EDUC 363 Weekly Readings

Week	Page	Reading
1	2	Bukowski, W, M. Motzoi, C., & Meyer, F. (2009; 2014 ebook edition). Friendship as Process, Function and Outcome. In K.H.Rubin, W.M. Bukowski, & B. Laursen, (Eds.). *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups.* Guilford Press; New York, pp. 217–231.
2	4	Mikami, A.Y., Boucher, M.A., & Humphreys, K. (2005). Prevention of peer rejection through a classroom-level intervention in middle school. *Journal of Primary prevention, 26 (1)*, 5 - 23.
3	6	Swearer, S., Espelage, D.L. & Napolitano, S.A. (2009). *Bullying Prevention and Intervention.* Guilford Press, New York. (Read Chapter 1 pp. 1- 14)
4	N/A	No reading this week due to the quiz.
5	8	McGrath, H. & Stanley, M. (2006). A comparison of two non-punitive approaches to bullying, in H. McGrath and T. Noble (Eds), *Bullying solutions: evidence-based approaches to bullying in Australian schools*, pp. 189-201, Pearson Longman, Frenchs Forest, N.S.W.
6	10	Masten, A.S. (2010). Ordinary Magic: Lessons from research on resilience in human development. *Education Canada, 49(3),* 28- 32.
7	11	Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, Victoria State Government (2015) *Building Resilience: Social and Emotional Learning Materials*.
8-10	N/A	No readings due to professional experience
11	12	Readings selected from the new *Be You* website: the national framework for mental health and wellbeing for children, young people and teachers.
12	14	Rubie-Davies, C. (2008). Teacher Expectations. In T. Good (Eds.) *21st Century Education: A Reference Handbook.* (pp. I-254- I-265). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.
13	17	Allen, K. A., Vella-Brodrick, D., & Waters, L. (2016). Fostering school belonging in secondary schools using a socio-ecological framework. *The Educational and Developmental Psychologist, 33,* 97–121.

The following notes comprehensively answer the questions that are given each week.

Bukowski, W, M. Motzoi, C., & Meyer, F. (2009; 2014 ebook edition). Friendship as Process, Function and Outcome. In K.H.Rubin, W.M. Bukowski, & B. Laursen, (Eds.). *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups.* **Guilford Press; New York, pp. 217–231.**

Friendship
- Definition: The strong, positive affective bonds that exist between two persons and that are intended to facilitate the accomplishment of socioemotional goals.
    o Hartup and Stevens, 1997
- Features of friendship:
    o Friendship as reciprocal/mutual liking
        ▪ Capturing the level of closeness and reciprocity that occurs between 2 individuals.
        ▪ Reciprocity – the tendency of 2 people to act in the same way.
        ▪ Use the index of reciprocated best friend nominations from a sociometric questionnaire
    o Friendship as responsivity, cooperation and coordination
        ▪ Interactions of friends are significantly different to interactions of non-friends.
        ▪ Responsivity:
            • Symmetrical interaction between people
            • E.g. Friends taking turns
            • E.g. Responding to a friend who is looking sad
        ▪ Cooperation
            • Cooperate and exhibit more positive social behaviours with friends
                o E.g. Friends taking turns
        ▪ Coordination
            • Participating in a way that requires the action of two people.
            • E.g. using a flashlight that can only turn on when each child presses a button on the box
    o Friendship as similarity
        ▪ Greater similarity between friends than between non-friends.

Peer Acceptance (not from the article)
- The degree to which a child or adolescent is socially **accepted** by **peers**. It includes the level of **peer** popularity and the ease with which a child or adolescent can initiate and maintain satisfactory **peer** relationships.
- Acceptance by one's peers at a larger or group level
- Like or dislike (acceptance levels vary)

Friendship functions and outcomes
- *Friendship as validation*
    o Experiences of reciprocity and exchange in friendships give children a sense of wellbeing and validation, which consequently affects their self-concept, self-esteem, value and worth.
    o E.g. being able to disclose secrets, knowledge of having friends, security.

- o The validation comes from children recognising the positive regard in which their friend holds for them.
- *Friendship as protection from family-related risk factors*
  - o Experiences of friendship may buffer children from stresses in their life.
  - o Association between family adaptability and cohesion and children's perceived social competence and self-worth was stronger for those without a friend.
    - ▪ Low cohesion and adaptability were associated with lower levels of perceived self-confidence and self-worth
- *Friendship as protection from victimisation*
  - o Protect at-risk children from victimisation by peers
  - o Close relationships function as a security system
  - o At risk students are less likely to experience victimisation within the peer group if they are friended rather than friendless.
- *Friendship as morality*
  - o Friendship serves to minimise harm and maximise adaptation; thus, ensuring that people are treated fairly and free from harm.
  - o Loyalty, help and trust are essential features of friendship.
  - o Moral development is often co-constructed – Piaget, 1932.
  - o Friendship is part of the process of moral attachment – Kohlberg, 1963.
    - ▪ Children develop a sense of shared self with a friend, leading to a heightened sensitivity to their perspective and needs.

Friendship is said to moderate negative effects of other life circumstances; what does the term moderate mean?
- Both parental support and friendship quality made independent and interactive contributions in students' socio-emotional adjustment.
- Friendship quality moderated different parenting outcomes.
  - o Lower maternal support was associated with lower perceived social competence among boys who also reported low-quality friendships.
  - o High friendship quality buffered the effects of low maternal support.
- In this instance moderate means to act as a buffer.
- Moderate the association between harsh home environment and peer victimisation
  - o If you have a harsh home environment it is expected you will be at risk from victimisation.
  - o But if you have friends, this risk is reduced.
- Powerful factors that significantly act and are often protective.
- Sometime moderating effects are risk factors
- *Moderating variables can be thought of as change variables as they change the expected impact of a risk factor
- *Friendship moderates the relationship between adverse life events and negative adjustment outcomes

Why is it important for teachers to understand the functions of friendship?
- Can understand the sorts of interactions that your students are likely to have in their everyday life.
- Need to know what is going on in the social aspect of students' lives as well as their head
- Links to the teaching of socio-emotional skills

Mikami, A.Y., Boucher, M.A., & Humphreys, K. (2005). Prevention of peer rejection through a classroom-level intervention in middle school. *Journal of Primary prevention, 26 (1)*, **5 - 23.**

- Studying an alternate way of addressing peer rejection as current approaches weren't really working.
- They used a randomized control trial (fairly rigorous)
- 24 classrooms were given the intervention but only 20 were includes in the evaluation.

Negative life outcomes
- More likely to engage in juvenile delinquency and adult criminality
- More likely to suffer from depression and anxiety as adults
- Links to academic failure in childhood, including school drop-out
- Links to substance abuse in adolescence

Teaching practices
- Can have a slightly negative long-term effect on self-related cognitions and affect.
    o Can be stigmatizing and students may still gain little popularity for all their efforts.
- Don't focus on social context
    o Need to focus on changing the beliefs of accepted peers so that they stop looking for evidence of unfavourable stereotypes.
- Often enforce teasing by overlooking popular peers.
- The classroom climate needs discourage rejecting processes among peers.
    o Teachers need to stress tolerance and respect for cultural differences.
    o There is a need to change the expectations, attitudes and behaviours of non-rejected peers.

Traditional interventions
- Peer rejected children may lack knowledge about social norms as well as the ability to convert knowledge into behaviour and to evaluate their own performance.
    o Interventions attempted to instruct children on a particular skill, provide opportunity to practice that skill, and provide feedback on the performance.

Mikami's Interventions
- Created an intervention that addressed strategies for everyone in the class:
    o This intervention consists of collaborative games, cooperative-learning based academic activities, and teacher meetings.
        ▪ Collaborative games serve to reduce peer rejection whilst the other 2 components reinforce the effects of the collaborative games and create a socially-accepting classroom environment.
            • Addressed the behaviour of ALL peers
        ▪ Importance of PD for teachers and to change attitudes and perceptions of teacher → change the whole classroom culture
    o These interventions seemed to increase peer acceptance on a classroom level
- They also did some teacher training and supported them in making a network where they could bounce ideas off of each other.