
PEER INFLUENCE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AS CORRELATES OF DEVIANT
BEHAVIOUR AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN DELTA CENTRAL
SENATORIAL DISTRICT

Onakpoberuo, Blessing Obakpororo & F. N. Ugoji

Department of Guidance and Counseling

Delta State University, Abraka

Email: onasbles@yahoo.com

***Abstract:** This study investigated the relationship between peer influence and socio-economic status as correlates of deviant behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. Three research questions and three null hypotheses were formulated for the study. A structured questionnaire titled "Peer influence, socio-economic status and deviant behaviour" was designed for the study. The study adopted a descriptive survey which is correlational in nature. Stratified random sampling procedure was used in the study in validating the instrument, factor analysis was used, face, content and construct validity of the instrument were established. A sample size of five hundred (500) students were drawn from a population of thirty-three thousand, five hundred and nineteen (33,519) senior secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. The data generated in the study were analyzed with both correlation and multiple regression statistics to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The findings of the study revealed: (i) There is significant relationship between peer influence, socio-economic status and deviant behaviour (ii) There is significant relationship between socio-economic status and deviant behaviour. There is relationship between peer influence and deviant behaviour. Conclusions made were that (i) Peer influences deviant behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District (ii) Socio-economic status influences deviant behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. Based on the findings, it was recommended that (i) Orientation programmes should be arranged for both students and parents on the need to eradicate deviant behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District (ii) School authorities should create enabling environment in form of good and adequate facilities and equipment with professional counsellors to handle negative peer influence among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District.*

Keywords: *Peer Influence, Socio-Economic Status, Deviant Behavior, Secondary School Students, parents, orientation and Correlation and Multiple Regression Statistics.*

Introduction

Understanding of human behaviour is a task for parents, teachers, medical practitioners, psychologists, physiotherapists, counselors, personnel managers, theologians and indeed, all concerned persons who have become aware, in recent years, of the incidence of deviant behaviour among students. Asuni (2009) noted that Nigeria adolescents are not

exempted from the various kinds of psychological problems commonly observed among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. The establishment of child guidance clinics in big cities like Lagos, Ibadan, Enugu and Benin City, as well the provision of guidance and counseling services in schools shows that there is awareness of deviant behaviour among students of secondary school. Gottesman (2003) defined deviant behaviour as variety of psychological disorder of school students, resulting from unfavourable environment rather than from organic disease or defect. This, according to him, includes undesirable trait and habit disturbance, conduct disorder, neurotic symptoms and some other school problems such as disruptive behaviour, school phobia and truancy. This definition recognizes that certain behaviours could become disturbing but does not state when a particular student's behaviour is normal and when it becomes abnormal. However, longitudinal study data indicate that isolated behaviour similar to nail biting and others listed in the above definition are very common among adolescents in school.

Therefore, while psychologically disturbed students have been defined in variety of ways, all the definitions tend to characterize such students as manifesting moderately to severe maladaptive behaviour with reference to the school setting. The components of such definitions usually include reference to activity, negative peer grouping, withdrawn behaviour, broken home, poor parenting style, emotional instability, over sensitivity to stimuli, short attention span, problems in interpersonal relationship, conduct disorder and under-achievement (Egbule, 2003). In all, deviant behaviour during adolescent period implies all abnormal behaviour patterns from accepted cultural norms of the society which may have effects on the students themselves or their community. Such effects could be in form of conduct disorder, personality maladjustment or psychological problems.

Moreover, deviant behaviour refers to the predisposition to and indulgence in criminal or unlawful activities by children under the age of 18. According to National Research Council (2001), when serious crimes are considered, 28% of them are committed by persons under age 18. These include 14% of all murders, 15% of all rape cases, 24% of all robberies, and 43% of car thefts. In southern Nigeria, theft, vandalism, leasing, bullying, 419, rape, promiscuity, examination malpractice, bribery, broken relationship, fighting, oppression and violence are extremely rampant. In northern Nigeria, bombing, kidnapping by Boko Haram, assassination, tribal sentiment, election malpractice and killing of innocent people are predominant. By these experiences, many homes have been broken and most children from these homes suffer a lot of emotional, psychological and physiological problems. Some of them (children) end up staying with single parents who might not be able to shoulder the full responsibilities of the family; they may try to seek help from their peers who may influence them into deviant behaviour. Factors constituting deviant behaviour include psychological, sociological and biological problems.

There have been efforts to determine whether certain personality factors predispose the adolescent to deviancy (Holcom, 1991). Generally speaking, no one personality type is associated with deviancy, but those who become deviants are more likely to be impulsive, destructive, suspicious, hostile, resentful, ambivalent to school authority, defiant, socially assertive and lack self-control (Azrin and Holz, 1990). Aggressive conduct is associated with delinquent behaviour. Deviancy is sometimes a manifestation of peer negative influence, hostilities, anxieties, fears or deeper neurosis. In some cases, deviancy or deviant behaviour is the result of poor socio-economic status that results in children not developing proper impulse control (Sass, 2008). Poor economic factor made most students drop out from school, thus, some students became deviant both in school and society. Travis (2009) found that students of high socio economic status were more likely to be involved in school vandalism than students of low economic status. Community and neighborhood influences are also important in deviant issues. Most larger communities have areas in which deviancy rates are higher than in other neighborhoods, e.g. Lagos State is typified with anti-social behaviours as gambling, prostitution, theft and robberies, alcoholism and drug abuse. In Delta State, such communities include Warri, Asaba, Abiraka, Oghara, Eku and Sapele. Some school students become deviants because of anti-social influence of peers.

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

- i. What is the extent of relationship between peer influence, socio-economic status and deviant behaviour?
- ii. What is the extent of relationship between peer influence and deviant activities among adolescent students in secondary school?
- iii. What is the extent of relationship between socio-economic status and deviant behaviour among adolescent children in secondary school?

Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were formulated for the study:

- i. There is no significant relationship between peer group influence, socio-economic status and deviant behaviour.
- ii. There is no significant relationship between peer influence and deviant behaviour among post-primary school students.
- iii. There is no significant relationship between socio-economic status and deviant behaviour among secondary school students.

Concept of Deviant Behaviour

Deviance involves a degree of stigmatization of a sub-population by the majority population on the basis of some difference; a difference that sets the sub-population apart and that is emphasized by the majority population in identifying the deviant population. Different theories have been propounded on why and how deviant population is identified and marginalized. At any given time, there are deviant conceptions and categories which determine who is and who is not to be identified as deviant according to behaviour, status,

or some other dimension. Social observers provide acts with meanings and so indicate whether the acts are deviant or non-deviant. At different times, certain behaviours may be removed from the deviant categories and so alter the picture of crime and deviance in the society (Thompson and Hickey, 2004). The term, deviant behaviour, is "a variety of psychological disorder of children resulting from an unfavourable environment rather than from organic disease or defect (Egbule, 2008).

At least four essential elements are involved in the process of defining deviance: norms, acts, actors, and an audience. Similarly, deviance is relative to time, place, situation, and culture (Thompson and Hickey, 2004).

The concept of deviance evolved through time, and an analysis of fictional representations of deviant behaviour can serve to show how society has viewed the issue over a historical period. This analysis shows, however, more clearly, what the writer views as deviant than how society may view the issue.

In classification of behaviour problems, Ross (2009) identified two definitional issues inherent in the development of taxonomy of behaviour disorder. Using the first simple criteria of normal and abnormal behaviour which attracted a number of researches, Werry and Quay (2000) showed that even children labeled "abnormal" are referred to mental health professionals. Quay (2003) is also in agreement with this idea that some of the behaviour are indicators of most commonly found to be associated with each of the four basis patterns of disorder of childhood and adolescence enumerated by him include conduct disorder, anxiety withdrawal, immaturity and socialized delinquency.

Socio-Economic Status and Deviant Behaviour

This relates to the individual status via parental background, parental occupation as well as other family factors which influence the behaviour and development of the individual positively or negatively in all ramifications. Consequently parental occupation and status has influence on the behaviour of the child in terms of his learning, socialization and personality. Similarly, the availability of modern learning and teaching aid materials have positive influence on the child learning in the areas of language and cognitive development.

The socio-economic status is of three strata the lower class, middle class and upper-class, the life adjustment in the lower class is not easy. They fall well into the category of the poor. Some cannot eat well nor afford to pay their children school fees. They are dependent on other persons for taking care of their responsibilities. This is very common among Ibo indigenes who bear children for other people to train for them in the name of "boy-boy" the child will be made to spend about 7-8years learning a trade to be settled after 7-8years, helping businessmen to acquire their wealth, they may lay false accusation on the child and drive them out (Egbule, 2009).

However, the level of socio-economic status of the parent might prevent the child from acquiring knowledge he or she ought to acquire. Many are very much interested to go to school but because of school fees they were sent to learn a trade, it will be difficult for such a child to behave well after being disappointed by his master for 7-8 years of apprenticeship.

Furthermore, it is not an understatement to say that more than 5% of the Nigeria populace are invariably poor. In the view of Uwakwe (2001) this comprises groups of people or families who are peasants farmers, palm wine tappers, rubber merchants, palm oil producer, which constitute about 40% in ratio while the remaining 45% are predominantly farmer for many communities. According to Caucult (2002), education is an expensive project and so for any parent to have successfully trained a child up to the university level is a great achievement in the rural area. Most parents in these suburbs are unable to adjust with increasing high demand of secondary schools. Adeyemi (2001) attributed all these to high fees charge for manuals or learning aid, cost of uniform, term fees and payment of transportation and other revolving funds which are paid intermittently. The above to him calls for the concern of parents in these areas, who are willing to train their children, fund and carry them along so as to cope with their peer. It is always a task for them and when they are unable to adjust, lead to the withdrawal of their wards from school. As significant discovery as accounted for by Adeyemi (2001) is that most parents allow their children to complete the basic primary education (primary 1-6) years relying heavily on the government free education policy at all levels. After this, the survival of these youths at secondary school level is conditional, to stay or quit.

Peer Influence and Deviant Behaviour

Peer influence on problem behaviour seems to have been studied more than any other area. There is considerable evidence that association with deviant peers puts adolescents at higher risk of problem behaviour. For example, having substance-using friends was found to be related to adolescents own substance use, and having delinquent friends was found to be related to adolescents' own involvement in delinquent behaviour (Patterson, 1991). These studies suggest that deviant peer association is a strong predictor of adolescent problem behaviour even after considering the fact that adolescents tend to select peers with characteristics similar to their own.

Furthermore, in a longitudinal study of adolescent substance use, Stephens (2006) demonstrated that having substance-using friends at age 13 or 14 significantly increased adolescent boys' substance use two years later, when they were 15 or 16 years old. This relationship remained significant even after controlling for the earlier level of problem behaviour of the boys. In another longitudinal study, Weissman (2005) found that boys who had moderate levels of problem behaviour became more delinquent later if they had hyperactive and aggressive friends at age 11 or 12 when compared with other boys with moderate problem behaviour who did not have friends with those negative qualities. In a recent review of adolescent intervention research, Dishion, McCord, and Poulin (2009) showed that intervention programs for adolescents with problem behaviour unfortunately

worsened their problems if the programs involved group activities. This review indicated that spending time with delinquent peers, even in intervention settings, can have negative impact on adolescents. Although peer influence has been well established as a factor in adolescent problem behaviour, the process by which peers affect adolescents' problem behaviour has been understudied. One approach to use to address this issue is Bronfenbrenner's (2009) ecological perspective. The perspective emphasized that research on human development should consider the interrelations between individuals' characteristics and their contexts. Similarly, Hermann (2006) pointed out that research on peer influence has to consider the factors that can moderate the process of peer influence such as the characteristics of the peer involved, those of the adolescents who are being influenced, and those of their families.

There are few studies on peer influence conducted from an ecological perspective. In these studies, parenting was considered as a factor that influences adolescent problem behaviour. For example, in a longitudinal study of peer influence, Mounts (2005) found that the relationship between having substance-using friends and adolescents' substance use one year later was stronger among adolescents whose parents were less authoritative. In another study of susceptibility to peer pressure, Steinbery (1994) also found differences in adolescents' susceptibility to negative peer pressure between those who reported their parents to be highly authoritative and those who reported their parents to be less authoritative. This result held true even when the adolescents spent after-school time with peers without parental supervision. These findings indicated that parenting style can make a difference in the ways in which adolescents are influenced by their peers.

Those studies on the moderating effect of parenting on the relationship between association with problem peers and adolescent problem behaviour have contributed to the understanding of peer influence process. However, parenting would not be the only factor that would moderate the relationship. As Bronfenbrenner (2009) maintained, adolescents' individual characteristic should also be considered as a factor that can make a difference in the extent to which adolescents are influenced by their contexts. Adolescents' conception of parental authority can be one such factor that moderate peer influence on adolescent problem behaviour.

Conception of parental authority which is operationally defined, in the study, as individuals' beliefs about whether they are obliged to obey parental rules (Damon, 2007), is more important to adolescents in developing a sense of themselves as distinct individuals with their own ideas and opinions, and growing into autonomous individuals (Bauman, 2008; Silverberg and Gondoli, 2006). To achieve these developmental goals, adolescents need to have increasing opportunities to make decisions for themselves. However, they are not yet capable of complete autonomy. They still need parental guidance to follow while being granted more autonomy. In that sense, adolescent conception of parental authority (rule obedience) can be especially important in situations where adolescents have to make decisions about whether to become involved

in problem behaviour. Because they spend a lot of time without parents' direct supervision, it is important that they have internalized parental standards and rules of behaviour and that they are willing to make decisions on their behaviour according to those standards and rules.

Adolescents' beliefs that they have to obey parental rules could be a protective factor against negative peer influence on adolescents in situations where they have to make decisions about whether to be involved in problem behaviour. It can be reasoned that if adolescents have internalized parental rules of behaviour and have strong beliefs that they should behave according to the parental rules, adolescents would be less prone to negative peer influence.

Empirical Evidence of Peer Influence on Deviant Behaviour

Yun-Joo (2006) studied "varying associations between peer problem adolescent drinking and vandalism as influenced by their friends". The study examined whether adolescent rule obedience can make a difference in the area of peer influence and adolescent problem.

A sample of 500 students were drawn through snowball sampling techniques from a population of 820 students. The results revealed that adolescents drinking and vandalism were affected by the level of peer drinking and vandalism respectively. Adolescents were more likely to drink and vandalize when their peers drank and vandalized at high level. However, the extent to which adolescents are influenced by their peers varies as function of adolescent rule obedience. The results of regression analyses suggest that adolescents drinking and vandalism are influenced by their friends. Adolescents whose friends reported relatively higher level of drinking reported higher level of drinking themselves and adolescents whose friends reported relatively high level of vandalism reported high level of vandalism themselves. These findings are in line with previous research that found negative peer influence on adolescent problem behaviour (Dishon, 2010). In support for previous research findings showing that adolescents' problem behaviour is influenced by peer problem behaviour, the results of the study suggest that adolescent rule obedience (feeling of obligation to obey parental rule) may be one individual characteristic of adolescence that can make a difference in the process of negative influence.

However, the influence of peer drinking and vandalism on adolescent drinking and vandalism varies depending on the level of adolescent obedience to parental rules. Adolescents who believe more strongly that they should follow parental rules were affected. These findings suggest that adolescents' obedience to rules may protect them against negative peer influence. The findings provide support for Suluter (2002) notion that individual differences should be considered in peer influence study. Bronfenbrenner (2011) is of the notion that human development research should pay attention to factors that can interact with developing individuals' contents.

Findings from the study also have implication for parenting, while adolescents, as they grow older, have increasing opportunities to make decisions about their behaviours on

their own; they are not yet able to be completely autonomous. They need some rules on which they can base their decision making and it is important that they feel obliged to follow those rules. In the study, it was suggested that adolescents' strong beliefs that they should obey parental rules are beneficial to them in situation of negative peer influence. Because adolescents obedience seem to be higher among adolescents who have authoritative parents (Darling and Steinberg, 2008). It can be said that authoritative parenting in which the balance between parents' behavioural control and support is maintained, would protect adolescents from negative peer influence by leading them to have stronger rule obedience. However, more empirical evidence is required to establish peer influence on deviant behaviour. Although the present study expands the current literature on peer influence on deviant behaviour, it is not without limitation.

Methods

Design and Procedure

The study is a correlational design. The researcher investigated the influence of peer group and socio-economic status on deviant behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District, as related to gender and location of students. This type of research design gives no chance for interference with the normal existence of the research conditions and situations (Asika 1999). According to Peretomode and Iboh (1992), the researcher, in this type of study, is concerned with investigation and description the extents to which two or more variables are related in quantitative terms. Three schools were selected from the eight Local Government Areas in Delta Central Senatorial District. In all, the subjects of the study comprised a total of 500 students including (SS1, SSII, SSIII) male and female students were sampled out of thirty-three thousand, five hundred and nineteen (33,519) senior secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District.

Presentation of Findings

Research Question 1: What is the extent of relationship between peer influence, socio-economic status and deviant behaviour?

Table 1: Multiple Correlations of Peer Influence, Socio-Economic Status and Deviant Behaviour of Secondary School Students.

	Peer Influence	Socio-Economic Status	Deviant Behaviour
Peer Influence	1		
Socio-economic status	0.11*	1	
Deviant Behaviour	0.25*	0.32*	1
Mean	36.74	49.13	33.07
Standard Deviation	4.66	6.21	5.10

*Significant ($P < 0.05$)

The data in table 1 show that there is significant correlation between peer influence and socio-economic status ($r = 0.11$); peer influence and deviant behaviour ($r = 0.25$); and socio-economic status and deviant behaviour ($r = 0.32$). These correlations observed here

are positive and implies that there is significant relationship between peer group influence, socio-economic status and deviant behaviour.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between peer influence and deviant behaviour.

Table 2: Multiple Regressions of Peer Influence, Socio-Economic Status and Deviant Behaviour.

Model	R	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared	Std Error of the Estimate	Significance	Remark
1	0.39 ^a	0.15	0.15	4.71		
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS						
Model 1	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F	Significance	Remark
Regression	1958.36	2	979.18	44.06	0.00 ^a	Significant
Residual	11044.75	497	22.22			
Total	13003.11	499				
Significance of regression weight of variables in the Equation 2						
Model	B	Std Error	Beta	t-Ratio	Significance	Remark
Peer Influence	0.23	0.05	0.22	5.19	0.00	Significant
Socio-economic status	0.25	0.03	0.30	7.19	0.00	Significant

a. Predictors: (Constant), socio-economic status, peer influence

b. Dependent Variable: deviant behaviour

The data in table 2 show that there is significant correlation between peer influence and deviant behaviour ($r = 0.25$) between socio-economic status and deviant behaviour ($r = 0.32$). This correlation observed here is positive and implies that there is significant relationship among peer group influence, socio-economic status and deviant behaviour.

Research Question 2: What is the extent of relationship between peer influence and deviant activities among adolescent students in secondary school??

Table 3: Linear of Peer Influence and Deviant Behaviour among Secondary School Students

	Peer Influence	Deviant Behaviour
Peer Influence	1	
Deviant Behaviour	0.25*	1
Mean	36.74	33.07
Standard Deviation	4.66	5.10

*Significant ($P < 0.05$)

The data in table 3 show that there is significant correlation between peer influence and deviant behaviour ($r = 0.25$). This correlation observed here is positive and implies that there is significant relationship between peer influence and deviant behaviour. That is, the more the influence of peer group, the greater the occurrence of deviant behaviour among students.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between peer influence and deviant behaviour.

Table 4: Linear Regression of Peer Group Influence and Deviant Behaviour.

Model	R	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared	Std Error of the Estimate	Significance	Remark
1	0.25a	0.06	0.06	4.95		
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS						
Model 1	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F	Significance	Remark
Regression	809.89	1	809.98	33.08	0.00a	Significant
Residual	12193.13	498	24.48			
Total	13003.11	499				
Significance of regression weight of variables in the Equation 2						
Model	B	Std Error	Beta	t-Ratio	Significance	Remark
Peer Influence	0.27	0.05	0.25	5.75	0.00	Significant

- a. Predictors: (Constant), peer influence
 b. Dependent Variable: deviant behaviour

The data presented in table 4 show that $F(1,498) = 33.08$, $p = 0.00$. This indicates a statistically significant correlation between peer influence and deviant behaviour. The hypothesis is therefore rejected and the alternative hypothesis holds true. The adjusted R^2 value of 0.06 shows that only 6% of deviant behaviour is due to the effect of peer influence.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between socio-economic status and deviant behaviour among students in secondary school?

Table 5. Linear Correlation of socio-economic status and deviant behaviour of secondary school students

	Socio-Economic Status	Deviant Behaviour
Socio-Economic Status	1	
Deviant Behaviour	0.03	1
Mean	27.85	33.08
Standard Deviation	7.01	5.10

*Significant($P < 0.05$)

The data in table 5 showed that there was no significant correlation between socio-economic status and deviant behaviour ($r = 0.03$). This correlation observed here is negative and it implies that there is no significant relationship between socio-economic status and deviant behaviour in students.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relationship between socio-economic status and deviant behaviour.

Table 6: Linear Regression of Socio-Economic Status and Deviant Behaviour

Model	R	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared	Std Error of the Estimate	Significance	Remark
1	0.03 ^a	0.01	-0.01	5.12		
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS						
Model 1	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F	Significance	Remark
Regression	11.38	1	809.98	0.44	0.51 ^a	Not Significant
Residual	11991.13	498	24.48			
Total	13003.11	499				
Significance of regression weight of variables in the Equation 2						
Model	B	Std Error	Beta	t-Ratio	Significance	Remark
socio-economic status	-0.04	0.06	-0.03	-0.66	0.51	Not Significant

a. Predictors: (Constant), socio-economic status

b. Dependent Variable: deviant behaviour

The data presented in Table 6 shows that $F(1,498) = 0.44$, $p = 0.51$. This indicated there is no statistically significant correlation between socio-economic status and deviant behaviour. This hypothesis is therefore accepted. The adjusted R^2 value of -0.01 showed that only 1% of deviant behaviour was due to the effect of peer influence. The Beta (β) weight of -0.03 shows that socio-economic status is not a predictor of deviant behaviour.

Summary of the Results

The following results come from the data analysed:

1. There is no significant relationship between peer influence, socio-economic status and deviant behaviour.
2. There is significant relationship between peer influence and deviant behaviour.
3. There is significant relationship between socio-economic status and deviant behaviour.

Discussion of Findings

The first finding indicates that there is significant relationship between peer influence, socio-economic status and deviant behaviour. The reason for this finding is that the more the influence of peer group and socio-economic status, the greater the occurrence of deviant behaviour, all these geared to influence deviant behaviour. This is in agreement with Akanle and Odu (2004) who opined that children in poor families tend to live below potentials because of the hardship that they face in their daily living and this might lead to deviant behaviour.

The second finding reveals that there is significant relationship between peer influence and deviant behaviour. The reason for this finding is that peer group has a stronghold on adolescents' lives because of the search for autonomy and role identity. This finding is in line with Okafor and Nnoli (2010) who noted that adolescents create a separate world for themselves using slangs, coded language, facial expression and body language which can

only be understood to them alone. These, in turn, aid their deviant behaviour both at home, school and the society at large. For instance, certain slangs are known to be used only by gangstars and cult groups.

The third finding shows that there is significant relationship between socio-economic status and deviant behaviour. The reason for this finding is due to the fact that individual status via parental background, parental occupation as well as other family factors, influence the behaviour and development of individual positively or negatively in all ramifications. Egbule (2009), stated that parental occupation and status has influence on the behaviour of the child in terms of learning, socializing and personality development. The finding also agreed with Adegemi (2001), who states that the social and economic status of most families often affects the behaviour of their children. Often times, involved in deviant behaviour such as gangsterism, than those of higher economic and socio classes.

Summary of the Study

The study was designed to investigate the issues relating to peer influence and socio-economic status as correlates of deviant behaviour among secondary school students in Delta Central Senatorial District. In order to give direction to the study, three research questions and three research hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance. A research instrument titled "peer influence and socio-economic status as correlates of deviant behaviour among secondary school students" was used to elicit responses from 500 students sample from the population. The instrument was made up of two sections. Section A consisted of personal data and Section B constituted detailed response of students. It was made up of 75 items. The face, content and construct validity of the instrument were established.

Stratified random sampling procedure was adopted in the selection of schools. The stratification was along girls' school, boys' school and co-educational schools. Furthermore, sample random technique was used for selecting 500 student respondents. Correlation and multiples regression statistics for relationship between mean and ANOVA was used to analyze the data and the findings are stated below:

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were made.

1. Peer group and socio-economic status influence deviant behaviour among secondary school students.
2. Peer group influences deviant behaviour among post primary school students.
3. Socio-economic status does not influences deviant behaviour among secondary school students.

Recommendations

In line with the findings of this work, the following recommendations that are imperative in curbing deviant behaviour among the secondary school students are made.

1. Orientation programmes should be arranged for both students and parents/guardians on the need to eradicate negative peer influence from school, home and the society at large.
2. School authorities should create enabling environment in form of good and adequate facilities and equipment, with motivated professional counsellors to handle negative peer influence among secondary school students.

References

- Adeyemi, J. D. (2001). A Text of Social Studies: Socialization and Political Culture International Organization for NCE and Undergraduates. Ibadan: Etori.
- Akanle, F. F., & Odu, B. K. (2004). Physical Characteristics as Determinants Adolescents' Moral Behaviour. A Case Study of Adolescents in Ekiti State Secondary Schools, Nigeria. *The Nigerian Journal of Guidance Counseling* 9 (1) 194 – 205.
- Asika, J. F. (1999). Adolescent Friendship Pairs: Similarities in Identity Status Development, Behaviours, Attitudes, and Intentions. *Journal of Adolescent Research* 13, 178 – 201.
- Asuni, C. A. (2009). Acquisition of Hostile Attitude and Its Relationship to Aggressive Behaviour of Personality and Social Psychology. P. 335 – 341
- Azrin, N. H. C., & Holz, W. C. (1990), Punishment in W.K, Hong ed. *Operant Behaviour: Areas of Research and Application*. New York: Appleton Century-Crofts.
- Bauman, J. (2008). What Beats having Two Parents? Educational Outcomes for African American Students in Single-Versus Dual-Parent Families. *Journal of Black Studies*, 28 (6), 785-801 (Eric journal No. EJ 571287).
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2009). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press.
- Caucult, Elizabeth (2002). "Educational vouches when there are peer group effects- size matters" 43 *International Economic Review*. 195-222.
- Damon, W. (2007). *The Social World of Child*. San Francisco, C.A: Jessey-Bass
- Egbule J. F. (2009). Psychology of Adjustment & Crisis Counseling: Diagnosis of Crisis Reactions, Human Trauma, Psychology Stress Disorders & Their
- Gottesman, I. I. & Shields, J. (2003), A Critical Review of Recent Adoption, Twin, and Family Studies of Schizophrenia: Behavioural Genetics Perspective. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 2(3), 360-398. Therapeutic Treatment Approaches, Urhuoka-Abraka.
- Hermann D. J. (2006). *Regstellende Askie, Alienasiien Die Nie-Aangewese Group* (Affirmative Action, Alienation & The Non-Designated Group).

- Holcom, A. S. (1997). Homophily of International Distress in Adolescent Peer Groups. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 89 – 906.
- National Research Council. (2001). *Losing Generations: Adolescents in High-Risk Settings*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Peretomode, V.F. (1994), *Psychology of Human Development, Owerri*: International Universities Press.
- Ross, A.O. (2009). *Psychological Problems of Childhood*. New York McGraw Hill Books Co.
- Sass, T.R. (2006). *Charter Schools and Student Achievement in Florida*. *Education Finance & Policy* 91-122.
- Steinberg, L, Fletcher, A., & Darling, N. (1994). *Parental Monitoring & Peer Influences on Adolescent Substance use*. *Pediatrics* 93, 1060-1064.
- Stephens, P. (2006). *More than one Love*. London: Plain Truth Magazine.
- Suluter, A. F. (2002). *Marital Status & Living Arrangement: March 1993*. Current Population Reports (series p20-478). Washington, DECISION: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Thompson, & Hickey, (2004). *The Myth of the Hyperactive Child*. New York: Pantheon.
- Travis, H. (2004). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Uwakwe, L. B., (2001). *Academic Achievement Analysis. An Unpublished Handout*. Department of Guidance & Counseling, University of Ibadan, Ibadan Nigeria.
- Weissman, M. M., & Klerman, G. L. (2005), *Sex Difference and the Epidemiology of Depression*. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 34, 98-111.
- Wery, A. & Quay, C. (1991). *Divorce Leads to Poor Psychological and Physical Health in Women*. Institute for Social and Behaviour Research. Retrieved March 19, 2007 from <http://www.searchmother.com>.
- Yun-Joo, C. (2006), *Vary Association Between Peer Problems Behaviour and Adolescent Problem Behaviour as a Function of Parental Rule Obedience*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Onakpoberuo, Blessing Obakpororo & F. N. Ugoji (2016), Peer Influence and Socio-Economic Status as Correlates of Deviant Behaviour among Secondary School Students in Delta Central Senatorial District. *J. of Education and Policy Review*, Vol. 8, No. 1, Pp. 62 – 77.
