

STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL LEADERS' EFFECTIVENESS IN PROMOTING PEACE CULTURE IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN CROSS RIVER STATE, NIGERIA

B. A. Akuegwu¹ and F. D. Nwi-ue²

¹Department of Educational Administration and Planning
University of Calabar, Calabar Nigeria

²Department of General Studies, Rivers State Polytechnic
Bori, Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *This survey-designed study focused on students' assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities in Cross River State. One research question and two hypotheses were isolated to give direction to this investigation. 3256 final year undergraduate students in the two public universities in the state constituted the population. Stratified random sampling technique was used to draw 326 of them to form the sample size. "Peace Culture Promotion Effectiveness Questionnaire (PCPEQ)" developed by the researchers was used for data collection. Data collected were analysed using Descriptive Statistics (mean rating), Population t-test of single mean and Independent t-test statistical techniques. Results obtained indicated that institutional leaders are most effective in promoting participatory communication and free flow of information and least effective in promoting peer mediation in public universities as indicators of peace culture. Students' assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities is significantly low. Students' university affiliation has no significant influence on their assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture, with state university students having a slight edge over their federal university counterparts in their assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture. It was concluded that though institutional leaders are rated low, yet very effective in promoting certain aspects of peace culture.*

KEYWORDS: Institutional leaders, effectiveness, peace culture, students.

INTRODUCTION

Peace is required for every human endeavour to thrive. Universities as part of educational institutions cannot function effectively in achieving their goals and objectives without a peaceful environment. However, universities are gradually becoming volatile resulting to peace being elusive. Students vent their anger through violent demonstrations and damage school properties worth huge amount of money at the slightest, flimsiest and sometimes uncalled for reasons. This is a clear indication of near absence of peace culture in Nigerian universities.

Universities are established to train and equip men and women with skills for self fulfilment which is necessary for becoming useful to themselves and their societies. Thus, they solve manpower needs of their country. Aside from these, they are also expected to inculcate in students right and desirable knowledge, values, aptitudes and attitudes with which to impart

positively on their immediate environment by promoting and sustaining peaceful co-existence. In essence, universities produce individuals who are found worthy in character and learning; that is sound, effective and total human beings.

The Nigerian nation has long realized the need for peaceful co-existence that she entrenched it as one of the cardinal philosophies of her education. Consequently, the overall philosophy of the nation is tailored towards using education to impart on her citizens the virtues of living in unity and harmony as one indivisible, indissoluble, democratic and sovereign nation which is founded on the principles of freedom, equality and justice. This is with a view to promoting inter-African solidarity and world peace through understanding (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2013).

Evidently, Nigeria laid a solid foundation for sound and lasting peace through education before now. Undoubtedly, peace is required for harmonious human existence and academic excellence. However, university campuses which are supposed to be theatres of peace are gradually sliding into chaos. Instances abound where academic activities have been disrupted and suspended as a result of strike actions embarked upon by teaching and non-teaching staff and in some cases, campuses shut down due to students' unrest. All these are clear indications that enduring peace culture is yet to be entrenched in our universities.

Universities are administered by institutional leaders referred to as principal officers, deans of faculties and heads of departments whose responsibility is not only to ensure that they fulfil their universities' vision, mission and core values, but to ensure that peace reigns in campuses for academic activities to thrive. For these leaders to live up to this expectation, they must be effective, which is have the ability to achieve goals at minimum cost and time using available resources. Peace, according to Johnson and Johnson (2011) is the absence of war, violence or conflict in a situation that is not only mutually beneficial, but supports and encourage harmonious relationship among relevant parties, which is aspects of a person or among individuals, groups or countries. Culture has to do with a way of life of a particular group of people. That is the unique ways, practices, shared values, behaviours, beliefs, deposits of knowledge and attitudes universities evolve to realize their visions, missions and core values, which is distinct from that of any other group of human organisations. It is learned and shared by university community for organizing and perpetuating her existence. In the same vein, peace culture is defined by United Nations General Assembly (1999) as the values, attitudes and behaviours that reflect and inspire social interaction and sharing based on the principles of freedom, justice and democracy, all human rights, tolerance and solidarity, that reject violence and endeavour to prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation and that guarantee the full exercise of all rights and the means to participate fully in the development process of their society.

To Boulding (2000), it is a mosaic of identities, attitudes, values, beliefs and patterns that lead people to live nurturing with one another and the earth itself without the aid of structured power differentials, to deal creatively with their differences, and to share their resources. In the context of this study, peace culture is viewed as measures embarked upon by institutional leaders in the university to facilitate and foster peaceful coexistence by ensuring that students embrace, practice and live in peace as a way of life. These measures include education for peace, human rights, sustainable development, gender equality, democratic participation; understanding, tolerance and solidarity, participatory communication and free flow of information, international peace and security, and peer mediation.

It is an integral approach to preventing campus unrest, students' demonstration, management and staff conflict, student/student conflict, staff/staff conflict and break down of law and order, and it is an alternative to the culture of violence. It is supposed to exist in daily life and habitual interaction as students and staff get on with their lives and works, negotiating differences rather than engaging in interminable conflicts or battles over just how to solve each problem as it comes up (Boulding, 2000).

Creative management of differences among individuals and groups is at the core of peace culture. It is not a culture without conflict, because conflict is inevitable in every human organisation. As students from different cultures converge together for the purpose of acquiring knowledge, there is bound to be conflict. The need for peace culture arises out of the fact that university is a centre for moulding character where desirable traits, values and attitudes are bred and cultivated. Students from different works of life converge together, each with their unique way of life distinct from those of others. There is the tendency that they will come to school with different perceptions of life, and are likely to have differences with others who do not share the same perceptions about life. Therefore, as converging point, universities through the type of education they provide refine characters, change behaviours and modify perceptions to acceptable standards where each student see the other as colleague, friend, partner and mate whose interest is supposed to be protected, nurtured and views respected. With the accommodation of these views, peaceful coexistence emerges naturally as a way of life, with integration, mutual and cordial relationship as the hallmark. As such, they spend their lives bridging the differences between their perceptions (and the needs and wishes they generate) and the perceptions of others (Boulding, 1998). This is likely to be extended to their different communities after their university education thereby perpetuating peace and imparting positively on the lives of others.

It is on this premise therefore, that the main thrust of this paper predicates on students' assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities in Cross River State. The way of going about this is reflected in the research question and hypotheses.

Statement of the Problem

University campuses appear to have been embroiled in interminable conflict. Yearly or seasonally management and students are locked up in one form of disagreement or the other bothering on increment in school fees and charges, unconducive learning environment and policy decisions. In most cases students vent their anger through violent demonstrations often resulting to incalculable damage to school properties at the slightest, flimsiest and sometimes uncalled for reasons. In addition, peace has appeared to be elusive because students engage in various acts of breaking of law and order. They inflict injuries among themselves and often destroy one another's properties in a bid to settle one score or the other.

University administration has organised fora, encouraged dialogue with students, free flow of information and supported unionism among students with a view to promoting peace culture, yet the desired peace has not been achieved in the campuses. Furthermore, studies of this nature have been conducted elsewhere, but none focused on university students. These underscored the need for this study. Therefore, the problem of this study is stated thus: How do students assess institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities in Cross River State?

Research Question

1. Which indicator of peace culture are institutional leaders most effective in promoting in public universities from students' viewpoint?

Hypotheses

1. Students' assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities is not significantly low.
2. Students' university affiliation has no significant influence on their assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture.

LITERATURE/THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING

A number of empirical evidences and reports were presented to give backing to this study. While emphasizing the need for peace culture to be entrenched in human organisations, Aharoni (2002) reported that societies are in a constant state of dynamic transformation be these cultural, economic, educational or political and that there is need for a world of peace so that human societies or organisations can function and flourish securely. Accordingly, one of the basic requirements for attaining security and an effective and sustainable development is indeed to eradicate the culture of violence in order to create a required global and national culture of peace system. Universities can be a fertile ground for breeding and nurturing a peace culture because of their accommodation of people (students) from different cultural backgrounds. For peace to be developed, universities need to integrate students from all relevant groups and foster positive relations among them.

According to Kemp and Fry (2004), empirical examination of peaceful cultures suggested that the core of their belief systems is a belief that (the people in question) are fundamentally peaceful. That is, they are self-defined as peaceful and committed to be peaceful. They avoid assertive, competitive, self-aggrandizing behaviour and they treat one another equally, kindly and with respect. This means that university authority needs to demonstrate to students practically that the school environment and everything in it is fundamentally peaceful. With students' believing that their university administration and school environment is peaceful, there is no doubt that they will replicate the peaceful nature among themselves and elsewhere.

Boulding (2000) opined that a peace culture promotes peaceful diversity by including patterns of behaviour and institutional arrangement that promote natural caring and successfully balance the need for autonomy with the need for relatedness. The essence of peace culture is that the strong do not dominate the weak. The aim is to structure societies so that positions of power and status in hierarchies are based on caring for others rather than dominating them. This underscores the need to structure university environment in such a way that students see themselves as equals where the strong do not oppress and dominate the weak ones. Without doubt, this promotes peaceful coexistence in diversity and entrench the culture of mutual relationship and understanding, which the university needs seriously for smooth operation of their programmes.

Public schools should provide a microcosm of a peaceful society that is lived and experienced. The day-to-day fabric of school life needs to reflect the cooperation, political discourse and creative problem solving and constructive conflict resolution inherent in a peaceful society. Through developing and maintaining peaceful relations with diverse school mates, students actually experience what they need to establish in society as a whole once they become adults (Johnson & Johnson, 2011). According to them, students need to internalise the values reflective of cooperation, commitment to the common good and to the well-being of others. They need to possess a sense of responsibility to contribute one's fair share of the work, respect for the efforts and viewpoints of others and for them as people, behaving with integrity, empathy with and caring for the other parties, compassion when other members are in need, equality and appreciation of diversity. This is a necessary condition for the entrenchment of peace culture in our university campuses.

United National General Assembly (1999) and De Rivera (2004) identified eight indicators or bases for peace culture that need to be promoted and strengthened in order to maintain a non-violent atmosphere whether in universities or any other human organisation. They include the following:

Peace Education

This is where education is directed towards teaching non-violent solutions for conflicts. Such education can teach principles of negotiation and mediation and training for the practice of non-violence, promote qualitative values, attitudes and behaviours of peaceful disposition. Ogunyemi (2006) stressed that teaching people (students) about the tenets of inter-cultural understanding, tolerance of opposing views, non-violent approach to conflict resolution and related strategies for coping with diversities would usher in a new era of a just, equitable and peaceful world. Kester (2007, p.2) accentuated this position thus, "since wars begin in minds of men, it is in the minds of men (and women) that the defences of peace must be constructed".

Human Rights

The need for emphasizing human right is predicated on the belief that without human right, there can be no culture of peace. Human rights are promoted by peace education which ensures equality and participation as well as create an environment of tolerance, care and respect (Ogunyemi, 2006).

Sustainable Development

Three components are involved in this namely - economic development as a solution to poverty, the reduction of economic inequalities and the sustainability of natural resources. Emphasis must include reducing social inequalities, eradicating poverty, assuring social justice and putting in place special measures for groups with special needs among university students.

Gender Equality

Focus is on gender empowerment measures such as full participation of women in economic, social and political decision-making, elimination of all forms of violence against women, support and assistance to women in need. Empirical studies demonstrate that when there is more gender equality, there is less interstate violence (Caprioli, 2000) and more domestic

tolerance (Caprioli & Trumbore, 2003). Increasing influence of women in collective decision-making whether in traditional communities or in contemporary democratic parliaments, significantly reduces the risk of violence in the respective societies (Harling, 2004; Jayal, 2006).

Democratic Participation

This requires choices to contribute to the well-being of the university, a transparent and accountable governance and administration, elimination of corruption and equal opportunities to participate in school administration.

Understanding, Tolerance and Solidarity

Internal solidarity is reflected by the absence of internal turmoil. Tolerance is reflected in the acceptance of others irrespective of who they are. Students have to be capable of overcoming enemy images with understanding, tolerance and solidarity among all people and cultures, and learn from their differences through dialogue. Commitment to non-violence should be their goal, along with sympathy for the weak. To an extent, this represents the basic propensity of a culture of peace.

Participatory Communication and Free Flow of Information

This reflects in ensuring freedom of information and communication, the sharing of knowledge and unfettered access to information among all classes of students. Students have to acquire pro-social communicative competence which is being aware of others' needs, knowing what kinds of help to offer, being aware of a limited or lacking resource, willingness to share or donate that resource and an understanding of such actions (Oyebanji, 2001).

International Peace and Security

Emphasis is on increasing efforts in negotiating peaceful settlements among all classes of students from within and outside the country. In addition to these, the researchers included peer mediation as an aspect of peace culture indicator. This involves selecting and training a number of students on conflict resolution strategies and vests them with the responsibility of resolving conflicts peacefully among students and promoting peaceful coexistence among their peers.

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted in Cross River State of Nigeria .It is one of the states in south-south geopolitical zone and part of the oil-rich Niger Delta region lying on the coastal axis. Two public universities located in the state provided the setting - one federal and the other state. Survey design was adopted because the researchers were interested in determining the nature of the situation (promoting of peace culture in public universities) as it exists at the time of this investigation. 3256 final year undergraduate students constituted the population, because having spent some years in the university; they are in a better pedestal to provide information on efforts of university administration to promote peace culture. Stratified random sampling technique was adopted to draw a sample size of 326 students – 163 from each of the two public universities studied.

Data collection was carried out with a research instrument developed by the researchers tagged: “Peace Culture Promotion Effectiveness Questionnaire (PCPEQ)”. It had two sections – A and B. Section A provided information on students’ university affiliation, while Section B, arranged on 5 point rating scale, contained 36 items, 4 of which measured each of the 9 indicators of peace culture isolated for this study. Face validity of the instrument was determined by experts in measurement and evaluation, while a trial test using Cronbach Coefficient Alpha method had coefficients ranging from 0.78 to 0.90. These figures confirmed the internal consistency of the instrument and showed that the instrument was reliable to be used to achieve the objectives of this study.

The researchers with the help of 2 trained research assistants administered the instrument to the sampled subjects. This measure yielded a 100 percent returns rate of the instrument.

Descriptive statistics (Mean Rating), Population t-test of single mean and Independent t-test statistical techniques were used to analyse the data collected for this study. Summaries of the results were presented in tables.

RESULTS/FINDINGS

Research Question

Which indicator of peace culture are institutional leaders most effective in promoting in public universities from students’ viewpoint? Descriptive statistics (Mean Rating) is used to provide answer to this question. Summaries of the results are presented in table 1.

Table 1: Mean (\bar{X}) and Standard Deviation (SD) of Institutional Leaders’ Effectiveness in Promoting Peace Culture in Public Universities from Students’ Viewpoint.

Variables	\bar{X}	SD	Rank
Promoting Participatory Communication and Free Flow of Information	13.01	3.83	1 st
Promoting International Peace and Security	12.42	3.61	2 nd
Promoting Democratic Participation	12.38	3.83	3 rd
Promoting Understanding, Tolerance and Solidarity	12.13	3.17	4 th
Promoting Sustainable Development	11.95	3.39	5 th
Promoting Gender Equality	11.94	3.73	6 th
Promoting Peace Education	11.61	3.56	7 th
Promoting Human Rights	11.36	3.38	8 th
Promoting Peer Mediation	11.07	3.90	9 th

Summaries of the results presented in table 1 revealed that university institutional leaders are most effective in promoting participatory communication and free flow of information as an indicator of peace culture, following its highest mean (\bar{x}) value (\bar{x} =13.01). Promoting International Peace and Security ranked second with mean (\bar{x}) value (\bar{x} =12.42), followed by promoting democratic participation in the third position with mean (\bar{x}) value (\bar{x} =12.38). Promoting understanding, tolerance and solidarity ranked fourth with mean (\bar{x}) value (\bar{x} =12.13). Ranked fifth is promotion of sustainable development with mean (\bar{x}) value (\bar{x} =11.95), followed by promotion of gender equality which ranked sixth with mean (\bar{x}) value

($x = 11.94$). Surprisingly, promoting peace education, promoting human rights and promoting peer mediation ranked seventh, eighth and last position with mean (x) values ($x = 11.61$; 11.36 and 11.07) respectively.

Hypotheses

1. Students' assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities is not significantly low. The only variable in this hypothesis is students' assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture. Population t-test of single mean is used to analyse data collected. Summaries of the results are presented in table 2.

Table 2: Analysis of Students' Assessment of Institutional Leaders' Effectiveness in Promoting Peace Culture in Public Universities. N = 326

Variables	Observed Mean (\bar{X})	Assumed Mean (μ)	SD	t
Promoting Peace Education	11.61	12.00	3.56	-56.457*
Promoting Human Rights	11.36	12.00	3.38	-58.254*
Promoting Sustainable Development	11.95	12.00	3.39	-61.119*
Promoting Gender Equality	11.94	12.00	3.73	-55.403*
Promoting Democratic Participation	12.38	12.00	3.83	56.072*
Promoting Understanding, Tolerance and Solidarity	12.13	12.00	3.17	56.693*
Promoting Participatory Communication and Free Flow of Information	13.01	12.00	3.83	58.918*
Promoting International Peace and Security	12.42	12.00	3.61	59.556*
Promoting Peer Mediation	11.07	12.00	3.90	-49.090*

*Significant at .05; df = 325; Critical t-value = 1.968

Summaries of the results presented in table 2 indicated that the calculated t-values were found to be higher than the critical t-value of 1.968 at .05 level of significance and 325 degrees of freedom. Specifically, the values obtained were: Promoting Peace Education ($t = -56.457$, $p < .05$), Promoting Human Rights ($t = -58.254$, $p < .05$), Promoting Sustainable Development ($t = -61.119$, $p < .05$), Promoting Gender Equality ($t = -55.403$, $p < .05$), Promoting Democratic Participation ($t = 56.072$, $p < .05$), Promoting Understanding, Tolerance and Solidarity ($t = 56.693$, $p < .05$), Promoting Participatory Communication and Free Flow of Information ($t = 58.918$, $p < .05$), Promoting International Peace and Security ($t = 59.556$, $p < .05$) and Promoting Peer Mediation ($t = 49.090$, $p < .05$). With these results, the null hypothesis was rejected and so, students' assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities is significantly low.

Further examination of these results showed that the observed mean students' assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities were found to be higher than the assumed mean of 12.00 in four of the variables, whereas in the remaining five, it was lower. Statistical comparison of these observed mean(x) values and the assumed mean value of 12.00 using Population t-test of single mean yielded positive and negative t-values. So, students' assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities is significantly low.

Students' university affiliation has no significant influence on their assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities. The independent variable is students' university affiliation, while the dependent variable is their assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities. Independent t-test statistical technique is used to compare the mean scores from the two categories of university affiliations namely: Federal and State. Summaries of the results are presented in table 3.

Table 3: Analysis of the Influence of Students' University Affiliation on their Assessment of Institutional Leaders' Effectiveness in Promoting Peace Culture in Universities

Variables	Federal N = 163		State N = 163		t
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	
Promoting Peace Education	11.65	3.60	11.28	3.54	.210
Promoting Human Rights	11.28	3.34	11.44	3.42	-.410
Promoting Sustainable Development	11.88	3.35	12.01	3.43	-.341
Promoting Gender Equality	11.77	3.74	12.11	3.73	-.789
Promoting Democratic Participation	12.33	3.82	12.43	3.84	-.226
Promoting Understanding, Tolerance and Solidarity	12.17	3.94	12.09	3.48	.187
Promoting Participatory Communication and Free Flow of Information	13.03	3.89	13.00	3.78	.060
Promoting International Peace and Security	12.35	3.54	12.49	3.69	-.351
Promoting Peer Mediation	11.17	4.03	10.97	3.79	.443

Not significant at .05; df = 324; Critical t-value = 1.968

Summaries of the results presented in table 3 disclosed that the calculated t-values were found to be lower than the critical t-value of 1.968 at .05 level of significance and 324 degrees of freedom. Specifically, the t-values obtained were: Promoting Peace Education ($t = .210$, $p > .05$), Promoting Human Rights ($t = -.410$, $p > .05$), Promoting Sustainable Development ($t = -.341$, $p > .05$), Promoting Gender Equality ($t = -.789$, $p > .05$), Promoting Democratic Participation ($t = -.226$, $p > .05$), Promoting Understanding, Tolerance and Solidarity ($t = .187$, $p > .05$), Promoting Participation Communication and Free Flow of Information ($t = .060$, $p > .05$), Promoting International Peace and Security ($t = -.351$, $p > .05$) and Promoting Peer Mediation ($t = .443$, $p > .05$). With these results, the null hypothesis was not rejected and so, students' university affiliation has no significant influence on their assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities.

Further examination of these results revealed that students from Federal University had higher mean(x) assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting four of the indicators (variables) of peace culture, while their counterparts from State University had an edge over five of those indicators (variables). This means that students from state university rated their institutional leaders as more effective in promoting peace culture than their federal counterparts. However, the difference in assessment was not glaring enough to warrant a significant outcome.

DISCUSSION

Summaries of the results of the research question presented in table 1 indicated that institutional leaders are most effective in promoting participatory communication and free flow of information as a means of fostering peace culture in public universities. This revelation emanated from this indicator's highest mean(x) value ($x = 13.01$), followed by promoting international peace and security ($x = 12.42$), promoting democratic participation ($x = 12.38$), promoting understanding, tolerance and solidarity ($x = 12.13$). Surprisingly, promoting peace education ($x = 11.61$), promoting human rights ($x = 11.36$) and promoting peer mediation ($x = 11.07$) took the last three positions in their ranking.

This outcome can be explained from the fact that virtually everything in the university is run through communication and exchange of information, and so university administration at the institutional, faculty and departmental levels do not encounter problems promoting them. Since students easily and freely participate in communication and exchange of information coupled with institutional leaders encouragement in using them, there is the likelihood that students will rate them high as a means of promoting peace culture in their campuses. Closely akin to this articulation, human interaction promote social contact, understanding and cordial relationship, and so the more university administration engage in communication and exchange of information with students, the more they promote peaceful coexistence with them. Through the promotion of participatory communication and free flow of information, students become aware of one another's needs, and what kind of help to offer and contributions to make to realize those needs (Oyebanji, 2001).

Furthermore, the second ranking of promoting international peace and security as a means of fostering peace culture arises from the security challenges the country is facing. It is ideal for students to embrace the need for international peace and security as a means of forestalling future escalation of conflict at all levels.

The low ranking of promoting peace education, human rights and peer mediation is an indication that university administration does not place much value on them as means of promoting peace culture. Surprisingly, peace education and human rights are at the core of peace culture because teaching students tolerance of opposing views and non-violent approach to conflict resolution, patterns of behaviour and institutional arrangements that promote mutual caring would usher in a new era of a just, equitable and peaceful world (Ogunyemi, 2006; Boulding, 2000). It therefore follows that these benefits are lacking because institutional leaders have not deemed it necessary to exert much effort in promoting them for peace culture to be imbibed and lived by students.

Results of hypothesis 1 presented in table 2 disclosed that students' assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in universities is significantly low. This means that students rate their institutional leaders low in their effectiveness in promoting peace culture. That is, from the perceptive of students, institutional leaders have not done much to promote peace culture in public universities. The incessant conflict among students, staff, students and university administration, staff and university administration which tends to have rendered peace elusive in the campuses studied might have informed students' low rating of their institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture. Perhaps, this low rating, which depicts ineffectiveness might have accounted for students taking to destruction of school property at the slightest provocation as a means of settling scores with their university administration over poor handling of issues relating to their well-

being in the campuses. Of course differences between students and administration often generate grave consequences for universities (Emetarom, 2012). Thus, it is difficult for one to put in practice what he/she is not taught, learned or exposed to.

Furthermore, university students nowadays appear to place less premium on peace. Instances abound where students take delight in indulging in unacceptable behaviours ranging from disrespect to their colleagues, lecturers and university authority to acts of violence at the flimsiest excuse. It therefore follows that institutional leaders have not been effective in inculcating values and attitudes necessary to promote peace culture in public universities. Even at that, the poor nature of learning environments in universities which has often fuelled students' unrest and staff embarking on strike actions seems incapable of guaranteeing peace culture. Thus, it is not only institutional leaders' ineffectiveness as rated by students that stalls promotion of peace culture in public universities, nature of learning environments do.

Results of hypothesis 2 presented in table 3 revealed that students' university affiliation has no significant influence on their assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in universities. This means that students' from the two classes of universities rated their institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture the same way. Thus the way students' from Federal University rate their institutional leaders is the same way their state counterparts rate theirs with regards to effectiveness in promoting peace culture. It therefore means that the level of effectiveness displayed by institutional leaders in federal university in promoting peace culture is the same level of effectiveness displayed by their state counterparts. Thus ineffectiveness of institutional leaders in promoting peace culture is common among the two universities. The reason for this finding might be that the two universities operate in the same learning environment obtainable in Nigerian public universities and managed by the same class of leaders. Therefore, what is obtainable in one is likely to be replicated in the other.

However, this finding revealed that state universities have a slight edge over their federal university counterparts with regards to students' assessment of their institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture, judging from their higher mean(x) values. Therefore, students from state university are more inclined and encouraged to embrace peace culture than their federal university counterparts. Incidentally, the slight difference in students' assessment of their institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture is not well pronounced to guarantee a significant outcome.

IMPLICATIONS TO RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

In the light of the findings of this study, the following implications to research and practice are articulated:

Institutional leaders being most effective in promoting participatory communication and free flow of information in public universities as an indicator of peace culture, implies that they invest their energies and resources in ensuring free flow of information and communication to the detriment of other practices. It seems that researches in these universities have centred mainly on participatory communication and free flow of information prompting institutional leaders not to consider other efforts worth promoting. In practice, they accord top priority to this above every other peace promotion effort believing that encouraging participatory communication and free flow of information is a means of guaranteeing peaceful atmosphere

in the universities. Therefore, they have not placed much premium on other practices as veritable means of promoting peace culture. The outcome has been conflict and violence-prone university environment.

Students' assessment of institution leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture to be low implies that students are of the opinion that institutional leaders have not done enough to encourage embracing peace as a way of life. It follows that institutional leaders have not generally, worked towards promoting peace in public universities as a norm. Worse still, research efforts have not been focused on motivating students to participate actively in institutional decision-making regarding peace culture promotion. Thus, it appears that students are not carried along in university administration, and so, no impression has been created that any effort university is putting in place to promote peace have positive impact on them.

The low ranking of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting gender equality, peace education, human rights and peer mediation by university students imply that these efforts have not been considered very important in promoting peace culture in public universities. This follows that research activities focusing on these areas have not been encouraged by institutional leaders. Thus, promotion of peace in diversity, equal opportunities for women, mutual respect where the strong does not oppress the weak and mutual caring are near absent in university campuses studied. This explains why conflict and crisis-free campuses has not been guaranteed.

The no significant influence of students' university affiliation on their assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture implies that students rated promotion of peace culture in their institutions the same way. It follows that the value attached to peace culture by the two universities in Cross River State is the same. This being the case, break down of law and order in one university may be replicated in the other. There is also the tendency that the two universities have not invested much in research aimed at promoting peace culture. Hence, the knowledge that would have been harvested from such a venture to enhance promoting peace culture is lacking. This explains why the institutional leaders have not been able to reinforce peace culture promotion efforts to produce tangible results.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion drawn from the findings of this study is that institutional leaders are most effective in promoting participatory communication and free flow of information and least effective in promoting peer mediation in public universities as indicators of peace culture. Students' assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture in public universities is significantly low. Students' university affiliation has no significant influence on their assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture, with state university students having a slight edge over their federal university counterparts in their assessment of institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture. Despite low rating of institutional leaders by students with regards to effectiveness in promoting peace culture, the former was most effective in promoting participatory communication and free flow of information among students as a means of fostering peace

culture. Thus, they can be rated low, yet very effective in promoting certain aspects of peace culture.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Arising from the implications to research and practice, the following suggestions for future research are made:

Since this study concentrated on students, it might be needful to replicate this study using staff to find out how they rate institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture. This is necessitated by the fact that they are integral part of the university community who also need peaceful atmosphere to discharge their responsibilities. Secondly, since this study is conducted in two public universities in Nigeria, out of 80 as at October 2015, there is need to extend the study to embrace more public universities, with a view to finding out whether students in those universities may assess their institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture the same way like their counterparts from the universities studied.

Furthermore, this study should be conducted using students from private universities to ascertain whether they rate their institutional leaders' effectiveness in promoting peace culture the same way like their public university counterparts.

REFERENCES

- Aharoni, A. (2002). *Peace culture, literature and media require for sustainable global development*. Retrieved from <http://www.iflac.com/ada/docs.html>
- Boulding, E. (2000). *Cultures of peace: The hidden side of human history*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Boulding, E. (1998). *Peace culture: The problem of managing human differences*. Retrieved from <http://www.crosscurrent.org/boulding.htm>
- Caprioli, M. (2000). Gendered conflict, *Journal of Peace Research*, 37(1), 51- 68.
- Caprioli, M. & Trumbore, P. F. (2003). Ethnic discrimination and interstate violence: Testing the international impact of domestic behaviour. *Journal of Peace Research*, 40(1), 5–23.
- De Rivera, J. (2004). Assessing the basis for a culture of peace in contemporary societies. *Journal of Peace Research*, 41(5), 531–548.
- Emetarom, U. C. (2012). Improving university governance in Nigeria for stability and innovation. In U. M. O. Ivowi & B. B. Akpan (Eds), *Education in Nigeria: From the beginning to the future* (pp. 475-487). Lagos: Foremost Educational Services
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2013). *National policy on education (6th ed)*. Lagos: Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council (NERDC).
- Harling, P. (2004). The centrality of locality: The local state, local democracy, and local consciousness in Late-Victorian and Edwardian Britain. *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 9 (2), 216 - 234.
- Jayal, N. G. (2006). Engendering local democracy: The impact of quotas for women in India's Panchayats. *Democratization*, 13 (1), 15 – 35.

- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (2011). *Peace education in the classroom: Creating effective peace education programs*. Retrieved from <http://www.co-operation.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Peace-Ed-Salomon-09.pdf>
- Kemp, G. & Fry, D. P. (2004)(Eds). *Keeping the peace: Conflict resolution and peaceful societies around the world*. New York: Routledge.
- Kester, K. (2007). Peace education: Experience and storytelling as living education. *The Peace and Conflict Review*, 2 (2), 1 - 14.
- Ogunyemi, B. (2006). Curriculum imperative for teacher preparation in peace and human rights education: The Nigerian case. In O. A. Oyedeji & B. Ogunyemi, (Eds). *Perspectives in Nigerian education: Issues of the New Millennium*. (pp. 225-237). Ibadan: Bash Moses Publishers,
- Oyebanji, M. A. (2001). *Peace education as a process of preparing youth for nation building*. A paper at the National Conference organized by Social Studies Association of Nigeria (SOSSAN) at Adeyemi College of Education Ondo.
- United Nations General Assembly (1999). Declaration and programme of action on a culture of peace. *Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly (Resolution 53/243)*. New York: Autor.