

**N J S E**

**NIGERIAN JOURNAL**  
*of* **SOCIOLOGY**  
**OF EDUCATION**

© **NJSE 2013**

**VOLUME VII NUMBER 2, OCTOBER, 2013**



*Supported by:*

**EDUCATION TRUST FUND**

Plot 433, Zambezi Crescent, off Aguiyi Street,  
Maitama, Abuja.

Tel: 09-4139111, 4139112, 4139101

**NJSE**

**NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF  
SOCIOLOGY OF  
EDUCATION**

**NJSE 2013**

**ISSN: 1118-1784**

**VOLUME VII NUMBER 2, OCTOBER, 2013**

**Copyright, October, 2013 NJSE**

All rights reserved, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise without the written permission of the Editors of NJSE.

**ISSN: 1118-1784**

**DAN-SiL Press,**  
*No. 49 Murtala Mohammed Way,*  
*Jos, Plateau State,*  
*Nigeria.*  
+234 (803) 4515 296

---

## EDITORIAL BOARD

*Editor-in-chief:*

**Dr. K.O. A. Noah**

Department of Educational Foundations,  
Faculty of Education,  
Lagos State University, Ojo.

*Managing Editor:*

**Dr. M.N. Sule**

Department of Educational Foundations,  
Faculty of Education,  
University of Jos.

*Editors:*

J.O. Balogun

Dr. Adesoji Oni

Dr. S.A. Dosunmu

Dr. Taiwo Edun

Dr. Mrs A. N. Okolo

*Consulting Editors:*

Prof. (Mrs) Uche Azikiwe

Prof. C.O Daramola

Prof. M.I. Junaid

Prof. Emma Obasi

Prof. C. C. Anadi

Prof. (Mrs) Julia, Oti Omokhodion

Prof. (Mrs) Oledinma P. Nwanna Nzewunwa

Prof. G.M. Mahuta

Prof. (Mrs) E.C. Okeke

## EDITORIAL NOTE

*Nigeran Journal of Sociology of Education(NJSE) is published by the Association of Sociologists of Education of Nigeria (ASEN) with the policy to produce at least one issue in a year. All articles are published basically for the promotion of scholarship while critique positions to any of them shall be welcomed and possibly published in subsequent editions of the journal.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Title of page.....  | i    |
| Copy right page.....  | ii   |
| Editorial Board.....  | iii  |
| Editorial Note.....   | iv   |
| Note to Contributors.....   | v    |
| Notes on Contributors.....  | vi   |
| Table of Contents.....  | viii |
|   |      |
| Sociological Perspectives on Social Violence in Nigeria.<br><b>Soyombo, O.....</b>  | 1    |
| Political Leaders' inflammatory Utterances and Nigerians' Perceptions of National Security.<br><b>Okafor, I. P.....</b>   | 19   |
| School-Based Violence and its Implications for Education and Society.<br><b>Oni, A.A. &amp; Agbaire, J.J.....</b>   | 30   |
| Prospects and Challenges: Management of Violence at Home Towards Girl-Child Education and Development.<br><b>Amadi, M. N.....</b>   | 41   |
| Education as Panacea for Socio – Cultural Violence Against Women.<br><b>Agu, S. O.....</b>  | 59   |
| A Conceptual Review of Undergraduate Students' Participation in Social Activities.<br><b>Ekeke, J.T. H.....</b>   | 67   |
| Causes and Effects of School Based Violence on Nigerian Secondary School Students.<br><b>Jimoh, M. &amp; Ezeana, P.....</b>   | 76   |
| Integrating Educational, Religious, and Ethnic Values for National Interest: A Strategy for Curbing Social Violence In Nigeria.<br><b>Dienye, V. U. &amp; Morrison, U. I.....</b> | 84   |
| Moral Education: A Panacea for Violence and Terrorism in Nigeria: A Sociological Perspective.<br><b>Yilben, J. J., Tali J. D. &amp; Mbwas, C. L.....</b>                          | 90   |
| Exploring Pragmatic Principles of Intelligence and Social Utility as Panacea for Social Violence.<br><b>Akinkuotu, Y. A., Olufowobi, O. O. &amp; Ayodele, Y.Q.....</b>            | 98   |
| The Family and Violence Against Women and Girls: A Contradiction in Functions.<br><b>Sule, M. N., Collins, A. E. &amp; Maijidda, M.....</b>                                       | 103  |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Managing Violence Through Nomadic Education in Nigeria.<br><b>Adediran, A. A., Olugbuyi, K. O. &amp; Balogun, M. A.</b> .....                                   | 112 |
| Religion and Violence: Historical Appraisal of the Activities of the Boko Haram Insurgence<br>in Nigeria: 2009-2012.<br><b>Falako, F. O.</b> .....              | 119 |
| Awareness of Forms of Domestic Violence Among Isu-Njaba Dwellers in Imo State.<br><b>Osuala, Q. I. &amp; Ekwebelem, I. A.</b> .....                             | 130 |
| The Role of Mothers in Controlling Voilence in Schools.<br><b>Garba, S. L. &amp; Muhammad, R.</b> .....   | 141 |
| Adult Learning in the Context of Comparative Higher Education.<br><b>Jonathan, E. O.</b> .....  | 146 |
| Media and Mediation as Measures in the Reduction of Conflict in Society.<br><b>Sirajo, A. L. &amp; Aliyu, H. K.</b> .....                                       | 157 |
| Peace Culture and Environmental Education: Repositioning Higher Education Students<br>Through Critical Literacy.<br><b>Ikonta, N. R. &amp; Onyene, V.</b> ..... | 166 |
| Violence Control Strategies in Tertiary Educational Institutions.<br><b>Umar, S. &amp; Bello, S.</b> .....  | 183 |
| Potentials of Teaching and Learning of Moral and Civic Education in the Reduction of<br>School Violence in the Society.<br><b>Nwosu, N.</b> .....               | 189 |
| Challenges of Students Unrest in Nigerian Tertiary Institutions: Causes and Way Forward.<br><b>Onyema, P. S. A., Nzulumike, C. &amp; Kulu, C. K.</b> .....      | 197 |
| The Influence of Nonconformist Subcultures on the Youth and the Emergence of School-<br>Based Violence.<br><b>Wali-Essien, R.C.</b> .....                       | 203 |
| Gender Inequality, Poverty and Social Exclusion as Indices of Social Violence: A<br>Sociological View.<br><b>Danjuma, M.</b> .....                              | 210 |
| Teachers' Assessment of the Philosophy of Nigerian Education and National Security.<br><b>Muhammed, R.</b> .....  | 217 |
| Domestic Voilence and its Effect on Societal Development.<br><b>Modoji, D. I.</b> .....   | 227 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Managing Violence Through Nomadic Education in Nigeria.<br><b>Adediran, A. A., Olugbuyi, K. O. &amp; Balogun, M. A.</b> .....                                   | 112 |
| Religion and Violence: Historical Appraisal of the Activities of the Boko Haram Insurgence<br>in Nigeria: 2009-2012.<br><b>Falako, F. O.</b> .....              | 119 |
| Awareness of Forms of Domestic Violence Among Isu-Njaba Dwellers in Imo State.<br><b>Osuala, Q. I. &amp; Ekwebelem, I. A.</b> .....                             | 130 |
| The Role of Mothers in Controlling Voilence in Schools.<br><b>Garba, S. L. &amp; Muhammad, R.</b> .....   | 141 |
| Adult Learning in the Context of Comparative Higher Education.<br><b>Jonathan, E. O.</b> .....  | 146 |
| Media and Mediation as Measures in the Reduction of Conflict in Society.<br><b>Sirajo, A. L. &amp; Aliyu, H. K.</b> .....                                       | 157 |
| Peace Culture and Environmental Education: Repositioning Higher Education Students<br>Through Critical Literacy.<br><b>Ikonta, N. R. &amp; Onyene, V.</b> ..... | 166 |
| Violence Control Strategies in Tertiary Educational Institutions.<br><b>Umar, S. &amp; Bello, S.</b> .....  | 183 |
| Potentials of Teaching and Learning of Moral and Civic Education in the Reduction of<br>School Violence in the Society.<br><b>Nwosu, N.</b> .....               | 189 |
| Challenges of Students Unrest in Nigerian Tertiary Institutionss: Causes and Way Forward.<br><b>Onyema, P. S. A., Nzulumike, C. &amp; Kulu, C. K.</b> .....     | 197 |
| The Influence of Nonconformist Subcultures on the Youth and the Emergence of School-<br>Based Violence.<br><b>Wali-Essien, R.C.</b> .....                       | 203 |
| Gender Inequality, Poverty and Social Exclusion as Indices of Social Violence: A<br>Sociological View.<br><b>Danjuma, M.</b> .....                              | 210 |
| Teachers' Assessment of the Philosophy of Nigerian Education and National Security.<br><b>Muhammed, R.</b> .....  | 217 |
| Domestic Voilence and its Effect on Societal Development.<br><b>Modoji, D. I.</b> .....   | 227 |



|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Curbing School Based Violence for Effective Teaching and Learning.<br><b>Abubakar, S. M. &amp; Muhammad, L. I.</b> .....  | 231 |
| Prevalence of and Strategies for Managing Delinquency Among Secondary School Students<br>in Ilorin Kwara State Nigeria.<br><b>Abdulaziz, I. &amp; Saba, M. D.</b> .....   | 240 |
| Ilorin Emirate Teachers' Perception of Group Dynamics Classroom Seating Arrangement in<br>Upper Basic Schools as a Means of Promoting Violence- Free Society.<br><b>Yusuf, A., Amali, I.O.O., Bello, M.B., &amp; Isiaka, A.</b> ..... | 251 |

# ILORIN EMIRATE TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF GROUP DYNAMICS CLASSROOM SEATING ARRANGEMENT IN UPPER BASIC SCHOOLS AS A MEANS OF PROMOTING VIOLENCE- FREE SOCIETY

Yusuf, A., Amali, I.O.O., Bello, M.B., & Isiaka, A.

Department of Arts and social Sciences Education, Faculty of Education,  
University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State.

## Abstract

The paper investigates the Ilorin Emirate teachers' perception of group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society. 357 teachers were randomly selected from 20 Upper Basic Schools in Ilorin Emirate. Researchers designed questionnaire was used to for data collection. The data collected was analyzed using mean rating, t-test and ANOVA. Among others, it was discovered that the respondents had positive perception of group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society. From the research hypotheses tested, the findings revealed that there was no significant difference in the teachers' perception of group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on gender, experience, ethnicity and school type. The study recommended that, teacher should employ classroom learning structure that will promote tolerance, self- respect, respect for others, and their dignity as well as development of social interaction among the diverse ethnic groups in Nigeria.

## Introduction

The sound and sight of bomb explosions were alien to most adult Nigerians when they were growing up except the ones they heard from other countries and the ones they probably watched in movies. Anytime a bomb-related story was read in the newspapers, it must be from another country. Then, throwing bombs was synonymous with countries at war, especially those in trouble spots in the Middle-East. But that which used to be a foreign culture has been gradually domesticated in Nigeria. Today, terrorism and terrorists are right here in our midst, and the effects of their machinations are staring everyone in the face (Makinde, 2012).

Terrorism is unarguably very deadly, but the growing insecurity in Nigeria is not limited to this alone; robbers are on the prowl, raping, maiming and killing innocent people on the road, in their houses and even inside places of worship. Killing for ritual purposes has continued to be on the rise although the nation has embraced the computer age (Makinde, 2012). Political violence is on the increase, and many Nigerians have been mowed down by the bullets of assassins to settle political scores. Kidnapping has become a lucrative business in the country; none is exempted as people of high and low statuses are abducted daily for ransom by armed youths.

It is axiomatic to say that security is central to development, and the national transformation agenda of the current administration will come to nought if there is no solution to the menace of insecurity ravaging the country. Nigeria has since been caught in the web of violent crimes and efforts to disentangle the nation from these social maladies have been futile, and this has made the problems to sink deeper into the recess of the country. The Nigerian security agencies appear to have little or no control over the situation; a situation that has made the ordinary law-abiding citizen to lose confidence in the capacity of the state to protect lives and property of the citizens. There is a strong scepticism that if the level of insecurity in our country is not scaled down, our vision to be among the best 20 countries of the world may be aborted.

In fact, the dimension which violence situation in the country has assumed is appalling. It is based on this fact that no one should expect the security agencies alone to tackle the problem of insecurity in the country. This called for why scholars, lawmakers, and academia consider education sector as an alternative to curbing societal violence. This is because sociologists of education like Durkheim (1961), Ottaway (1980) among others observed that there is a strong relationship between education and society. This observation is borne out of the fact that it is impossible to separate or draw any line of demarcation between the two concepts. Empirical evidence has shown that what happens to the educational system undoubtedly affects the society and whatever occurs in the society influences or shapes the educational system in all its ramifications (Meighan, 1986).

Thus, schools are established in many societies of the world to instill in the students those skills which will afford them the opportunity of taking their rightful positions in the society. This is done through different strategies, which could be teaching methods, content of the curriculum as well as school setting and classroom seating arrangement (Lawin, 1999). Teacher in the school adopted any of these strategies in order to achieve its aims, depending on the nature and phenomenon that arise. According to Pinter (2009), seating arrangement is the way by which desks and chairs are arranged in a classroom. This could either be, traditional row seating, L-shape, U-shape, Horseshoes- shape among others.

Traditional fixed row seating arrangement is the most commonly used strategies that schools in Nigeria have adopted in the teaching and learning process over time. Ramsden (1999) pointed out that the traditional arrangement could no longer meet the social need and at the same time promote cooperation and social integration which the society requires in recent times. Based on this, Forsyth (1990) and Perry and Bussey (1984) advocated for the use of group dynamics seating arrangement (cooperative learning) as the alternative, that is capable of promoting social interaction, integration, peace and unity which will eventually influence the students positively in the larger society. According to Montagu (1965), society cannot survive without the cooperation of its members, and the society of man has survived because the cooperativeness of its members made survival possible. It was not an advantageous individual here and there who did so, but the group. In human societies, the individuals who are most likely to survive are those who are best enabled to do so by their group.

How students sit and interact with one another is a neglected aspect of instruction. Much training time is devoted to helping teachers arrange appropriate interactions between students and materials (i.e., textbooks, curriculum programs) and sometimes is spent on how teachers should interact with students, but how students should interact with one another is relatively ignored. How teachers structure student-student interaction patterns have a lot to say about how well students learn, how they feel about school and the teacher, how they interact with and tolerate each other and their views, and how much self-esteem they have. It is in the researchers' opinion that group dynamic seating arrangement would go a long way in promoting cooperative living and learning in the classroom, school environment, immediate community and the Nigerian society at large.

In the mid-1960s, cooperative learning was relatively unknown and largely ignored by educators (Johnson and Johnson, 2009). Teaching at all levels was dominated by competitive and individualistic learning. Cultural resistance to cooperative learning was based on social Darwinism, with its premise that students must be taught to survive in a "dog-eat-dog" world, and the myth of "rugged individualism" underlying the use of individualistic learning. While competition dominated educational thought, it was being challenged by individualistic learning

largely based on B. F. Skinner's work on programmed learning and behavioural modification. Educational practices and thought, however, have to change. Research findings on cooperative learning structure (group dynamics) have confirmed that, the instructional model allows the teacher's attention to nurture and manage the classroom, student behaviour, and social aspects of learning that contribute significantly to promote an environment that is conducive to teaching and learning. In addition, it has the capacity to promote social integration and unity (Diane, Smith and Brian, 2008). However, many teachers are used to group dynamic seating arrangement. It may be as a result of their perception.

Perception is our sensory experience of the world around us involves both the recognition of environmental stimuli and action in response to these stimuli. Through the perceptual process, we gain information about properties and elements of the environment that are critical to our survival. Hall and Langton (2006), studies revealed that, three main factors responsible to shape and sometimes distort perception. These factors can reside:

- a. In the perceiver (characteristics)
- b. In the Object or target being perceived or
- c. In the context of the situation in which the perception is made.

Cooperative learning structure is now an accepted and often the preferred instructional procedure at all levels of education. Cooperative learning is presently used in schools and universities in every part of the world, in every subject area, and with every age student (Johnson and Johnson, 2009). One way of promoting cooperative is through the use of group dynamic seating arrangement.

#### **Purpose of the Study**

The main purpose of the study is to examine the perception of teachers on the use of group dynamics seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society. Specifically, the study tries to investigate;

1. The perception of teachers on group dynamics seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on gender.
2. The perception of teachers on group dynamics seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on years of experience in the teaching service
3. The perception of teachers on group dynamics seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on school type
4. The perception of teachers on group dynamics seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on ethnicity

#### **Research Questions**

1. What is the perception of teachers on the use of group dynamics seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society?
2. Is there any difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on gender?
3. Is there any difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on years of experience in teaching service?
4. Is there any difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on school type?
5. Is there any difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on ethnicity?

### Research Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on gender
2. There is no significant difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on years of experience in teaching service
3. There is no significant difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on school type
4. There is no significant difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on ethnicity

### Methodology

The descriptive survey design was used in this study. The choice of the descriptive survey was in line with Akuezulo and Agu (2003), who maintained that it is concerned with gathering of information on peoples' opinion. The target population for this study comprised all the teachers of upper basic schools in Ilorin Emirate. There are 6,387 Upper Basic School teachers in Ilorin Emirate (which comprises of Ilorin south, Ilorin west, Ilorin central, Asa and Moro Local Government Areas) of Kwara State out of which 357 respondents were purposively sampled. This is in line with Research Advisors (2006) table for selecting the sample size. The respondents consisted of both male and female teachers. Stratified sampling technique was used to select 20 schools from the three senatorial district.

A 10-item four point-likert scale researchers designed questionnaire was used for eliciting the needed data from the respondents. The questionnaire items were validated by experts in the Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education, University of Ilorin to ensure its face and content validity. This is in line with Sambo (2008) who maintained that the best procedure for validating research instrument is to give it to a panel of experts. A test- re-test reliability method was carried out with a sample of four secondary schools within Ilorin metropolis. Three-week interval period was given. The scores of the first were correlated with the scores of the second using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient and reliability index of 0.67 was obtained. The questionnaire contained two sections, Bio-data of the respondent constituted the first section while the second contained 10 items with 4 points responses (Strongly Agreed (4), Agreed (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1). The questionnaires were administered to the respondents by the researchers in the company of trained research assistants. The data collected was analyzed using mean rating with 2.5 as accepted means value, t-test was used to test hypotheses 1,2 and 3 while ANOVA was used to test hypothesis 4 at 0.05 alpha level using IBM SPSS 20 vision

### Results

The research questions are answered as followed:

**Research question 1:** What is the perception of teachers on the use of group dynamics seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society?

**Table 1: Responses of Teachers' on the perception of group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society**

| s/n | Items  | SA  | A   | D  | SD | Mean |
|-----|--|-----|-----|----|----|------|
| 1   | Group dynamics seating arrangement is appropriate for the multi- cultural Nigerian society.  | 219 | 116 | 17 | 5  | 3.57 |
| 2   | With Group dynamics seating arrangement, students in each group learn from others.   | 312 | 45  | -  | -  | 3.87 |
| 3   | Group dynamics seating arrangement promotes cooperative learning.  | 197 | 143 | 6  | 11 | 3.47 |
| 4   | Group dynamics, as the new seating arrangement, can lead to friendship among the learners in the classroom if well managed.                    | 178 | 97  | 51 | 31 | 3.18 |
| 5   | Group dynamics seating arrangement allow the students from different ethnic background to understand their cultural differences                | 133 | 179 | 35 | 10 | 3.21 |
| 6   | Group dynamics seating arrangement promote social interaction among students in the group.   | 301 | 45  | 9  | 2  | 3.80 |
| 7   | Group dynamics seating arrangement promotes tolerance among students in the group.   | 257 | 87  | 5  | 8  | 3.66 |
| 8   | Group dynamics seating arrangement encourages respect for other people views.  | 257 | 87  | 5  | 8  | 3.66 |
| 9   | Group dynamics seating arrangement is an instructional strategy that promotes living together of students from different cultural backgrounds. | 257 | 87  | 5  | 8  | 3.66 |
| 10  | Group dynamics seating arrangement help students in the group to learn to settle their differences amicably.                                   | 227 | 93  | 20 | 17 | 3.48 |

Table 1 showed that the respondents had positive perception of group- dynamic seating arrangement as a means of promoting violent- free society. This is because the mean scores of all the items range from 3.18- 3.87. This indicated that teachers perceived group- dynamic- seating arrangement as a means of promoting violent- free society.

**Hypothesis One:** There is no significant difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on gender.

**Table 2: Responses of Teachers' on the perception of group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society on the basis of gender**

|        | N   | Mean  | Std.D | t-test | df  | Sig (2-tail) | Decision |
|--------|-----|-------|-------|--------|-----|--------------|----------|
| Male   | 124 | 40.91 | 2.98  |        |     |              |          |
| Female | 233 | 40.46 | 1.81  | -1.51  | 355 | 0.13         | Accepted |

Table 2 showed the t-test value of male and female teachers to be -1.51 with  $P > 0.05$ . Since  $P > 0.05$  level of significant, the null hypothesis was accepted. Meaning there was no significant difference in the perception of teachers of group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society on the basis of gender.

**Hypothesis One:** There is no significant difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on gender.

**Table 2: Responses of Teachers' on the perception of group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society on the basis of gender**

|        | N   | Mean  | Std.D | t-test | df  | Sig (2-tail) | Decision |
|--------|-----|-------|-------|--------|-----|--------------|----------|
| Male   | 124 | 40.91 | 2.98  |        |     |              |          |
| Female | 233 | 40.46 | 1.81  | -1.51  | 355 | 0.13         | Accepted |

Table 2 showed the t-test value of male and female teachers to be -1.51 with  $P > 0.05$ . Since  $P > 0.05$  level of significant, the null hypothesis was accepted. Meaning there was no significant difference in the perception of teachers of group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society on the basis of gender.



**Hypothesis Two:** There is no significant difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence-free society based on years of experience in teaching service.

**Table 3: Responses of Teachers' on the perception of group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence-free society on the basis of years of experience.**

|                    | N   | Mean  | Std.D | t-test | df  | Sig (2-tail) | Decision |
|--------------------|-----|-------|-------|--------|-----|--------------|----------|
| 10 years and above | 237 | 41.20 | 2.08  | -1.71  | 355 | 0.80         | Accepted |
| less than 5 years  | 120 | 41.61 | 2.02  |        |     |              |          |

Table 3 revealed t-test -1.71 thus,  $P = 0.80 > 0.05$ . This indicated that all the teachers regardless of their years of experience in teaching profession do not differ significantly in the way they perceived the use of group dynamics classroom seating arrangement in promoting violence-free society.

**Hypothesis Three:** There is no significant difference in the perception of teachers on group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society based on school type.

**Table 4: Responses of Teachers' on the perception of group dynamics classroom seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence- free society on the basis of school type**

|                | N   | Mean  | Std.D | t-test | df  | Sig (2-tail) | Decision |
|----------------|-----|-------|-------|--------|-----|--------------|----------|
| Public schools | 202 | 41.98 | 1.26  | 1.06   | 355 | 0.29         | Accepted |
| Private school | 155 | 41.81 | 1.60  |        |     |              |          |

The table above showed the t-test= 1.06, P-value: 0.29 > 0.05. In other words, the hypothesis was accepted. This means that there was no significant difference in the perception of public and private schools teachers of group dynamic seating arrangement as a means of promoting violence free society.

## References

- Akuezuilo, E. & Agu, N. (2003). *Research and statistics in education and social sciences*. Awka; Nuel centi publishers.
- Diane, P. B., Smith, D. D. & Brian, R. B. (2008). Promoting positive behavior and facilitating social skills. Retrieved from: [www.ablongman.com/bryantle](http://www.ablongman.com/bryantle).
- Durkheim, E. (1961). *Moral Education, English Translation*. London: Free Press.
- Forsyth, D. R. (1990) *Group dynamics*. California, USA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Hall, D. & Langton, B. (2006). Perceptions of the Status of Teachers: This report is part of a series of reports carried out for the Ministry of Education and the New Zealand Teachers Council as part of the Teacher Status Project. Retrieved from: [www.tetachers%20percpeption%20of%20teaching%205971.htm](http://www.tetachers%20percpeption%20of%20teaching%205971.htm).
- Johnson, D. W. (2003). Social interdependence: The interrelationships among theory, research and practice. *American Psychologist*, 58 (11), 931-945.
- Johnson, D.W. (2009). *Reaching out: Interpersonal effectiveness and self-actualization* (10<sup>th</sup>ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, F. (2009). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (10<sup>th</sup>ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson D. W. & Johnson, R. (1989). *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Lazarowitz, R. & Karsenty, G. (1989). Cooperative learning and students' academic achievement, process skills, learning environment and self-esteem in tenth grade biology classroom. In S. Sharan (Ed.), *Cooperative Learning Theory and Practice*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishing Co.
- Makinde, F. (2012). Finding way out of labyrinth of insecurity. Retrieved from: [www.punchdaily-digest](http://www.punchdaily-digest).
- Meighan, R. (1986). *Sociology of educating*. London: Cassel Educational
- Montagu, A. (1966). *On being human*. New York: Hawthorn.
- Ottaway, A.K.C. (1980) *Education and Society An Introduction to the Sociology of Education*. New York: The Humanities Press.
- Pitner, S. (2009). How to plan a classroom seating arrangement: Retrieved from: [www.how-to-plan-a-classroom-seating/agragemnet-a122150](http://www.how-to-plan-a-classroom-seating/agragemnet-a122150).
- Amsden, A. O. (1999). Seating arrangements. Retrieved from : [www.ematuson.soe.udel.edu](http://www.ematuson.soe.udel.edu).
- Sambo, A. A. (2008). *Research methods in education*. Edo: Stirling-Horden Publishers.
- Sharan, Y. & Sharan, S. (1990). Group investigation expands cooperative learning. *Educational Leadership*, 47,4, 17-21.
- Haran, S. & Sharchar. H. (1988). *Language and Learning in the Cooperative Classroom*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Co.
- Smith, P. L. & Ragan, T. J. (2005). *Instructional Design* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley Publishing.
- Vaughan, J. I. & Hogg, U.J. (2010). Group dynamics. Processes and development. Retrieved from: [www.group-dynamic/7730877pdf](http://www.group-dynamic/7730877pdf).