Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics for Deviant Behaviours

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Mean** | **Standard Error** | **Standard Deviation** | **Sample Variance** | **Kurtosis** | **Skewness** | **Range** |
| **Pilfering** | 1.95 | 0.06 | 1.08 | 1.16 | 1.14 | 1.30 | 1-5 |
| **Destructive** | 1.47 | 0.05 | 0.91 | 0.82 | 4.65 | 2.24 | 1-5 |
| **Violence** | 1.34 | 0.05 | 0.86 | 0.75 | 7.39 | 2.82 | 1-5 |
| **Smoking** | 1.28 | 0.05 | 0.87 | 0.75 | 9.11 | 3.18 | 1-5 |
| **Drinking** | 1.40 | 0.05 | 0.91 | 0.83 | 5.48 | 2.49 | 1-5 |
| **Foul language** | 2.27 | 0.07 | 1.27 | 1.60 | -0.72 | 0.65 | 1-5 |
| **Sexual intercourse** | 1.74 | 0.07 | 1.16 | 1.35 | 0.87 | 1.44 | 1-5 |
| **Pornography** | 1.66 | 0.06 | 1.06 | 1.13 | 2.34 | 1.77 | 1-5 |

Other behaviours investigated all follow similar trend of mean value greater than one and positive skewness. For foul language a negative value of -0.72 was recorded.

Figure 4-1 shows the rate of deviance amongst youth in Lagos State. It was observed that that over 60% of the youths in Lagos State has one form of deviant bahaviour or the other.

Figure 4‑1 Rate of deviance amongst youths in Lagos State

For example 62% of them are given to foul language followed by pilfering 59%. The addiction to pornography was observed to be rampart among the youth with 43.3% of them in this category followed by 37% that are involved in casual sex with an unmarried relationship.

The detailed frequencies of the deviant population are shown in Figures 4-2, 4-3, 4-4 and 4-5.

Figure 4‑2 Rate of deviance for (11-13 years)

Figure 4‑3 Rate of Deviance for (14-17) years

Figure 4‑4 Rate of Deviance for (18-25) years

Figure 4‑5 Rate of Deviance for (26-30) years

## The Pattern of Deviance among Youths in Lagos State

The pattern of deviance is shown in Figures 4-6, 4-7. Figure4-6 shows the comparison of deviance pattern among males and females. About 38% of the male compared with 22% female were observed to at one point or the other took what was not theirs. Similarly, 38% and 24% exhibit foul language for male and female respectively. For sexual and pornography, 28% and 27 % were respectively observed for males and 8% and 10% for females. It was observed that for all the deviant behaviours investigated, the male youths are more susceptible to deviant behaviours than the females This is in consonance with the work of Ikefuna and Ojinnaka, (2010) who reported more deviant behaviour among male youths of Enugu compared with their female counterparts and Fagbohungbe et al.(2012) who also reported a significant difference between deviant behaviours among males and females.

Figure 4‑6 Deviance pattern amongst males and females

Figure 4‑7 Deviance pattern for the various age groups

Figure 4-7 revealed that the youths within the 18-25 years age bracket appears to be more deviant followed by those within the 14-17 years. This can be traced to adolescence for the 14-17 years, freedom from parental control and peak of youthfulness for the 18-25 years youth.

## Comparison of the Rate of Deviance among the youths in Secondary, Tertiary and Outside School

The deviant behaviour among youths in secondary, tertiary and the street were presented and compared.

Figure 4-8 presents the comparison of rate of deviance behaviour among the secondary, tertiary and outside street youths. The data revealed that among secondary school students pilfering is the prevalent deviant behaviour with 69% followed foul language 53% and destructive tendency 32%. The tertiary students have the highest score for foul language 69% and 57% score for pilfering. Both tertiary students and street youths engage more in casual sex compared with secondary school youths. Similar trend was also observed for pornography, with 45% and 43% for tertiary youths for casual sex and pornography, 45% and 40% for outside youths respectively.

Figure 4‑8 Deviant behaviour amongst Secondary, Tertiary and Youths on the Street in Lagos State

Figure 4‑9 Deviance behaviour among secondary school

Figure 4-9 shows the distribution of the manifest deviant behaviour among secondary schools while Figures 4-10 and 4-11 describe that of the tertiary and outside street respectively.

Figure 4‑10 Deviance behaviour among Tertiary Institution

Figure 4‑11 Deviance behaviour amongst the youths on the street

## Prevalent Deviant Behaviour among the youths in Lagos State

Figure 4-12 shows deviance by type among the youths with deviant behaviour. The Figure reveals that of the deviant population, 22% were given to foul language followed closely by pilfering 21% and with 4% smoking. Other deviant behaviour including destructive, drinking, casual sex had 10%, 8%, 13% patronage respectively while 6% and 16% of the youths are involved in violence and pornography. This suggests that most youths in Lagos state at one point or the other use foul language. Ikefuna and Ojinnaka, (2010) has reported antisocial behaviour as the prevailing deviant behaviour among youths in Enugu. However, the specific antisocial behaviour was not mentioned. In this study, foul language, pilfering, and other prevalent behaviours can be regarded as antisocial.

Figure 4‑4‑12 Proportion of Deviance by types

## Factors Causing Deviant Behaviour amongst youth in Lagos State-Results from SEM

In sections 2.3 and 3.62, SEM was introduced and the procedure well discussed. In this study, factor analysis was employed to investigate that our manifest variables indeed measure deviant behaviour among youths. Several measures were also combined to create a factor as discussed in section 3.6.2.2. The measures of fit and magnitude of factor loadings were determined. Several fit statistics was used to assess if the model fit the data. In this study, chi-square, Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), comparative fit index (CFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) were used.

The results of logistic regression analyses carried in section 3.6.3 were also presented.

### Differential Association Theory

To investigate the differential association theory, we employed the method detailed in section 3.62 and the results are presented next.

Table 4.2 Fit indices for Differential Association Theory

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Goodness of Fit test | results | Standard |
| Comparative Fit Index (CFI) | 0.975 | 0.90 |
| Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) | 0.972 | 0.90 |
| Root Mean Square Error of Approximation: |  |  |
| (RMSEA) | 0.085 | <0.10 |

Lavaan 0.6-3 ended normally after 56 iterations, number of observations used was 493 and 27missing patterns. The pairwise deletion was used to handle the missing data. estimator is DWLS.

Model fit test Statistic ;p-value<0.001. model fitted well.

For the std.all for Attitude, all variables investigated where of statistical significance to the model as the values were greater than 0.3. The strength of relationship was in smoking (0.913) and relatively low in speaking foul language (0.652). The strength of relationship between Value and the variables were also significant to the model as smoking (0.910) and low in speaking foul language (0.719). Association with friends also was statistically significant but was high in drinking instead (0.917) and low in speaking foul language. The covariances were also statistically significant such that Attitude and association was 0.749 and Value was 0.756. Value and Association with friends was 0.604. Standard error ranged between (0.029 and0.032)

Std.all the usual boundary is meant to be greater than 0.3

### Labelling Theory

The factors affecting labelling theory were investigated.

Model fit test Statistic (43 ) =117.029 ;p<0.05

Table 4.3 Fit indices for Labelling Theory

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Goodness Of Fit test | Results | Standard |
| Comparative Fit Index (CFI) | 0.980 | 0.90 |
| Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) | 0.975 | 0.90 |
| Root Mean Square Error of Approximation: |  |  |
| RMSEA | 0.059 | <0.10 |

Lavaan 0.6-3 ended normally after 24 iterations.

For the std.all for Attitude, all variables investigated where of statistical significance to the model as the values were greater than 0.3. The strength of relationship was high in smoking (0.921) and low in speaking foul language(0.640). The strength of relationship between labelling and the variables were also significant to the model as ftc was held constant and the strength was 0.587 and above The covariances were also statistically significant such that Attitude and association was 0.749 and Value was 0.756. Value and Association with friends was 0.604. Standard error ranged between (0.029 and0.032)

### Control Theory

The control theory was tested and the method described in section 3.62 was employed and the results are presented next.

Table 4.4 Fit indices for Control Theory

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Goodness Of Fit test | Results | Standard |
| Comparative Fit Index (CFI) | 0.964 | 0.90 |
| Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) | 0.959 | 0.90 |
| Root Mean Square Error of Approximation: |  |  |
| RMSEA | 0.058 | <0.10 |

Lavaan 0.6-3 ended normally after 33 iterations.

Model fit test Statistic.(186)=496.403;p<0.001

Results for Attitude showed that all variables where appropriate for the analysis. But for the attachment to school the highest was 0.801inschools teach good citizenship and the lowest -0.199 which showed inappropriate. Attachment to parents showed were all good for the model. Covariance analysis of attachment to teachers (Standardized)was -0.425 while that of parents was -0.384. This implies that attachment to school and parent will not aid deviance. Attachment to school and parent covariance was 0.452

### Strain theory

The strain theory was investigated and the factors correlated are discussed next. Lavaan 0.6-3 ended normally after 37 iterations.

Model fit test Statistic(43) =115.213; p<0.001

Table 4.5 Fit indices for strain theory

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Goodness Of Fit test | Results | Standard |
| Comparative Fit Index (CFI) | 0.979 | 0.90 |
| Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) | 0.973 | 0.90 |
| Root Mean Square Error of Approximation: |  |  |
| RMSEA | 0.058 | <0.10 |

All standard values were positive in educational strain analysis with highest value (0.053) is how much of education the respondents are willing to attain. And lowest in the financial strain (0.156). The standardized test shows that educational strain is not likely to cause deviance (-0.194).