers	students	Total
1	Federal University Ndifu Alike, Ebonyi State	Federal	50	90	140
2	University of Nigeria, Nsukka.	Federal	50	90	140
3	Federal University of Technology , Owerri	Federal	50	90	140
4	Ebonyi State University	State	50	90	140
5	Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu.	State	50	90	140
6	Abia State University, Uturu.	State	50	90	140
	Total		300	540	840

Researchers' structured four- point Likert scale questionnaire of 30 items with four point response option of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A) Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) was used for data collection. The questionnaire

tagged "Management of Insecurity and Quality Education Delivery in Public Universities in the South-East Nigeria" (MIQEDUSEN) has items that cover the four research questions. The questionnaire is made up of two parts A and B.



Part A elicited information on the demographic data of the respondents while part B contained the forty (40) item statements which the respondents provided answers in line with the purpose of the study and research questions posed for the study. The Instrument's face and content validity was done to ensure that each of the items sought the information that it was supposed to seek and as well, useful suggestions and corrections made to ensure that the items measured what they were intended to measure. The validation of the instrument was established by two experts from the Department of Measurement and Evaluation of Imo State University, Owerri who made inputs and modifications to the initial instrument. The reliability of the instrument was determined through the use of Cronbach Alpha reliability test to establish the internal consistency of the items. This yielded a Cronbach Alpha threshold of 0.88

which was considered adequate because it reflected a strong internal consistency. Considering the geographical span of the research three (3) research assistants were used to administer and retrieve the instrument in the universities selected for the study. The data generated from the respondents were collated and analyzed with mean scores. The mean was used to analyze the data collated while a threshold mean rating of 2.50 and above was regarded as agreed, while any items with a mean rating of less than 2.50 were regarded as disagreed. The two (2) null hypotheses formulated for the study were tested using the t-test statistics.

Result and Findings

Research Question 1: What is the prevailing state of insecurity in public universities in Southeast, Nigeria?

Table 1: Mean Response of Students and Lecturer on Prevailing State of Insecurity in Public Universities in South-East Nigeria

S/N	ITEMS	RESPONSES			
		Lecturers		Students	
		n=300	Remarks	n = 540	Remarks
1	Kidnapping of students occur regularly	2.80	Agree	2.78	Agree
2	Lecturers suffer from violent attacks by students	2.03	Disagree	1.99	Disagree
3	Theft and burglary in students hostels on the increase	3.51	Agree	3.51	Agree
4	Students avoid night classes for fear of being attacked	2.43	Disagree	2.07	Disagree
5	Classrooms surroundings are dark at night	2.90	Agree	2.25	Disagree
6	Security men patrol the campuses at night	2.35	Disagree	2.31	Disagree
7	Student cult clashes are rampant	3.13	Agree	2.31	Disagree
8	Lecturers are often attacked by unknown persons	2.35	Disagree	2.20	Disagree
9	Offices are often burgled by petty thieves	3.13	Agree	3.13	Agree
10	Students often engage in violent demonstrations	3.14	Agree	2.31	Disagree
11	Cases of rape exists on campus	2.32	Disagree	2.16	Disagree
	Grand Mean	2.73	Agree	2.46	Disagree

The analysis above presents responses from both lecturers (n = 300) and students (n = 540) regarding the state of insecurity in public universities in Southeast Nigeria. The data compares the mean responses on various insecurity-related items with a threshold mean of 2.50.

The data in Table 1 indicate that theft and burglary in students' hostels and offices by petty thieves are rampant. Also kidnapping of students student cult clashes, are adjudged as common occurrences. However, lecturers view the situation as more severe than students do. There is significant concern regarding theft, cult violence, and kidnapping, but less agreement on



issues like student demonstrations, attacks on lecturers, or dark classrooms. It is instructive to note that the lecturers and students disagree that cases of rape exists on the campuses. The grand mean suggests that while lecturers generally perceive the state of insecurity in these universities to be more serious, students tend to disagree with most of the insecurity concerns

raised in the survey. With a mean of above 2.50, the analysis of data in Table 1 shows a general perception of insecurity in the public universities surveyed.

Research Question 2: What are the effects of insecurity on quality education delivery in public universities in Southeast Nigeria?

Table 2: Mean Response of Students and Lecturer on the Impact of Insecurity on Quality Education Delivery in Public University in South-East Nigeria

S/N	ITEMS	RESPONSES			
		Lecturers		Students	
		n=300	Remarks	n = 540	Remarks
12	Students avoid reading in classrooms at night	2.67	Agree	2.6	Agree
13	Educational facilities are destroyed and vandalized	2.61	Agree	2.59	Agree
14	There is an atmosphere of uncertainty on campus	2.40	Disagree	2.31	Disagree
15	The syllabus is hardly covered	2.53	Agree	2.5	Agree
16	Campus closure occurs regularly	3.11	Agree	2.89	Agree
17	Students lack the zeal to study	2.99	Agree	2.86	Agree
18	Lecturers operate under fear of being attacked by hoodlums	2.57	Agree	2.55	Agree
19	Lecturers are afraid to evaluate students' performance objectively.	2.67	Agree	2.22	Disagree
20	The academic calendar is disrupted by incessant student demonstration.	2.47	Disagree	2.09	Disagree
21	Stolen/destroyed educational facilities are not promptly replaced	3.91	Agree	2.99	Agree
22	Reduction in class attendance by students	2.4	Disagree	2.11	Disagree
Grand Mean		2.76	Agree	2.52	Agree

Table 2 compares the mean responses of Lecturers (n = 300) and Students (n = 540) regarding the effects of insecurity on quality education delivery in public universities in Southeast Nigeria. Below is the interpretation of the analysis:

Both Lecturers and Students with a mean of above the threshold of 2.50 agreed that insecurity affects several aspects of education delivery,

such as students avoiding reading at night, educational facilities being destroyed, and the atmosphere of uncertainty on campuses. They also agree that the destruction of educational facilities is not quickly addressed. Both groups disagree with a mean below 2.50 on some points, particularly concerning syllabus coverage, student motivation, and campus closures. For example, the syllabus being hardly covered (item 16) is not seen as a major consequence of



insecurity. Also, while lecturers perceive more fear of being attacked, students don't seem to see it as a major concern. The grand mean of 2.76 and 2.52 suggests that both lecturers and students generally perceive that insecurity affects quality educational delivery in public universities in

Southeast Nigeria.

Research Question 3: What management strategies can be adopted in the management of insecurity in public universities in Southeast, Nigeria?

Table 3: Mean Response of Students and Lecturer on what Management Strategies can be adopted in the Management of Insecurity in Public University in South-East Nigeria

S/N	ITEMS	RESPONSES			
		Lecturers		Students	
		n=300	Remarks	n = 540	Remarks
23	The installation of Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) in appropriate places to monitor facilities and persons	3.01	Agree	2.94	Agree
24	Control of human and vehicular movement by well-trained security guards	3.03	Agree	3.44	Agree
25	Placing security men at all entrance and exit gates	3.02	Agree	3.00	Agree
26	Regular training of security personnel	2.19	Disagree	2.25	Disagree
27	Organizing security awareness seminar for academic and non-academic staff	3.05	Agree	2.28	Disagree
28	Provision of identity cards for staff and students	3.03	Agree	2.25	Disagree
29	Provision of visitors tags for to identify visitors	2.43	Disagree	2.41	Disagree
30	Expulsion of student cultists and students involved in violence	3.07	Agree	3.05	Agree
31	Attending to the genuine needs of students to forestall student unrest	3.13	Agree	3.00	Agree
32	Having a well -staffed students affairs department	3.02	Agree	3.10	Agree
33	Installation of solar lights around classrooms for enhanced night vision	3.09	Agree	3.14	Agree
Grand Mean		2.73	2.92	Agree	2.81

The table above presents responses from both lecturers (n = 300) and students (n = 540) regarding the management strategies that can be adopted to address insecurity in public universities in Southeast Nigeria. The responses highlight various strategies that may help improve security. Below is the interpretation of the analysis:

Both lecturers and students with mean above 2.50 agree on several strategies, particularly the installation of closed Circuit Television (CCTV), controlling human/vehicular movement, and placing security at gates. There is also strong agreement about the importance of expelling students involved in violence, attending to students' needs to prevent unrest, and improving



the student affairs department. Furthermore, with mean below 2.50, both groups tend to disagree on the effectiveness of identity cards and visitors' tags in improving security. They also differ on the usefulness of organizing security awareness seminars, with lecturers supporting it more than students. Both lecturers and students agree that improving security on campus is critical, and several management strategies are suggested. The most supported strategies include better surveillance, control of movement, training for

security personnel, and stronger administrative actions against violence. However, the two groups show varying levels of support for specific strategies, such as identity cards, security awareness seminars, and visitor identification systems.

Research Question 4: How do the insecurity management strategies adopted influence quality of education delivery?

Table 4: Mean response of students and lecturers on how insecurity management strategies adopted influence quality of education delivery in Public University in South-East Nigeria.

S/N	ITEMS	RESPONSES			
		Lecturers		Students	
		n=300	Remarks	n = 540	Remarks
34	Provision of identity cards helps in identifying undesirable elements	3.19	Agree	3.09	Agree
35	CCTV cameras can deter theft and burglary of offices	2.31	Disagree	2.22	Disagree
36	Theft and burglary in students hostels on the increase	3.09	Agree	3.01	Agree
37	Solar lights around classrooms can encourage students to attend night classes	2.43	Disagree	2.41	Disagree
38	Well trained security men can prevent violence against staff and students	3.10	Agree	3.00	Agree
39	Attending to students needs can prevent violent demonstration	2.42	Disagree	2.35	Disagree
40	Expulsion of cultists can enhance a conducive environment for academic studies	3.12	Agree	3.00	Agree
	Grand Mean	2.81	Agree	2.73	Agree

The table presents the mean responses of Lecturers (n = 300) and Students (n = 540) on how insecurity management strategies influence the quality of education delivery in public universities in Southeast Nigeria. Below is the interpretation of each item:

Both lecturers and students with a mean of above 2.50 agreed that certain strategies, such as identity cards for identification, well-trained security personnel, and expulsion of cultists, contribute positively to improving the security

environment, which can enhance the quality of education. With mean below 2.5, both groups disagree on the effectiveness of CCTV cameras in deterring theft and burglary, the increase of theft in hostels, and the impact of solar lights on encouraging night classes. Additionally, addressing students' needs is not seen as sufficient to prevent violent demonstrations. Both groups place significant value on the presence of well-trained security personnel and the expulsion of cultists, which are seen as key



factors in maintaining a secure and conducive learning environment. However, they seem less convinced that other strategies, such as identity cards and solar lights, are as impactful in improving educational delivery.

The analysis shows that lecturers' and students' agreed on the importance of specific insecurity management strategies, particularly those related to security personnel and addressing cultism on campus. However, both groups are less convinced about the effectiveness of certain other strategies like installation of CCTV cameras, solar lighting, and addressing students'

needs as solutions to security challenges. The grand mean for both groups suggests a general agreement that security management strategies do influence the quality of education, though there is some divergence in how effective different strategies are perceived to be.

Analysis of Research Hypothesis

The null hypotheses below were tested at 0.05 level of significance:

Hypothesis1: there is no significant impact of insecurity on the quality education delivery in public universities in South East Nigeria.

Table 5: t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means

Respondents	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	df	t-cal	t-critical
Lecturer	300	2.76	0.44	838	2.91	2.23
Students	540	2.52	0.31			

The table above presents the results of a Paired Two Sample t-Test to test the hypothesis

H₀: There is no significant impact of insecurity on the quality of education delivery in public universities in Southeast Nigeria.

The result reveals that the t-calculated value (2.91) is greater than the t-critical value (2.23). This suggests that the difference between the mean responses of lecturers and students is statistically significant. Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis (H₀) and conclude that there is a significant impact of insecurity on the quality

of education delivery in public universities in Southeast Nigeria. The analysis indicates that insecurity does have a significant impact on the quality of education delivery, as the t-statistic exceeds the critical value, and the null hypothesis is rejected. The lecturers and students have different perceptions of how insecurity affects education, but their responses both show that the impact is significant.

Hypothesis 2: insecurity management strategies do not significantly influence the quality of education delivery in public universities in South East Nigeria.

Table 6: t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means.

Respondents	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	df	t-cal	t-critical
Lecturer	300	2.81	0.40	838	6.85	2.45
Students	540	2.73	0.38			

The table presents the results of a Paired Two Sample t-Test to test the hypothesis

H₀2: Insecurity management strategies do not significantly influence the quality of education delivery in public universities in Southeast Nigeria.

The t-calculated value (6.85) is much greater than the t-critical value (2.45). This suggests that the difference between the mean responses of lecturers and students regarding the impact of insecurity management strategies is statistically significant. Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis (H₀) and conclude that insecurity



management strategies do significantly influence the quality of education delivery in public universities in Southeast Nigeria.

Discussion of Findings

The findings in the study revealed that kidnapping of students, theft and burglary in students' hostels and offices, violent demonstrations by students and student cult clashes are the most significant prevailing security challenges in public universities in Southeast, Nigeria. This is in line with the findings of Offor et al (2023) that kidnaping is on the high side in Nigerian Universities and that daylight robbery, stealing in students' lodges and hostels are common occurrences in public universities in South East, Nigeria. This finding is in consonance with the views of Abdullahi and Orukpe (2016) who observed that cultism, violent protests by students are common occurrences in public universities. This brings to the fore the lamentations of Ogwudile (2020) that the activities of cultists are inimical to peace and stability in our universities. The implication of this is that insecurity creates gap in teaching and learning hence paving way for unsafe school environment. On the other hand, this study does not validate the opinion that raping of students is one of the prevailing cases of insecurity in public universities and therefore contradicts the views of Abdullahi and Orukpe (2016) that one of the forms of insecurity in Nigeria is the raping of students and sexual abuses perpetrated by staff of the universities.

Furthermore, the study revealed that insecurity affects quality educational delivery in public universities in Southeast Nigeria. The regular closure of the campuses, the destruction of school facilities and the attendant lack of zeal to read by students are factors which could negatively affect quality education delivery in public universities. In agreement, Adelakun and Olorunsola (2024) decried that insecurity within and outside the immediate locality of universities disrupt curricular and extracurricular activities and unanticipated closure of universities. This often leads to other negative consequences such as brain drain as evident in the emigration of lecturers to safer places within and outside Nigeria. The

implication here is the constant obstruction in teaching and learning processes which significantly affect the quality output.

More so, this study found that several management strategies like the installation of Closed Circuit Television (CCTV), control of human and vehicular movement by well-trained security guards, organizing security awareness seminar for academic and non-academic staff, provision of identity cards for staff and students, provision of identity cards for staff and students, expulsion of student cultists and students involved in violence, provision of visitors tags for to identify visitors can be adopted in the management of insecurity in public universities in Southeast, Nigeria. This finding corroborates the findings of Nwankwo and Olu (2021) that students who engage in anti-security activities should be expelled from public universities. The advantage in expelling them is to act as deterrence to other cult members and to affirm a zero tolerance for cultism in the universities. The same measure should be applicable to students who engage in other forms of violence. It is imperative to maintain surveillance in public universities with the use of CCTV. This is in line with the views of Mustapha et al (2023) that if security measures like school fence, gate, ICT surveillance, and provision of CCTV to monitor movements of persons are provided in public universities, the quality of educational service delivery will improve.

In addition, this study found that security management strategies do influence the quality of education. The availability of well-trained security men is one of the measures that can act as a boost to security in our public universities. This means security men employed must be well trained to respond to security threats in public universities. This is in consonance with the views of Udeorah (2006) that Vice- Chancellors of Universities should employ the services of experienced retired security officers as a strategy to manage insecurity. These security men should demand for means of identification from staff and students or entry pass from visitors at designated entrance and exit gates of the university.



Based on this study, the null hypothesis 1(H_{01}) that there is no significant effect of insecurity on the quality education delivery in public universities in South-East Nigeria was rejected. This means that insecurity has a significant effect on quality education delivery. This could be due to the fact that students often lack the zeal to study during periods of insecurity and the consequent unplanned closures of the universities as a strategy to manage insecurity. This brings to fore the views of Jacob, Ahaotu and Obi-Ezenekwe (2021) that insecurity in schools has led to poor quality of academic delivery due to uncertainty and disruptions in the school calendar, and closure of educational institutions. In Table 2, analysis of data indicates that stolen and destroyed educational facilities are not promptly replaced. The implication here is that the needed facilities to aid in teaching and learning become scarce or insufficient. This is in congruence with the observation of Otu (2019) that the burning down of university buildings and facilities during insurgency or violent student protests often lead to the state of inadequacy of these facilities, which in turn affects the teaching-learning processes in Nigerian universities. This is buttressed by the views of Offor et al (2023) that insecurity inhibits academic performance of undergraduates in public universities in south east geopolitical Zone.

The null hypothesis 2(H_{02}) that insecurity management strategies do not significantly influence the quality of education delivery in public universities in South-East Nigeria was rejected. This invariably means that insecurity management strategies can have significant effect on quality academic delivery. This study found that the provision of identity cards to identify undesirable elements, having well trained security men to protect against insecurity and the expulsion of student cultists can enhance a conducive environment for academic studies. This in consonance Ukwu et al (2024) that optimal teaching-learning environments have the potential to enhance educational outcomes.

Conclusion

The South- east geopolitical zone has been

relatively peaceful in the past decade but currently insecurity has worsened and the spill-over effect has been noticed in many public universities in the zone. This study confirms that incidents of insecurity exist in public universities in the south-east geopolitical of Nigeria and effective strategies should be adopted to address the challenges they pose to quality academic delivery. Public universities need a conducive environment to achieve their educational goals. The increasing incidences of insecurity act as barriers to a peaceful academic environment. The need for the administrators of public universities and the federal and state governments to be proactive in managing insecurity is underscored by the negative effect of insecurity on quality education delivery.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made

1. University authorities should ensure provision of identity cards and visitors tag to identify human and vehicle movement to checkmate unwanted visitors
2. The management of public universities should provide competent and trained security personnel at all entry and exit points to screen those coming in and going out of their campuses with well equipped with tools such as metal detector and security cameras.
3. The management of public universities should ensure the installation of CCTV gadgets and solar lights at strategic locations to assist in monitoring the movement of persons at night
4. The management of public universities should use intelligence personnel to identify and fish out student cultists. After investigation such student cultists should be expelled from the university.
5. The administrators of public universities should pay special attention to the needs of students to prevent violent student protest which could lead to a disruption of academic activities.



References

- Abdullahi, A., & Orukpe, P. E. (2016). Developing an integrated campus security alerting system: *Nigerian Journal of Technology*, 35 (4)
- Abubakar, A. & Bashar, S. (2024). School security management in Nigeria: Benefits, challenges and way forward: *Rima International Journal of Education* 3, (1)
- Achumba, O. S. Ighomereho, M. O. & Akpor. R (2013). Security challenges in Nigeria and the implications for business activities and sustainable development. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 4(2)
- Adelakun, I. S & Olorunsola, E. O (2024) Insecurity and university education in Nigeria: Implications on national development and ways to the fore: *Fuoye Journal of Educational Management* 1 (1)
- Afu, M. O, Oguche, T. E, Usman, Z. S. & Gimba B (2023) Relationship between insecurity, depression and students academic achievement in Nigeria: Implication for guidance *International Journal of Education and National Development Vol.1(3) www.ijaar.org*
- Agazuma, E. S, Mochi S. (2021.) Emerging Insecurity Challenges and its Impact on Quality Tertiary Education in Nigeria: A case study of Delta State University, Abraka and Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Edo State. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science* Vol5, (9), 581-58.
- Akor, A. I, Abubakar, M, & Ogunode, N. J (2022) Causes, forms and consequences of insecurity on Nigerian educational system: Implications for educational managers: *Journal of Middle European Scientific Bulletin Vol 18*
- Atsumbe, B. N. (2020). Access, quality and equity in Nigerian education system: Emergent issues and agenda for action: *Journal of Arts and Education*, 8 1 (2)
- Bamisaiye, E. A (1983). Qualitative primary and secondary education in Nigeria: implications for implementation. *Ilorin journal of Education Vol 3(1)*,
- Esenea, N. A, Obinwa, S. O, Amaefule, C (2014) Improving Quality of Education in Nigeria through the Use of Community Informatics Social E-Learning Network: *International Journal of Computer (IJC)* 8 (1), pp 26-34
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2014). *National Policy on Education*. Abuja: Government Press. Institute for Economics & Peace (2024) Global peace index 2024: identifying and measuring the factors that drive peace a complex world:
- Jacob, O. N, Ahaotu G. N. & Obi-Ezenekwe U.C. (2021). Effects of insecurity on school administration in Nigeria: *Journal of Middle European Scientific Bulletin* 1(3)
- Mailuno, I. P. & Mimi A. (2019). Nigeria's vision 20:2020 and quality education in Nigeria: implications for sustainable development: *Benue State University Journal of Educational Management*, 1(2)
- Manga, S. D. (2019). Assessment of causes and forms of insecurity in educational institution in Kebbi State: Implication for School Administration. *International Journal of Current Research*, 11(10)7676-7680. <https://doi.org>.
- Mustapha, A. I, Sallee, K. W & Adaramaja, S. M (2023). Assessment of insecurity on quality education in Nigeria Tertiary Institutions: *KWASU International Journal of Education*: 6 (1) <https://www.kije.com.ng>



- Nnorom, S. U; Ezenwagu, S & Nwankwo, B. C. (2020) Security Management Practices In The 21 St Century for Improved University Administration, *International European Extended Enablement in Science, Engineering & Management Journal*, 8, 7, 1-14.
- Nwakpa. P (2015) The effect of insecurity on quality tertiary education in Nigeria: *Asian Journal of Applied Sciences Volume 3* (6) 2321–0893
- Obeta, M. (2019). Unveiling the poverty state of youths in Aba South Local Government Area. department of sociology, *Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Unpublished*.
- Offor, U. I, Offiah C & Nwaru, P. (2023). Challenges and solutions of insecurity on academic performance of undergraduates in public universities in south east geopolitical zone: implications to societal development. *Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 15 (1) 175 - 186; <https://unijerps.org>.
- Ogunbunm, I. S. T & Olaoye, O. F. (2024). Impacts of insecurity on the Nigeria tertiary institutions: *Journal of Economics and Environmental Education*, 8(12) 210-219.
- Ogwudile, E. C. (2020). Cultism menace: A case study of Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 5(1), 368-384.
- Ojukwu, M. O. (2017). Effect of insecurity of school environment on the academic performance of secondary school students in Imo State. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*. 5 (1).
- Okpe P. U. & Igwebuike, F. K. (2019) Management of security challenges in Nigerian Universities: The role of school administrator: *Journal of Sustainable Development in Education*. 2 (1): 29–41.
- Olowonefa, J. A. (2024). Insecurity and university education in Nigeria; *International Journal Of Applied Research and Sustainable Sciences*, 2 (9) 771 -780.
- Otu. P. A. (2019). Insecurity in Nigeria: A factor impeding sustainable tertiary education in Northern Nigeria: *Journal on African Education Indices*. 11 (1).
- Saleh A. D, Uwaleke G. C & Allahnana, K. M. (2019) Quality of Nigerian university education system: Implications for functional educational development: *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Development, Education and Science Research* 5, (1), 95-115.
- Udeorah, S. (2006) (Ed) Cultism: death trap on our campuses: the way out: *Nigeria Uniport. Press*.
- Ukwu, F. E. Ojonta, P. N & Manasseh, C. O. (2024). Managing insecurity in Nigeria through quality education in the Post-Covid-19 Era: *Journal of Economics and Allied Research*, 9 (3), 303-315.