

**PREVALENCE OF BIPOLAR DISORDER AND VIOLENT BEHAVIOR AMONG  
UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN NIGERIA**

**BY**

**WILLIAMS EMIKE VALERIE**

**(SSC1909865)**

**BEING A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF  
SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF THE BACHELOR OF SOCIENCE(B.Sc.)  
DEGREE IN SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY, FACULTY OF SOCIAL  
SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY**

**SEPTEMBER, 2023**

**CERTIFICATION**

We the undersigned, hereby certify that this work was carried out by WILLIAMS EMIKE VALERIE with Matriculation number: SSC1909865 and confirmed to be adequate in scope and value for the award of a Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.) Degree in Sociology and Anthropology the University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.

.....

Dr. Lucky Omoruyi  
PROJECT SUPERVISOR

.....

DATE

.....

PROF. A. DOKPESI  
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

.....

DATE

## **DEDICATION**

This work is dedicated to Almighty God for his guidance throughout my time in school most especially during the period of this research work and for his blessings and love upon my friends and family.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My utmost gratitude goes to God for the gift of life, good health, wisdom, knowledge, understanding and perseverance needed for the success of this work.

My sincere gratitude goes to DR. LUCKY OMORUYI my project supervisor his guidance, encouragement and prompt attention given to this work. May the lord God fulfill and grant you your heart desires (Amen). I also want to appreciate my lecturers who worked tirelessly to impart knowledge to me, hence I say a big thank you to you DR. AUSTIN ALENKHE, PROF. A. DOKPESI, DR. AKABA.

I remain indebted to my parents MR RICHARD WILLIAMS and MRS ELIZABETH WILLIAMS for their role in making my life a reality and for their undying love and affection towards me.

Special thanks to siblings ANIBOKU WILLIAMS, OSHOMA WILLIAMS, OMOKHUDU WILLIAMS whose love, support and sacrifices made this journey possible and to the OGBONMWAN family

I say thank you for always being there for me. To MRS CELINE ONI who was always there to act a mother and providing for me like her own child I'm forever grateful.

My appreciation also goes to my course mates who made learning easy and also became a vital part of my life, I sincerely appreciate Ohenhen Johnson who always had the right words to encourage me, thank you for being a friend and a confidant, to Edosa Tessy Osato, Okoh Onyekachukwu Augusta, Isiaka Isaac, Idemudia Osawaru Becklyn, Egwuatu Asika jeffery, Esin

Maro Othniel and Rukeme Fabian Ejakpovi, thank you for your constant support. Special thanks to Ohenhen Johnson for being a friend and a leader.





## ABSTRACT

Over the years, there have been encouraging findings related to youth violent behaviour and bipolar disorder. The trend has been toward lower incidence of weapon-carrying and fighting in schools. This study titled “the prevalence of bipolar disorder and violent behaviour among University students in Nigeria. The study examine the relationship between personality trait and violent behaviour among University students, relationship between mental health and violent behaviour among University students, relationship between peer group influence and violent behaviour among University students, relationship between biological factors and violent behaviour among University students. This study adopted a qualitative research method with survey instruments deployed to gather relevant data for analysis. The findings revealed that there are significant relationship between personality traits and violent behavior among university students, it was also revealed that revealed that there is a relationship between mental health and violent behavior among university students. Based on findings, it was recommended if you can find out what the triggers are, you may be able to work out how to prevent the behaviour. Try to keep a calm environment by cutting down the stimulation, which could be in the environment, or in the activity that the person is doing. ‘Environment’ could mean the TV, radio, other noisy residents or an unfamiliar place, it was also recommended that Perhaps the person has become frustrated at a task he cannot do or does not want to do. Remember that people with dementia often have severe reactions to feelings of failure. When you show or tell the person what to do, explain what to do step by step, with plenty of time in-between for the person to carry it out. Do not give too many choices, as this will be confusing.

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

Over the years, there have been positive findings regarding youth violent behavior and bipolar disorder, with a decrease in incidents of weapon-carrying and fighting in schools (Brener, 2020). However, despite these improvements, public concern has risen due to school shootings and persistently high rates of violence among students. The 2020 Youth Risk Behavior Survey revealed alarming statistics: 17.4% of students carried a weapon in the past month, 33.2% had been in a physical fight in the last year, 6.6% missed school days due to feeling unsafe, and 6.4% carried a weapon to school. Additionally, 8.9% reported threats or injuries with a weapon on school property in the past year (Grunbaum, 2020). Hence, despite the decline in overall school violence, young individuals are still vulnerable to bullying, fights, and other aggressive behaviors.

Of particular concern is the emergence of violent incidents in rural schools, challenging the assumption that small communities were immune to such issues. Previous studies, while touching on rural students, did not exclusively focus on them (Ellickson & McGuigan, 2020). Understanding aggression and violence, ranging from verbal aggression to physical fights, is complex. Various factors contribute, making it challenging to predict and prevent violent acts (O'Toole, 2017). Early exposure to violence can negatively impact cognitive abilities and pro-social behaviors in adolescents, affecting academic performance and overall functioning, both within and outside the school environment (Burton, 2018). According to YU & SHI (2019), early aggressive behavior can predict later-onset violent crimes, indicating its crucial role.

However, the present study narrows its focus to examining the prevalence of bipolar disorder and violent behavior among university students in Nigeria. The findings shed light on this specific context, highlighting the need for targeted interventions and further research to address the complexities of youth violence in educational settings.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

In the general population, social and interpersonal relationships thrive, contributing to optimal performance across various sectors. However, the prevalence of bipolar affective disorder, affecting 1.3% of the population, disrupts individual well-being and productivity, leading to increased morbidity and mortality. This disorder significantly impairs social and interpersonal relationships, academic and work performance, leading to a higher tendency for drug abuse, self-mutilation, and suicide.

Despite scientific recognition, in Nigeria, there is a substantial portion of the population that perceives bipolar affective disorder and similar mental conditions as spiritual afflictions. This perception hampers those suffering from these disorders from receiving adequate and effective treatment.

Research indicates that antisocial behavior, including aggression, often begins in early life and persists into adolescence and adulthood, especially in high-risk behaviors during adolescence (Newman, 2017). Lacan (2017) differentiates aggression from aggressivity, the latter encompassing a wide range of aggressive, rivalrous, and hateful emotions manifesting in both covert and overt behaviors (Hook, 2019).

Exposure to violence during youth can detrimentally impact the development of cognitive abilities and pro-social behaviors, adversely affecting academic performance and the ability to function healthily both within and outside of the school environment (Burton, 2018). YU & SHI

(2019) argue that early aggressive experiences or behaviors in adolescents can predict later-onset violent crimes, emphasizing the importance of addressing aggressive tendencies in early interventions to prevent long-term consequences.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

The main objective of this study is to investigate the prevalence of bipolar disorder and violent behaviour among University students in Nigeria. Specifically, it sought to:

1. Examine the relationship between personality trait and violent behaviour among University students.
2. Find out the relationship between mental health and violent behaviour among University students.
3. Examine the relationship between peer group influence and violent behaviour among University students.
4. Assess the relationship between biological factors and violent behaviour among University students.

### **1.4 Research Questions**

The study provides answers to the following questions:

1. To what extent do personality trait relates to violent behaviour among University students?
2. What is the relationship between mental health and violent behaviour among University students?
3. How does peer group influence violent behaviour among University students?
4. To what extent do biological factors influence violent behaviour among University students?

### **1.5 Significance of the study**

The findings of this study would help to update information on the bipolar disorder as predictors of violent behaviour among undergraduates. The findings would be an eye-opener to teachers, school administrator, policy makers, parents, general public and government on the impact of bipolar disorder as predictors of violent behaviour among undergraduates.

Firstly, it would also help school administrators to be aware of how to manage violent behaviour among undergraduates.

It would also assist teachers in finding out the causes of aggressiveness and violent and ways of managing it within the school system.

The findings of this research would also be useful to parents in such a way that it will serve as an eye opener on the causes of this bipolar disorder among their children.

The study will also serve as a reference point to the government on how bipolar disorder among university students should be handled.

### **1.6 Scope of the Study**

The scope of this study covers prevalence of bipolar disorder and violent behaviour among University students in Nigeria. This study will be limited to students in 200level to 400level (full-time) in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Benin.

### **1.7 Area of the study**

The study is carried out in the Department of Sociology and anthropology, Faculty of Social Science, University of Benin, Benin City. The University is located in Ovia North East Local Government Area of Edo State located in the state capital which is Benin City.

## **1.8 Definition of Terms**

The following terms have been defined operationally as follows:

**Bipolar disorder:** Bipolar disorder, formerly called manic depression, is a mental health condition that causes extreme mood swings that include emotional highs (mania or hypomania) and lows (depression).

***Violent behaviour:*** *Violent Behaviour means any act or threat of physical, verbal, or psychological aggression or the destruction or abuse of property by any individual.*

**Personality:** the totality of somebody's attitudes, interests, behavioural patterns, emotional responses, social roles, and other individual traits that endure over long periods of time

**Personality Traits:** These includes; introverts and extroverts, mental health, environment, peer group influence and locus of control.

**Biological Factors:** These includes; age, gender, religion, marital status, birth control

**Psychosocial:** relating to both the psychological and the social aspects of something, or relating to something that has both of these aspects.

**Aggressiveness:** showing a readiness or having a tendency to attack or do harm to others.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

## **LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **2.1 Personality Trait and Violent Behaviour among University Student**

Defining violence remains a contentious issue in scientific research, encompassing behaviors like child abuse, sexual offenses, and manslaughter. Scholars have proposed diverse definitions, categorized into four camps: the exemplars approach, social psychology approach, public health approach, and animal research approach. Each perspective has merits and drawbacks, necessitating a comprehensive understanding of violence that incorporates elements from all.

A comprehensive definition of violence involves intentional, harmful, and undesirable physical force and aggressive behavior directed from one person toward others (Arnett, 2020). This definition integrates social-cognitive frameworks, providing a holistic understanding of aggression and violence. Personality traits significantly influence behaviors, making violence potential a predictor for detecting and preventing violent actions, crucial in justice and governmental systems.

Recognized as a severe public health concern by the World Health Organization (WHO), violence has led to nearly one million deaths globally annually, encompassing self-inflicted, interpersonal, domestic, and intimate partner incidents. Understanding the roots of violent behavior is vital for prevention efforts, particularly in psychological, mental health, criminal justice, and forensic domains (Ayduk, 2015, 2018). The complexity of defining violence

necessitates a nuanced approach, drawing from various perspectives to comprehensively address this critical societal issue.

A comprehensive definition of violence includes 4 essential elements: behavior that is (a. However, compiling all definitions, violence refers to intentional, harmful, and undesirable physical force and aggressive behaviour from one person toward others (Bailey, 2018) which provides a comprehensive and integrative social–cognitive framework for understanding aggression and violence. After providing a brief description of the basic components of GAM, we discuss how it can be used to better understand 4 topics related to phenomena that occur primarily outside the laboratory and apply to a broad range of people. Specifically, we apply GAM to better understand intimate partner violence, intergroup violence, global climate change effects on violence, and suicide. We also explain how the tenets of GAM can be used to inform interventions aimed at reducing these forms of violence.

Finally, we show how GAM can explain why people do not behave violently, such as in societies where violence is exceedingly rare. Applying GAM to violent behavior that occurs outside the laboratory adds to its explanatory power and enhances the external validity of its predictions. Because the 4 topics apply to such a broad range of people, GAM may have broader influence in fostering understanding of aggression in these domains. By increasing our understanding of the causes of violent behavior, GAM may help reduce it. (PsycInfo Database Record (c. This violence can have physical, psychological, and emotional consequences (Barlett, 2018). While all types of violence are considered to be aggressive, all aggression is not necessarily violence.

Violence is intricately linked to learned behaviors and cognitive processes. Research, primarily focused on risk factors, has often overlooked the perpetrators' perspectives and the psychological influences driving their violent acts. In forensic contexts, anger management, utilizing cognitive behavioral approaches, has been a popular model for understanding violence triggers and information processing biases. Notably absent in this literature is the exploration of the role of embarrassment and humiliation in violent behavior.

Personality traits, specifically the 'big five' factors associated with aggression and violent offending, provide crucial insights. These traits, encompassing extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience, play a fundamental role in discriminating between perpetrators and potentially violent individuals. The Five Factor Model (FFM) serves as a vital personality taxonomy, widely used to elucidate personality structures. Researchers regard FFM as essential, not only in understanding individual personalities but also in delineating national character stereotypes and cultural ethos. These traits serve as foundational elements in various personality theories and measurements.

Personality traits, often regarded as remarkably universal across various cultures, serve as key predictors for violent and aggressive behavior. Research conducted across 50 different cultures indicates the prevalence of the big five factors – extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness – in describing personality traits (Bonica, 2017). These traits vary from person to person, shaping individual characteristics and roles in society, directly and indirectly influencing behavior (Botwin, 2015).

Personality theorists emphasize the importance of these traits in understanding violence and aggression. For instance, extraversion is linked to motivation for drug and alcohol abuse, as well as violent acts (Castillo, 2017). Studies have shown that agreeableness, neuroticism, and openness can predict violence, particularly physical aggression. Agreeableness and conscientiousness are negatively associated with violence, while neuroticism shows a positive correlation (Dam, 2021). However, the relationship between these traits and aggressive behavior can be direct or indirect, mediated by aggressive attitudes and emotions.

Gender differences significantly influence aggressive behavior. Boys tend to display more aggression and are more likely to be perpetrators, a phenomenon rooted in socialization patterns (McCullough, 2021). Educational, economic, and health-related factors further amplify these gender disparities in personality traits. Childhood experiences, including learning about positive and negative behavior, play a crucial role in shaping personality traits, which in turn impact individuals' behaviors throughout their lives (Miller, 2016). Understanding these intricate connections between personality traits, gender, and socialization is vital for developing comprehensive interventions to address violence and aggression effectively.

The concept of learned behavior, rooted in Bandura's social learning theory (1969), is further supported by the theory of differential association, emphasizing that individuals can learn attitudes and techniques motivating violent actions. This understanding sheds light on the prevalence of certain types of violence, such as sexual violence, coercive control, and stalking, predominantly perpetrated by men. The correlation between these behaviors and personality traits highlights the significance of individual disposition in shaping violent tendencies.

Personality traits, as described by Diener and Lucas (2017), embody an individual's distinctiveness in thoughts, feelings, and behavior. These traits manifest stability and constancy, influencing how people interact with the world over time. The widely used Five-Factor Model, established by Costa and McCrae in 1992, categorizes personality into five major traits: Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism (OCEAN). This study delves into these traits:

I. **Openness to experience** reflects a person's inclination to seek and appreciate new things, encompassing thoughts, feelings, values, and experiences. Individuals high in openness are more conservative, resistant to change, and prefer traditional approaches, sticking to established routines (Sajjad, Muhmmmed, Khurram & Syeda, 2018).

II. **Conscientiousness** signifies an individual's tendency to be organized, hardworking, and rule-abiding. Highly conscientious individuals exhibit meticulous planning, discipline, and risk aversion, often excelling in their careers (Burch and Anderson, 2018).

III. **Extraversion** characterizes sociability, outgoingness, and assertiveness. Extraverted individuals thrive in social interactions, enjoying company and active engagement. Introversion, on the other hand, represents reservedness and discomfort in social settings (Sajjad, Muhmmmed, Khurram, and Syeda, 2012).

Understanding these personality traits provides valuable insights into why certain individuals may be prone to violent behaviors, highlighting the intricate interplay between personality, learned behaviors, and societal contexts.

IV. **Agreeableness** signifies an individual's inclination to be compassionate, cooperative, warm, and caring toward others. Agreeable individuals are kind, dependable, and accommodating, often creating win-win solutions in problem-solving situations (Cattell and Mead, 2018). They possess a flexible attitude, accommodating others' shortcomings, and are ever ready to assist, promoting cooperation and social harmony (Sajjad, Muhmmmed, Khurram & Syeda, 2012). Highly agreeable individuals focus on the common good rather than solely pursuing their self-interests. In contrast, individuals with low agreeableness struggle to adapt, displaying selfishness, roughness in relationships, and a self-centered approach (Sajjad, Muhmmmed, Khurram & Syeda, 2012).

V. **Neuroticism** reflects an individual's predisposition to experience negative emotions such as anxiety, fear, sadness, frustration, anger, depression, stress, and self-blame. Those high in neuroticism tend to be pessimistic, easily stressed, emotional, and anxious. They often overreact to mistakes, leading to feelings of hopelessness and frustration (Sajjad, Muhmmmed, Khurram, and Syeda, 2012). Individuals with high neuroticism levels dwell on "what ifs," worrying about situations beyond their control, and are preoccupied with negative thoughts, hindering their success in various aspects of life.

Understanding these personality traits, including agreeableness and neuroticism, provides insights into individuals' social behaviors and emotional responses, forming a crucial foundation for comprehending antisocial behavior, a focal point in this study.

### **2.1.1 Mental health and violent behaviour among university student**

The relationship between mental health and violence in the general population has been a topic of extensive research. However, the findings from these studies are not consistent. While some studies indicate a significant link between psychiatric disorders and violence (Miles, 2014), others do not find such an association. This inconsistency in findings can be attributed to various factors, including the use of non-representative samples (such as institutionalized patients and incarcerated individuals), measurement ambiguity (such as relying on self-reports of previously diagnosed disorders), and insufficient control for confounding variables, among other limitations.

Moreover, previous research has not specifically explored whether these patterns of findings apply to college students. To address this gap, the current study aims to contribute to the existing literature by investigating the potential association between mental health and violent behaviors among college students. The study utilizes data from a nationally representative sample to compare the prevalence of specific psychiatric disorders and violent behaviors between college students and their non-student counterparts. Additionally, the study explores whether particular psychiatric diagnoses are linked to specific types of violent behaviors specifically among college students. This study stands as the first of its kind to explore these associations within a nationally representative sample of college students, shedding light on this critical area of research..

### **2.1.2 Peer group influence and violent behaviour among University Student**

The relationship between peer group influence and violent behavior among university students is indeed intricate and multi-faceted. Peer groups wield significant power in shaping individuals' thoughts and actions, including their propensity for violence. This influence, whether positive or negative, stems from several factors, including conformity, socialization, and the fundamental human need for acceptance and belonging.

Conformity within peer groups can lead individuals to adopt the norms and values of the group, even if these norms condone violent behavior. During the university years, when young adults are forging their identities, this pressure to conform can be especially potent. Socialization further solidifies this connection, as individuals may adopt violent tendencies to fit in and maintain their social status within the group. Additionally, peer groups indirectly influence violent behavior by shaping attitudes and beliefs about violence through shared experiences and discussions.

The need for acceptance and belonging can drive individuals to engage in violent behavior if they perceive it as a means to gain respect or inclusion within their peer group. Research studies have consistently demonstrated a positive correlation between peer group influence and violent behavior among university students. However, it's essential to recognize that not all individuals within a peer group are equally influenced. Susceptibility to peer influence varies due to factors like self-esteem, the need for affiliation, and individual characteristics such as personality traits and upbringing.

Positive peer groups can serve as a protective factor against violent tendencies. Groups that emphasize non-violent conflict resolution, empathy, and respect can mitigate the risk of violent behavior among their members. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for developing interventions and prevention strategies to foster a safe and non-violent campus environment among university students. By addressing the complexities of peer group influence, universities can work towards promoting positive social norms and behaviors, ultimately creating a more secure and harmonious campus community.

### **2.1.3 Biological factors and violent behaviour among University students**

The relationship between biological factors and violent behavior among university students is complex and multifaceted. Genetic variations, such as the MAOA gene, are linked to increased risk of violent behavior when exposed to adverse childhood experiences. Abnormal brain functioning, such as reduced prefrontal cortex activity or increased amygdala activity, can also increase the risk of violent behavior (Nicholls, 2019).

However, biological factors alone are not enough to predict violent behavior accurately. Environmental factors, such as exposure to violence, childhood trauma, and social influences, also play a crucial role in shaping an individual's propensity for violence. Personality traits, such as impulsivity, low empathy, and hostility, have been consistently linked to violent behavior. John and Sarah, with a history of childhood trauma and exposure to violence, have a combination of genetic and biological factors, increasing their vulnerability to engage in violent behavior (Bettencourt, 2017).

However, understanding the complex interplay between biological factors, personality traits, and environmental influences is crucial for developing effective prevention and intervention strategies to address and reduce violent behavior among university students.

While it is important to note that not all individuals with biological factors associated with violence will engage in violent behavior, there is evidence to suggest that certain biological traits may increase the likelihood of violent tendencies.

It can be discussed that these relationships between biological factors and violent behavior among university students is complex and multifaceted. Genetic variations, such as the MAOA gene, are linked to increased risk of violent behavior when exposed to adverse childhood experiences. Abnormal brain functioning, such as reduced prefrontal cortex activity or increased amygdala activity, can also contribute to increased risk of violent behavior.

One biological factor that has been linked to violent behavior is the presence of certain genetic variations. For example, a study conducted by Caspi et al. (2012) found that individuals with a specific variation of the MAOA gene were more likely to engage in violent behavior when exposed to adverse childhood experiences. This gene is responsible for producing an enzyme that breaks down neurotransmitters such as dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine, which are involved in regulating mood and aggression.

Biological factors alone are not enough to predict violent behavior accurately. Environmental factors, such as exposure to violence, childhood trauma, and social influences, also play a crucial role in shaping an individual's propensity for violence. Personality traits, such as impulsivity, low empathy, and hostility, have been consistently linked to violent behavior. High levels of impulsivity may lead to aggressive impulses without considering consequences,

increasing the likelihood of violent behavior. Low empathy may make it easier for individuals to understand and relate to others' emotions, making it easier for them to engage in violent acts.

Another biological factor that has been associated with violent behavior is abnormal brain functioning. Research has shown that individuals with certain brain abnormalities, such as reduced prefrontal cortex activity or increased amygdala activity, may have difficulty regulating their emotions and impulses, leading to an increased risk of violent behavior. For example, a study conducted by Raine et al. (2017) found that individuals with reduced prefrontal cortex activity were more likely to engage in aggressive and violent behavior.

It is essential to note that biological factors alone are not sufficient to predict violent behavior accurately. Environmental factors, such as exposure to violence, childhood trauma, and social influences, also play a crucial role in shaping an individual's propensity for violence. Additionally, personality traits can interact with biological factors to further influence violent behavior.

To illustrate this particular relationship between personality traits and violent behavior among university students it is necessary to consider a hypothetical scenario where John and Sarah have a genetic predisposition for aggression due to a specific variation of the MAOA gene and abnormal brain functioning. Their combination of genetic and biological factors, along with their personality traits, may increase their vulnerability to engage in violent behavior.

Personality traits, such as impulsivity, low empathy, and hostility, have been consistently linked to violent behavior. For instance, individuals with high levels of impulsivity may act on their aggressive impulses without considering the consequences, increasing the likelihood of violent behavior. Similarly, individuals with low empathy may have difficulty understanding and

relating to others' emotions, making it easier for them to engage in violent acts. Hostility, characterized by anger, irritability, and a tendency to interpret ambiguous situations as hostile, has also been associated with violent behavior.

To illustrate the relationship between personality traits and violent behavior among university students, consider a hypothetical scenario. Suppose there are two students, John and Sarah, both with a history of childhood trauma and exposure to violence. John has a genetic predisposition for aggression due to a specific variation of the MAOA gene, while Sarah has abnormal brain functioning, characterized by reduced prefrontal cortex activity. Both students also exhibit high levels of impulsivity, low empathy, and hostility.

In this scenario, John and Sarah's combination of genetic and biological factors, along with their personality traits may increase their vulnerability to engage in violent behavior. When faced with a stressful situation, such as a disagreement with a fellow student, their impulsivity may make it difficult for them to control their aggressive impulses (Fahlgren, 2022). Additionally, their low empathy and hostility may contribute to a lack of remorse or empathy towards their victims, further facilitating violent acts.

However, it is important to emphasize that the presence of these biological and personality factors does not guarantee violent behavior. Many individuals with similar traits do not engage in violence, highlighting the importance of environmental and social factors in shaping behavior. Understanding the complex interplay between biological factors, personality traits, and environmental influences is crucial for developing effective prevention and intervention strategies to address and reduce violent behavior among university students.

## **2.2 Theoretical Framework**

### **2.2.1 Psychological Theory**

The issue of human violence is also a major topic within the academic discipline of psychology. As biosocial theorists do, psychologists focus on how individual characteristics may interact with the social environment to produce a violent event. However, rather than focus on the biological basis of crime, psychologists focus on how mental processes impact individual propensities for violence. Psychologists are often interested in the association between learning, intelligence, and personality and aggressive behaviour. In this section of the report, we briefly review some of the major psychological perspectives that have attempted to explain violent behaviour. These perspectives include the psychodynamic perspective, behavioural theory and cognitive theory. We will also explore the possible relationship between mental illness and violence.

### **2.2.1 Behavioural Theories**

Behavior theory asserts that human behavior, including violent behavior, is learned through interactions with the social environment. According to behaviorists, people are not inherently violent but learn violent thoughts and actions through their daily experiences. This learning process can include observing friends or family members being rewarded for violent behavior or witnessing the glorification of violence in the media. Studies on family dynamics indicate that aggressive children often mimic the violent behaviors of their parents. Similarly, individuals living in violent communities may adopt the aggressive behaviors of their neighbors.

Behavioral theorists identify four key factors contributing to the production of violence:

1. Stressful Events: Arousal is heightened due to stressful events or stimuli, such as threats or assaults.
2. Learned Aggressive Skills: Individuals learn aggressive techniques by observing others' behavior.
3. Belief in Social Rewards: There is a belief that aggression or violence will be socially rewarded, whether by reducing frustration, boosting self-esteem, gaining material goods, or earning praise from others.
4. Condoning Value System: Within certain social contexts, there exists a value system that condones violent acts.

Empirical tests of these principles have shown promising results, contributing significantly to the development of social learning theories of deviance. These theories, including differential association theory, sub-cultural theory, and neutralization theory, have become influential in understanding criminological behavior and are further discussed in the section on Social Learning and Violence in this report.

### **2.2.3 Cognitive Development and Violence**

Cognitive theorists focus on understanding how individuals perceive their social environment and learn to solve problems. Within cognitive theory, the moral and intellectual development perspective, associated with researchers like Piaget and Kohlberg, sheds light on criminal behavior.

Piaget (1932) argued that people's reasoning abilities develop in a logical manner, progressing from simple responses in the early stages of development to complex reasoning and

abstract thought in adulthood. Kohlberg (1969) applied the concept of moral development to the study of criminal behavior, proposing six stages of moral development. At the initial stages, people obey laws out of fear of punishment, but as they progress, they obey laws due to an inherent sense of obligation and belief in universal principles of justice and respect for others.

Kohlberg's research (Kohlberg et al., 1973) revealed that individuals with lower moral development, even after accounting for social background, were more likely to engage in violent behavior. Those with higher moral reasoning, however, exhibited altruism, generosity, and non-violence. The evidence suggests that individuals with lower moral reasoning are prone to crime and violence when they believe they can escape consequences. Conversely, individuals with higher moral reasoning tend to abstain from criminal behavior because they perceive it as morally wrong.

In the realm of cognitive theory, researchers have delved into the intricacies of information processing, a vital aspect of decision-making. When individuals make decisions, they undergo a series of complex cognitive processes: encoding and interpreting information, searching for appropriate responses, and acting on their decisions (Dodge, 1986).

According to information processing theorists, those prone to violence might misinterpret information. For instance, individuals inclined towards violence could perceive others as more threatening or aggressive than they actually are, leading them to react violently even to minor provocations. This heightened vigilance and suspicion significantly increase the likelihood of engaging in violent behavior, especially among aggressive children (Lochman, 1987). In some

cases, individuals who commit violent acts might genuinely believe they are defending themselves, even when their perception of the threat is entirely skewed.

Recent research has unveiled intriguing insights, particularly in cases of sexual offenses. Male rapists, for instance, often lack sympathy for their own victims but exhibit empathy toward the female victims of other sexual offenders. This paradoxical finding suggests that certain offenders, due to information processing issues, fail to recognize the harm they inflict on others (Langton and Marshall, 2001; Lipton et al., 1987). These nuances in information processing shed light on the complexities underlying violent behavior and challenge traditional understandings of criminal motivations.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

Research method deals with the system and procedure for gathering relevant data and information concerning a particular research project. This chapter therefore focuses on the research design, population of study, sample size and sampling method amongst others.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

This study is designed to collect quantitative data through the survey design. The essence is to collect accurate information needed to address the objective of the study. This study therefore adopts the cross-sectional survey design whereby the researcher contacted the research participants once to administer and retrieve the research questionnaire.

#### **3.3 Population of Study**

The population for the study is '480' entire population of Sociology and Anthropology students (full-time), Faculty of Social Science 200level to 400level University of Benin. (HOD office, Dept of Sociology and Anthropology)

#### **3.4 Sample size**

The sample size was arrived at by the use of number estimation formula as suggested by Taro Yamane 1967 as calculated below. The sample size for this study was 218. And it been justify by Taro Yamane 1967

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where n – sample size

N- Population size

(e) – the percentage of level of significant

Therefore  $n = \frac{480}{1 + 480(0.05)^2}$

$$n = \frac{480}{1 + 480(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{480}{1 + 480 \times 0.0025}$$

$$n = \frac{480}{1 + 1.2}$$

$$n = \frac{480}{2.2}$$

$$n = 218.181$$

$$n = 218$$

$$n = 218$$

$$n = 218$$

$$n = 218.181 \text{ approximately } 218$$

Therefore  $n = 218$

### 3.5 Sampling technique

In this study, a non-probability sampling procedure: i.e. accidental sampling technique will be used in selecting students in each level in the Department by the researcher.

### 3.6 Instrument of Data Collection

The instrument that will be used for data collection is a structured questionnaire which is a major instrument used for gathering data in survey research. The instrument will be administered to participants at their convenience on one on one basis not by proxy and left alone to complete the questions designed to sample their opinion on the prevalence of bipolar disorder

and violent behaviour among University students in Nigeria. The questionnaires will be divided into five (5) sections.

Section 'A' describes the demographic characteristics of the respondents such as age differences, sex, faculties, level, religion, and marital status.

Section 'B' examine the relationship between personality trait and violent behaviour among University students.

Section 'C' find out the relationship between mental health and violent behaviour among University students.

Section 'D' Examine the relationship between peer group influence and violent behaviour among University students.

Section 'E' Assess the relationship between biological factors and violent behaviour among University students.

### **3.7 Validity of the Instrument**

The validation of the questionnaire will be undertaken by the researchers' supervisor to ascertain suitability and appropriateness for the research and one other expert in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, faculty of Social Sciences, University of Benin, Benin City. Their suggestions and criticism will make up the final copy.

### **3.8 Methods of Data Collection**

The study employed both primary and secondary sources of data collection. The primary source of data is the use of the structured questionnaire. The structured questionnaire is one of the instruments that will be used in collecting the data for this study. The questionnaires will be

self-administered by the researcher so as to minimize error in the instrument when returned. The researcher will use each lecture timetables to administer the questionnaire when the student will be lecture free to enable the respondents answer the questionnaire guide conveniently.

The questionnaire comprised two sections- the first section covered social demographic and socio-economic variables of the participants while the second section comprises questions aimed at providing answers to the research questions in the study.

### **3.4 Method of Data Analysis**

The data will be organized in tables using simple percentages. The simple percentages is used to present the frequency counts and percentage represents action of respondents' responses to the issues raised.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

#### 4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the data presentation, analysis and interpretations of the various data collected for this study. Consequently, it entails the application of both mathematics and statistical techniques to provide the basis for analyzing the research objectives listed in chapter one. Hence, it is a vital part of this study since it forms the basis for conclusion and policy recommendations.

#### 4.2 Data Presentation and Analytical Techniques

Tables and percentages were used in this chapter in this research work, the use of table was the most appropriate means of interpreting information for easy understanding. In analyzing the data, judgment was based on the number of favourable or unfavourable responses received on each statement in the questionnaire. Generally, the favourable responses are, “strongly agree” and “agree” while the unfavourable responses are “strongly disagree” and “disagree”. The results of the data collected are analyzed below based on each research questions, and out of the two hundred and eighteen (218) questionnaire distributed, two hundred (200) questionnaire were well completed and valid for analysis of this study. The two hundred (200) questionnaire retrieved represent 95 percent of total distributed questionnaire.

#### Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

**Table 4.1: Frequency and percentage relating to age, sex, level, religion, income of the parents/sponsors and marital status of respondents**

<b>Age distribution of respondents</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentages %</b>
18 - 20 years	30	9.7
21-25 years	110	64.2

26-30 years	50	25.3
31-35 years	10	0.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Sex distribution of respondents</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentages %</b>
Male	60	31.3
Female	140	68.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Level</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
100L	0	0
200L	19	4.2
300L	81	43.7
400L	100	52.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Religion</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Christianity	192	98.4
Muslim	6	0.8
ATR	0	0
Others	2	0.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Marital Status</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentages %</b>
Single	191	97.6
Married	9	2.1
Divorced	0	0
Separated	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>

*Source: Field Survey, 2023*

From table 4.1 above, 9.7% of the total respondents are between the age brackets of 18-20 years; 64.2% of the total respondents are between the age brackets of 21-25; 25.3% percent of the total respondents are between the age brackets of 26-30 years while 0.8% of the total respondents are between the age brackets of 31-35years. Furthermore, 31.3 percent of the total respondents are male while 68.7 percent of the total respondents are female. This implies that majority of the respondents are female. The table further shows that 0 percent of the total respondent is 100L; 4.2 percent of the total respondent are in 200L; 43.6 percent of the total respondents are in 300L while 52.1 percent of the total respondents are in 400L.

Under the religion it was indicated that 98.4 percent of the respondents are practicing Christianity; 0.8 percent of the respondents are Muslim; 0 percent is ATR while 0.8 percent of the respondents are others. This implies that the majority of the respondents are Christians. Lastly, under the marital status of the respondents, it shows that 97.6 percent of the total respondents' are single; none of the total respondents are separated; none were divorced while 2.1 percent of the total respondents' were married. This implies that the majority of the respondents' single.

**Research Question one: To what extent do personality traits relate to violent behavior among university students?**

**Table 4.2: Frequency and percentage of the extent personality traits relate to violent behavior among university students.**

<b>People with violent behavior tend to be irritable, impulsive, and restless</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly Agree	74	43.7
Agree	76	48.9
Disagree	24	3.2
Strongly Disagree	26	4.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Violent persons are more vigilant and suspicious than normal youth are</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly Agree	98	44.2
Agree	68	42.9
Disagree	20	8.4
Strongly Disagree	14	4.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>People with low intelligence are more likely to engage in crime and violence than people with high intelligence were</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly Agree	68	27.4
Agree	94	32.6
Disagree	30	24.2
Strongly Disagree	8	15.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Youth who engage in violent attacks on others actually believe that they are defending themselves</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentages</b>
Strongly Agree	20	5.3

Agree	38	13.7
Disagree	78	43.1
Strongly Disagree	64	37.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>

*Source: Field Survey, 2023*

### **Interpretation;**

Table 4.2 above reveals that 43.7 percent of the total respondents were strongly agree; 48.9 percent of the respondents agreed; 3.2 percent of the respondents disagreed and 4.2 percent of the respondents strongly disagree that people with violent behavior tend to be irritable, impulsive, and restless. It was also reveals that 44.2 percent of the total respondents strongly agree; 42.9 percent of the total respondents agreed; 8.4 percent of the total respondents disagreed while 4.5 percent of the population strongly disagreed that violent persons are more vigilant and suspicious than normal youth are.

It was also indicated that 27.4 percent of total respondents strongly agreed that people with low intelligence are more likely to engage in crime and violence than people with high intelligence were; 32.6 percent of the total respondents agreed, 24.2 of the total respondents disagreed to the statement, while 15.8 percent of the total respondents strongly disagreed.

It was also indicated that 5.3 percent of total respondents strongly agree that youth who engage in violent attacks on others actually believe that they are defending themselves, 13.7 percent of the total respondents agreed to the statement, 43.1 percent of the total respondents disagree that youth who engage in violent attacks on others actually believe that they are defending themselves and lastly 37.8 percent of the total respondents strongly disagree that youth who engage in violent attacks on others actually believe that they are defending themselves.

**Research Question Two: what is the relationship between mental health and violent behavior among university students?**

**Table 4.3: Frequency and percentage of the relationship between mental health and violent behavior among university students**

<b>Violent behavior emanates from mental health</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentages</b>
Strongly Agree	74	43.1
Agree	86	45.3
Disagree	22	8.4
Strongly Disagree	18	3.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Lack of social contact and loneliness may likely cause violent behaviour in human</b>		
Strongly Agree	66	35.8
Agree	89	47.1
Disagree	30	10.0
Strongly Disagree	15	7.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Violent behavior could occur as a result of mental health</b>		
Strongly Agree	13	12.6
Agree	39	19.7
Disagree	104	40.5
Strongly Disagree	53	27.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Emotional problems are the most common cause of aggressive behaviour</b>		
Strongly Agree	114	51.1
Agree	66	42.4
Disagree	12	3.7
Strongly disagree	8	2.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>

*Source: Field Survey, 2023*

It was also indicated that 43.2 percent of total respondents strongly agree that violence behavior emanates from mental health, 45.3 percent of the total respondents agree to the same statement, 8.4 percent of the total respondents disagreed, while 3.2 percent of the total respondents strongly disagree to the same statement.

It was also showed that 35.8 percent of total respondents strongly agree that lack of social contact and loneliness may likely cause violent behaviour in human, 47.1 percent of the total respondents agree that, 10.0 percent of the total respondents disagree, while 7.1 percent of the total respondents strongly disagree.

It was also revealed that 12.6 percent of total respondents strongly agree violent behavior could occur as a result of mental health, 19.7 percent of the total respondents agreed, 40.0 percent of the respondents disagreed to the statement, while 27.1 percent of the total respondents strongly disagreed

It was also revealed that 51.1 percent of total respondents strongly agreed that Emotional problems are the most common cause of aggressive behaviour, 42.4 percent of the total respondents agreed, 3.7 percent of the total respondents disagreed to the statement, while 2.9 percent of the total respondents strongly disagreed.

**Research Question Three: How does peer group influence violent behavior among university students?**

**Table 4.4: Frequencies and percentages on how peer group influence violent behavior among university students**

<b>Negative peer influence contributes greatly to violent in youth</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentages</b>
Strongly Agree	92	40.0
Agree	86	41.1
Disagree	19	11.6
Strongly Disagree	3	7.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>By modeling and imitation</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	68	38.9
Agree	104	53.6
Disagree	20	5.3
Strongly Disagree	8	2.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Violent skills or techniques are learned through observing others</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>

Strongly Agree	118	55.5
Agree	74	43.2
Disagree	5	0.8
Strongly Disagree	3	0.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Socialization contributes greatly to violent in youth</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	72	37.3
Agree	102	53.2
Disagree	14	5.0
Strongly Disagree	12	4.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>

*Source: Field Survey, 2023*

Table 4.4 above shows that 40.0 percent, 41.1 percent, 11.6 percent and 7.6 percent of the total respondents strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that negative peer influence contributes greatly to violent in youth. It was also shows that 38.9 percent, 53.6 percent, 5.3 percent and 2.1 percent of the total respondents strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that by modeling and imitation. It was also shown that 55.5 percent, 43.2 percent, 0.8 percent and 0.5 percent of the total respondents are strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that violent skills or techniques are learned through observing others. It was also indicated that 37.3 percent, 53.2 percent, 5.0 percent and 4.5 percent of the total respondents strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that socialization contributes greatly to violent in youth.

**Research Question four: To what extent do biological factors influence violent behavior among University Students?**

**Table 4.5: Frequency and percentage of the extent do biological factors influence violent behavior among University Students.**

<b>Family structure and harsh discipline may be accountable for aggressive behaviour</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly Agree	74	43.7
Agree	76	48.9
Disagree	24	3.2

Strongly Disagree	26	4.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>In the aspect of brain structure and functioning</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly Agree	98	44.2
Agree	68	42.9
Disagree	20	8.4
Strongly Disagree	14	4.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Aggressive behaviour could be biological inheritance</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly Agree	68	27.4
Agree	94	32.6
Disagree	30	24.2
Strongly Disagree	8	15.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>People who live in violent communities learn to model the aggressive behaviour of their neighbours</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentages</b>
Strongly Agree	20	5.3
Agree	38	13.7
Disagree	78	43.1
Strongly Disagree	64	37.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>

*Source: Field Survey, 2023*

### **Interpretation;**

Table 4.5 above reveals that 43.7 percent of the total respondents were strongly agree; 48.9 percent of the respondents agreed; 3.2 percent of the respondents disagreed and 4.2 percent of the respondents strongly disagree that family structure and harsh discipline may be accountable for aggressive behaviour. It was also reveals that 44.2 percent of the total respondents strongly agree; 42.9 percent of the total respondents agreed; 8.4 percent of the total respondents disagreed while 4.5 percent of the population strongly disagreed that In the aspect of brain structure and functioning.

It was also indicated that 27.4 percent of total respondents strongly agreed that aggressive behaviour could be biological inheritance; 32.6 percent of the total respondents agreed, 24.2 of

the total respondents disagreed to the statement, while 15.8 percent of the total respondents strongly disagreed.

It was also indicated that 5.3 percent of total respondents strongly agree that people who live in violent communities learn to model the aggressive behaviour of their neighbours, 13.7 percent of the total respondents agreed to the statement, 43.1 percent of the total respondents disagree that people who live in violent communities learn to model the aggressive behaviour of their neighbours and lastly 37.8 percent of the total respondents strongly disagreed that People who live in violent communities learn to model the aggressive behaviour of their neighbours.

### **4.3 Discussion of findings**

#### **Research question one: To what extent do personality traits relate to violent behavior among university students?**

The study emphasis on the prevalence of bipolar disorder and violent behavior among University students in Nigeria. For the purpose of this study, four (4) research questions were raised and appropriate answers were provided by the respondents through administration of questionnaire.

The first research question stated the extent do personality traits relate to violent behavior among university students, 43.7 percent of the respondents strongly agreed that people with violent behavior tend to be irritable, impulsive, and restless, 48.9 percent of the total respondents agree to the same statement, 3.2 percent disagreed, 4.2 percent of the total respondents strongly disagreed. If the opinion of the respondents is accepted, then we may accept the fact that personality traits relate to violent behavior among university students.

It was also discussed that violent persons are more vigilant and suspicious than normal youth are with 44.2 percent of the total respondents strongly agreeing to the statement, 42.9 percent agreed,

8.4 percent of the total respondents agreed and lastly 4.5 percent strongly disagreed. This simply implies that violent persons are more vigilant and suspicious than normal youth are.

It was also discussed that people with low intelligence are more likely to engage in crime and violence than people with high intelligence were with 27.4 percent of the total respondents strongly agreeing with the statement, 32.6 percent agreed, 24.2 percent disagreed, 15.8 percent of the total respondents strongly disagreed. If the opinion of this majority is anything to go by then we may accept that people with low intelligence are more likely to engage in crime and violence than people with high intelligence were.

It revealed the fact that youth who engage in violent attacks on others actually believe that they are defending themselves with almost all the respondents agreeing to that. Following the analysis, it is very clear that youth who engage in violent attacks on others actually believe that they are defending themselves.

### **Research question two: What is the relationship between mental health and violent behavior among university students?**

Under research question two, the relationship between mental health and violent behavior among university students.

It was revealed that violent behavior emanates from mental health, 43.1 percent of the total respondents strongly agreed to it, 45.3 percent agreed, 8.4 percent disagree, while 3.2 percent of the total respondents strongly disagreed. This implies that violent behavior emanates from mental health.

In the same vein, it was discussed that lack of social contact and loneliness may likely cause violent behaviour in human, the percentage of positives response higher; this means the statement is true.

Furthermore, it was discussed if violent behavior could occur as a result of mental health, from the analysis; it was also revealed that emotional problems are the most common cause of aggressive behaviour.

**Research question three: How does peer group influence violent behavior among university students?**

Furthermore, it was revealed that negative peer influence contributes greatly to violent in youth. It was revealed that 40.0 percent of the respondents strongly agree, 41.1 percent agree, 11.6 percent of the total respondents disagree, while 7.4 percent of the respondents strongly disagree. If the opinion of this majority is anything to go by then we may accept that negative peer group influence violent behavior among university.

Findings still made us understand that by modeling and imitation with all the respondents agreeing to it, it was also revealed that violent skills or techniques are learned through observing others, findings made us understand that socialization contributes greatly to violent in youth.

**Research question four: To what extent do biological factors influence violent behavior among university students?**

43.7 percent of the respondents strongly agreed that family structure and harsh discipline may be accountable for aggressive behaviour, 48.9 percent of the total respondents agree to the same statement, 3.2 percent disagreed, 4.2 percent of the total respondents strongly disagreed. If the opinion of the respondents is accepted, then we may accept the fact that family structure and harsh discipline may be accountable for aggressive behaviour.

It was also discussed that In the aspect of brain structure and functioning, 44.2 percent of the total respondents strongly agreeing to the statement, 42.9 percent agreed, 8.4 percent of the total

respondents agreed and lastly 4.5 percent strongly disagreed. This simply implies that in the aspect of brain structure and functioning.

It was also discussed that aggressive behaviour could be biological inheritance with 27.4 percent of the total respondents strongly agreeing with the statement, 32.6 percent agreed, 24.2 percent disagreed, 15.8 percent of the total respondents strongly disagreed. If the opinion of this majority is anything to go by then we may accept that aggressive behaviour could be biological inheritance.

It revealed the fact that people who live in violent communities learn to model the aggressive behaviour of their neighbours with almost all the respondents agreeing to that. Following the analysis, it is very clear that youth who engage in violent attacks on others actually believe that they are defending themselves.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1.Introduction

This chapter presented the summary conclusion and recommendations of the study based on the results of the findings.

#### 5.2.Summary

This study titled “prevalence of bipolar disorder and violent behavior among University students in Nigeria” was structured into five chapters to effectively carry out this research. The study raised four objectives that guided the study. Based on these objectives, research questions were formulated, the assumptions and significance of the study were highlighted, scope and delimitations were also discussed. Chapter two reviewed literature related to the research topic. The review critically examined and analyzed the views of some psychologists and other concerned scholars on the concepts. The theoretical frame work used is the psychological theory. In chapter three the design and methodology of the study were discussed. The research design was a cross-sectional survey design, the population of the study comprised of all sociology and anthropology 200level to 400level (full time) students of the University of Benin. A total of 218 students were sampled using simple random sampling procedure. Two instruments were used for data collection, the questionnaire. The returned questionnaires were analyzed using simple percentage table. Chapter four presented the analysis of the data collected which were analyzed through the use of descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings in this study after the analysis gave the following results:

1. It was discovered that, there are significant relationship between personality traits and violent behavior among university students.

2. Finding also revealed that there is a relationship between mental health and violent behavior among university students.
3. Finding also revealed that peer group influence violent behavior among university students.
4. It was also revealed that biological factors influence violent behavior among university students.

### **5.3. Conclusion**

The extensive research conducted by social psychologists and other experts over many years has provided significant insights into the factors within individuals and their environment that contribute to aggression. This wealth of knowledge has led to the development of well-validated models such as the General Aggression Model, which provide a detailed understanding of the psychological and neurological processes underlying aggressive behavior. Despite this understanding, there remains a gap in applying this knowledge effectively in society.

One pressing global issue highlighting this gap is climate change. The General Aggression Model, in conjunction with research from various fields, suggests three primary ways in which rapid global warming could increase violence worldwide. Firstly, there's a direct effect due to rising temperatures, a phenomenon already observed. Secondly, the associated increase in poverty, malnutrition, and family disruption can lead to a higher proportion of children growing into aggression-prone adolescents and adults. Lastly, the phenomenon of ecomigration, where populations move due to ecological disasters, can trigger intergroup conflicts.

This insight underscores the urgency of leveraging the knowledge gained from decades of aggression research to address the multifaceted challenges posed by climate change and its potential to increase societal violence. Applying this understanding effectively could be pivotal in mitigating the adverse effects of climate change on human behavior and society at large.

#### **5.4 Recommendations**

The following recommendations are suggested as a result of the findings of the study:

1. If you can find out what the triggers are, you may be able to work out how to prevent the behaviour. Try to keep a calm environment by cutting down the stimulation, which could be in the environment, or in the activity that the person is doing. 'Environment' could mean the TV, radio, other noisy residents or an unfamiliar place.
2. Perhaps the person has become frustrated at a task he cannot do or does not want to do. Remember that people with dementia often have severe reactions to feelings of failure. When you show or tell the person what to do, explain what to do step by step, with plenty of time in-between for the person to carry it out. Do not give too many choices, as this will be confusing.
3. Do not criticise mistakes or inadequacies. Instead, give praise for efforts and achievements.

## References

- Brener, C.A., (2020). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology* 53, 27–51.
- Burton, J., (2018). Mothering, fathering, and infant negativity as antecedents of boys' externalizing problems and inhibition at age 3 years: Differential susceptibility to rearing experience? *Development and Psychopathology*, 10, 301-320.
- De Wet, B.D., (2018). Interactive effects of life experience and situational cues on aggression: the weapons priming effect in hunters and nonhunters. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 41, 48–60.
- Ellickson, C.A., & McGuigan, D.A., (2020). *Violent Video Game Effects on Children and Adolescents: Theory, Research, and Public Policy*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Furlong, A., & Morrison., U. (2020). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Goldstein, J.E., & Conoley, K.A. (2017). Attachment security, mother-child interaction, and temperament as predictors of behavior-problem ratings at age three years. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50, Nos. 1-2, 167-193.
- Grunbaum, C.A., (2020). Implications of global climate change for violence in developed and developing countries. In: Forgas, J., Kruglanski, A., Williams, K. (Eds.), *The Psychology of Social Conflict and Aggression*. Psychology Press, New York, pp. 249–265.
- Hagan, C.P., & Foster, C.A., (2018). Direct and indirect relations between the Big 5 personality traits and aggressive behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences* 52, 870–875.
- Hook, J. (2017). *Attachment and loss, Vol. 1*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lacan, B.A., (2017). Personality and aggressive behavior under provoking and neutral conditions: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin* 132, 751–777.
- Newman, L., (2017). Frustration-aggression hypothesis: examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin* 106, 59–73.
- Saner, A. & Ellickson, O., (2016). Psychological mechanisms of aggression. In M. von Cranach, K. Foppa, W. Lepenies, & D. Ploog (Eds.), *Human ethology: Claims and limits of a new discipline* (pp. 316-356). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Singer, C.A., & Flannery, L.R., (2019). Human aggression: a social-cognitive view. In: Hogg, M.A., Cooper, J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Sage Publication, London, pp. 296–323.
- Aguilar, B., Sroufe, L.A., Egeland, B., Carlson, E., (2020). Distinguishing the early-onset/persistent and adolescence-onset antisocial behavior types: from birth to 16 years. *Developmental Psychopathology* 12, 109–132.
- Anderson, C.A., Anderson, K.B., (2018). Men who target women: specificity of target, generality of aggressive behavior. *Aggressive Behavior* 34, 605–622.
- Anderson, C.A., Berkowitz, L., Donnerstein, E., Huesmann, L.R., Johnson, J., Linz, D., Malamuth, N., Wartella, E., (2017). The influence of media violence on youth. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 4, 81–110.
- Anderson, C.A., Bushman, B.J., (2021). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology* 53, 27–51.
- Anderson, C.A., DeLisi, M., (2019). Implications of global climate change for violence in developed and developing countries. In: Forgas, J., Kruglanski, A., Williams, K. (Eds.), *The Psychology of Social Conflict and Aggression*. Psychology Press, New York, pp. 249–265.
- Anderson, C.A., Gentile, D.A., Buckley, K.E., (2017). *Violent Video Game Effects on Children and Adolescents: Theory, Research, and Public Policy*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Anderson, C.A., Huesmann, L.R., (2017). Human aggression: a social-cognitive view. In: Hogg, M.A., Cooper, J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Sage Publication, London, pp. 296–323.
- Bandura, A. (1979). Psychological mechanisms of aggression. In M. von Cranach, K. Foppa, W. Lepenies, & D. Ploog (Eds.), *Human ethology: Claims and limits of a new discipline* (pp. 316-356). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A., (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Barlett, C.P., Anderson, C.A., (2017). Direct and indirect relations between the Big 5 personality traits and aggressive behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences* 52, 870–875.
- Bartholow, B.D., Anderson, C.A., Carnagey, N.L., Benjamin, A.J., (2015). Interactive effects of life experience and situational cues on aggression: the weapons priming effect in hunters and nonhunters. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 41, 48–60.

- Bates, J.E., Maslin, C.A., & Frankel, K.A. (2017). Attachment security, mother-child interaction, and temperament as predictors of behavior-problem ratings at age three years. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50, Nos. 1-2, 167-193.
- Belsky, J. Hsieh, K., & Crnic, K. (2018). Mothering, fathering, and infant negativity as antecedents of boys' externalizing problems and inhibition at age 3 years: Differential susceptibility to rearing experience? Development and Psychopathology, 10, 301-320.
- Berkowitz, L., (2019). Frustration-aggression hypothesis: examination and reformulation. Psychological Bulletin 106, 59–73.
- Bettencourt, B.A., Talley, A., Benjamin, A.J., Valentine, J., (2016). Personality and aggressive behavior under provoking and neutral conditions: a meta-analytic review. Psychological Bulletin 132, 751–777.
- Bowlby, J. (2019). Attachment and loss, Vol. 1. New York: Basic Books.
- Bronson, W.C. (2015). Developments in behavior with age mates during the second year of life. In M. Lewis & L.A. Rosenblum (Eds.), The origins of behavior: Friendship and peer relations. New York: Wiley.
- Burchinal, M.R., Follmer, A., & Bryant, D.M. (2016). The relations of maternal support and family structure with maternal responsiveness and child outcomes among African American families. Developmental Psychology, 32, 1073-1083.
- Bushman, B.J., Huesmann, L.R., (2017). Aggression. In: Fiske, S.T., Gilbert, D.T., Lindzey, G. (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology, fifth ed., vol. 2. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, pp. 833–863.
- Buss, A.H. (2017). The psychology of aggression. New York: Wiley.
- Calkins, S. (2017). Origins and outcomes of individual differences in emotion regulation. In N. A. Fox (Ed.), The development of emotion regulation: Biological and behavioral considerations. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development (pp. 53-72). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, S.B. (2019). Behavior problems in preschool children: Clinical and developmental issues. New York: Guilford Press.
- Campbell, S.B. (2014). Hard-to-manage preschool boys: Externalizing behavior, social competence, and family context at two-year-follow-up. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 22, 147-166.
- Cole, P. M., Michel, M. K., & Teti, L. (2014). The development of emotional regulation and dysregulation. In N. A. Fox (Ed.), The development of emotion regulation: Biological

and behavioral considerations. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development (pp. 73-100). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cummings, E.M., Iannotti, R. J., & Zahn-Waxler, C., (2019). Aggression between peers in early childhood: Individual continuity and developmental change. Child Development, 72, 887-895.

Dadds, M.R., & Powell, M.B. (2019). The relationship of interparental conflict and global marital adjustment to aggression and immaturity in aggressive and nonclinic children. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 19, 553-567.

Dodge, K.A., (2020). Social cognition and children's aggressive behavior. Child Development 51, 620–635.

Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer, O., Sears, R., (2019). Frustration and Aggression. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Dollard, J., Doob, L.W., Miller, N.E., Mowrer, O.H., & Sears, R.R. (2019). Frustration and aggression. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dunn, J., & Kendrick,, C. (2016). Siblings: Love, envy, and understanding. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Erickson, M.F., Sroufe, L.A., & Egeland, B. (2016). The relationship between quality of attachment and behavior problems in preschool in a high-risk sample. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), Growing points of attachment theory and research. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50, Nos. 1-2, 147-167.

Eron, L.D., Walder, L.O., Lefkowitz, M.M., (2017). The Learning of Aggression in Children. Little Brown, Boston.

Fagot, B., & Kavanaugh, K. (2016). Parenting during the second year: Effects of children's age, sex, and attachment classification. Child Development, 64, 258-271.

Fagot, B., & Leve, L.D. (2018). Teacher ratings of externalizing behavior at school entry for boys and girls: Similar early predictors and different correlates. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 39, 555-566.

Forehand, R., & McMahon, R J. (2018). Helping the noncompliant child: A clinician's guide to parent training. New York: Guilford.

## Questionnaire

Department of Sociology and Anthropology,  
Faculty of Social Sciences,  
University of Benin,  
Benin City

Dear Sir/Ma,

### CONSENT FORM

I humbly request your assistance in filling this questionnaire. This questionnaire is aimed at eliciting responses on **“prevalence of bipolar disorder and violent behavior among University students in Nigeria”**, in partial fulfillment of an award of B.Sc in Department of Sociology and Anthropology from the University of Benin. Your prompt response will be highly appreciated and shall be used exclusively for academic purpose. Any information given will be treated in strict confidence.

Thanks in anticipation.

Yours faithfully,

Williams Emike Valerie

Researcher

**PREVALENCE OF BIPOLAR DISORDER AND VIOLENT BEHAVIOR AMONG  
UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN NIGERIA**

**SECTION A: Socio demographic characteristics**

1. Gender: Male [    ] Female [    ]
2. Age: 16-20 [    ], 21-25 [    ], 26-30 [    ], 30 and above [    ].
3. Level: 100level [    ], 200level [    ], 300level [    ], 400level [    ]
4. Marital Status: Single [    ], Married [    ], Divorced [    ], Separated [    ], Widowed [    ].
5. Religion: Christianity [    ], Islam [    ], Traditionalist [    ], Others [    ]

**Sections B: SA-Strongly agree, A-Agree, D-Disagree, SD-Strong Disagree**

S/N	RESEARCH QUESTION	SA	A	D	SD
<b>1</b>	<b>TO WHAT EXTENT DO PERSONALITY TRAITS RELATE TO VIOLENT BEHAVIOR AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS?</b>				
1.01	People with violent behavior tend to be irritable, impulsive, and restless				
1.02	Violent persons are more vigilant and suspicious than normal youth are				
1.03	People with low intelligence are more likely to engage in crime and violence than people with high intelligence were				
1.04	Youth who engage in violent attacks on others actually believe that they are defending themselves				
<b>2</b>	<b>WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MENTAL HEALTH AND VIOLENT BEHAVIOR AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS?</b>				
2.01	Violent behavior emanates from mental health				
2.02	Lack of social contact and loneliness may likely cause violent behaviour in human				
2.03	Violent behavior could occur as a result of mental health				
2.04	Emotional problems are the most common cause of aggressive behaviour				

3	<b>HOW DOES PEER GROUP INFLUENCE VIOLENT BEHAVIOR AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS?</b>				
3.01	Negative peer influence contributes greatly to violent in youth				
3.02	By modeling and imitation				
3.03	Violent skills or techniques are learned through observing others				
3.04	Socialization contributes greatly to violent in youth				
4	<b>TO WHAT EXTENT DO BIOLOGICAL FACTORS INFLUENCE VIOLENT BEHAVIOR AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS?</b>				
4.01	Family structure and harsh discipline may be accountable for aggressive behaviour				
4.02	In the aspect of brain structure and functioning				
4.03	Aggressive behaviour could be biological inheritance				
4.04	People who live in violent communities learn to model the aggressive behaviour of their neighbours				