

Peer Relationship, Bullying and Victimization among Adolescents

Nu Nu Nyunt¹ & Myo Myo Myat²

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the peer relationship, bullying and peer victimization among adolescents. Then, this study aimed to compare the peer relationship by gender, age groups, school locations, socio-economic status and life event. Quantitative research design was used in this study. The sample for this study was chosen from four Basic Education High Schools located in Yangon Region. A total of 312 adolescent students in selected schools participated. The peer relationship among adolescents was examined by using questionnaire survey method. The Peer Relations Questionnaire (PRQ) developed by Rigby, K. and Slee, P.T. (1993) was used as research instrument to measure the peer relationship among adolescents. The results of independent sample t-test revealed that significant difference was not found on all three subscales of peer relation by gender. ANOVA results pointed out that significant difference was not found on all three subscales of peer relation by age groups. And then, ANOVA results revealed that significant difference was found on Pro-social subscale of peer relation by school location. In addition, the result of ANOVA confirmed that significant difference was found on Bullying subscale of peer relation by socio-economic status. Independent sample t-test revealed that a significant difference was found on Victim subscale of peer relation by life event.

Keyword: peer relationship, socio-economic status, pro-social behavior, adolescents, bullying, peer victimization

Introduction

Importance of the Study

An important factor in adolescent development is how they get along with others. Relations between others are very important for life success. Relation includes what to say with others, how to make and keep

¹ Dr. Lecturer, Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education

² Senior Teacher, Basic Education High School No 3, South Dagon Township, Yangon Region

friends, how to work well with others, how to make good choices and how to act in different social situations. Most children acquire positive relations in their day-to-day interactions with others (Pathirana, 2016).

Peer relationships offer unique opportunities for getting acquainted with social norms and processes involved in interpersonal relationships and for learning new social skills. They also provide contexts in which capacities for self-control may be tested and refined (Boivin, 2005). Research findings have also consistently documented that friendships, as well as successful adaptation in the peer group play an important role in adolescents' social and cognitive development, protect them from feelings of loneliness and social dissatisfaction, minimize stress deriving from major changes in adolescents' lives and work as "emotional supports" (Dunn, 2004). Therefore, it is important to explore the peer relationship among adolescents.

Purposes of the Study

- (1) To compare the peer relationship among male and female adolescent students.
- (2) To examine the peer relationship among adolescents by school locations, age groups, socio-economic status and life event

Review of Related Literature

Adolescence is a critical period in social development, marked by an expansion of peer networks, increased importance of close-friendships, and the emergence of romantic relationships. Changes in adolescent physical and cognitive development are also accompanied by major changes in an adolescent's relationships with others. This includes family members and friends.

Nature of Peer Relationship in Adolescents

Peer relation refers to associations among equals, but in reality the equality is confined to individuals who share the same life stage. Peer relations become more salient in adolescence. The transition from childhood to adolescence engenders changes in the individual, social context, and social norms that serve to elevate the importance of peers. Young people become likely to spend more time with age mates, often with reduced oversight by adults, and they put greater stock in the expectations and opinions of peers. In some arenas, peers compete with adults as a

significant source of influence on adolescent attitudes, activities, and emotional well-being (Brown & Larson, 2008).

Peer relation tends to develop between adolescents that are most similar in nature, interest, social class and ethnic backgrounds than younger age friendships. While childhood friendships tend to be based on common activities, adolescent friendships expand to include similarities in attitudes, values, as well as shared activities.

The concept of peer relations in educational psychology is related to understanding relationships between fellow peers in terms of their acceptance, rejection, or friendship (Asher & Coie, 1990). Children's friendships have inevitable ups and downs. The feelings of satisfaction and security that most children derive from interacting with peers outweigh periodic problems. For a number of children, however, peer relations are constantly problematic. Some children are actively rejected by peers while others are simply ignored or neglected. It even appears that some popular children have many friends but nevertheless feel alone and unhappy (Newcomb & Bagwell, 1995). It is necessary to understand the role of peer relations as an important part of social and emotional development of children and adolescents. Harry Sullivan (1953) proposed that experiences with peers in childhood and early adolescence provide learning opportunities for important social skills such as cooperation, altruism, and empathy. He further argued that interactions with real and imagined others were the basis of the self in terms of building one's personality. It is also related to adjustment to school, self-worth, and self-esteem (Connell & Wellborn, 1991).

Peers are important in children's academic development, social functioning, and psychological well-being (Wentzel, 2009). In particular, peer acceptance, whether an individual is liked or disliked by his peers, is an indication of well-being. Also, peer rejection has been able to forecast adjustment problems in adulthood (Parker & Asher, 1993). Peer relationships can be important sources of affection, intimacy, reliable alliance, feelings of inclusion, and enhancement of self-worth (Erdley et al., 2001), and have been linked to both the current and future well-being of children. Research studies have demonstrated that having positive peer relationships in the early elementary school years is associated with an increase in social competence and acceptance throughout the later school years (Kupersmidt & Coie, 1990), whereas poor peer relationships are

known to forecast negative outcomes later in life such as early school withdrawal, delinquency, substance abuse, and mental health problems (McDougall, Hymel, Vaillancourt, & Mercer, 2001).

Children who engage positively with their peers also tend to be more motivated in school and perform better on academic tasks (Wentzel, 2009). In addition to its relationship to academic outcomes, peer acceptance also has been found to be significantly associated with self-reported well-being. Engaging in positive relationships with peers has been linked to higher levels of emotional well-being, increased adoption of values for pro-social behaviors, and more positive beliefs about the self (Rubin et al., 2006). Positive youth development (Benson et al., 2006) is one such example where the researchers are looking at the strengths and capacities of youth rather than looking at their weaknesses. Well-liked children tend to be kind, cooperative, friendly, and helpful, whereas rejected children tend to show heightened levels of aggression, disruptive behaviors, withdrawal, and submissive behaviors (Asher & McDonald, 2009).

Decovic and Gerris (1994) reported that besides having social cognition skills, being perceived as helpful, cooperative, empathic, and sympathetic by peers significantly predicted popularity in the peer group students. Greener (2000) found that children who were rated as more pro-social by their peers had fewer social adjustment problems than children who were perceived to be less pro-social. Studies have also found that anxious youth perceive themselves as being rejected by their classmates and report fewer friendships than do non-anxious youth. Children's peer acceptance is positively associated to psychological adjustment and pro-social behaviors and negatively associated with aggression and maladjustment (Juvonen & Graham, 2001).

Types of Peer Relationships

As the children get older, the dynamics of the social groups change. Instead of attending a small local school, children may go to a large school attended by students from many neighborhoods. In such situation, they have the opportunities to meet people of all ages, races, religions and backgrounds. Interaction with peer can enrich students' life and contribute to personal growth. According to Gooden (2015), there are seven types of peer relationship such as friendship, platonic friendship, casual friendship, close friends, clique, prejudice and stereotype.

Friendship is a significant relationship between two people. Friendships are based on caring, respect, trust, and consideration. Friends are people who share hobbies, interests with others. They may also become peers who are comfortable sharing their needs, wants, emotions, and confidences.

Platonic friendship is a friendship with a member of the opposite gender in which there is affection but the two people are not considered a couple. Such relationships can help peer understand and become comfortable with individuals of the opposite gender. Platonic friendship helps to realize that all people, regardless of gender, have similar feelings, needs and concerns.

Casual friendship is a relationship between peers who share something in common. Peer may form a casual friendship with a classmate. Casual friends are people who share interests but are not necessarily people who form deep emotional bonds.

Close friends have strong emotional ties and feel comfortable sharing their thoughts, experiences, and feelings. They trust and support each other, acting with kindness, courtesy, and loyalty. When problems arise in the relationship, close friends will try to work them out together.

Clique is a small circle of friends usually with similar backgrounds or tastes, who exclude people viewed as outsiders. Clique members may share the same attitudes, wear similar clothing, meet regularly in an area identified as their "truf" or engage in other behaviors that identify them as a clique. Clique can have positive and negative peer influences on peer. Clique may provide members with a sense of belonging. A clique is a negative influence if members are discouraged from thinking for themselves or acting as individuals. Clique membership is limited – not everyone who wants to belong is welcome.

Prejudice is making assumptions or judgments about an individual without really know him or her.

Stereotype is an exaggerated or an oversimplified belief about an entire group of people, such as an ethnic or religious group or gender (Gooden, 2015).

Peer Group

A peer group is defined as a small group of similarly aged fairly close friends, sharing the same activities. Peer groups provide a variety of

positive experiences for adolescents. Castrogiovanni (2002) cited the following: (1) the opportunity to learn how to interact with others; (2) support in defining identity, interests, abilities, and personality; (3) autonomy without control of adults and parents; (4) opportunities for witnessing the strategies others use to cope with similar problems, and for observing how effective they are; (5) involved emotional support and; (6) building and maintaining friendships. According to Black (2002), peer groups provide a forum where teens construct and reconstruct their identities. Castrogiovanni (2002) stated that at no other stage of development is one's sense of identity so unstable. A peer-labeling process may be contributing to the construction of positive identities for some adolescents but negative identities for others (Downs & Rose, 1991). Unfortunately, members of groups may accept negative labels, incorporate them into their identity, and through the process of secondary deviance, increase levels of deviant behavior. Teenagers learn about what is acceptable in their social group by "reading" their friends' reactions to how they act, what they wear, and what they say. The peer group gives this potent feedback by their words and actions, which either encourages or discourages certain behaviors and attitudes (Howard, 2004).

Peer groups are constantly evolving and many factors play a role in how peer groups function today. Lingren (1995) cited some interesting facts about peer relations. These facts may help adults better understand the potential foundation of some peer group behaviors during adolescence. Adults should understand the facts surrounding peer relations before forming an opinion about adolescent groups in general. First, during adolescence, parents and their children are more physically and psychologically distant from each other. This is a normal process, but it is shown in decreases in emotional closeness and warmth, increases in parent-adolescent conflict/disagreement, and an increase in time adolescents spend with peers. Second, increases in family strains, such as economic pressures and divorce, have prompted teenagers to depend more on peers for emotional support. Third, in ten to twenty percent of families, parents and adolescents are in distressed relationships characterized by emotional coldness and frequent outbursts of anger/conflict. Fourth, youth gangs commonly associated with inner-city neighborhoods are becoming a more common phenomenon among youth in smaller cities, suburbs, and even rural areas. Fifth, formal dating patterns have been replaced with informal socializing patterns in mixed-sex groups. This may encourage casual sexual

relationships that heighten the risk of teenage pregnancy, AIDS, and other sexually transmitted diseases. Sixth, ethnicity is replacing individual abilities or interests as the basis for defining peer “crowds.” Finally, the increase in part-time employment among youth has had little effect on peer relations. In order to spend time with peers, teenagers drop extracurricular activities, reduce time spent on homework, and withdraw from family functions. It is clear that everything from family strain to ethnicity plays a role in how peer groups develop and operate. All of these factors have the potential for creating greater peer influence in or outside of school, and sometimes have the consequence of generating increased pressures on adolescents to engage in problematic behaviors. Some parents may assume that they are the only family experiencing frustration with some of their adolescent’s behaviors when, in reality, frustration between parents and adolescents is a fairly universal occurrence (Howard, 2004).

Peer Status

Peer status is defined as the extent to which children are liked or disliked by groups of peers such as classmates (Schneider, Wiener, & Murphy, 1994). Children may be evaluated in terms of the degree to which they are liked (acceptance/popularity) or disliked by most children (rejection). When nomination socio-metrics are used (i.e., when children are asked to nominate a designated number of children they like or dislike), some children receive very few nominations in either category and are termed neglected (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982).

Peer status in children is important because children who are rejected by peers are at risk for a variety of disorders in childhood and adulthood. One of the most consistent findings on children and adolescents is that they are less likely to be socially accepted and more likely to be socially neglected and rejected by peers than typically functioning children (Wiener, 1987). Bryan (1976) found that children maintained their low peer acceptance over a period of two years even though teachers and classmates had changed. The peer status of children declines over the course of a school year; that is, many children who have average social status at the beginning of the school year are seen as neglected or rejected by the end of the school year (Kuhne & Wiener, 2000).

Peer rejection of children is high in studies of children in contained special education classes of children in mainstream settings who are pulled out to go to a resource room and of children in fully inclusive settings. Peer

neglect, however, is most common for children in self-contained special education classes (Coben & Zigmond, 1986).

Peer Pressure

Peer pressure is defined as when people your own age encourage or urge you to do something or to keep from doing something else, no matter if you personally want to do it or not (Ryan, 2000). The more subtle form of peer pressure is known as peer influence, and it involves changing one's behavior to meet the perceived expectations of others. In general, most teens conform to peer pressure about fairly insignificant things like music, clothing, or hairstyles. When it comes to more important issues like moral values, parents still remain more influential than the peer group (Black, 2002).

Peer, together with their way of life and choices, lead a person into another world that may provide positive and negative impacts on their behavior and personality. Peers can greatly affect the way of perception and behavior of a certain individual, whether in a good way or bad way. Peer pressure gives both benefits and drawbacks to the person involved. Peer pressure is the direct influence on people by peers or an individual who get encouraged to follow their peers by changing their attitudes, values and behavior to conform to those of the influencing group. Peer pressure causes an individual to change in response to a feeling of being pressure. Social groups affected include both membership groups, in which individual are "formally" members and cliques in which membership is not clearly defined. A person does not need to be a member of a group to be affected by peer pressure. Peer pressure can affect individuals of all ethnicities, genders, and ages.

Adolescence is the time when a person is most susceptible to peer pressure because peers become an important influence on behavior during adolescence. Peer pressure has been called a hallmark of adolescent experience. Adolescents become aware for the first time of the other people around them and realize the importance of perception in their interactions. Peer conformity in young people is most pronounced with respect to style, taste, appearance, ideology, and values. Peer pressure is commonly associated with episodes of adolescent risk taking because these activities commonly occur in the company of peers. Affiliation with friends who engage in risk behaviors has been shown to be a strong predictor of an adolescent's own behavior. Peer pressure can have positive effects when

adolescents are pressured by their peer toward positive behavior. Peer pressure was greatest among more popular adolescents because they were the children most attuned to the judgments of their peer. Peer pressure is widely recognized as a major contributor to the initiation of drug use, particularly adolescents (Brown, 2004).

Peer Victimization

Peer victimization is defined as “actions taken by one or more youths with the intention of inflicting physical or psychological injury or pain on another youth” (Vernberg, Jacobs, & Hershberger, 1999). Peer victimization can be overt, relational, or reputational. Overt victimization involves bringing harm to another through physical acts (e.g., punching, hitting, scratching, pinching, verbal threats). Relational victimization is defined as “willful attempts to damage another youth’s self-esteem, social status, or close relationships through social exclusion, negative gossip, or friendship manipulation” (Coleman & Byrd, 2003). Reputational victimization can be defined as “attempts to damage the victim’s social reputation within the peer group hierarchy”. Relational and reputational victimization have been found to be conceptually distinct types of victimization in that reputational victimization is aimed at damaging one’s standing in the peer group as a whole, while relational victimization is directed at one’s standing in a particular friendship group or clique (Prinstein & Cillessen, 2003).

During adolescence, relational victimization is more common than overt victimization, although boys report higher levels of overt victimization than girls do. Three types of peer victimization are related to psychosocial adjustment and the factors that may moderate this relationship. Several studies have found high rates of victimization among adolescents (Holt & Espelage, 2003). Victimization can be considered as chronic life stressor. Peer victimization is a life stressor. Stress has been defined as “environmental events or chronic conditions that objectively threaten the physical and/or psychological health or well-being of individuals of a particular age in a particular society” (Grant et al., 2003). Rigby (1998) described peer victimization as occurring in stressful situations, in which individuals have aversive peer experiences and are deprived of social support from peers. In addition, he noted that victims often cannot predict when they will be victimized or when victimization will cease and that they

have difficulty escaping their victimizers, all of which can lead to poor physical and mental reactions to stress (Rigby, 1998).

Peer victimization has been shown to be associated with a number of negative outcomes. Hawker and Boulton (2000) found that peer victimization in children and adolescents is most strongly related to depression and then to loneliness, low self-esteem and anxiety. Adolescents are of particular concern because peer victimization may disrupt the natural tasks of this developmental period, including identity development and increasing independence. Peer victimization during adolescence may be more damaging than early or later victimization. Although peer victimization often leads to negative consequences, this may not be the case for all adolescents (Newman et al., 2005).

Nature of Bullying

Bullying is quite prevalent in the school setting and has important adverse effects on many areas of the adolescents' life. It is a specific type of aggression in which an intention to harm or disturb can be identified, occurs repeatedly over time and there is an imbalance of power, with a more powerful person or group attacking a less powerful one. According to a widely used research definition of bullying a student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students.

Negative actions are further defined as when someone (the "perpetrator") intentionally inflicts, or attempts to inflict, injury or discomfort upon another (the "victim"). Negative actions can be verbal, including threatening, taunting, teasing, or name calling, or physical, such as hitting, kicking, pushing, shoving or pinching. Being a victim of bullying has been associated with lower self-esteem, depressive symptomatology, anxiety, physical and psychosomatic symptoms, suicidal ideation and suicide. On the other hand, being a perpetrator has been associated with aggression, antisocial personality, criminality and substance abuse. As regards the direction of causality, studies have shown that bullying appears to be a potential risk factor for mental health problems, since it usually precedes the onset of emotional difficulties.

A large number of studies conducted in different countries indicate that bullying at school occurs all over the world and is not confined to any geographical region, socioeconomic or cultural group. The prevalence,

however, of bullying varies considerably between countries. Regarding socioeconomic status, lower parental education and poorer academic achievement of the student in school have been associated with bullying. An international study showed that being a victim was more common among adolescents from families of lower socioeconomic position and this association appeared to be relatively strong across several countries (Magklara, 2012).

Pro-social Behaviors

Pro-social behavior and peer relationships have primarily focused on the receipt of pro-social acts from peers and its effect on developmental outcomes. The receipt of pro-social behaviors, or pro-social support from peers, has been recognized as a protective factor against the effects of peer victimization on a child's subsequent adjustment. In the associations between pro-social support, peer victimization, and loneliness, researchers found that the effect of peer victimization on loneliness was moderated by pro-social support from peers. That is, children who were overtly or relationally victimized yet received pro-social support from peers were significantly less lonely than those who were victimized and received no pro-social support from peers. Pro-social support serves as an important protective factor for victimized children.

Pro-social interactions allow children to build self-esteem, to gain emotional support, and to implement effective social skills. Peer interactions that are likely to decrease the negative effects of peer victimization. Although researchers have begun to understand the positive developmental effects of pro-social support, the research has been limited within this area. In particular, although pro-social support from peers has been examined in the victimization-adjustment models, the potential impact of children's own pro-social behavioral tendencies, have not yet been explored in these models.

Pro-social behavior has been linked with a variety of positive psychosocial indices including adequate social competence with peers, increased perspective taking and interactional skills, adequate conflict resolution, and increased levels of empathy and emotional regulation. Although researchers are aware of the positive outcomes of pro-social behaviors, its potentially unique role for victimized children remains unexamined. Pro-social support and its protective role victimized children. It seems likely that a child's pro-social behavioral tendency would also

serve as a protective factor against the negative adjustment outcomes often associated with peer victimization (Griese, 2011).

Method

Questionnaire survey method and quantitative research design were used in this study.

Sample of the Study

The sample of this study consists of 312 (156 male and 156 female) adolescent students (Grade 8, Grade 9 and Grade 10) from four Basic Education High Schools in Yangon Region.

Instrument

The Peer Relations Questionnaire (PRQ) developed by Rigby, K. and Slee, P.T. (1993) was used. PRQ consists of 20 statements (three subscales- Bully, Victim and Pro-social) in 4 point likert format.

Procedure

For getting essential concept of this research, related literature for this study was gathered by studying research papers, articles, journals and relevant books and then previous researches related to this study. After adopting the instrument, expert review was conducted by 10 experts in the field of education. Pilot study was conducted during the first week of November, 2017, with a sample of 30 students who enrolled in Grade 8, Grade 9 and Grade 10 from No.3, B.E.H.S South Dagon. Cronbach's alpha of PRQ is 0.87. After collecting the required data, data analysis process will be conducted by using SPSS. Finally, data analysis, interpretation and report writing will be done.

Data Analysis and Results

Mean Comparison of Peer Relation by Gender

Table 1. Independent Sample *t*-test Result of Peer Relation by Gender

Variable	Gender	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Bully	Male	8.9	2.50	0.51	0.61
	Female	8.74	2.86		
Victim	Male	7.84	2.35	-0.50	0.62
	Female	7.99	3.05		
Pro-social	Male	12.96	2.49	-1.26	0.21
	Female	13.31	2.45		

The mean score of male students on Bully subscale was slightly higher than that of the female students. It can be interpreted that male students show bullying behavior than female students. On the other hand, the mean scores of female students on Victim and Pro-social subscales were slightly higher than those of male students. Although a slight variation of mean score was found in three subscales, the result of *t*-test confirmed that there is no significant difference on all three subscales of peer relation by gender.

Mean Comparison of Peer Relation by Age Group

Table 2. ANAVO Results of Peer Relation by Age Group

Variable	Age Group	Mean	SD	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Bully	13 ⁺ year	8.72	3.15	0.64	0.59
	14 ⁺ year	8.69	2.41		
	15 ⁺ year	8.76	2.56		
	16 ⁺ year	9.28	2.90		
Victim	13 ⁺ year	8.16	3.17	0.32	0.81

Variable	Age Group	Mean	SD	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
	14 ⁺ year	7.73	2.28		
	15 ⁺ year	7.94	2.98		
	16 ⁺ year	7.98	2.52		
Pro-social	13 ⁺ year	13.09	2.39	0.32	0.81
	14 ⁺ year	13.01	2.65		
	15 ⁺ year	13.13	2.33		
	16 ⁺ year	13.42	2.52		

The mean scores of 16⁺ year age group students on Bully and Pro-social subscales were slightly higher than those of other age groups. On the other hand, the mean score of 13⁺ year age group students on Victim subscale was slightly higher than that of other age groups. Although a slight variation of mean score was found in three subscales, the result of ANOVA showed that there is no significant difference on all three subscales of peer relation by age group.

Mean Comparison of Peer Relation by School Location

Table 3. ANOVA Results of Peer Relation by School Location

Variable	School Location	Mean	SD	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Bully	West	9.40	3.22	2.52	0.06
	East	8.77	2.61		
	North	8.23	2.38		
	South	8.88	2.69		
Victim	West	7.91	2.81	0.36	0.78
	East	7.67	2.26		
	North	7.99	3.26		
	South	8.10	2.48		

Variable	School Location	Mean	SD	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Pro-social	West	13.22	2.42	3.69	0.01
	East	12.36	2.71		
	North	13.41	2.32		
	South	13.54	2.31		

The mean score of west district on Bully subscale was slightly higher than that of other districts. The mean scores of south district on Victim and Pro-social subscales were slightly higher than that of other districts. Although a slight variation of mean score was found in three subscales, the result of ANOVA showed that there is a significant difference on Pro-social subscale of peer relation. It can be interpreted that students from south district show more friendship and they show cooperative behavior and pro-social behaviors such as giving emotional support, showing empathy and sharing than that of students from other districts.

Mean Comparison of Peer Relation by Socio-economic Status

Table 4. ANOVA Results of Peer Relation by Socio-economic Status

Variable	SES	Mean	SD	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Bully	Low	8.14	1.93	3.99	0.02
	Middle	8.95	2.88		
	High	9.43	2.76		
Victim	Low	8.41	3.02	1.88	0.15
	Middle	7.80	2.56		
	High	7.55	2.76		
Pro-social	Low	13.17	2.54	0.74	0.48
	Middle	13.02	2.47		
	High	13.13	2.39		

The mean score of the students from high socio-economic status families was higher than that of the students from other socio-economic status group on Bully subscale. It can be interpreted that high SES students show bullying behavior than the other SES students. On the other hand, the mean scores of low SES students on Victim and Pro-social subscales were slightly higher than those of high and middle SES students. Although a slight variation of mean score was found in three subscales, the result of ANOVA confirmed that there is a significant difference on Bully subscale of peer relation questionnaire.

Mean Comparison of Peer Relation by Life Event

Table 5. Results of Independent Sample *t*-test on Peer Relation by Life Event

Variable	Life Event	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
Bully	Negative Life Event	9.26	2.84	1.66	0.09
	Positive Life Event	8.68	2.62		
Victim	Negative Life Event	8.65	2.96	2.75	0.01
	Positive Life Event	7.68	2.60		
Pro-social	Negative Life Event	12.88	2.59	-1.01	0.31
	Positive Life Event	13.21	2.44		

The mean scores of students who encountered with negative life event on Bully and Victim subscales were slightly higher than that of the students who encountered with positive life event. It can be interpreted that students who encountered with negative life event show bullying and victimizing behavior than positive life event students. On the other hand, the mean score of students who encountered with positive life event on Pro-social subscale was slightly higher than that of students who encountered with negative life event. The result of *t*-test showed that there is a significant difference on victim subscale of peer relation by life event.

Conclusion

According to the research findings, there were no significant differences on three subscales of peer relation by gender and age groups. There was significant difference on pro-social subscale of peer relation by school location. There was significant difference on bully subscale of peer relation by socio-economic status. There was significant difference on victim subscale of peer relation by life event. Young people who have poor relationships with peers are more likely to engage in socially disruptive behaviors. Peer relationships contribute strongly to adolescents' psychosocial adjustment. Peers may pressure each other into negative behaviors but they may also pressure each other into positive behaviors.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express profound and sincere thanks to Rector Dr. Aye Aye Myint (Yangon University of Education). I would like to offer respectful gratitude to Pro-Rector Dr. Pyone Pyone Aung (Yangon University of Education) for her administrative supports and her official help in this study. I would like to express my special thanks to Professor Dr. Naing Naing Maw (Head of Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education) for her precious guidance and suggestions. I owe a great debt to headmistresses and teachers of the selected schools who helped me heart and soul in collecting data and participation in this study. I also owe debt to participants students from selected schools for their cooperation in this study.

References

- Asher, S. R., & Coie, J. D. (1990). Peer rejection in childhood. Cambridge, UK: CUP Archive.
- Asher, S. R., & McDonald, K. L. (2009). The behavioral basis of acceptance, rejection, and perceived popularity. In K. H. Rubin, W. M. Bukowski, & B. Laursen (Eds.) *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups* (232-248). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Hamilton, S. F., & Sesma, A. (2006). *Positive youth development: Theory, research, and applications*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Black, S. (2002). When students push past peer influence. *The Education Digest*, 68, 31-36.
- Boivin, M. (2005). *The Origin of Peer Relationship Difficulties in Early Childhood and their Impact on Children's Psychosocial Adjustment and Development*. Retrieved August 17, 2017, from www.child-encyclopedia.com.

- Brown, B.B. (2004). Adolescents' Relationship with Peer. *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*, New York: Wiley, 363-394.
- Brown, B.B. & Larson, J. (2008). *Peer Relationships in Adolescence*.
- Bryan, T. (1976). Peer popularity of learning-disabled children: A replication. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 9, 307-311.
- Castrogiovanni, D. (2002). Adolescence: Peer groups. Retrieved December 24, 2017, from <http://inside.bard.edu/academic/specialproj/darling/adolesce.htm>
- Coben, S., & Zigmond, N. (1986). The social integration of learning disabled students from self-contained and mainstream elementary school settings. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 19, 614-618.
- Coie, J. D., Dodge, K., & Coppotelli, H. (1982). Dimensions for types of social status: A cross-age perspective. *Developmental Psychology*, 18, 557-570.
- Coleman, P. K. & Byrd, C. P. (2003). Interpersonal correlates of peer victimization among young adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescents*, 32, 301-314.
- Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence autonomy and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-system processes. In R. Gunnar & L.A. Sroufe (Eds.), *Self processes in development: Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology*, 23 (43-77). Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Decovic, M., & Gerris, J. R. M. (1994). Developmental analysis of social, cognitive and behavioral differences between popular and rejected children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 15, 367-386.
- Downs, W.R., & Rose, S.R. (1991). The relationship of adolescent peer groups to the incidence of psychosocial problems. *Adolescence*, 26, 473-493.
- Dunn, J. (2004). *Children's Friendships: the beginnings of Intimacy*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Erdley, C. A., Nangle, D. W., Newman, J. W., & Carpenter, E. M. (2001). Children's friendship experiences and psychological adjustment: Theory and research. In D. W. Nangle & C. A. Erdley (Series Eds.) & W. Damon (Volume Ed.), *New directions for child and adolescent development. The role of friendship in psychological adjustment* (Vol 91; pp. 5-24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gooden, L. (2015). Positive Peer Relation. Retrieved August 17, 2017, from <http://www.slideshare.net/leteshagooden>.
- Grant, K. E., Compas, B. E., Stuhlmacher, A. F., Thurm, A. E., McMahon, S. D., & Halpert, J. A. (2003). Stressors and child and adolescents psychopathology: Moving from markers to mechanisms of risk. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 447-466.
- Greener, S. H. (2000). Peer assessment of children's pro-social behaviour. *Journal of moral education*, 29(1), 47-60.

- Griese, E.R. (2011). Pro-social Behavior as a Protective Factor for Children Peer Victimization. Public Access Theses and Dissertation from the College of Education and Human Sciences.
- Hawker, D. S. J., & Boulton, M. J. (2000). Twenty years' research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology*, 41, 441-445.
- Holt, M. K. & Espelage, D. L. (2003). A cluster analytic investigation of victimization among high school students: Are profiles differentially associated with psychological symptoms and school belonging? *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 19, 81-98.
- Howard, N.M. (2004). Peer Influence in Relation to Academic and socialization Among Adolescents: A Literature Review.
[http://answers.yahoo.com>question](http://answers.yahoo.com/question)
http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa_dissertations
- Juvonen, J., & Graham, S. (2001). Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Kuhne, M., & Wiener, J. (2000). Stability of social status of children with and without learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 23, 64-75.
- Kupersmidt, J. B., & Coie, J. D. (1990). Preadolescent peer status, aggression, and school adjustment as predictors of externalizing problems in adolescence. *Child Development*, 61(5), 1350-1362.
- Lingren, H.G. (1995). Adolescence and peer pressure. Retrieved January 24, 2004, from <http://www.ianr.unl.edu/pubs/family/nf211.htm>
- Magklara, K. (2012). Bullying behaviour in schools, socioeconomic position and psychiatric morbidity: a cross sectional study in late adolescents in Greece. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*.
- McDougall, P., Hymel, S., Vaillancourt, T., & Mercer, L. (2001). The consequences of childhood peer rejection. In M. Leary (Ed.), *Interpersonal rejection* (21–53). London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Newcomb, A. F., & Bagwell, C. L. (1995). Children's friendship relations: A meta analytic review. *Psychological bulletin*, 117(2), 306.
- Newman, M. L., Holden, G. W., & Delville, Y. (2005). Isolation and the stress of being bullied. *Journal of Adolescence*, 28, 343-357.
[Onlinelibrary.wiley.com>di.abstract](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abstract)
- Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1993). Friendship and friendship quality in middle childhood: Links with peer group acceptance and feelings of loneliness and social dissatisfaction. *Developmental psychology*, 29(4), 611.

- Pathirana, B. (2016). Sri Lankan Adolescents' Relationship with their Parents, Sibling and Peers: An Exploratory Study. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(2), 2349-3429.
- Prinstein, M.J., & Cillessen, A.H.N. (2003). Forms and functions of adolescent peer aggression associated with high levels of peer status. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 49, 310-342.
- Rigby, K. & Slee, P.T. (1993). Dimensions of Interpersonal Relating among Australian School children and their Implications for Psychological Wellbeing. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133(1), 33-42.
- Rigby, K. (1998). The relationship between reported health and involvement in bully/victim problems among male and female secondary schoolchildren. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 3, 465-476.
- Rubin, K. H., Wojslawowicz, J. C., Rose-Krasnor, L., Booth-LaForce, C., & Burgess, K. B. (2006). The best friendships of shy/withdrawn children: Prevalence, stability, and relationship quality. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 34(2), 139-153.
- Ryan, A.M. (2000). Peer groups as a context for the socialization of adolescents' motivation, engagement, and achievement in school. *Educational Psychologist*,
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychology*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Vernberg, E. M., Jacobs, A. K., & Hershberger, S. L. (1999). Peer victimization and attitudes about violence during early adolescence. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 28, 386-395.
- Wentzel, K. R. (2009). Peers and academic functioning at school. In K. H. Rubin, W. M.
- Wiener, J. (1987). Peer status of learning disabled children and adolescents: A review of the literature. *Learning Disabilities Research*, 2, 62-69.