POLAC MANAGEMENT REVIEW (PMR)
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE
NIGERIA POLICE ACADEMY, WUDIL-KANO

# EFFECTS OF PENN RESILIENCY PROGRAMME ON AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOURS OF JUNIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN KAURA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA

**Tanko A. Benjamin** Department of Educational Foundations, University of Jos, Nigeria

**Prof. Bahago A. Beatrice** Department of Educational Foundations, University of Jos, Nigeria

**Prof. Anakwe I. Augustina** Department of Educational Foundations, University of Jos, Nigeria

**Musa S. Waziri** School of General and Applied Sciences, College of Health, Makarfi, Kaduna State

**Abstract**

*This study examined the effects of Penn Resiliency Programme on Aggressive behaviours of Junior Secondary School students in Kaura Local Government Area, Kaduna State, Nigeria. Three research questions were raised and three null hypotheses formulated and tested. The experimental design (randomized, pre-test – post-test control group) was used for the study. The population for the study was made up of 86 eligible Junior Secondary School Three students in Government Junior Secondary School, Kukum. A sample of 60 respondents made of 30 males and 30 females were randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups. The simple random multistage sampling techniques were used to select the school and students used. The instruments used for data collection were the "Students' Risk-taking Behaviour Scale with a Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.77 and Resilience scale for Early Adolescents with a reliability coefficient of 0.90. The instruments were administered by the researcher with the aid of two research assistants. Statistical mean, standard deviation, ANCOVA and ANOVA were used to analyse the data collected. The Penn Resiliency Programme intervention was administered to the experimental group while the Botvin life skills training as given the control group as a control placebo. Both the intervention and control placebo had sixteen sessions, lasting eight weeks, two sessions a week and each session had 40 minutes duration. The scores of pre-test was then compared with the post-test to determine the effects of the (PRP) intervention on students' aggressive behaviours. The result of the ANCOVA revealed that the Penn Resiliency Programme intervention improved on students' involvement in aggressive behaviours. The result showed a significant difference between the experimental and control groups on aggression after removing the effects of pre-test. The conclusion was that Penn Resiliency of the (PRP) intervention had high effects in reducing students' aggressive behaviours and so could be used to treat students that manifest high degree of aggressive behaviours. It is therefore recommended that all students in Kaduna Stateshould be given the Penn Resiliency Programme*

**Keywords:** Penn Resiliency Programme, Risk-Taking Behaviours, Family Type, Aggressive, Adolescents.

## 1. Introduction

Increasing youth involvement in aggressive behaviours in Kaura Local Government Area of Kaduna State seems to be an issue of major concern to stakeholders in education.Aggression is a behavioural problem and acts that are usually associated with adolescentswho are not acceptable culturally, socially and religiously in the society. Studentsengage in aggressive behaviours that are mostly risk-taking. Some of these risk-taking aggressive behaviours of in-school adolescents include verbal or physical assault towards their mates and fighting their teachers or parents. The students are also involved in mob actions at school or in their community. Aggression is a form of risk-taking behaviour by students whose sole purpose is to injure other students physically or psychologically. Students in Junior Secondary School, who are aggressive, disrupt lessons by instigating others to fight thereby exerting a negative influence on their peers. Aggressive students or adolescents are likely to exhibit high rate of hostility

by assaulting their fellow students, perhaps due to their growth spurt and physique.They may extend their aggression to other members of the school community verbally or physically, even when there is little or no provocation. (Kaur & Niwas, 2017).

In-school early adolescents who engage in aggressive behaviours stand the risk of jeopardizing their future education and career. For instance, students who have been conditioned to aggression are likely to become aggressive to their fellow students rather than being mutual peers.Another concern of this work is students' low level of resilience, may not enable them to resist engagement in aggressive behaviours. Students in this circumstance need be helped to increase their level of resilience.

Resilience as a set of qualities helps one to adapt and achieve positive outcome. In other words, resilience is an individual's ability to make rapid recovery from trauma or adversity at home Andor School. Hence, aggressive students need appreciable level of resilience, to reduce their engagement in aggression.

Similarly, the students in Kaura Local Government Area come from different family types and structures namely polygamy, monogamy or divorced parents. Their family type could likely influence their involvement in aggressive behaviours (Kalule-sabiti & Akaal (2016)). Monogamy is a family type that is small and can provide supportive environment and bonding for resilience that can help them withstand academic stress and risk-taking behaviours at school. A divorced family on the other hand, can influence students negatively. Students from a divorced family are likely toengage in aggressive behaviours because in the African setting, child upbringing is expected to be a collective responsibility of both parents and siblings. Likewise, in most polygamous families, there is the likelihood of lack of mutual trust that could lead to conflicts. The persistent exposure of students to these conflicting home environments could make them develop aggressive behaviours.As such, they need corrective measures to help them adapt well at school.

Stakeholders in education in Kaura Local Government Areahave employed some approaches like punishment, suspension or expulsion from school to curb these aggressive behaviours.Despite all these efforts, no significant improvement seemed to have been achieved as aggressive behaviours and tendencies had continued in defiant opposition to these measures or strategies. This informed the choice of the use of Penn Resiliency Programme (PRP) to address aggression and low resilience of Junior Secondary School(JSS3) students in Kaura Local Government Area.The (PRP) is a school-based preventive intervention thatwas design by the University of Pennsylvania to help reduce students' involvement in aggressive behaviours. Again, the intervention provides in-school early adolescents with some resilience skills for social problem-solving and decision making (Ungar, Rusell & Connelly, 2014). The programme allows students to develop essential resilience skills for life in America and Europe (Howard, 2014). Available literature shows that nothing has been reported on the effects of the (PRP) intervention on risk-taking behaviours among Junior Secondary School in Kaura Local Government Area yet. Thus, this research is to determine the efficacy of the Penn Resiliency Programme on risk-taking behaviour of Junior Secondary School students in Kaura Local Government Area, Kaduna State, Nigeria.

In Kaura Local Government Area of Kaduna State, like many local areas in Nigeria, youths are found to engage in aggressive risk-taking behaviours. From 2011 to 2017, as observed by Hoffmann (2017), Kukum and Kafanchan has become a flashpoint of religious and political violence. In such situation, schools in violent parts of the local government usually fail to meet students' security, protection and developmental needs, which could cause them to be afraid to attend schools in such areas and may likely, move to safer schools in neighbouring communities as the case was with Kukum, Kagoro, Takau, Manchok, Katsit, Gwaska in Kaura and Jema'a Local Government Areas in 2016 and 2017. In-school early adolescents in the study area manifest aggressive behaviours, as at any violent crisis they are at the forefront. They move with weapons like knives, sharp pointed objects and blades.

The high rate of youth engagement in aggressive risk-taking behaviorsmade Kaduna State Government to establish the Salama Centre in Kafanchan in February, 2019.This was to help victims or survivors access services like medical treatment, psychosocial

counselling, referral and optional legal intervention. However, more attention needs to be in the direction of preventive intervention for in-school early adolescents and youths in secondary schools of the study area. Sinceits inception, cases reported to the centre have been on the increase annually. For instance, reported cases of aggression to the Salama Centre in 2019 were 167(11.5 %); 2020, 490(33.7 %); and 2021, 795(54.8 %). This is not healthy for youths in the area, if their smooth development and educational goals are to be attained. Particularly worrisome are in-school adolescents persistent engagement in aggressive behaviours which could affect healthy development and schooling.The need to curtail the behaviours has become inevitable to avoid the upsurge of risky behaviours and loss of great human potentials for the development of the society. The human potential could be loss as potential thugs, bandits and cultists, unleash terror, pain and in most cases, demand for huge ransom or kill abductees.When this happens, makes schools and the society unbearable and threaten the peaceful co-existence of the people in Kaura Local Government Area. As such, the students need cognitive restructuring intervention programme to nip in the bud this malady.The problem of this study therefore, is to examine the "effects of Penn Resiliency Programme on risk-taking behaviours of Junior Secondary School students in Kaura Local Government Area, Kaduna, Nigeria".

The theoretical framework for this study is the one developed by Aaron Temkin Beck in 1960 called "Cognitive Behaviour Theory" (Beck, 1967). Beckbelieves that thoughts are shaped by beliefs which determine the course of our actions. The cognitive behaviour theory alsoisconcerned with the persuasion of participants to think constructively and forsake negative thoughts. The (PRP)intervention empowered the participants to refine their automatic thoughts or beliefs, in order to be positive to self or their academic work.Some terms were operationally defined as used in the context of this study.Some terms like Aggression whichis a display of behaviours such as hostility, assault on fellow Junior Secondary School Three(JSS3) students and other members of the school community. Family typeis any of monogamous, a household where (JSS3) student is raised by his biological father and mother; polygamous, raised in a polygyny form of polygamous family which his biological fathermarried more than one wife; and divorced, a parent that was once married and got separated. Resilienceis a set of qualities that help one to adapt and achieve positive outcomes despite experiencing trauma as usedin this study.

**Objectives of the study**

The aim of this study was to find out the effect of Penn Resiliency Programme on....

The specific objectives of the study were to:

i. examine the mean scores of aggression of Junior Secondary School Three (JSS3) students in the experimental and control groups before and after exposure to (PRP) intervention and control placebo respectively;
ii. fine out the level of Resilience of Junior Secondary School Three (JSS3) students in the experimental and control groups before and after exposure to (PRP) intervention and control placebo respectively; and
iii. determine which of the family type (monogamous, polygamous, and divorced) has highrisk-tasking behaviours among Junior Secondary School Three (JSS3) students in Kaura Local Government Area

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested in the study:

i. There is no significant difference between the post-test aggressive behaviours mean scores of (JSS3) students in the experimental and control groups.

ii. There is no significant difference between the post-test resilience mean scores of (JSS3) students in the experimental and control groups.

iii. There is no significant difference between the post-test family type's risk-taking behaviours mean scores of (JSS3) students in the experimental and control groups.

## 2. Literature Review

Related literature to the study includes a study conducted by Yusuf and Khan (2018) was on "Towards Understanding Aggressive Behaviour of Nigerian Adolescents: Focus of Family Structure in Azare, Bauchi State". The study revealed statistically significant influence of family structure on adolescent aggressive behaviour. A gap in the study was the extent of effect of aggressive behaviours on family structure

was not determined. Again, Adeosun, Adegbohun, Jejeleye, Oyekunle, Ogunlowo and Pedro, (2015) conducted a study "Bullying Victims among Secondary School Students in Lagos, Nigeria. Emotional, behavioural and mental health correlates." Results of the study revealed that bullied victims were more likely to have conduct problems (P>0.001), emotional problems (P=0.0015), hyperactivity (P=0.002) and mental health problems (P<0.001) than non-bullied students. Based on the study no effort was made to determine the extent of bullying victimization among students.

In a study on resilience by Gialio, Garhand, Woolhouse, Mensah, Westrupp, Nicholson and Brown (2018) titled "Emotional-behavioural Resilience among Children of First-time Mothers With and Without Depression across the Childhood Period". The authors discovered that the home learning environment, practical support from a partner, and adequate economic resources are particularly important protective factors that may buffer children from the potential adverse effects of depression.Thesample did not spread well for women from vulnerable backgrounds and low socio-economic backgrounds. Again, a study on "Resiliency Training in Indian Children: A Pilot Investigation of the Penn Resiliency Programme" was carried out by Sankaranayanan and Cycil (2014). The results obtained an ANCOVA predicting explanatory style of negative effects (CASQ, Total Bad) revealed a significant effect of condition, $F(1, 57) = 6.10$, $P < 0.05$ ($R2 = 0.32$). The exact target population was not made available in the study.

Howard (2014) in an evaluation of the Penn resiliency programme for disruptive pre-adolescents in an elementary school setting used an experimental design to establish that students benefited from the interventions that focused on social skills, problem-solving and decision making. Also, finding of the study revealed that the PRP and the Botvin programme were equally effective in modifying automatic thoughts for the students in the sample. The PRP was found to be as effective in helping students to change negative automatic thoughts. In their study on risk-taking behaviour among adolescents and their attachment with parents and peers Uzraina, and Srivasta, (2016) adopted a descriptive survey design on 100 respondents, 50 male and 50 females' undergraduate students between 18 to 21 years in Aligarh Muslim University, India. Findings of the study were that indulgence of adolescents in risk-taking behaviours is as a result of poor parenting practices and peer attachment.Also, a finding of the study was that in females the desire of indulging in risk-taking behaviours was low compared to males while males faced ridicule for not engaging in risk-taking behaviours. It was concluded that peer pressure was found helpful in keeping females away from indulgence in risk-taking behaviours.

## 3. Methodology

An experimental design(randomized, pre-test – post-test control group)was employed in the study in which the researcher collected data from the respondents by means of rating scale fromstudents to investigate the effects of Penn Resiliency programme on Aggressive behaviours of Junior Secondary School Three (JSS3) students in Kaura Local Government Area. The population comprises all the 86 JSS3 students identified to be engaging in aggressive behaviours after being pretested. A multistage sampling technique was used. First stage, a purposive sampling was adopted to select Junior Secondary School level of education and the Government Secondary School, Kukum. The second stage, selection of participants on the basis of the pre-test conducted which students with high scores in the SRBS and low scores in the RSEA were drawn. The third stage was by simple random sampling for assignment of participants into the experimental and control groups.The sample for this study was 60JSS3 students measured to be involved in aggressive behaviours made up of 30 males and 30 females.

Two research instruments were used for the study and these were Students Risk-Taking Behaviours Scale (SRBS). This instrument contained 29 items with three subscales; sexual activities subscale which contains 19 items on a three-points response scale, adopted by Fredrich, Sim and Shamos (2004); aggressionsub-scalecontains 10 itemson a five-response scale, adopted by Orpinas and Frankarshi (2001); and substance use subscale has 10 items on a five-response scale adopted byKane, Murray, Bass, Johnson, and Bolton (2016). The Resilience Scale for Early Adolescents (RSEA) is an instrument that measures student's resilience and has 23 items on a weighing scale. The content validity was

proven and convergent and divergent validity established. The SRBS and RSEA are standardized instruments but were adopted and subjected to pilot study to establish it reliability using Cronbach's alpha method. A reliability index of 0.77 was obtained for the SRBS and 0.90 for the RSEA using SPSS version 24.

The PRP intervention and the control placebo were administered to both groups by trained research assistants under the supervision of the researcher. The PRP intervention was administered to the experimental group while the Botvin Life Skills Training (BLST) was given to the control group as a control placebo. Both the intervention and control placebo had sixteen sessions, lasting eight weeks, two sessions a week and each session had 40 minutes duration. The researcher ensured that the control group was far away from the experimental group location. This was to minimize the level of interaction between the students' research participants of the two groups. At the beginning of the last session, both groups were given 40 minutes to respond to the instruments (SRBS) and (RSEA) designated for both groups.

To determine the level of aggression and resilience, mean and standard deviation was used. The mean score was computed based on 0 - 4 (5-point) for level of aggression scale measuring aggressive behaviours that consists of 10 items (where least score = 0, highest score = 40). Hence, 0+1+2+3+4= 10 ÷5 = 2.However, 2 x 10 = 20, meaning that: mean score 0.0 - 20.0 = Low aggression and 21.0 - 40.0 = High aggression. Again, Mean and standard deviation was established to ascertain level of aggression. The mean score was obtained based on 1 - 4 (4-point) scale assessing resilience construct that consists of 23 items (least score = 23, highest score = 92). Therefore, 1+2+3+4= 10 ÷4 = 2.5.However, 2.5 x 23 = 57.5, signifying that: mean score 23.0 – 57.5 = Low Resilience and 58.0 - 92.0 = High Resilience.The data collected from the two instruments were analysed by factorial Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

## 4.Presentation and Discussion of Results

The data obtained for this study were analysed according to the hypotheses formulated thus:

**Hypothesis 1:**There is no significant difference between the post-test aggressive behaviours mean scores of (JSS3) students in the experimental and control groups.

**Table 1: Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA)Test on Post-test AggressiveBehavioursMean Scores of (JSS3) Students in theExperimental and Control Groups**

| Source | Type III Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | p | Effect size |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 5393.68 | 2 | 2696.84 | 9.84 | 0.000 | 0.257 |
| Intercept | 9690.79 | 1 | 9690.79 | 35.34 | 0.000 | 0.383 |
| Pretest | 26.08 | 1 | 26.08 | 0.10 | 0.759 | 0.002 |
| GROUP Posttest (Exp. & Control) | 5141.93 | 1 | 5141.93 | 18.75 | 0.000 | 0.248 |
| Error | 15629.13 | 57 | 274.20 | | | |
| Total | 87856.25 | 60 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 21022.81 | 59 | | | | |
| **DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | $\overline{X}$ | **SD** | | | | |
| Experimental group | 9.57 | 7.40 | | | | |
| Control group | 17.13 | 5.63 | | | | |

**Note:**R Squared = .257 (Adjusted R Squared = .230)

**Source:**Researcher's Fieldwork, September, 2019.

Table 1the post-test mean difference between the experimental (M=9.57, SD=7.40) and control group (M=17.13, SD=5.63) had p value = 0.000 less than the significance level (α = .05, effect size = 24.8%). Therefore, result reveals that the null hypothesis is rejected and concludes that there is significant difference between the experimental and control groups on aggression after removing the effect of pre-test, F (1, 59) = 18.76, p < .05. On the other side,the p value (p=0.759, small effect size=0.2%) for covariate(pre-test)greater than the significance level (α = .05), means no significant difference between the groups in the pre-test scores, F (1, 59) = 0.10, p > .05. This indicates that (PRP) interventionhas effect on aggression of (JSS3) students.

**Hypothesis 2:**There is no significant difference between the post-test resilience mean scores of (JSS3) students in the experimental and control groups.

**Table 2**: **Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) Test on Post-test Resilience Mean Scores of (JSS3) Students in the Experimental and Control Groups**

| Source | Type III Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | P | Effect size |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 9844.789 | 2 | 4922.40 | 43.88 | 0.000 | 0.61 |
| Intercept | 8086.84 | 1 | 8086.84 | 72.09 | 0.000 | 0.56 |
| Pre-Resilience | 218.12 | 1 | 218.12 | 1.95 | 0.169 | 0.03 |
| GROUP | 9423.76 | 1 | 9423.76 | 84.01 | 0.000 | 0.60 |
| Error | 6393.81 | 57 | 112.17 | | | |
| Total | 252116.00 | 60 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 16238.60 | 59 | | | | |
| **DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS** | | | | | | |
| Group | $\overline{X}$ | SD | | | | |
| Experimental group | 75.37 | 9.38 | | | | |
| Control group | 50.03 | 11.83 | | | | |

**Note:** R Squared = .606 (Adjusted R Squared = .592)

**Source:** Researcher's Fieldwork, September, 2019.

Table 2 shows that the post-test mean difference between the experimental and control group had p value = 0.000 less than the 0.05 level of significance (effect size = 60.0%). Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected and concludes that there is significant difference between the experimental and control groups on resilience scores after controlling for the pre-test effects, F (1, 59) = 84.01, p < .05.On the other side, the p value (p=0.169) for covariate (pre-test) between the experimental and control groups on resilience is higher than the 0.05 level of significance (α = .05) which indicates no significant difference between the groups on the pre-test scores, F (1, 59) = 1.95, p > .05. The experimental group is higher in mean score (M=75.37, SD=9.38) compared to the control group (M=50.03, SD=11.83). This suggests that the (PRP) intervention has a significant effect on resilience of Junior Secondary (JSS3) students in Kaura Local Government Area.

**Hypothesis 3:**There is no significant difference between the post-test family type's risk-taking behaviours mean scores of (JSS3) students in the experimental and control groups.

**Table 3: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test of Group Difference in the Post-test Mean Scores of Aggressive Behaviour of (JSS3) Students Based on Family Types**

| Variable/Description | Source | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aggressive Behaviours | Between Groups | 239.62 | 2 | 119.81 | 1.421 | 0.250 |
| | Within Groups | 4806.39 | 57 | 84.32 | | |
| | Total | 5046.00 | 59 | | | |

| Descriptive statistics | **Group** | **N** | $\overline{X}$ | **SD** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Monogamy | 36 | 61.47 | 8.90 | | |
| | Polygamy | 13 | 56.54 | 9.39 | | |
| | Divorce | 11 | 59.27 | 9.87 | | |

N = 185, $p < 0.05$

**Source:**Researcher's Fieldwork, September, 2019.

Table 3 indicates that the p-value = 0.250 is greater than the 0.05 level of significance (α=.05). Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted and concludes that there is no significant difference among aggressive behaviours of (JSS3) students in monogamous (M=61.47), polygamous (M=56.54), and divorce (M59.27) families, $F(2, 57) = 1.421$, $p > 0.05$. This suggests that family type has no significant effect on risk-taking behaviours of Junior Secondary (JSS3) students in Kaura Local Government, Nigeria.

### 4.1 Discussion of Results

The findings from the study revealed that the mean aggressive behaviours of students was high before the (PRP) intervention but that of the experimental group reduced after being exposed to the (PRP) interventioncompared to those that received the control placebo. This work corroborated with past research findings such as that of Onukwufor. According to Onukwufor (2013) physical and verbal aggression was higher among JSS than SSS students and verbal aggressive students were higher than the physically aggressive. The present finding was supported by Berk (2011) who noticed high level of aggression among children that were frequently exposed to aggressive behaviours.The consistencyof the current finding withprevious ones could be due to lack of providing studentseffective resilience intervention. The finding by Hogendourn, Walter, Vermoort, Prins, Boer, Kooiji, and De-Haan (2010) provide a varyingview that young children have more negative thoughts concerning physical and social aggression than older children.

The findings that students' amount of resilience increased in the experimental group after exposure to the (PRP) intervention, while that of the control group was still low. This is generally associated with positive emotional experiences which students gained from effective school-based intervention.This finding is supporting Ungar, Russell, and Connelly (2014) who found that children had low resilience at baseline but when exposed to a school-based intervention, had more resilience. In contrary findings,Gialio, Gartland, Woolhouse, Mensah, Westrupp, Nicholson and Brown (2018) discovered that resilience can be increased by home learning environment, supportive adults or peers who have socially acceptable ways.

The findings on the effects of (PRP) intervention on aggression risk-taking behaviours indicated that JSS3 students that were exposed to the (PRP) intervention experienced decrease in their rate of engagement in aggression than those who were not. It means the (PRP) intervention helps to improve students' cognitive and resilience skills. This is in agreement with the findings ofHoll, Kirsch, Rohlf, Krahe and Elsner (2018), who found that students had large effects size of PHY-A (Physical Aggression) and REL-A (Relational Aggression) when exposed to the theory of the mind (TOM). It is most likely that students in the experimental group gained optimistic orientation due to exposure to coping strategies in stress situation, decision making techniques and social skills training of the (PRP) intervention.

Again, findings on the hypothetical statement that (PRP) intervention have no significant effect on risk-taking behaviours based on family type (monogamy, polygamy and divorced) of students showed thatthere is no significant difference of aggressive behaviours of students as it relates to family types. This means that both students from monogamy, polygamy and divorced families that were exposed to the (PRP) intervention benefited. This finding agree with and Ayokunle, Makinde, Oluwatomip, Adebanke, Akinyimika and Kelechi (2017) who discovered that both monogamy, polygamy and divorced families can help impact positively and negative on adolescents' or students' engagement in aggressive behaviours.However, this

finding refutes Akanni and Adayonfa (2015) who revealed that school adolescents from polygamous families involved in aggressivebehaviours against the respondents from monogamous.Students put to practice gains from the intervention which helped decrease involvement in aggressive behaviours.

**5. Conclusion and Recommendations**

The study found that the (PRP) intervention has high effects on students' aggressive behaviours. Students alsoindicatedlow resilience to aggressive behaviours at baseline butincreased their resilience and reduced their rate of involvement when given the (PRP) intervention than those who were not given. Furthermore, both students from monogamy, polygamy and divorced families that were exposed to the (PRP) intervention benefited. The (PRP) intervention improved on students' engagement in aggression, resilience and benefited students based on family type.

Based on the finding of this investigation, the following were recommended:

i. A "Risk-Taking Behaviours (Aggression) Free (RBF)" Club should be introduced in secondary schools of Kaduna State as a model to other students who engage in aggression and other risk-taking behaviours.
ii. Students changed positively on their aggressive behaviours due to their exposure to the (PRP) intervention. The intervention should be extended to all in-school adolescents in senior secondary schools in Kaduna State.
iii. Students should be helped by educational psychologists and guidance counsellors by organizing workshops for the (PRP) intervention and providing psychotherapy and counselling services on aggressive behaviours.
iv. Aggression should be discouraged and good behaviours encouraged by inclusion of the (PRP) intervention principles in the school rules and regulations for students.
v. Parents through the parent-teacher association (PTA) should organize training on the (PRP) intervention during their meetings. This is to support the efforts of educational psychologists' and counsellors' towards curbing students' engagement in aggressive behaviours when the students are at home.

**References**

Adeosun, I., Adegbohun, A., Jejelaye, A., Oyekunle, O., Ogunlowo, O., & Pedro, A. (2015).Bullying, victimization among secondary school students in Lagos, Nigeria.*Australian Journal of Social Science Research, 42*(3), 63-72.

Akanni, O.O., &Adayanfo, E. O. (2015).Correlates of psychoactive substance use among Nigerian adolescents.*Sahel Medical Journal, 18*(4), 192-199.

Ayokunle, A. M., Makinde, G. B., Oluwatomipe, A. P., Adebanke,O, I., Akinyimika, S.,&Kelechi, G.A. (2017). Influence of family structure on adolescents 'sexual behaviour in Mushin local government area of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Social Science Research, 46*(3), 83-90.

Beck, A. T. (1967).*Depression: Clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects.*New York: Penguin Press.

Berk, L. E. (2011).*Child development* (8thed.). New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.

Fredrich, W. N., Lysne, M., Sim, L., &Shamos, S. (2004) (2004). Assessing sexual behaviour high-risk adolescents with the adolescent clinical sexual behaviour inventory (ACSBI). *Child Maltreatment, 9, 3,* 239-250

Giallo, R., Gartland, H., Woolhouse, H., Mensah, F., Westrupp, E., Nicholson, J., & Brown, S., (2018). Emotional-behavioural resilience among children of first-time mothers with and without depression across the early childhood period.*International Journal of Behavioural Development, 42*(2),214-224.

Hoffmann, L. K. (2017). Violence in Southern Kaduna threatens to undermine Nigeria's

democratic stability. Retrieved February 15, 2017 from *www.chathamhouse.org*on

Hogendourn, S.M., Wolter, L.H., Vervoort, L., Prins, P.J.M., Boer, F.,Kooij, E., & De-Haan, E. (2010). Measuring negative and positive thoughts in children: An adaptation of the children`s automatic thoughts scale (CATS). *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 34*(1), 467-478.

Holls, A. K., Kirsch, F., Rohlf, H., Krahe, B.,&Eliner, B. (2018).Longitudinal reciprocity between theory of mind and aggression in middle childhood.*International Journal of Behavioural Development, 42*(2), 257-266.

Howard, M. J. (2014). *An evaluation of the Pennresiliencyprogramme for disruptive pre adolescents in an elementary school setting.* Unpublished Dissertation for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy, Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia

Kalule-Sabiti, I.,&Akaal, Y. J. (2016).Risk-taking behaviour among high school adolescents in the Nort-West Province, South Africa.

Kane, J.C., Murray, L.K., Bass, J. K., Johnson, R.M., & Bolton, P. (2016). Validation of a substance and alcohol use assessment instrument among orphans and vulnerable children in Zambia using audio computer assisted self-interviewing (ACASI). *Drug Alcohol Dependence, 166*, 85-92.
Doi S.10. `066/j.drugalcdep.2016.06.026.

Kaur, D.,&Niwas, R. (2017).Aggressive behaviour of secondary school students in relation to school environment.*International Journal of Advanced Research, 5*(5), 801-809.

Onukwufor, J. N. (2013). Physical and verbal aggression among adolescent secondary school students in Rivers State of Nigeria.*European Journal of Education Learning and Development, 1*(20), 73-84.

Orpinas, P.,&Frankowski, R. (2001). The aggression scale: A self-report measure of aggressive behaviour for young adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 21*(1), 50-67.

Sankaranarayanan, A., &Cycil, C. (2014). Resiliency training in Indian children: A pilot investigation of the Penn resiliency programme. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 11*(1), 1425-4139

Ungar, M., Russell, P. A., & Connelly, G. (2014). School-based interventions to enhance the resilience of students.*Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, *4*(1),66-83.

Yusuf, M. T., & Khan, A. (2018). Towards understanding aggressive behaviour of Nigerian adolescents: Focus on family structure. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 120*(6),7737-7746.