

INFLUENCE OF CLASS TYPES AND HOME BACKGROUND AND THE EFFICACY OF COGNITIVE SELF INSTRUCTION ON BULLYING BEHAVIOUR OF NIGERIA SECONDARY SCHOOLS STUDENTS.

AUTHOR'S DETAILS

EWENIYI GEORGE, ASSOCIATE PROF.IN COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY IBRAHIM BABANGIDA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION & COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY

&

ADEOYE, AYODELE. O. (PH.D)-ASSISTANT CHIEF COUNSELLOR/LECTURER,SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND
HUMANITIES ,DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL STUDIES BABCOCK UNIVERSITY, ILISHAN REMO NIGERIA

&

RAHEEM ADEBAYO, I.(PH.D)AISHAT MEMORIAL COLLEGE-ILORIN.KWARA STATE

&

ANWANANE, BIDEMLB-DEPT.OF STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES, COUNSELLING UNIT,BABCOCK UNIVERSITY,
ILISHAN REMO NIGERIA

ABSTRACT

Bullying constitutes a significant threat to the mental, social and physical wellbeing of school children. As an old phenomenon and worldwide problem, it has defied several efforts to curb it. This study examined the influence of class types and home background on the efficacy of Cognitive self-instruction on bullying behaviour among secondary school students in South Western part of Nigeria.

The population for the study consisted of bullies in public secondary schools in Nigeria schools. Stratified random sampling technique was used to select three schools while purposive sampling was used to select the participants. The study adopted a 2x2x2 pre-test and post test experimental research design consisting of a treatment group and one control group. Each of this group has 60 participants each, while six participants did not complete the study. Adolescent Peer Relation Inventory (APRI) was the instrument used for data collection and a total number of one hundred and fourteen students fully participated. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to analyse the three hypotheses formulated at the 0.05 level of significance.

The study revealed that class types and home background of the students did interact with the effect of the treatment ($F_{(2,101)} = 7.39; p < 0.05$) did affect bullying behaviour. Also, home background and treatment collectively ($F_{(2,101)} = 6.028; p < 0.05$) did affect bullying behaviour and lastly result revealed a non-significant effect of Cognitive self-instruction and class types on bullying behaviour ($F_{2, 101} = 1.943; p < 0.05$). Based on these findings, it was recommended that psychologists, counsellors, parents, teachers and social workers should use these treatment packages in controlling bullying behaviour among secondary schools students without the fear of the two moderating variables interfering with the treatment. Also, the government should sponsor seminars/workshops for school counsellors and educational psychologists on how to use Cognitive self-instruction.

Keywords: home background, class types, Cognitive Self-Instruction and Bullying behaviour.

Introduction:

Bullying is now recognized as a widespread and often neglected problem in schools around the world, and one that has serious implications for children who are victimized by bullies and for those who perpetrate the bullying. A rapidly growing body of research over the past 15 years has shown that both bullies and victims are at risk for short-term and long term adjustment difficulties such as academic problems (Adeoye 2008;Batsche& Knoff, 1994; Carney & Merrell, 2001;Egbochukwu,2008),psychological difficulties (Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpela,Rantanen,&Rimpela,2000;Espelage,Bosworth&Si

mon(2001),and social relationship problems (Craig, Pepler, &Connolly, 2003; Nansel et al., 2001; Olweus, 1993b, 1995). Bullying has been linked to anger, aggression, violence,hyperactivity, and externalizing problems as well as to later delinquency and criminality (Olweus, 1993a). Victimization by peers has been linked to illnesses, school avoidance, poor academic performance, increased fear and anxiety, and suicidal ideation as well as to long-term internalizing difficulties including low self-esteem, anxiety, and depression (Hawker & Boulton, 2000; McDougall, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2009). Moreover, suicidal ideation is reported by both bullies and victims, and especially by

bully-victims (e.g., Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpela, Marttunen, Rimpela, & Rantanen, 1999).

Peets & Kikas (2006) found that bullies were more likely than non-bullies were to have authoritarian, high punitive and low supportive parents who disagreed with each other. Olweus (1980) identified a number of other factors in the development of an aggressive reaction pattern in adolescent boys. These included a negative emotional attitude characterized by a lack of warmth and involvement by the primary caregiver during the early years; permissiveness on the part of the primary caregiver for aggressive behaviour by the child; and the use of power-assertive child-rearing methods such as physical punishment and violent emotional outbursts. Owens, Slee & Shute (2000) summarizes these findings stating, 'too little love and care and too much "freedom" in childhood are conditions that contribute strongly in the development of an aggressive reaction pattern'.

School climate is an important consideration in understanding school bullying because adult supervision decreases as students move from elementary to middle and secondary school. In turn, less structure and supervision are associated with concomitant increases in student bullying, particularly in locations such as play grounds, lunchrooms, and hallways (Craig & Pepler, 1997). Students often report feeling unsafe and afraid in unsupervised places in and around schools (Astor, Meyer & Pitner, 2001).

A significant amount of empirical evidence has shown how Cognitive self-instruction has been used to modify behaviour of aggressive children in social situations. Lynch, Laws & McKenna (2009) formulated a five-step sequential model of social information processing. According to this model, an individual must first encode the social cues, interpret those cues, generate solutions, decide on an optimal response and then enact the response. Research has shown that there is a relationship between biases as well as deficits in processing information at some or all of the steps and problem behaviour, particularly in aggressive children. (Kingdon & Price, 2009). They further stated that one of the most replicated findings is the tendency of elementary school-age aggressive children to attribute hostile intent to peers under conditions of ambiguity. Hostile attribution bias was particularly found to characterize aggressive/ delinquent adolescents. Follette & Ruzek (2006) proposed that social behaviour is to a greater extent controlled by cognitive self-instruction learned during early developmental stages. By cognitive scripts, Follette & Ruzek (2006) meant a representation in memory of a specific sequence of actions corresponding to a familiar event. When explaining the sequential steps through which scripts guide the behaviour, Prather (2007) reported that an individual possessing a stable cognitive representation of the script, enters a social interaction that contains elements evoking the script, and retrieves the script from memory. The concept of the script emphasized the role of the content of thought and the process of thinking in mediating behaviour. Prather (2007) found that beliefs serve to motivate and to inhibit social behaviour. In their study of aggressive adolescents, Sadiku (2000) and Aderanti (2006) found that boys were

more likely to be aggressive than girls. The aggressive boys were also found to be more likely to respond aggressively without considering other non-aggressive responses and the consequences of their behaviour

The study is aimed at establishing the effects of these independent variables (Cognitive self Instruction) on the dependent variable (Bullying behaviour). It is also designed to establish the moderating effects of class types and home background on bullying behaviour. The study would government and all other stakeholders in the reduction of this behaviour and would reduce the amount of money spend in rehabilitation, psychiatric hospital and remand homes. The following hypotheses were raised:

1. There is no significant home background and class types difference in the effect of cognitive self-instruction on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students.
2. There is no significant home background and class types difference in the effect of cognitive self-instruction on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students.
3. There is no significant class types difference in the effect of cognitive on the bullying behaviour secondary school students.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted a 2x2x2 pre-test, post-test, factorial design. The factors of the study are treatment, which exists at two levels (Cognitive Self-Instruction and Control), class types, which exists at two levels, (Junior Secondary School & Senior Secondary School) and Home background which was observed at two levels, (monogamy and polygamy). This design enabled the researcher to determine the effect of the independent and moderators on the dependent variable at a single shot.

Population of the study

The population of this study consisted of secondary school students exhibiting bullying behaviour in three local governments comprising of Sagamu, Ikenne and Remo North Local Governments Areas in South Western part of Nigeria.

Sample and Sampling Technique:

A stratified random sampling technique was used to pick one school each in each of the three Local Government Areas in Remo namely Shagamu, Ikenne and Remo North Local Government. In each of the randomly selected Local Government Areas. One school each was randomly selected, the researcher requested the counselors to provide a list of bullies. From each of these lists 120 bullies (60 from JSS and 60 from SSS) were selected to

participate making a total of one hundred and twenty participants, Six of these students did not participate fully leaving a total of one hundred and fourteen participants. Each of the Classes was assigned with the treatment and the control group thus: (A&B)

Instrumentation

Bullying behaviour was assessed by Adolescent Peer Relation Instrument (APRI) by Parada (2000) for both pre-test and post-test. Items No. 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, & 14 represent verbal bully, while Items No, 2, 6, 9, 12, 15, 16 represent physical bully, Items No, 4, 8, 11, 13, 17, 18, represent social. It is of 6 – point scales from 1 – Never, 2 – Sometimes, 3 -1 or 2 times a months, 4 – once a week, 5- Several times a week, 6-Everyday.

The validity was also ensured through proper scrutiny of the items by experts in Educational Psychologist. The internal consistency of the scale was reported by the developer using Chrombach's alpha to have yielded a scale of 0.92. The Adolescent Peer Relation Instrument (APRI: Parada, 2000) is an 18 –items inventory that measure specifically 3 types of bullying behaviours (physical, verbal, and social) as well as to generate total bullying. A high scores in these subscales designated frequently bullying behaviour, whereas low scores designate bullying or victimization that is not as frequent. The Instrument was subjected to three weeks pre and post test among some Secondary Schools students in Oyo state. Scores generated from these were correlated using Pearson Product Moment Correlation method. A co-efficient(r) of 0.81 showing that the instrument is reliable to be used for the study.

Administration of the Instrument/Procedure

Results:

Hypothesis One

1. There is no significant home background and class types difference in the effect of cognitive self- instruction on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students.

Table 1: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects of Treatment, Class types and Home setting grouping on Bullying Behaviour of Secondary School Students.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2953.691 ^a	29	101.851	1.124	.332
Intercept	2929.422	1	2929.422	32.332	.000
Pretest	525.229	1	525.229	5.797	.018
Group	647.968	2	323.984	4.576	.021
Class types	.005	1	.005	.000	.994
group * class types	350.486	2	175.243	1.943	.151

This study was carried out in three phases. In the first phase the participant was assigned to the two treatment groups (Cognitive self Instruction, $N=60$ and Control group $N=60$) respectively. Adolescent Peer Relation Instrument (APRI) was administered. The data generated through the administration of pre-test served as covariate in the analysis of covariance. At phase two, each group went through six weeks (1 hour a week) of intensive training. 30 minutes of discussion/lecture, 15 minutes to discuss the previous assignments given, 15 minutes to summarize and give the next assignment. Instructions and explanations on the task involved in each experimental group such as lectures, discussion, and assignments were given to all participants. Among other discussions/lectures given to participants under cognitive self Instruction (CSI) were the effect of self-statements on behavior and the importance of substituting negative self-statements with positive self-statements. Assignments include: giving examples of self-statements, substituting negative self-statement with positive self statements such as substituting "I have to can overcome this behaviour" " I need to think twice before acting". The participants in the control group received a placebo treatment in which study habits technique was taught to them. Things like time management, jotting recap was mentioned Assignments were also given to them. Phase three involve the use of APRI as post test .

Method of Data Analysis

All the stated hypotheses in this study were analyzed using Analysis of Co-variance (ANCOVA). This method helped to draw out the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable using scores as covariant. The hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significant.

group * home setting	222.468	2	111.468	6.028	.014
class * home setting	1.368	1	1.368	.204	.949
group * class * home setting	431.102	2	215.551	7.379	.011
Error	9150.093	101	90.603		
Total	116857.000	114			
Corrected Total	10564.360	113			

Table 2: Estimates of the Interaction Effect of Treatment, class types and home background on Participants' Bullying Behaviour

Treatment Group	Class types	Home background	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Cognitive Self-Instruction Group	JSS	Monogamy	22.292 ^a	3.102	20.138	32.446
		Polygamy	28.250 ^a	3.181	21.939	34.562
	SSS	Monogamy	19.786 ^a	2.919	25.997	37.576
		Polygamy	25.822 ^a	2.885	17.100	28.544
Control Group	JSS	Monogamy	31.621 ^a	3.230	30.213	43.028
		Polygamy	34.129 ^a	2.981	28.216	40.042
	SSS	Monogamy	32.551 ^a	2.885	26.829	38.274
		Polygamy	36.867 ^a	3.065	30.786	42.947

a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Pre-test Bullying Behaviour = 37.0877.

The results in Table 1 revealed that there was a significant two-way interaction of home background and class types difference in the effect of cognitive self- instruction on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students. ($F_{(2,101)} = 7.379$; $p < 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant home background and class types difference in the effect of cognitive self- instruction on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students was rejected by this finding. The implication of the results is that class types and homebackground would interact significantly with treatment to affect the bullying behaviour of participants.

This was revealed in the results in Table 2 which showed that class types and home background participants in the Cognitive self Instruction group had a lower mean score compare to those in the control group .

Hypothesis Two

There is no significant home background difference in the effect of cognitive self- instruction on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students.

Table 3: Estimates of the Interaction Effect of Treatment and home background on Participants' Bullying Behaviour

Treatment Group	Home background	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Cognitive Self-Instruction Group	Monogamy	16.039 ^a	2.097	24.879	33.200
	Polygamy	25.536 ^a	2.145	21.282	29.791
Control Group	Monogamy	34.586 ^a	2.165	30.292	38.880
	Polygamy	35.498 ^a	2.189	31.155	39.840

a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Pre-test Bullying Behaviour = 37.0877.

The results in Table 1, showed that there was a significant two-way interaction effect of treatment and home background on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students ($F_{(2,101)} = .6.028$; $p < 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant home background difference in the effect of cognitive self instruction and control on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students was rejected by this finding. The implication of the results was that treatment would interact with home background to influence the bullying behaviour of secondary school students. This is indicated in the results in Table 4 which showed that participants home background with cognitive behaviour treatment had a mean lower than the control group.

Hypothesis Three

There is no significant class types difference in the effect of cognitive on the bullying behaviour secondary school students.

Table 4: Estimates of the Interaction Effect of Treatment and Class Types on Participants' Bullying Behaviour

Treatment Group	Class Types	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Cognitive Self-Instruction Group	JSS	27.271 ^a	2.127	23.052	31.490
	SSS	25.304 ^a	2.051	23.236	31.373
Control Group	JSS	35.375 ^a	2.221	30.969	39.780
	SSS	34.709 ^a	2.103	30.537	38.881

a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Pre-test Bullying Behaviour = 37.0877.

The results in Table 1 revealed that there was no two way interaction of treatment and Class types on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students ($F_{(2,101)} = 1.943$; $p > 0.05$). The null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant class types difference in the effect of cognitive self instruction and control on the bullying behaviour of students from different secondary school students was by this finding accepted. The finding reflects that participants' bullying behaviour would not be affected by the interacting effect of treatment and class types as indicated in Table 4.

Discussion

The first hypothesis states that there is no significant class types and home background difference in the effect of cognitive self-instruction and control on the bullying behaviour of secondary student. Results from table 1 and table 2 revealed that there were significant difference in the three way interactions of treatment class types and home background on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students. Hence, it rejected. This implies that the combination of class types and home background will aid the effect of cognitive self-instruction on bullying behaviour of secondary school students. The data further revealed the effectiveness of cognitive self-instruction as a therapy in controlling anti social behaviour.(Aderanti,2006;Gardner,2003; Kazdin,Seigel,& Bass,1992).Moreover, the home in which a person is brought up has been established to be a factor in which youth character are developed.(Smith, Nika& Papisideri,2004) This might be the reason for the interaction of class types and home background on the efficacy of cognitive instruction therapy on bullying behaviour among secondary school students.

The second hypothesis stated that there is no significant home background difference in the effect of cognitive self-instruction and control on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students. The results as revealed in tables 1 and 3 shows that a significant two - way interaction effect of treatment and home background on the bullying behaviour of secondary students. It was noted that the means score of group treated with cognitive self instruction is relatively lower than the control group and hence a significant two way interacting effect was noticed. The significant difference in treatment and home background may be explained using Piaget cognitive development and social learning theories by Bandura(1977) who described that antisocial behaviours are learnt and imbibed especially at youth especially when the home background is not stable. The third hypothesis stated that there is no significant class types difference in the effect of cognitive self-instruction and control on the bullying behaviour of secondary school students. The results as revealed in tables 1 and 4 shows that no significant two - way interaction effect of treatment and class types on the bullying behaviour of secondary students. It was noted that the means score of cognitive self-instruction and control

group score are close and hence no significant two way interacting effect. This might be as a result of Nigeria public schools setting in which students of higher ages can be in junior secondary schools and lower ages in junior secondary schools.

Conclusion

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings of the study;

Cognitive self-instruction therapy is effective in treating bullying behavior .Home background and class types together will affect the interaction of cognitive self-instruction in treating secondary schools students with bullying behaviour. Class types alone will not affect the interaction of cognitive self-instruction in treating secondary schools students with bullying behaviour.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusion of the studies, the following recommendations were made:

Counselling psychologists could use this treatment package (cognitive self-instruction) Home background must be recognised as this affect the effectiveness of the cognitive self-instruction

References

- Adeoye,A.O.(2008).Gender,Age and Class as Predictors of Bullying Behaviour in some secondary Schools in Ogun State in Nigeria.*Contemporary Humanities*;(2):1:38-48
- Aderanti, R.A. (2006). *Differential effectiveness of cognitive restructuring and self- management and token reinforcement in the treatment of selected delinquent behavioural pattern of remand inmates*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago – Iwoye
- Bandura, A. (1977) *Social Learning Theory*. General Learning Press. U.S.A
- Batsche, G.M. & Knoff, H.M. (1994). Bullies and their victims - Understanding a pervasive problem in the schools. *School Psychology Review*, 23(2), 165-174
- Carney, A. G., & Merrell, K. W. (2001). Bullying in schools. Perspectives on understanding and preventing an international problem. *School Psychology International*, 22, 364 – 382.
- Craig W. M. & Pepler, D.J. (1997). Observation of bullying and victimization in the School yard. *Canadian journal of school psychology*. 13, 41 – 59.
- Craig, W.M., & Pepler, D.J. (2007). Understanding bullying: From research to practice. *Canadian Psychology*, 48, 86-93.
- Craig, W.M., & Pepler, D.J. (2007). Understanding bullying: From research to practice. *Canadian Psychology*, 48, 86-93.

- Egbochukwu,E.(2007).Bullying in Nigeria Schools: Prevalence and Implication. *Journal of Social Sciences*.14 (1):65-71
- Espelage ,D.L., Bosworth, K.& Simon, T.S. (2001)Short-term stability and change of bullying in middle school students: An examination of demographic, psychosocial, and environmental correlates. *Violence and Victims*.;16(4):411–426
- Follette,K. & Ruzek.G.(2006). *Cognitive-Behavioral Therapies for Trauma*. Second Edition. Guildford Press
- Prather,W.(2007). Trauma and Psychotherapy: Implications from a Behavior Analysis Perspective. *International Journal of Behavioral Consultation and Therapy*, 3(4), 555– 570.
- Gardner, A.O.(2003). Cognitive-behavioural depression treatment for mothers of children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Behaviour Therapy*, 37, 143–158.
- Garret, A. G. (2003). *Bullying in American schools. Causes. Preventions and Intervention* McFarland and Company, Inc. Publishers. London.
- Hawker, D. S. J. & Boulton, M. J. (2000). Twenty years of research on peer victimization and psychological maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of child psychology and Psychiatry*. 41, pp. 441-455
- Kaltiala-Heino R, Rimpela M, Marttunen M, Rimpela A, Rantanen P. (1999) Bullying, depression, and suicidal ideation in Finnish adolescents: school survey. *British Medical Journal*.;319:348–351.
- Kazdin, A.E., Seigel, T.C. & Bass, D. (1992). Cognitive problem solving skills and problem management training in the treatment of anti-social children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 60 (5) 733 -747
- Kingdon, D. & Price, J. (2009). "[Cognitive-behavioral Therapy in Severe Mental Illness](#)". *Psychiatric Times* 26 (5).346-351
- Lynch, D., Laws, K.& McKenna, J. (2009). "Cognitive behavioural therapy for major psychiatric disorder: does it really work? A meta-analytical review of well-controlled trials". *Psychological medicine* 40 (1): 1–16
- Nansel, T. (2001). Bullying is a common study. Retrieved from www.abcdnews.go. Com/section/living/dailynews/bullying.html on 23 July,2007
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school*. What we know and what we can do. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing
- Olweus, D. (1993a). *Bully/ Victim Problems among schools children long term consequences and an effective intervention program*. In S. Hodgins, Mental disorder and crime (pp – 317 – 349 Thousand Oaks, C.A: Sage.
- Olweus, D.(1995)). Bullying at school: basic facts & effects of a school: basic acts effect of a school based intervention programme. *Journal of child psychiatry* 1171 – 1190.
- Olweus,D.(1993b). *Bullying among school children: intervention and prevention*.Aggression and violence throughout live span. Sage publications Newburg Part.,
- Owens, L., Slee, P., & Shute, R. (2000). "It hurts a hell of a lot. . ." The effects of indirect aggression on teenage girls. *School Psychology International*, 21, 359 – 376.
- Parada, R., (2000). *Adolescent Peer Relations Instrument*. test manual publication unit University of Western Sydney .Australia.
- Peets, K., & Kikas, E. (2006). Aggressive strategies and victimization during adolescence: Grade and gender differences, andcross-informant agreement. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32, 68 – 79
- Sadiku, O.S. (2000). *Cognitive restructuring and token reinforcement technques in enhancing academic self concept of secondary school student in Lagos State Nigeria*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
- Smith, P. K., Nika, V., & Papisideri, M. (2004). Bullying and violence in schools: An international perspective and findings in Greece. *Psychology*, 11, 184 – 203