Attributes of Students Crisis in Egyptian Governmental and Private Universities

Wafaa A El-Hosany,[1] Sanaa A. Ibrahim,[2] Fatma E. Hafez[3]

[1]*Nursing Administration, Faculty Of Nursing, Suez Canal University*
[2]*Nursing Administration, Faculty Of Nursing, Port Said University*
[3]*Community and Family Health Nursing Department, Faculty Of Nursing, Port Said University*

Abstract
Background: *The university mission clearly provided a support of the educational goals of a different types of students. Similarly, it committed to propose assistance to students in crisis and who need help to overcome emotional and physical barriers.* **The aim of the study** *was to investigate attributes of students' crisis in Egyptian governmental and private Universities.*
Methods: *This study designed as a comparative research including two groups. The first group included 474 students from governmental university, while the second group included 829 students from private university Data collection performed by self-assessment questionnaire that comprised of five parts; demographic characteristics, level of crises occurrence, causes of crisis occurrence, consequences of crisis, and control measures to manage crisis.*
Results: *The study showed a significantly lower level of crisis occurrence among students at private university compared to governmental university (45.9% versus 51.2%, respectively). Lack of accommodation was the most common cause of crisis occurrence among the students at private and governmental universities (89.9% versus 55.5%, respectively) with significant difference between them. Disruption of academic programs was the extremely important consequence of crisis (65.3%) among the students at private university, while dismissal of students' ring leaders was the most significant consequence of crisis (57.6%) among the students at governmental university. The study also observed a significantly higher consequence of crisis among students at governmental university in comparison to private university (40.9% versus 32.4%, respectively). Use of dialogue with students was the most common control measure to manage crisis at governmental and private universities (74.1% versus 71.9%, respectively) without significant difference between them). There were insignificant differences between both universities regarding control measures of students' crises).* **In conclusions,** *students' crises were common at both governmental and private universities with higher incidence at governmental universities. The study described many causes of crises, from which, lack of accommodation was the most common. The consequence of crisis was significantly risky among students at governmental versus private universities. Governmental and private universities showed similar control measures to manage students' crises.*
Recommendations: *Faculty staff and counselors must have the professional training to understand emotional communications and to resolve the students' crises. Although utilizing these services require that the instructor allocate time beyond the classroom, it is often less demanding than struggling to counteract the negative impact of the crises if occurred. Both the Departments of Academic and Student Affairs encourage instructor utilization of counseling consultation. The instructor may directly initiate a consultation or a classroom observation from the Crisis Intervention Specialist.*
Keywords: *"Crisis occurrence", "Control measures", "Students", "Governmental Universities", "Private universities".*

I. Introduction

Crisis is defined as an anxiety and fear that are aroused when a person experiences or perceives a threat to self-esteem, significant relationships or role mastery. When the usual coping strategies do not restore an internal sense of confidence that these feelings can be tolerated and managed, a crisis state ensues. The person's usual coping mechanisms are overwhelmed and the anxiety and fear are destabilizing **(Department of Student Affairs, 2010).**

Reactive aggression is one common response that signals that a student has been overwhelmed by feelings of rejection, frustration or shame. This destabilization can be frightening but it can also be an opportunity for growth, especially when it is met by an instructor who recognizes the behavior as a sign of vulnerability. The need to relieve the discomfort increases the motivation to explore alternative resolutions when there is sufficient trust between students and instructors **(Abramson, 2015).**

University-based crisis is a serious concern in several countries and takes a number of forms. Students who had crisis at faculty may be emotionally assaulted, financially suffered, or politically blocked **(Lewis, Deardorff, Lahiff, Soleimanpour, Sakashita & Brindis, 2015).**

Crisis is associated with negative outcomes for students' mental, physical, and social well-being, with students who experience multiple forms of crises being at greater risk for poor outcomes compared with those who experience just one form. Crises are associated with depression and other psychological problems, as well as physical health problems; student with crisis also report lower educational achievement **(Felix, Furlong & Austin, 2009; Lewis et al., 2015**).

The mission of the college explicitly advances a commitment to support the academic goals of a diverse student body. Just as we provide remediation to students who are academically under prepared, we are similarly committed to offering assistance to students in crises or who need help to overcome emotional barriers to achieving educational goals **(Gulati, Mayo & Nohria, 2014).**

Faculty members play an important role in teaching students how to become mature learners. An atmosphere that is welcoming and has clearly defined behavioral standards that respect the rights of all students can exert a positive influence on classroom conduct. Disruptive behavior should not be tolerated and distressed students should not be ignored **(Reinhardt, Keller, Summers & Schultz, 2012).**

Regarding control strategies of crisis, trust and safety are promoted when academic standards allow students to form and express relevant ideas in ways that promote free speech and respect the rights of others. It is important to create clear expectations on the educational policies, group work, late assignments and make-up examinations **(Hopkinson & Skelton, 2009).**

When an instructor is overburdened by worries about a fragile student, or when the deleterious effects that a student crisis has on the functioning of the class frustrates the instructor, a counseling consultation can be helpful. A counseling staff member acts as a partner to the instructor in developing strategies to manage the emotional climate in the classroom **(Department of Student Affairs, 2010).**

II.   Significance Of The Study

Few researches had been performed on crisis occurrence among students and its causes, consequences and   control measures. In Egypt, no studies, to our knowledge, were conducted in the area of research. So that, it is important to implement this study, where it may help leaders to invent strategies for management of crisis occurrence. These management strategies will have a positive influence on the students' performance and their academic achievement.

As a unique approach to this matter, a crisis management process is used to develop and implement an intervention for at-risk students, and to revise educational program policies to better support ongoing student success.

Aim: of the study was to investigate attributes of students' crisis in Egyptian governmental and private Universities.

Objectives

1-Determine level of crises occurrences among students at governmental and private Universities

2- Investigate causes leading to crisis occurrences among students at governmental and private Universities

3- Identify consequences of students' crisis at governmental and private Universities

4- Detect control measures by governmental and private Universities to manage student crisis

Research questions.

1.   What are the level of crises occurrence among students at governmental and private universities?

2.   What are the causes of crisis occurrence?

3.   What are the consequences of students' crises?

4.   What are the control measures to manage students' crises?

III.   Subjects And Methods

Design

A descriptive comparative research design was utilized. .

Study sample:

Convenience   sample from senior students in pre and final academic years .consisted of 1303 students divided into two groups students at governmental university and students at private university. The first group included 474 (with response rate of 46%) students from governmental university, while the second group included 829 (with response rate of 92 %) students from private university.

Study settings:

The study conducted at governmental and private universities, Namely: Port Said University in Port Said Governorate, and Delta Private Univesity in Dakahlia Governorate in Egypt. Students enrolled from the following faculties: Nursing Arts, Commerce, Computers, Education, Engineering, Pharmacy, Physical Education, Science, Social Services Institute, and Specific Education, Kindergarten, Medicine, Pharmacy, Dentistry, Management and Physical Therapy.

Tools of the study:
Data collection performed by standardized questionnaire. The included students encouraged to fill out the self-assessment questionnaire adopted from **Adeyemi, (2009)**, which consists of five parts.

   The first part contained demographic characteristics of the included students (age,   university, faculty, residence, family number, and income).

   The second part comprised of 12 questions about the level of crises occurrence. The students' responses included; occurred two times or more (high), occurred one time (moderate), and never occurred (low).

   The third part comprised of 9 questions about the causes of crises, the 8th question divided into 4 parts. The students' responses included; "agreed" and "not-agreed".

   The fourth part comprised of 6 questions about the consequences of crises. The students responded as; "agreed" and "not-agreed".

   The fifth part comprised of 9 questions about the control strategies to manage students' crises. The students responded as; "agreed" and "not-agreed".

Procedures
Included preparatory phase, validation, reliability of tools, pilot study, and field work phase.

Preparatory phase:
The tool was translated into Arabic Language to make it easy and clear to the students.

Validation of tools:
The content validity (or logical validity) performed to measure the extent to which the tools represent all facets of the social psychometrics construction. The method of measuring content validity performed by gauging agreement among judges (five professors of Nursing Administration) regarding how essential of a particular item of the tools is.

Each of the subject matter expert raters (SMEs) on the judging panel respond to the following question for each item: "Is measured item 'essential,' 'useful, but not essential,' or 'not necessary' to the performance of the construct?" If more than half the panelists indicate that an item is essential, that item has content validity. Greater levels of content validity exist as larger numbers of panelists agree that a particular item is essential. The recommended modifications performed and the tools tested through the pilot study.

Reliability of the tool
Tool reliability was tested by Cronbach alpha coefficient as follows: - crises occurrences, causes, Consequence and control measures(0.72, 0.86, 0.79 and 0.92 respectively), that reflects high level of reliability.

Pilot study:
A pilot study conducted before performing the main study. The questionnaires tested on a sample of 130 students, and they excluded from the main study sample. The aim was to test the clarity, completeness and practicability of the study tools, and time needed to fulfill the questionnaire.

Field work:
Regarding the self-assessment questionnaire, the sheets were filled by the students through 15-20 minutes for each student.

IV.   Administrative Design

An official permission was obtained using proper channels of communication. Official letters were sent from the authorities of all included Faculties and Universities to take their permission to carry out the study.

Meeting and discussion were held between the researcher and Administrative Personnel to make them aware of the aim of the study and its expected outcome and to get better cooperation during the implementation phase of the research. Acceptance of the Dean of each Faculty, where the study setting performed, was also obtained.

The total participants fulfilled an informed consent before giving any data. The researchers explained the aim of the study in a straightforward manner to be understood by the participants. Students were reassurance that their entire data considered confidential, through coding of all data, and not used outside this study without their approval. The researcher confirmed voluntary participation and withdrawal of the students without any

rationale. All possible communicating methods with the researchers were identified to return at any time for any explanation.

V. Statistical Design

To obtain a power of 90% with an assumption of α as 0.01 a sample size of 1303 students required. Data processing was done using Microsoft Excel software. Data were then imported and managed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 (IBM SPSS Ver. 20.0).

Quantitative or continuous data with normal distribution expressed primarily based on means and standard deviations (SD). Meanwhile, qualitative or categorical data presented as frequencies (numbers) and percentages.

Comparisons between two groups were made using chi-square (χ^2) test for categorical or qualitative data. Statistical significance tests used and a P-value of less than or equal (0.05) considered statistically significant.

VI. Results

Study results showed that, mean age of the studied students was 22.16±1.34 years. Approximately, 50.7% of students were expatriates and 91.1% of them had 4-8 members in family. About, 92% of the students reported adaquate income. The study showed a significantly lower level of crisis occurrence among students at private university compared to governmental university (45.8% versus 54.1%, respectively) (p=0.047). Crises arising from inadequate facilities and equipment was the most significant crisis at governmental university in comparison to private university (35.2% versus 5.1%, respectively) (p<0.0001). Crises arising from political opinion differences was the most significant crisis at private university in comparison to governmental university (42% versus 24.5%, respectively) (p<0.0001), as shown in Table 1.

According to Table 2, lack of accommodation was the most common cause of crisis occurrence among the students at private and governmental university (89.9% versus 55.5%, respectively) with significant difference between them (p<0.0001).

Disruption of academic programs was the extremely important consequence of crisis (65.3%) among the students at private university, while dismissal of students' ring leaders was the most significant consequence of crisis (57.6%) among the students at governmental university. The study also observed a significantly higher consequence of crisis among students at governmental university in comparison to private university (40.9% versus 32.4%, respectively) (Table 3).

Table (4) showed the control measures performed by governmental and private universities to manage students' crisis. Use of dialogue with students was the most common control measure to manage crisis at governmental and private universities (74.1% versus 71.9%, respectively) without significant difference between them (p>0.05). There were insignificant differences between both universities regarding control measures of students' crises (p>0.05).

VII. Discussion

A crisis that affects the university students can be chronic, unexpected, or unanticipated event that not only can disrupt the college's daily functioning, but can involve short-term turmoil such as depression, confusion, and fear. A crisis that impacts the educational process can affect a single building or an entire district or community. The following are examples of university-wide crisis events: insufficient facilities, inadequate accommodation, dissatisfaction about academic programs and political differences **(Eaton, Kann, Kinchen, Shanklin, Ross, Hawkins & Lim, 2010; Schultz, Barnes-Proby, Chandra, Jaycox, Maher & Pecora, 2010).**

The impact of these crisis events can be manifested at three distinct levels: the individual (student), the faculty system, and/or the surrounding community. On individual level, psychological and cognitive disruptions occur frequently, but may be difficult to identify. For example, interference with the ability of students to focus on learning is a common reaction to a university-wide crisis event. Disruptions to the faculty system frequently occur following a crisis event with changes to regular college functions and routines (i.e. changes to safety protocols) **(Kataoka, Langley, Wong, Baweja & Stein, 2012).**

In this study a significantly higher level of crisis occurrence among students at governmental universities compared to private universities was determined. This shows that governmental university usually susceptible or vulnerable to student crises. The finding agreed with those of other researchers **(Ojo, 1995; Adeyemi, 2009).**

Although there is no society where crises do not occur, the finding suggests that private university probably has a means of resolving students' crises. The working group examined governmental responses to the students' crisis. They found a higher risk of crisis occurrence inside these public institutes than that occurred in the private institutes **(Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE), 2009).** This raises the question that why the incidence of crisis is higher in governmental versus private university? This may be due to

the governmental universities had limited resources with poor financial support. Meanwhile, the private universities had several sources of finance, where, the objectives of private universities expanded beyond the educational interests only to include investment purposes. The government must learn the lesson and extend the crisis perspective to include stakeholders who can help the government in its responsibilities. This view should go both ways so that the government must make crisis control not only supported by universities but also demanded by the society.

Our study reported that the crises arising from inadequate facilities and equipment was the most significant crisis at governmental university in comparison to private university. Causes of crises seem to be institution-based as they could be attributed to the inability of the institutions to provide necessary facilities needed by students. The reason for this perhaps might be the fact that student expect the authority of governmental universities to provide essential facilities for the students because the universities are being financed from public funds. The problem usually encountered in the control of the governmental universities was that of inadequate funding which was the result of insufficient allocation of funds to the universities. This could perhaps lead to insufficient facilities in the universities. The need for more private universities is emphasized **(Onifade, 2003; Adeyemi, 2009).**

Inadequate investment in faculty facility maintenance in governmental universities has led to a scenario where there are a significant number of facilities with need for major repair and renovation. The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) in their "Report Card" gave governmental universities infrastructure a D grade in the 2005 and the most recent 2009 editions, which indicate fair grade **(American Society of Civil Engineers, 2009).**

Universities are centralized locations where learning is encouraged and both subjects and values are taught. As educating the next generation is a critical need for every society, it is imperative the faculty environment is conducive for learning. In governmental facilities, both teachers and students struggle with such issues as noise, poor indoor air quality, poor lighting and even physical security concerns is unlikely to be conducive **(Bello & Loftness, 2010).**

Lawrence (2003) pointed out that poorly maintained university facilities may have adverse health and safety impacts in causing asthma attacks, drowsiness, lethargy and a resulting inability to concentrate. The study also expressed that poor university facility conditions negatively impact staff and student morale. Another study **(Cash, 1993)** found schools with better facility conditions had higher student achievement scores.

Additionally, while it is important to adequately invest in university facility maintenance, it is also necessary to appropriately staff the university facilities with security and maintenance workers. This is in order to effectively maintain and monitor building conditions. This issue along with other developments such as, the outsourcing of facility maintenance, need to be investigated to better identify the path towards improved conditions in the governmental university facilities **(Bello & Loftness, 2010).**

This research detected that crises arising from political opinion differences was the most significant crisis at private universities in comparison to governmental universities. These differences between private opinion and governmental universities most likely results from "social desirability" concerns, a desire to cloak attitudes that society as a whole might deem unacceptable for fear of social and security sanctions **(Berinsky, 1999).**

The voicing of political opinion in Egypt has been facing limitations in the traditional media, but now with the news media conditions have changed. One study interpreted the conditions of political opinion in Egypt, specifically the students in public versus private universities in order to analyze the effect of technology-availability on political opinion. This research focuses on Egypt, as a developing country that has seen several changes in the past years in attempt to change its culture and become more democratized, although it does not have strong technological advancements. The researchers found similar findings in current study **(Eissa, 2012).**

Regarding causes of crises, lack of accommodation was the most common cause of crisis occurrence among the students at private and governmental universities. In Egypt, many students at various public universities complained of lack of accommodation **(Khaled, 2012).** Student' accommodation should be the most important part of university attention. Many factors to consider can make the students' accommodation as stressful as selecting the course in the first place. Students overwhelmingly want to be part of safe university environment to make friends and socialize **(Lightfoot, 2013).**

Our findings indicated that the failure of authority to listen to students' complaints was a significant cause of crises in governmental than in private universities. This observation agreed with those of earlier researchers **(Bens, 1999).**

The fact that students' crises could lead to the closure of public universities thereby disrupting academic programs tends to have adverse consequences on students' learning, among the students at private universities. This could be witnessed in the fact that student who could have spent four years for a degree programs would now be spending additional years as a result of crises. This finding was consistent with

Asummo's (1999) findings that students' crises could have adverse consequences on the effective teaching and learning in the universities.

The finding of this study highlighted that the use of dialogue with students was the most common control measure to manage crisis at governmental and private universities. This suggests that the use of dialogue and effective communication might hitherto not have been put in place for the control of students' crises in both private and governmental universities thereby leading to adverse consequences on the relationship between the authorities of the universities and the students. The finding was consistent with those of **Marcia and Rock's (1997). Adeyemi (2009)** also confirmed current finding about the dialogue strategy as a good measure for controlling students' crises, which was also agreed with findings in other studies **(Sessa, 1996; Akinyemi, 2002).** This could be seen in the fact that information that was not well told by the authorities of the universities could easily be misinterpreted by the students thereby leading to crises.

VIII.   Conclusions

Considering the results findings, it was concluded that students' crises were common at both governmental and private universities with higher incidence at governmental university. The study described many causes of crises, from which, lack of accommodation was the most common. The consequence of crisis was significantly risky among students at governmental versus private university. Governmental and private universities showed similar control measures to manage students' crises.

IX.   Recommendations

Faculty staff and counselors must have the professional training to understand emotional communications and to resolve the students' crises. Although utilizing these services requires that the instructor allocate time beyond the classroom, it is often less demanding than struggling to counteract the negative impact of the crises if occurred. Both the Departments of Academic and Student Affairs encourage instructor utilization of counseling consultation. The instructor may directly initiate a consultation or a classroom observation from the Crisis Intervention Specialist.

References

[1]   Abramson, C. I. (2015). A crisis in comparative psychology: where have all the undergraduates gone? Frontier Psychology, Pp. 6:15.
[2]   Adeyemi, T. O. (2009). Causes, consequences and control of students crises in public and private universities in Nigeria. Educational Research and Reviews, 4(4), 156-163.
[3]   Akinyemi, B. (2002). Management of students' crisis in Higher Institutions in Ekiti State. Unpublished MD Thesis, University of Ado–Ekiti. pp. 61-68.
[4]   American Society of Civil Engineers. (2009). Report card on America's infrastructure (1998 - 2009): available at: http://www.asce. org/ reportcard/.
[5]   Asunmo, O. (1999): Management of Students' crisis in Nigeria higher Institutions. A case study of St. Andrews' College of Education Oyom, Unpublished MD Thesis, University of Ibadan. pp. 54-62.
[6]   Bello, M. A., & Loftness, V. (2010). Addressing Inadequate Investment in School Facility Maintenance. Carnegie Mellon University, 1-48.
[7]   Bens, I. (1999). Keeping your team out of trouble. The Journal for Quality and Participation, 22 (4), 45-47.
[8]   Berinsky, A. J. (1999). The two faces of public opinion. American Journal of Political Science, 43 (4): 1209-1230.
[9]   Cash, C. S. (1993). Building condition and student achievement and behavior (Doctoral dissertation), Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Blacksburg, Virginia.
[10]   Department of Student Affairs (2010). Dealing with students in crisis. Handbook: Guidelines for Responding to Disruptive and Distressed Students on Campus. New York City College of Technology, Department of Student Affairs, The City University of New York, pp. 1-13.
[11]   Eaton, D. K., Kann, L., Kinchen, S., Shanklin, S., Ross, J., Hawkins, J., & Lim, C. (2010). Youth risk behavior Surveillance-United States, 2009. Morbidity and mortality weekly report. Surveillance summaries (Washington, DC: 2002), 59(5), 1-142.
[12]   Eissa, E. (2012). The Internet and Political Public Opinion in Egypt: A Comparative Study between Private and Public University Students. LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.P.8.
[13]   Felix, E. D., Furlong, M. J., & Austin, G. (2009). A cluster analytic investigation of school violence victimization among diverse students. Journal of Interpersonal Violence. 24(10): 1673-1695.
[14]   Gulati, R., Mayo, A., & Nohria, N. (2014). Management. Cengage Learning, pp. 411-417.
[15]   Hopkinson, R., & Skelton, Z. (2009). Coping with a Crisis. Rail Professional, (143).
[16]   Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) (2009). Impact of the Crisis on Education at a Governmental Level. Report from the working group sessions at the OECD Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) international conference on Higher Education at a Time of Crisis: Challenges and Opportunities, 29-30.
[17]   Kataoka, S., Langley, A., Wong, M., Baweja, S., & Stein, B. (2012). Responding to students with PTSD in schools. Child and adolescent psychiatric clinics of North America, 21(1), 119.
[18]   Khaled, A. 2012. Students protest against lack of campus accommodation. University World News Egypt, 21 October, Issue No: 244. VAILABLE AT : http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=2012101916193837
[19]   Lawrence, B. K. (2003). Save a Penny, Lose a School. The Real Cost of Deferred Maintenance. Policy Brief Series on Rural Education, Washington D.C.
[20]   Lewis, C., Deardorff, J., Lahiff, M., Soleimanpour, S., Sakashita, K. & Brindis, C.D. (2015). High school students' experiences of bullying and victimization and the association with school health center use. Journal of school health, 85(5): 318-326.

[21]   Lightfoot, L. (2013). Student accommodation: Dingy student digs are a thing of the past for today's undergraduates. Independent, 12:18. Available at: http://www.independent.co.uk/student/into-university/clearing/student accommodation-dingy-student-digs-are-a-thing-of-the-past-for-today-s undergraduates-8754733.html.

[22]   Marcia, L., & Rock, M. (1997). Effective crisis management planning: Creating a collaborative framework. University of Alabama 248-264. Available at http://www.educationandtreatment of children.net/index.html

[23]   Ojo, J. D. (1995). Students' unrest in Nigerian universities: a legal and historical approach. Spectrum Books.

[24]   Onifade, A. (2003). The funding problem. Vanguard Education and Manpower, 19 (5167), 27-29.

[25]   Reinhardt, A. C., Keller, T., Summers, L. O., & Schultz, P. (2012). Strategies for success: Crisis management model for remediation of at-risk students. Journal of Nursing Education, 51(6), 305-311.

[26]   Schultz, D., Barnes-Proby, D., Chandra, A., Jaycox, L. H., Maher, E., & Pecora, P. (2010). Toolkit for Adapting Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools (CBITS) or Supporting Students Exposed to Trauma (SSET) for Implementation with Youth in Foster Care. Technical Report. RAND Corporation. PO Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138.

[27]   Sessa, V. I. (1996). Using perspective taking to manage conflict and affect in teams. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 32(1): 101-115.

Table 1. Level of crisis occurrence among students at governmental and private universities.

Occurrence	Governmental University (n=474)			Private University (n=829)			χ^2 test	p-value
	Low	Moderate	High	Low	Moderate	High		
1-Crises resulting from hike in fees	187 (39.5%)	170 (35.9%)	117 (24.7%)	199 (24.0%)	385 (46.4%)	245 (29.6%)	34.7	<0.0001**
2-Crises arising from high handedness of Faculty administration:	200 (42.2%)	154 (32.5%)	120 (25.3%)	431 (52.0%)	292 (35.2%)	106 (12.8%)	33.9	<0.0001**
Faculty members:	206 (43.5%)	139 (29.3%)	129 (27.2%)	369 (44.5%)	380 (45.8%)	80 (9.7%)	78.7	<0.0001**
Administrators:	252 (53.2%)	130 (27.4%)	92 (19.4%)	603 (72.7%)	177 (21.4%)	49 (5.9%)	73.1	<0.0001**
3-Crises arising from poor services	170 (35.9%)	146 (30.8%)	158 (33.3%)	677 (81.7%)	115 (13.9%)	37 (4.5%)	308	<0.0001**
4-Crises arising from inadequate facilities and equipment	171 (36.1%)	136 (28.7%)	167 (35.2%)	693 (83.6%)	94 (11.3%)	42 (5.1%)	325	<0.0001**
5-Crises arising from inadequate accommodation	256 (54.0%)	108 (22.8%)	110 (23.2%)	425 (51.3%)	239 (28.8%)	165 (19.9%)	6.1	0.047*
6-Crises arising from inadequate classrooms and lecture theaters	176 (37.1%)	147 (31.0%)	151 (31.9%)	680 (82.0%)	91 (11.0%)	58 (7.0%)	275	<0.0001**
7-Crises arising from sudden change in school's policies	211 (44.5%)	144 (30.4%)	119 (25.1%)	548 (66.1%)	228 (27.5%)	53 (6.4%)	105	<0.0001**
8-Crises arising from disagreement on strict application of rules and regulations	204 (43.0%)	131 (27.6%)	139 (29.3%)	522 (63.0%)	231 (27.9%)	76 (9.2%)	95.8	<0.0001**
9-Crises arising from political opinion differences	236 (49.8%)	122 (25.7%)	116 (24.5%)	297 (35.8%)	184 (22.2%)	348 (42.0%)	41.9	<0.0001**
10-Crises on obsolete books in libraries	244 (51.5%)	123 (25.9%)	107 (22.6%)	566 (68.3%)	167 (20.1%)	96 (11.6%)	41.6	<0.0001**
11-Crises arising from poor transport system	238 (50.2%)	124 (26.2%)	112 (23.6%)	559 (67.4%)	176 (21.2%)	94 (11.3%)	46.6	<0.0001**
12-Crises arising from mode of dressing	291 (61.4%)	97 (20.5%)	86 (18.1%)	667 (80.5%)	76 (9.2%)	86 (10.4%)	57.7	<0.0001**
Average total	231 (48.8%)	130 (27.4%)	113 (23.8%)	448 (54.1%)	229 (27.6%)	152 (18.3%)	6.13	0.047*

*Chi-square (χ^2) test, *significant p<0.05, **highly significant p<0.01.*

Table 2. Causes of students' crisis at governmental and private universities.

Causes	Governmental University (n=474)		Private University (n=829)		χ^2 test	p-value
	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree		
Lack of accommodation	211 (44.5%)	263 (55.5%)	84 (10.1%)	745 (89.9%)	204	<0.0001**
Poor campus transportation	241 (50.8%)	233 (49.2%)	313 (37.8%)	516 (62.2%)	21.1	<0.0001**
Failure to guarantee security to lives and properties	257 (54.2%)	217 (45.8%)	658 (79.4%)	171 (20.6%)	91.3	<0.0001**
Dissatisfaction over academic programmes	229 (48.3%)	245 (51.7%)	317 (38.2%)	512 (61.8%)	12.6	0.0004**
Dissatisfaction over national issues	259 (54.6%)	215 (45.4%)	195 (23.5%)	634 (76.5%)	129	<0.0001**
Cultism: Differences on political affairs	256 (54.0%)	218 (46.0%)	166 (20.0%)	663 (80.0%)	159	<0.0001**
Poor leadership	255 (53.8%)	219 (46.2%)	487 (58.7%)	342 (41.3%)	3.01	0.08
High handedness from Colleagues:	270 (57.0%)	204 (43.0%)	549 (66.2%)	280 (33.8%)	11.1	0.0009**
Faculty members:	255 (53.8%)	219 (46.2%)	423 (51.0%)	406 (49.0%)	0.93	0.33
Faculty administrators:	286 (60.3%)	188 (39.7%)	510 (61.5%)	319 (38.5%)	0.18	0.67
Employees:	296 (62.4%)	178 (37.6%)	589 (71.0%)	240 (29.0%)	10.2	0.001**
Failure of authority to listen to students' complaints	261 (55.1%)	213 (44.9%)	508 (61.3%)	321 (38.7%)	4.8	0.028*
Average total	254 (53.5%)	220 (46.5%)	412 (49.7%)	417 (50.3%)	1.8	0.18

*Chi-square (χ^2) test, *significant p<0.05, **highly significant p<0.01.*

Table 3. Consequences of students' crisis at governmental and private universities.

Consequences	Governmental University (n=474)		Private University (n=829)		χ² test	p-value
	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree		
Disruption of academic programs	274 (57.8%)	200 (42.2%)	288 (34.7%)	541 (65.3%)	65.4	<0.0001**
Destruction to lives	326 (68.8%)	148 (31.2%)	679 (81.9%)	150 (18.1%)	29.5	<0.0001**
Wanton destruction of properties	330 (69.6%)	144 (30.4%)	694 (83.7%)	135 (16.3%)	26.1	<0.0001**
Closure of institution	329 (69.4%)	145 (30.6%)	690 (83.2%)	139 (16.8%)	33.8	<0.0001**
Suspension of erring students	221 (46.6%)	253 (53.4%)	389 (46.9%)	440 (53.1%)	0.01	0.92
Dismissal of students' ring leaders	201 (42.4%)	273 (57.6%)	620 (74.8%)	209 (25.2%)	136	<0.0001**
Average total	280 (59.1%)	194 (40.9%)	560 (67.6%)	269 (32.4%)	9.5	0.002**

*Chi-square (χ²) test, *significant p<0.05, **highly significant p<0.01.*

Table 4. Control measures performed by governmental and private universities to manage students' crisis.

Measures	Governmental University (n=474)		Private University (n=829)		χ² test	p-value
	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree		
Using emergency strategy such as inviting law enforcement agents	262 (55.3%)	212 (44.7%)	502 (60.6%)	327 (39.4%)	3.5	0.062
Imposition of authority	346 (73.0%)	128 (27.0%)	494 (59.6%)	335 (40.4%)	23.7	<0.0001**
Inviting parents-teachers' association to mediate	324 (68.4%)	150 (31.6%)	473 (57.1%)	356 (42.9%)	16.2	<0.0001**
Students; agreement on the prohibition of students' unionism	334 (70.5%)	140 (29.5%)	497 (60.0%)	332 (40.0%)	14.4	0.0001**
Involving students in decision making	151 (31.9%)	323 (68.1%)	396 (47.8%)	433 (52.2%)	31.4	<0.0001**
Provision of necessary facilities and equipment	136 (28.7%)	338 (71.3%)	403 (48.6%)	426 (51.4%)	49.3	<0.0001**
Use of dialogue with students	123 (25.9%)	351 (74.1%)	233 (28.1%)	596 (71.9%)	0.71	0.40
Use of negligence strategy	309 (65.2%)	165 (34.8%)	498 (60.1%)	331 (39.9%)	3.4	0.067
Use of effective leadership behavior	162 (34.2%)	312 (65.8%)	355 (42.8%)	474 (57.2%)	9.4	0.002**
Average total	239 (50.4%)	235 (49.6%)	428 (51.6%)	401 (48.4%)	0.18	0.67

*Chi-square (χ²) test, *significant p<0.05, **highly significant p<0.01.*