

A STUDY OF ADOLESCENT-PARENTS INTERACTIONS AND PEER GROUP INVOLVEMENT

Solomon Idemudian Ehiemua, Ph.D.
Clinical Psychologist
District of Columbian Public School System
Washington, DC

ABSTRACT

Good relationship and conflict between adolescents, parents and peer is usually seen as normal and necessary part of human development. However the purpose of this study was to Determine if changes could be noted in adolescent, peer and parent relationship during the period of 1990 and 1990 in Nigeria. There were two different sample groups for this study.

SAMPLE I

Sample of adolescents came from a survey of 100 boys and girls randomly drawn from a list of classes four and five at a local secondary school in Lagos, Nigeria.

SAMPLE II

Sample of adults came from a survey of 100 males and females randomly drawn from the teachers/parents association at same local secondary school in Lagos, Nigeria. Interaction was assessed with a scale of 12 items consisting of statements and questions with respect to parent-adolescents related and adolescent-peer group related. Subjects judged each item as it applied to him or her personally, choosing one out of the following alternatives: "always", "most of the time", "sometime", "very seldom", and "never". Each response had a figure weight attached to it: 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively for items 1-6 and 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 respectively for items 7-12. The 12 items were submitted to chi-square analysis. The results of the study indicated significant relationships between ages and how respondents answered the questions respectively. The results supported the five hypothesis that:

1. Young male subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescent, and peer relationships than old male subjects.
2. Young male subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescents, and peer relationships than old female subjects.
3. Young female subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescent, and peer relationships than old female subjects.
4. Young female subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescent, and peer relationships than old male subjects.
5. The total young male and female subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescents and peer relationships than the total old male and female subjects.

INTRODUCTION

Nigeria, a country on the Continent of Africa, lies along the Western Coast by the Atlantic Ocean. Nigeria is about the size of Texas, a state in the United States, and is divided into 32 states with Abuja as the federal capital. The country is rich in colorful heritages with diverse cultures. The various cultures somehow survived the western civilization that invaded it in the 1930s through the British. The country is made up of several ethnic groups with about 40

languages, among which Yoruba, Ibo and Hansa are most prominent. Despite the turmoil that continues to delay the progress in Nigeria as a result of ethnicity, language differences, and others, there are however some similarities among the various ethnics and child rearing is most noticed (Omolola, 1985). Child rearing, socialization of the young, and the methods parents perceive and treat their offspring (old and young) have been the same across the board since the 1930s to present. Parents and older members of extended families have the exclusive right to override an adolescent's decisions, autonomy and independence at any point in time. At the same time, the adolescent was duty bound to always accept his parents and older family members as those to look up to. However, the educational revolution of the later 1970s in parts of Nigeria was accompanied by a cultural revolution that witnessed chaotic events between adolescents and their parents over autonomy. The Cultural Revolution spread across the entire nation, and as a result, a peer culture was formed by the adolescents. Since then, there has been a continued struggle between parents, adolescents and peer-groups. There are few literature sources on adolescents, peers, and parents written by Nigerians and very few studies on adolescent, parent relationship and adolescent-peer relationship. The only known major study on this subject was in the early 1970s, and none in the 1980s or 1990s. It is hoped that this study will be educational, enlightening, and fact-finding about the status of parents and adolescents and parents in that part of the continent.

There is no period in one's life that is so difficult, full of conflicts and problems as adolescent. The adolescent's behavior often has a surface appearance of gaiety, carefree activity marked by frolicking antics and enthusiasm for living. But beneath the shiny veneer of adolescent's self-expression, is the shadow of anxious thoughts and uncertainty which face the young person undergoing a decision-making and problem-solving period of development (Erik Erikson, 1950, 1987). The term "adolescence" is derived from the Latin verb *adolescere*, meaning "to grow into maturity." Thus it is "a process rather than a time period, a process of achieving the attitudes and beliefs needed for effective participation in society" (Roger, 1981, p. 6). It may be interpreted in other ways as a period in physical development, as a social cultural phenomenon, as a chronological age span, as a transition period, or even abstractly as an attitude towards life.

There is no agreed upon age when adulthood begins. Chronological age alone is somewhat meaningless. Hence society has developed a social clock that is superimposed upon the biological clock, thus producing orderly and sequential changes in behavior and in self-perceptions (Peterson, and Taylor, 1990). All the ages that an adolescent juggles—biological, social, emotional, intellectual and academic—make a mockery of chronological age (Lipsitz, 1979, p.4). A related concept, stage theory, suggest that the lifespan may be developed into relatively distinct periods, each with its distinctive characteristic, task, and privileges. Transition between stages may span several years each constituting "both an ending and a beginning, a departure and arrival, a death and rebirth, and a meeting of past and future" (Steinberg, 1981).

Adolescence is often viewed as a transition, a link between childhood and adulthood, with no genuine essence of its own. Lipsitz, however, objected to this notion. He saw adolescence as no more transitional than any other stage in life and with a significance of its own and felt that it may not receive the attention it deserved if it was only viewed as transient. Socially, adolescence is that span in an individual's life when society stops regarding an individual as a child, but fails as yet to grant full adult status. Adolescence may also be viewed historically by comparing youth in one age of history with youth in another. Also during adolescence, young people make decisions that set patterns for the year that follow in work, loving

relationships, friendship experiences, religious involvement, and academic orientations. Peers- the contemporaries or age-mates with whom a young person spends much of his or her time—play a crucial role in the physiological and social development of most adolescents. Adolescents are said to be more dependent on peer relationships than younger children, simply because their ties to their parents become progressively looser as the adolescent gains greater independence. In addition, relationships with family members are likely to become charged with conflicting emotions in the early years of adolescence—dependent yearning existing alongside independent strivings, hostility mixed with love, and conflicts developing between intra-familial and external cultural values and social behavior. This may not have been true in most third world countries in Africa in the 30s, 60s, and early 70s, where it was discovered that the relationship between the parents and adolescents became stronger as the adolescent progressed in age and maturity due to lack of foreign exposure. Many areas of the adolescent's inner life and outward behavior were never too difficult to share with parents which is contrary to the western and industrialized world (Threaskill, 1983).

Yet people need, in adolescence perhaps more than any other time in their lives, to be able to share strong and often confusing emotions, doubts and dreams with others. "Adolescence is generally a time of intense loneliness as well as a time of intense sociability. Merely being with others does not solve the problem; frequently the young person may feel alone in the midst of a crowd, at a party or a dance" (Brennan, 1982). This means that acceptance by peers generally, and especially having one or more close friends, may be of crucial importance in a young person's life. The role of a peer in helping an individual to define his or her identity is particularly important.

Conformity with peers is another area within which culture may have or used to have some impact on the social life of adolescents. In the western world, the heightened importance of a peer group during adolescence leads to heightened needs to conform, to its standards, behaviors, fads and fashions. Parents may wonder why it seems so important to their adolescent sons and daughters to have the specific brand of jeans currently in fashion and no other, or why only certain kinds of music, hairstyles, language, dance, food, recreational activities...(the list goes on and on) are acceptable. To parents, additions and rapid shifts they undergo may seem bewildering because they seem so arbitrary and trivial (Rice, 1981). But to the adolescent, for whom they serve as ledges of belonging and insurance policy for the future, they are anything but trivial. They also serve another important purpose, to establish, at least superficially, a clear line of demarcation from adults. In the third world countries, for example Ghana, Gambia, Dahomy and in Nigeria, adolescent's conformity to peer pressure was almost never noticed nor a concern to the adults; but times have changed and it may now be a concern to the adults and parents in particular (Abi, 1985). Among the peer relationships of adolescents, friendships hold a special place (Frank, 1984). They are more intimate, involve more intense feelings, and are more honest and open than other relationships. There is less defensiveness and less need for self-conscious attempts at role playing in order to gain greater popularity and acceptance. In such relationships, there is trust, no need to pretend, and no need to be on guard against betrayal of shared secrets.

Adolescents want friends to be loyal, trustworthy and a reliable source of support in an emotional crisis. In the words of one 14-year-old urban Black girl, "A friend don't talk behind your back. If they are a true friend, they help you get out of trouble and they will always be right behind you and they help you get through stuff. And they never snitch on you. That's what a friend is" (Interview, 1989).]

LITERATURE REVIEW

It is plausible to say that parents have little authority when they are unaware of what their adolescents are doing, or thinking about in the area of their lives. Whether lack of knowledge is due to adolescents controlling information or to parents granting privacy, the result is the same. Adolescents gain independence from parental authority when they are allowed to act outside their parent's domain and without parent's intervention (Wright & Keple, 1981).

Second, while parents can assert their authority unilaterally, adolescents perceive that they can also partake of cooperative decision making with their parents. Examples of obvious unilateral authority were found in the ways that parents settled some disagreements with their sons and daughters. In some matters parents are clearly ready to discuss differences and seek compromises. On topics such as school performance, parents appear to have strong expectations for their adolescents to meet. There is not much negotiation on such topics. In matters of personal problem, if parents were involved at all, they act less as unilateral authorities and more as advisors willing to listen, and seeking to understand (Hunter, 1983).

The two major changes discussed above suggest that the structure of unilateral authority that is characteristic of parent-child relationships is revised somewhat in adolescence. In some matters, the structure is maintained with parents keeping their role as valuers and authorities for their adolescents (Bell & Bell 1983; Cooper, Grotovant & Condon 1983). In other matters, unilateral authority gives way to a more cooperative stance and, for other matters, parents simply exclude themselves or are excluded by adolescents from any involvement.

The changes that occur in adolescence with respect to the unilateral-authority structure of parent-adolescent relationships correspond to changes that also occur concerning perceptions of parents as persons. There is a striking absence from children's and preadolescents' descriptions of interactions with their parents of a view of parents as being persons with personalities entailing likable and unlikable traits, variable moods, and a scale of competences (Youniss, 1980). Children are prone to perceive their parents as figures who have knowledge and power to get things done, especially those things children need or want. This perception may be seen as the logical consequence of the structure of unilateral authority. But seeing parents as figures to seeing them as personalities begins with adolescents' statements of their obligations to their parents. The majority of adolescents perceived their primary obligation to their father in terms of conforming to their father's wishes and expectations. In contrast, the same adolescents feel that what they are obliged to reciprocate to their mother for all that their mother had done for them (cf. Alesha); this may not be true in western culture.

The revision of the structure of unilateral authority, which is characteristic of parent-child relationship to a structure that incorporates both unilateral authority and cooperation allows for the increasing independence of adolescents from parental authority and for the construction of a self-separation from parental influence. At the same time, the change that occurs during adolescence from parents-as-figures to parents-as-persons—with needs and feelings of their own—implies a correctness between parents and adolescents that is based not on authority but rather on respect for one another as persons. This dual process is expressed in the concept of individualization (Cooper, Grotovant & Condon 1983). It is a process where adolescents move away from dependence on parents while attempting to remain connected to them. Time spent away from parents is surely a common feature of contemporary adolescent life. Adolescents spend six or more hours in school, frequently hold part time jobs after school, and have active social schedules that often consume evenings and

weekends. Time spent away from home is not monitored or directly controlled by parents. It is also the time when ideas are formed and decisions are made without parental involvement. Furthermore, many activities in this private space take place without parent's knowledge and are not discussed with parents. While separation is occurring, a large proportion of adolescents still maintain definite connection with their parents. First, they feel respect for and are respected by their parents. Secondly, they clearly desire to please their parents, to meet the expectations that parents have for them, and to seek their parent's approval. Third, although parents grant them freedom through privacy, many adolescents keep their parents informed about their lives and even consider parents as advisors on special matters, and the majority adolescents appreciate both parents' roles—insofar as they view them as an expression of concern for their own wellbeing. Fourth, adolescents have a sense of being a member of a family, of having obligations to the family and of feeling attachment to their parents (Greenberg, Siegel, & Leitch 1983; Offer, Ostrov & Howard 1981).

The issue of conformity and influence has been of concern to socialization theorists who tend to think of parents as transmitters of culture to the younger generation. These theorists have emphasized parents' teaching functions and the styles of instruction that are most efficacious in the leading to internalizations of norms. A side issue had been whether or not modern parents have reneged on this function and have given it over to others, in particular, their sons and daughters' peers (Bronfenbrenner, 1981). A more recent concern has been voiced regarding the evidence that contemporary family structure has deteriorated to the point that parents and peers do not even constitute opposing forces. As Smith (1983) has expressed the matter, contemporary parents no longer care to exert control and their sons and daughters no longer care whether or not their parents approve or disapprove of their actions. But however, disinterest by parents is not typical. Indeed the reoccurring theme is that adolescents seek their parent's advice and approval and that parents give advice and approval because they are very much concerned about their children's socialization.

As must have been observed, there is a hint of a paradox between adolescents' attachment and detachment from their parents. It may have been apparent in the conjunction of separation and attachment, or in the foregoing view of parent-adolescent alliance against society and of parental distance in managerial function. The argument has been that parent-adolescent relationships are, in fact, complex in makeup, and cannot be described as having a single theme without serious risk of distortion. My view is that the parent-adolescent relationship is not entirely in itself but is part of social construction. This would follow from historical data that shows how family structure and parental roles have changed in accordance with a deep shift in overall social structure (cf. Smith, 1983).

Some historians and sociologists who have tried to build historical results into a psychological theory have noted that individuality is a central mark of modern society. The notion is that individual identity has replaced the older definition of self as a member of a lineage or of a family. The implications for psychological theory are rather clear. Implicit in many of these theories is the concept that maturity requires taking a stand as an individual who can think rationally and act self-sufficiently. Obvious examples include self-constructed ego identity, independence, and autonomy. All these terms refer to the adolescents' abilities to reflect on experiences and make sense of them so that reality is ordered as is the self within reality. This implied, but not necessarily stated, that in becoming an individual, the adolescent has overcome dependence on their persons, in particular, their parents. (Sampson, 1977; 1981; for critiques of this position).

Fadely and Hosler, (1984) in their book Confrontation in Adolescence stated that the first important variable is the rate of social change. They stated that extreme rapid change in modern civilization, in contrast to most societies, tends to increase parent-youth conflict as well as parent-youth understanding, for within a fast changing social order, the time interval between generations, ordinary but a mere moment in the life of a social system, becomes historically significant, thereby creating a different gap between one generation and the next. Inevitably and under such a condition, youth is reared in a milieu different from that of the parents; hence the parents are perceived as old fashioned. As a result, youth rebellions and clashes that occur in the closely combined circle of the immediate family generate sharp emotions.

Psychologically, there is a sharp difference between child and parent relationships (Fasick, 1988). At infancy parents are in total control of their offspring both in security and supervision. This according to him is called the period of domination. The stage of adolescence according to Fasick consists of personality reorganization, and mainly gaining emotional and social autonomy from parents. Hallinan, (1980) in his article Pattern of Cliques among Youths stated that earlier feelings of tenderness and affection towards parents during childhood are then readily directed towards individuals of one's own age. The young adolescent become emotionally and socially distant from his parents, making many attempts to gain and hold affection, confidence and esteem of his age group. In addition, the adolescents need for exchange of personal experience thoughts are desires and best satisfied by his peers in both dyadic and group situations. He concluded his article by stating that parental claims to intimacy and dependence meet with resistance and resentment from the adolescent, and parental controls and restrictions are seen as a barrier to outside association and group activities.

One of the goals of adolescence is to construct an adult self from the child self. Following the lead of Sabatelli and Mazor, (1988), who offered an account of how the infants sense of self derives through the process of separation /individualization, many theorists of adolescent identity formation hypothesize that this process reoccurs in adolescence (Blos, 1987); Cooper, Grotovant & Codon, 1989; White Speisman & Coster, 1989). While a global similarity may be obtained by the processes of separation from parents in infancy and adolescence, the nature of the processes should be different for the adolescent and the toddler. The transformation of identity during adolescence may occur through a reconstructing of relationships and attachments to others and it has been hypothesized that this restructuring occurs through a process of selective identifications with parents and peers.

The current debate about the relative influence of parents and peers of adolescent behavior can be recast as an attempt to understand the mechanism by which both parent and peers influence the transition from the child to the adult self. One approach to the debate about the relative influence of parents and peers has been to note the areas of influence each has on adolescent opinions or decision making. While historically the relative influence of peers and parents has been dichotomous (e.g. parental influence is supplanted by peer influence (Coleman, 1980)), recent research suggests that parents and peers both play important functions for adolescents, but in different domains. Parents are seen as influencing career goals and future plans, while peer advice is sought out for questions of popularity in peer society. Others have suggested that in most cases, adolescents choose peers that mirror parental values so that the dichotomy between parents and peers is more apparent than real (Kandel, Denis, Andrew and Kenneth, 1990). The parent child relationship does not lose its importance; it can meet certain needs of the adolescent: needs for attention, assistance,

encouragement, activation and confirmation. Yet as children grow older, opportunities for conflicts and for insufficient understanding increase, because parents do not always succeed in adjusting their parenting practices to the development of autonomy in the older child or the adolescent (Hill, 1980). Consequently, parent-related loneliness was expected to increase with age.

Another variable whose relationship with loneliness seemed worth considering was the choice of a “first-comfort figure.” The bond of attachment to parents undergoes a transformation during childhood and adolescence. In adolescence, there is an increase in natural detachment from parents; peers become more significant (Hartup, 1983). One of the functions of attachment figures is to comfort an individual in moments of sorrow and unhappiness. One may hypothesize that there is a relation between loneliness involving parents or peers and the person chosen as the first source of comfort in situations of sadness. Parent-oriented adolescents were expected to feel lonelier with regard to their peer relationships, while peer-oriented adolescents were expected to feel lonelier in their relationship to parent relationships.

Social and personal factors may influence the loneliness of adolescence (Jones, 1982). For example, Brennan (in Brennan 1982) found that loneliness was related to feelings of unpopularity. The relation of loneliness to another aspect of social status, namely, perceived social sensitivity was examined too. Each adolescent had a certain position in a class group as a confidante and comforter for his classmates in moments of sorrow and unhappiness. This position may be rather central if many class fellows see the adolescent as a comfort figure or rather marginal if only a few or no classmates consider him or her as much. The position in the class group in the above sense may be considered as a measure of perceived social sensitivity. Adolescents who were seen as socially sensitive to peers within the class group were expected to experience peer-related loneliness less frequently.

Finally Marcoen and Brumagne concluded their investigation with a key note that students experiencing their parents having no interest in their lives have no choice but to seek comfort in the peer group or with other adults when they are confronted with certain stressful life events. “But the reverse direction of causation is also possible,” they said. Young adolescents who form intimate relationships with their peers will not need the comfort or support of their parents or will need it less often. Because they do not ask parents for comfort, and they feel less noticed by them.

A number of theories have been proposed to explain the importance of peers during adolescence. Some of these theories emphasize such divergent factors as the modern social condition under which work and education are organized, the need for adolescents to direct their sexual drive away from family members (cf. Fasick, 1984), and the desire for individuals to associate with others who have abilities and interests similar to their own. Undoubtedly, the most widely accepted view of why adolescents are more oriented toward peers than to their parents has been presented by Bronfenbrenner (1981, 1984), who argues that adolescents turn to peers for the companionship and emotional support that they wish to receive from their parents but do not. According to Bronfenbrenner, adolescents are not inevitably attached to peers over parents, but are pushed in that direction by inattentive and unconcerned parents. Along these same lines, Hill (1980) proposed that even more than neglect, continual parent-adolescent bickering eventually lead adolescents to accept the norms, values and standards of peers and reject those of parents.

Hartup (1981) offered a thoughtful review of studies that dealt with the question of whether adolescents are more prone to follow the advice of their parents or the suggestion of peers. The assumption behind this work was that parents and peers give different, if not opposite advice; hence this literature became known as the study of “counter influence”. Until 1960, results were mixed as adolescents followed peers for some choices and parents for other choices. Britain (e.g., 1983) reported that peers were influential regarding social-recreational events while parents were influential regarding decisions about college and jobs. Sebald (1986) reported that parental advice was more likely sought for financial issues, personal problems, choosing future occupations and deciding “whether or not to go to college”. Advice was more likely sought from peers on social events, clubs to join, how to dress and dating. This diversion of influence corresponds to Britain’s differentiation of expertise. Sebald also found that in the main, girls were parent oriented in the 1960s while boys were more oriented towards peers. By the 1980s, the pattern changed toward greater balance between peers for both sexes.

Joyner, J (1984) stated that the declining rate of socialization, when taken with rapid social change and other conditions of development in the society tend to produce certain differences of orientation between parent and adolescent. Contrarily, Steward, G (1985), in her research (*Adolescence and Parents*), found out that the relatively unchecked idealism in youth grows rapidly that in no time youths (adolescents) possess a keen reasoning ability. The mind simply as a logical machine works as well at 18 just as at 36. With such logical capacity, she concluded in his finding, it seems that youth soon discovers with increasing age that the ideal they have been taught by adults are true but consistently not so as fact.

Joyner and Seward, both psychologists contracted themselves in their perceptions about psychological explanation as related to the formation of ideals between parents and adolescents. Interpreting both concepts to the frequency of adolescent interaction and establishment of relationship with either peer group or parents, Joyner and Steward suggested that the adolescent was more likely to go to his or her own peer group than his parents due to their sharp contrast in ideas. Furthermore, Steward, who also summarized the data collected over a ten year period for her major research on adolescents found out that the major problem as seen by both generation (*Adolescent and Parents*) involves a gap in communication, and deficiencies in understanding. This was as a result of one generation growing away from the other with each partially blinded to the other although both may have common objectives. She concluded that “there is a great deal that is positive in each generation’s view, trusting and appreciating the work of the other. That the covert attempt to please each other is manifested by both adults and youth but to express this openly for people to see is the main problem.”

Hilde’s (1999) replication of a study by Locavette (1975 and 1988) found that under any circumstances, an adolescent is more likely to establish a strong relationship with its peers than with an adult. This is made possible as the adolescent is made increasingly preoccupied with his social experience and his increasing concern over acquiring primary status as an independent entity. In learning to adjust to his own changing body and motivation and assailed by some irrational drive and desire, the adolescent is struggling with himself and life offering new goals and views. He is becoming increasingly aware of new relationships with his parents and peers. The problem of adjusting in an adult made world springs from any source including new abilities and discouragements from parents. Therefore the adolescent’s reaction as to whether or not to turn to his peers when turned away/down by an adult or when he receives an unsatisfactory answer to his problems is the main object of his concern.

It is most clear that in the youth culture literature that peers and peer groups are a major influence. Fasick (1984) summarizing much of his work on Parents, Peers, Youth Culture and Autonomy in Adolescence; argues that the terms “adolescent subculture” and “youth culture” usually imply “the view that adolescents are extremely concerned to gain the approval of their peers, with the result that values and tastes perceived as distinctly adolescent have been strengthened.” Writers using the concept of “youth class” and “counter-culture” also address its anti-adult nature. Fasick went on to say that youth is oppositional in that adolescents are seen to reject adult culture and influence in favor of youthful alternatives. Such positions need not be specifically anti-parent nor necessarily require a direct link with peers. It is conceivable that a youth might reject his or her immediate peers as being “straight” in preference for a counter cultural group from whom he or she is physically remote. Nevertheless the emphasis is still on the decline of adult influence and it is replaced with a youthful source of influence.

This literature might lead us to suppose that parental influence will be replaced by that of peers with the adoption of youth status. Even if this did happen, there are doubts as to the extensiveness of peer influence. Although the theoretical positions discussed above all have the notion of youth in opposition to adults, the nature of the opposition is very different between, say, upholders of the concepts of youth culture and supporters of the concept of counter culture. How oppositional and how extensive the influence of peers would be is questioned by some empirical studies. There is some evidence to suggest that although the influence of peers does increase, it does only in very little spheres of activity, and that parental influence continues to be important elsewhere. Thus, Yamu, (1982) argues on the basis of opinion poll material, “The typical teenager is responsive to the feelings and opinions of his peers on such question as to what to wear at a party, what club to join, how to act when out with out with the gang, personal grooming...On the other hand, he is sensitive to the feelings of his parents and other adults about his political feelings, about how he spends his money and about his personal problems. Joyner, (1984) came to similar conclusions arguing that where the larger society is concerned, parents are seen as the major influence whereas peers are a crucial influence in terms of conformity of behavior.

Finally on Fischer’s report, there were four logical possibilities during adolescence. The first possibility seemed the least likely on the basis of the literature received that parental influence will remain strong, as it was in childhood, and that no marked changes would arise during this period. The second possibility was that parental influence will decline and be replaced largely by that of peers. This would suggest that youth might be viewed as a distinctive age category, to some degree in opposition to adults. A third possibility was that parental influence will continue to be strong in some areas but would be replaced by that of peers in other areas. This seemed the most likely on the basis of much of the American and Nigerian literature. A fourth probability also exists—that parental influence will decline but will not be replaced by peer influence. This is very unlikely.

The influence of significant others in adolescent development is commonly studied in the terms of the outcomes of socialization, with less attention paid to the intervening process. For example, certain parental attributes, for example, power and discipline styles, are examined in relation to adolescent characteristics that are considered to be products of socialization, for example, morality, autonomy and identity (cf. Enright, Lapsley, Drivas & Fehr, 1980; Leahy, 1981). Similarly, attitudes and behaviors between socializing agents is another frequently used measure (e.g. Huba & Bentler, 1980). Recent reviews (e.g. Berndt, 1982; Wright &

Keple, 1981) point to the need for future studies to focus on the interplay between the socializing contribution of parents and peers and the processes involved in socialization.

Fumiyo Tao Hunter in his study Socializing Procedures in Parent-Child and Friendship Relation during Adolescent investigated the procedures by which parents and friends contribute towards adolescent socialization and how these procedures may change with increasing age. The basic premise was that social development of children and adolescents involves their actively constructing the rules of social behavior in their interactions with various socializing agents. It was assumed that (a) parents and friends hold various forms of relations with adolescents (cf. Piaget, 1932; Youniss, 1980); (b) interpersonal relations may be characterized in terms of “the content, quality and patterning of interactions” (Hinde, 1979, p. 20); (c) much of socializing influence is mediated through interpersonal interactions; and (d) the parents and friends’ socializing procedures may be inferred from the patterns of interpersonal interactions occurring in these relations.

According to Youniss (1981), parent- child relations at childhood and adolescence exemplify the unilateral authority relationship in which parents strive to impart already constructed knowledge to their children. They approve or disapprove children’s behavior and attitude based on their nurturing and didactic concerns and greater experience. Friendship on the other hand, is a form of mutual reciprocity relationship in which both members share equal privileges in expressing divergent opinions, being listened to, and mutually constructing new ideas. The evaluation of friendship from early adolescence on is characterized by increasing an open communication and mutual understanding (cf. Berndt, 1982). Thus in the unilateral authority relationship, children are expected to accept a reality that is imposed on them whereas in the mutual reciprocity relationship, they have the right to actively construct and verify their own reality with someone else whose ideas can be challenged and tested along with their own. In cross pressure situations that force adolescents to choose parent or peer conformity, peer influence is generally found to increase with age, whereas parent influence wanes (cf. Berndt, 1979). However, parents are reported to remain a major source of advice and guidance throughout adolescence (cf. Adelson, 1979; and Sebald & White, 1980). It appears that parental and peer influences may be affected by the nature of interactional contexts, for example, parents and peers competing for adolescents’ conformity are responding to adolescents’ request for advice.

While many of the generalizations and statements to the relationship of parent- adolescents are broad, they do indicate that the need for peer affiliation may have much to do with the quality of adolescent-adult interaction. Thus the general hypothesis states: The lower the quality of the adolescent-parent interaction, the higher will be his peer-group involvement. This would seem to be a reasonable exchange theory and reciprocity. The logic of the exchange theory and the theory of reciprocity represent two ways in which interrelated demand i.e. give and take can be applied to both the adolescents and his parents. This is so as the adolescent is very likely to establish a relationship with those groups and individuals from whom he can establish a reciprocal relationship and share a common idea. According to Gouldner (1988), the norm of reciprocity represents two interrelated demands:

1. People should help those who have helped them.
2. People should not injure those who have helped.

Gouldner suggested that “reciprocity included not only a pattern of exchange but also a moral norm which defined certain actions and obligations as repayment of benefits received.” The norm of reciprocity according to Gouldner suggested therefore, that if the adolescent does not find interactions with parents and adults satisfactorily in any manner, the norm of reciprocity

will not apply and he may be unlikely to seek further interaction with them or be compelled to honor whatever demand or suggestion they may have. In such a situation, the adolescent is likely to establish relations or primarily with those groups and individuals for whom he receives gratification and with whom he can establish reciprocal obligations. The proceeding argument suggests, therefore, that the responsiveness of youngsters to the demands of parents and their interaction with adults in general are partly following the logic of the reciprocity thesis, a matter of the development of reciprocal obligation arising out of what to do for the adolescents. Where parents and adults in general can do little to provide youngsters with rewards and gratifications, they are perceived by the adolescent as being unable to provide reward and gratification either by way of transmitting reciprocal obligations built up. Thus adolescents are likely to be motivated and compelled to interact with peer groups as better alternative preferences. The need to be liked, to be accepted, and to belong are universal feelings but perhaps at no time more emphatically felt than during the stage of adolescence. This is true because during this period the adolescent is undergoing many new and varied experiences involving self-concept and trying to solve problems left behind unsolved at this early age of puberty (cf. Lipsitz, 1979). With such burden, it is a small wonder that the adolescent seeks out his fellow with such intensity of feelings. The need to succeed in these developmental tasks is primary and since, generally, he cannot relate to or communicate with his parents, he finds refuge with his peers.

Lacovetta (1975), who performed his research on ghetto adolescent about “self”, found how the adolescent copes with his problem of self-identification in relation to his peers. Lacovetta concluded that social relationships among adolescents were the main friction that brought adolescents together. The patterns of conformity within the adolescent peer group constitute perhaps his most unique structural characteristic in comparison with the grouping of children and adults. Gouldern, (1970) stated that as adolescents become more and more resistive to adults and parental suggestions and increasingly indifferent to adult-parent approval and disapproval, the approval and disapproval of peers becomes progressively the most influential force motivating their conduct. These efforts of the adolescents are all directed at appearing alike, behaving alike and doing what everyone in the group does. The most remarkable phenomena in the lives of adolescents is inwardly connected with their object relations and adolescents are inevitably disillusioned with the ideas they held of their parents and society and thus seek innumerable new relationships with their peer groups who are obviously substitutes for the renounced parents. They do this in accordance with their new and changing concepts of self and the total environment around them. They find it useful to have some comrades, to whom they can relate, air out their views and get some similar views in return (Peterson, 1980).

The security achieved in the group through friendship is vastly significant to the adolescent for it helps him to handle the panic resulting from unresolved conflicts of late childhood. Also it is through this friendship that the individual learns how to modify his infantile conscience and play an acceptable role in the culture to which he belongs. Lacovetta in his major study experimented with a factor analysis design to measure the strength of adolescent-adult interaction and peer-group involvement. His data for the study came from a survey of 623 white male seniors in seven high schools. Lacovetta designed six items which were to represent the quality of adolescents’ interaction with, and perception of adults. Several of his items relate specifically to the adolescent-parent interaction. He found out that three dimensions of peer-group involvement were considered relevant to his research as tapped by his data. (1) Frequency of interaction with peers: (2) dependency upon peers and (3) autonomy of interaction between peers which is dependent on their relationship with their

parents were noted. However, he concluded that the quality of adolescent-adult interaction which refer to the effective relationship between adults and adolescents including adult understanding and helpfulness relative to the needs of the adolescent dictate the adolescent involvement with his peer-groups. Frightened by his own impulses, and hazardous choice between complete repression and free expression, the adolescent turns to the group for support and for answers to his question. As stated by Lacovetta, the adolescent can therefore discuss his mixed feelings and find solution from the identical sufferings of others. The adolescent can test tentative answers to his perplexities against the equally tentative formulations of his friends. Most importantly, the adolescent can participate in the development of restrictions upon his behavior and this will assure him of protection from chaotic expression of impulses without risking the danger inherent in the restrictions outlined by his parents.

The social personality of the adolescent is based upon cultural definitions and group expectations (Alwater, 1988). Group patterns according to him sets the standard of behavior; and the adolescent is coerced into the group mold and acquires the set of attitudes and standard behavior that brings him into line with the required behavioral norms. Modell (1989) in his book From Youth to Adulthood title 'Into One's Own' wrote that the adolescent is overwhelmingly preoccupied with the social experiences of his surroundings. The intensity of his passionate absorption in interpersonal relationships results from four factors: (a) his increasing concerns with acquiring primary status as an independent entity; (b) his newly won emancipation from home; (c) his greater mobility; and (d) the opportunities the group provided for ratifying newly acquired interests. It is through peer association that the adolescent learns to clarify the social skills and values and his method of competing and cooperating with one another.

According to Erikson (1968), the identity formation is the primary tasks in adolescence as his acquisition of social roles is central to identity formation. Erikson's concept was supported by Matteson (1985) in his article about adolescent and role. As stated by Matteson, the adolescent who is mastering his appropriate role, both in effect and behavior has generally the opportunity to observe, choose and learn the skills required for appropriate role enactment. Essentially, successful role acquisition is achieved if the adolescent meets different types of people and if there are individuals who, in his opinion, are appropriate models of role behavior (appropriate because he approves and their behavior as accepted by significant other in the community).

Okara, 1980 in his major study on adolescents and parents interaction measured the strength of adolescent, peer and parent relationship. His subjects came from a survey of 350 boys and girls who were secondary school students from Lagos University Preparatory School, Lagos. He found out three dimensions relevant to his study. First, the data tapped a very strong relationship between adolescents and their parents. Secondly, adolescents looked toward their parents for matters important to them and thirdly, adolescents in good relations with their peer groups were cosmetic and peers were no good alternative to parents. Okara's study is to this date is one of the known major study that had attempted to measure the strength of relationships between adolescents' peer-groups and parents in Nigeria. The results of the study was crystal clear that adolescents were more dependent on their parents and that parents had almost total control over their adolescent children. However, the study in question is more than 30 years old and Nigeria has since gone through a series of Cultural Revolution. It is assumed therefore that such study, if done today may yield very different results contrary of Okara's, 1980. To test the assumption and to be up to date in matters concerning

adolescent, peer group and parent relationships, it became necessary to repeat Okara's early study.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine if changes could be noted in adolescent, peer and parent relationships during the period after 1980s in Nigeria.

Hypothesis

1. Young male subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescent, and peer relationships than old male subjects.
2. Young male subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescents, and peer relationships than old female subjects.
3. Young female subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescent, and peer relationships than old female subjects.
4. Young female subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescent, and peer relationships than old male subjects.
5. The total young male and female subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescents and peer relationships than the total old male and female subjects.

Significant of Study

This study is important because the data, findings and results could be valuable to parents who perhaps until this moment had never thought about their, maybe deteriorating relationships with their adolescent children. Furthermore, this study will be educational, enlightening and fact finding about the status of parents, adolescents and peer groups in Nigeria and whether or not the strength of the cultural bonds between the adolescent and their parents still exists or has been weakened as a result of massive education and exposure to the western cultures through mass media. Finally, this study will provide an important starting point for further research in the area of adolescent-parent interaction and peer group involvement in the third world countries especially in Nigeria.

METHOD

There were two different sample groups: the first sample group was made up of adolescents between ages 16-18 while the second sample group was adults between ages 36-38. The two sample groups were given the same scale of 12 items each with few modifications for the group of adults.

Subject I: Sample of adolescents came from a survey of 100 boys and girls randomly drawn from a list of all classes four and five students at a large local secondary school in Lagos, Nigeria. The students represented all social classes and all major religious identities. In the Nigeria school system, compared to the American school system, senior secondary two and three are the same as eleventh and twelfth graders while secondary school is the same as high school.

Subject II: Samples of adults between the ages of 36-38 years old came from a survey of 100 males and females randomly drawn PTA (Parent-Teacher Association) members at Eko secondary school in Lagos, Nigeria. The adults represented all social classes and all major religious identities.

Procedures

Interaction was assessed with a scale of 12 items consisting of statements and questions with respect to parents-adolescents related and adolescent-peer group related. Subjects of each sample judged each item as it applied to him or her personally, choosing one out of the following alternatives: always, most of the time, sometimes, very seldom, and never.

Each response had a figure weight related to the degree of influence experienced by the participants that completed the questionnaire, the weighted figures to each response ranged from a + 5 to a -5. Items 1 through 6 asked questions about the participant's relationship with parents, were directed toward positive influences and rated as follows: (+5) = always, (+4) = most of the time, (+3) = sometimes, (+2) = very seldom, and (+1) = never. Items 7 through 12 asked questions about the participant's relationships with peers were directed toward negative influence and rated as follows: (-5) = always, (-4) = most of the time, (-3) = sometimes, (-2) = very seldom, and (-1) = never. Each participant's questionnaire score was computed as follows: computation of the positive weighted value of items 1-6 subtracted from the negative weighted value of items 7-12 yielded a computed total score. The computed total score carried a positive or negative sign based on the larger of the two scores from the parental influenced items 1-6 or from the peer influenced items 7-12. The score range varied from a high (+30) positive thirty to a low (-30) negative thirty. The size of the computation score on the positive side of the scale reflected parental influence and the negative side reflected influence of peer relationships. The 12 items were each submitted to chi-sq analysis.

RESULTS

The purpose of this analysis was to determine if changes could be noted in adolescent, peer and parent relationships during the period of late 70s and 2000s in Nigeria, Chi-square and analytic techniques were employed to achieve this purpose. The relationship between adolescents and parents interaction with each dimension of adolescents and peer group involvement was determined from the tabular presentation of the data. The gross relationship of interaction between adolescents and parents interaction to the respective dimension of peer-group involvement was determined statistically ($\chi^2 = (fo-fe)^2/fe$) with appropriate degree of freedom to determine the relationships. The results are organized with the first section presenting the subjects performance to each question and followed by explanations of the performance.

TABLE 1
THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 1 "CAN YOU GO TO YOUR PARENTS OR OTHER ADULTS FOR ADVICE WHEN YOU HAVE A PROBLEM OR WHEN YOU ARE INVOLVED IN SOME KIND OF TROUBLE?"

COLUMNS SUMJECTS	1 MY	2 OM	3 YF	4 OF	5 YM	6 OF	7 YF	8 OM	9 TY	10 TO
NEVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VERY SELDOM	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
SOMETIMES	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	38	0
MOST OF THE TIMES	27	12	31	10	27	10	27	10	58	22
ALWAYS	2	38	0	40	2	40	2	40	2	78
TOTAL	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100	100
CHI-SQUARE	59	169	69	756	63	191	63	191	128	400

DEGREE OF REEDOM		3		2		3		3		3
SIGNIFICANCE		.000		.000		.000		.000		.000
EXPECTED PROBABILIT	P < .05	P < .05		P < .05						

In column 1 and 2 of Table 1, a chi-square of 59.17 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.
 In column 3 and 4 of Table 1, a chi-square of 69.76 was computed with 2 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.
 In column 5 and 6 of Table 1, a chi-square of 63.19 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.
 In column 7 and 8 of Table 1, a chi-square of 63.19 was computed, with degree of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.
 In column 9 and 10 of Table 1, a chi-square of 128.40 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 2
 TO THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE
 ITEM 2 “DO YOUR PARENTS UNDERSTAND YOUR PROBLEMS?”

Columns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Subjects		YM	OM		YF	OF	YM	OF	YF	OM
TYS	TOS									
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very Seldom	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
Sometimes	38	1	46	0	38	0	38	0	84	1
Most of the times	10	18	4	15	10	15	10	15	14	33
Always	0	31	0	35	0	35	0	35	0	35
66										
Total	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100
100										

Chi – Square	70	388	87	386	76	000	76	.000	156	.727
Degree of Freedom	3		2		3		3		3	3
Significant	.000		.000		.000		.000		.000	
Expected Probability	P<.05		P<.05		P<.05		P<.05		P<.05	

In column 1 and 2 of Table 2, a chi-square of 70.39 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.
 In column 3 and 4 of Table 2, a chi-square of 87.37 was computed with 2 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.
 In column 5 and 6 of Table 2, a chi-square of 76.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.
 In column 7 and 8 of Table 2, a chi-square of 76.00 was computed, with a degree of freedom of 3 and found significant at the .05 level.
 In column 9 and 10 of Table 2, a chi-square of 156.73 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3
THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE
ITEM 3 “DO YOU THINK THE OPINIONS AND SUGGESTIONS OF MOST PARENTS ARE
GOOD GUIDES FOR BEHAVIOR?”

Columns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Subject	YM	OM	YF	OF	YM	OF	YF	OM	TY	TO
Never		0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
Very Seldom		1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	2
Sometimes		41	0	13	0	41	0	41	0	54
Most of the times		8	12	35	15	8	15	8	15	34
Always	0	38	0	35	0	35	0	35	0	73
Total		50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100	100
Chi – Square		80.80	58.000	709.130	79.130	130.728				
Degree of Freedom		3	3	3	3	3				
Significance		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000				
Expected Probability		P<.05	P<.05	P<.05	P<.05	P<.05				

In column 1 and 2 of Table 3, a chi-square of 80.80 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 3 and 4 of Table 3, a chi-square of 58.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 5 and 6 of Table 3, a chi-square of 79.13 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 7 and 8 of Table 3, a chi-square of 79.13 was computed, with a degree of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 9 and 10 of Table 3, a chi-square of 130.73 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4
THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE
ITEM 4 “HOW OFTEN DO YOU OBEY THE WISHES OF YOUR PARENTS”

Columns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Subjects	YM	OM	YF	OF	YM	OF	YF	OM	TY	TO
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very Seldom	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sometimes	20	0	42	0	20	0	20	0	62	0
Most of the time	30	33	8	40	30	40	30	40	38	73
Always	0	17	0	10	0	10	0	10	0	27
Total		50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100	100
Chi – Square		37.142	73.333	31.428	31.428	100.036				
Degree of Freedom		2	2	2	2	2				
Significance		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000				
Expected Probability		P<.05	P<.05	P<.05	P<.05	P<.05				

In column 1 and 2 of Table 4. A chi-square of 37.14 was computed with 2 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 3 and 4 of Table 4, a chi-square of 73.33 was computed with 2 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level

In column 5 and 6 of Table 4, a chi-square of 31.43 was computed with 2 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 7 and 8 of Table 4, a chi-square of 31.43 was computed, with a degree of freedom of 2 and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 9 and 10 of Table 4, a chi-square of 100.04 was computed with 2 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 5
THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE
ITEM 5 “HOW FREQUENTLY IS YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH YOUR PARENTS
CONSIDERED A POSITIVE ONE?”

Columns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Subjects	YM	OM	YF	OF	YM	OF	YF	OM	TY	TO
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very Seldom	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
Sometimes	33	0	33	0	33	0	33	0	66	0
Most of the Time	15	28	17	40	15	40	15	40	32	68
Always	0	22	0	10	0	10	0	10	0	22
Total	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100	100
Chi – Square	60.030		52.280		56.363		56.363		102.718	
Degree of Freedom	3		2		3		3		3	
Significance	.000		.000		.000		.000		.000	
Expected Probability P<	.05		P<.05		P<.05		P<.05		P<.05	

In column 1 and 2 of Table 5, a chi-square of 60.93 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 3 and 4 of Table 5, a chi-square of 52.28 was computed with 2 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 5 and 6 a chi-square of 56.36 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 7 and 8 of Table 5, a chi-square of 56.36 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 9 and 10 of Table 5, a chi-square of 102.72 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 6
THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 6
“HOW FREQUENTLY DO ADULTS HELP ADOLESCENTS THESE DAYS?”

Columns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Subjects	YM	OM	YF	OF	YM	OF	YF	OM	TYS	TOS
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very Seldom	23	0	13	0	23	0	23	0	36	0
Sometimes	25	1	31	0	25	0	25	0	35	1
Most of the Time	2	43	7	45	2	45	2	45	9	88
Always	0	6	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	11
Total	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100	100
Chi – Square	88.509		75.769		92.340		92.340		142.994	
Degree of Freedom	3		3		3		3		3	
Significance	.000		.000		.000		.000		.000	

Expected Probability P< .05 P< .05 P< .05 P< .05 P< .05

In column 1 and 2 of Table 6, a chi-square of 88.51 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 3 and 4 of Table 6, a chi-square of 75.77 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 5 and 6 of Table 6, a chi-square of 92.34 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 7 and 8 of Table 6, a chi-square of 92.34 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 9 and 10 of Table 6, a chi-square of 142.99 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 7

THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 7
“DO YOU CONSIDER IT BETTER TO TURN TO YOUR PEERS IF
TURNED DOWN BY AN ADULT OR WHEN YOU RECEIVE AN UNSATISFACTORY
ANSWER TO YOUR PROBLEM FROM AN ADULT?”

Columns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Subjects	YM	OM	YF	OF	YM	OF	YF	OM	TYS	TOS
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very Seldom	1	13	0	20	0	20	0	20	0	23
Sometimes	2	31	15	30	2	30	2	30	20	71
Most of the Time	46	5	35	0	46	0	46	0	80	5
Always	2	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	1

Total	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100	100
-------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----

Chi – Square	71	.778	60	000	92	.500	92	.500	110	.356
Degree of Freedom	3		2		3		3		3	
Significance		.000		.000		.000		.000		.000
Expected Probability P<		.05		P<.05		P<.05		P<.05		P<.05

In column 1 and 2 of Table 7, a chi-square of 71.78 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 3 and 4 of Table 7, a chi-square of 60.00 was computed with 2 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 5 and 6 of Table 7, a chi-square of 92.50 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 7 and 8 a chi-square of 92.50 was computed with a degree of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 9 and 10 of Table 7, a chi-square of 110.36 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 8

THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF THE 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE
ITEM 8 “FOR HELP IN FACING LIFE’S PROBLEMS,
THE ADOLESCENT TODAY MUST TURN MOSTLY TO HIS/HER OWN AGE GROUP?”

Columns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Subjects	YM	OM	YF	OF	YM	OF	YF	OM	TYS	TOS
Never	0	2	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	2
Very Seldom	0	37	2	45	0	45	0	45	2	87
Sometimes	45	11	45	0	45	0	45	0	90	11
Most of the Time	5	0	3	0	5	0	5	0	8	0

Always 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100 100
Chi – Square	66 .642	92 .340	100 .000	100 .000	147 .951					
Degree of Freedom	3	3	3	3	3					
Significance	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000					.000
Expected Probability	P< .05	P< .05	P< .05	P< .05	P< .05					P< .05

In column 1 and 2 of Table 8, a chi-square of 64.64 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 3 and 4 of Table 8, a chi-square of 92.34 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 5 and 6 of Table 8, a chi-square of 100.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 7 and 8 of Table 8, a chi-square of 100.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 9 and 10 of Table 8 a chi-square of 147.95 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 9
THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 9”AS A YOUNG PERSON, I WOULD PREFER TO BE WITH MY FRIENDS RATHER THAN MY PARENTS.”

Columns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Subjects	YM	OM	YF	OF	YM	OF	YF	OM	TYS	
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very Seldom	0	2	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	7
Sometimes	0	45	1	45	0	45	0	45	1	90
Most of the Time	44	3	49	0	44	0	44	0	93	3
Always	6	0	0	0	6	0	6	0	0	1
Total	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100 100
Chi-Square	88 .765	96 .086	100 .000	100 .000	184 .418					
Degree of Freedom	3	2	3	3	3					
Significance	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000					.000
Expected Probability	P< .05	P< .05	P< .05	P< .05	P< .05					P< .05

In column 1 and 2 of Table 9, a chi-square of 71.78 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 3 and 4 of Table 9, a chi-square of 96.07 was computed with 2 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 5 and 6 of Table 9, a chi-square of 100.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 7 and 8 of Table 9, a chi-square of 100.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 9 and 10 of Table 9, a chi-square of 184.42 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 10

THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 10 "SELECTION OF DESIRED ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE LEFT TO ME AND MY FRIENDS RATHER THAN MY PARENT."

Columns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Subjects	YM	OM	YF	OF	YM	OF	YF	OM	TYS	TOS
Never	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Very Seldom	0	12	0	35	0	35	0	35	0	47
Sometimes	0	34	8	15	0	15	0	15	8	49
Most of the Time	44	2	42	0	44	0	44	0	86	2
Always	6	0	0	6	0	6	0	6	0	
Total	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100	100
Chi – Square	92.34779	.130	100.000		100.000		164.673			
Degree of Freedom	4		2		3		3		4	
Significance	.000	.000		.000		.000		.000		
Expected Probability p<	.05		P<.05		P<.05		P<.05		P<.05	

In column 1 and 2 of Table 10, a chi-square of 92.35 was computed with 4 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 3 and 4 of Table 10, a chi-square of 79.13 was computed with 2 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 5 and 6 of Table 10, a chi-square of 100.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 7 and 8 of Table 10, a chi-square of 100.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 9 and 10 of Table 10, a chi-square of 164.67 was computed with 4 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 11

THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 11 "THE APPROVAL OF YOUR FRIENDS IN MOST MATTERS IS MORE THAN THE APPROVAL OF YOUR PARENTS."

Columns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Subjects	YM	OM	YF	OF	YM	OF	YF	OM	TYS	TOS
Never	0	16	0	35	0	35	0	35	0	51
Very Seldom	0	33	1	15	0	15	0	15	1	48
Sometimes	16	1	29	0	16	0	16	0	45	1
Most of the Time	43	0	20	0	34	0	34	0	54	0
Always	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100	100
Chi – Square	96.235	96.250	100.000		100.000		192.168			
Degree of Freedom	3		3		3		3		3	
Significance	.000		.000		.000		.000		.000	
Expected Probability P<	.05		P<.05		P<.05		P<.05		P<.05	

In column 1 and 2 of Table 11, a chi-square of 96.24 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 3 and 4 of Table 11, a chi-square of 96.25 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 5 and 6 of Table 11, a chi-square of 100.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 7 and 8 of Table 11, a chi-square of 100.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 9 and 10 of Table 11, a chi-square of 192.17 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 12

THE RESPONSES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF 200 SUBJECTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 12 "I SEEK ADVICE ON VERY PERSONAL MATTERS FROM MY FRIENDS RATHER THAN MY PARENTS."

Columns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Subjects	YM	OM	YF	OF	YM	OF	YF	OM	TYS	TOS
Never	0	16	0	30	0	30	0	36	0	46
Very Seldom	0	29	1	20	0	20	0	20	1	49
Sometimes	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Most of the Time	46	1	48	0	46	0	46	0	94	1
Always	4	0	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	
Total	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	100	100
Chi – Square	96 .085	96 .190	100 .000		100 .000		188 .922			
Degree of Freedom	4		3		3		3		4	
Significance	.000		.000		.000		.000		.000	
Expected Probability	P< .05		P< .05		P< .05		P< .05		P< .05	

In column 1 and 2 of Table 12, a chi-square of 96.09 was computed with 4 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 3 and 4 of Table 12, a chi-square of 96.19 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 5 and 6 of Table 12, a chi-square of 100.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 7 and 8 of Table 12, a chi-square of 100.00 was computed with 3 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

In column 9 and 10 of Table 12, a chi-square of 188.92 was computed with 4 degrees of freedom and found significant at the .05 level.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The study by Okara on adolescents, peer, and parents attempted to measure the strength of relationship between adolescents, peers, and parents. The result was overwhelming as adolescents were found to be more dependent on their parents than on their peers in decision making. It was also found that parents had almost total control on their adolescent children in areas of autonomy and independence (Okara, 1970). But later years witnessed a state of social revolution in Nigerian history.

In early 70s, the national literacy rate in Nigeria was 25 percent, ranking 85 in the world. There were 14,502 primary schools, 1,235 secondary schools, 156 teacher-training colleges and about three universities in Nigeria (Awaji, 1980). At the time in question, Nigeria had not introduced free, universal and compulsory system of secondary education. The gross enrollment rate was 32 percent in the first and second level combined. As expected, most families could not afford to send their children to school and for those who could do so, school was not a wonderful ideal/option for them. Large and extended families, enough food

production and family heritage had priority over school. However, in late 1970 and 1980, 15,000 new primary schools, 800 secondary schools, 75 teacher-training colleges and new universities were built. In addition to the new institutions built, the government also introduced free, universal and compulsory system of education in the country.

Also, in the early 1970, television stations were operated only by federal governments on a very small scale. The Nigerian Television Authority, under the umbrella of the federal government controlled its branches in Ibadan and Kaduna and were on air for about 35 hours a week. As late as 1977, there were about 105,000 television sets in the country or about 1.6 per 1,000 inhabitants (Anifowose, 1980).

Limited television stations, mode of operation and scarcity of television sets at that time helped the family traditional system and cultures in Nigeria. Most families and children in particular lived in the dark as they were blindfolded to the external/foreign exposure. As a result, imitation and external influence were almost non-existence in the early 1970. Almost every child looked toward his/her parents as the most important main authority and role model worthy of emulation. Also at this time in question, crimes were almost non-existent.

In the 80s, mass media just like educational institutions had a complete boost. New television stations were built by both the federal and state governments as well as newspaper circulation increased to the most remote parts of the country. There were about 19 federal owned television stations and about 5 state-owned television stations with significant increase in hours of operations. In addition to building new television stations, the state governments made several television sets available to most households who wanted them in form of loans. At this time, the darkness in the communities, in the country and in the world as a whole was cleared. Nigeria became united to other parts of the world in communication and no longer an island of its own (Okpaku, 1981).

As a result of increased numbers of schools and television stations, the educational system was revolutionized and this inversely affected most parts of the social functions in the country and the way people lived and raised their children. All the changes that occurred between 1970 and 1990 made it necessary to repeat or to reaffirm the 1970 study on adolescents, peer and their parents. This study was an attempt to measure the strength of relationship between adolescents, peers and parents in the 90s as compared to the 70s. In addition, the study was to determine if changes could be noticed in adolescents, peer and parents relationships during the period of years between 70s and 90s in Nigeria.

The participants of this study were composed of young subjects; boys and girls ranging from ages 16 to 18 years old, and old subjects, males and females ranging from ages 36 to 38 years old. The young subjects of boys and girls were randomly drawn from classes four and five at a local secondary school in Lagos, Nigeria. The old subjects, males and females were also drawn from parents/teachers association at the same local secondary school in Lagos, Nigeria.

Analyzed data

In responses to tables 1 to 12, significant relationships at the .05 level were found between young male subjects and old male subjects, young female subjects and old female subjects, young male subjects and old female subjects, young female subjects and old male subjects, and the total young subjects were made up of young males and young females, while the total old subjects were made up of both old male and old female subjects.

There were significant relationships between ages and how respondents answered all the respective questions. These supported the five hypothesis: (1) Young males' adolescents will show a significantly higher influence between adolescents and peer relationship than old male adolescents. (2) Young female subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescents and peers relationships than older female subjects. (3) Young male subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescents and peer relationships than old female subjects. (4) Young females will show a significantly higher influence between adolescent peer relationships than old male subjects. (5) Total young male and female subjects will show a significantly higher influence between adolescents and peer relationships than the total old male and female subjects because the obtained chi-squares (χ^2) were statistically significant at the .05 level since the obtained values were more than the table values.

The findings of this study was crystal clear as the results overwhelming supported the five hypotheses. Okara's study in the 70s strongly supported strong relationship between adolescents and their parents in decision-making, autonomy and independence than in their peer groups. But his study is about 30 years ago. The result of this study compared to the Okara's study could be as a result of the changes that have occurred in Nigeria between the periods of late 70s and 80s. Education and mass media are two powerful vehicles/tools to effectively change in society, and Nigeria was no exception.

The literature on adolescence is laden with generalization to the effect that adolescents' subculture has risen and gained importance due to the sociocultural conditions which preclude the possibility of effective interaction between adults and adolescents (Furman and Bierman, [1984]). As a peg on which to lay social status, adolescence shares the peculiarities of all age classifications. It is, for instance, more transitory and less definite than most age statuses. Whereas childhood is set by relatively long period of dependency and adulthood by a long period of self-sufficiency, adolescence is distinguished by nothing very positive of long duration. This according to Furman and Bierman gives the adolescent unquestionable advantages to either interact and submit to the adult world or create his own circle of interaction with his favorites, possibly his peers in the adult made world. This is a sociological gift to the adolescents with focus on the various societies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Special thanks to Dr. John Joyner for his marvelous and relentless effort towards the success of this research. His diligent and knowledgeable guidance and support were vital to the successful completion of this work. The invaluable assistances of Joan Elliot Ph.D., James Threalkill, Ph.D. and Roger J, Ph.D. are gratefully acknowledged. A lot of thanks to the entire members of my family for their encouragement and moral support.

REFERENCES

- Ehiemua, S. I., Adolescents – Parents Interaction and Peer Group Involvement (1993) Doctoral Dissertation (Abstract), Tennessee State University, Nashville USA
Joyner, J. (1984) Adolescence and Changing Society, University Press. Michigan.
Adelson, J., (1979) Adolescence Generation Gap. Psychology Today, 12 (9) 33-37.

- Okara, I. (1970) Parents-Adolescents and Peer Interaction Relationship. Educational Social Research. University of Lagos.
- Anifowose, F. O., (1980) the Politics of Violence in Nigeria, Oxford Press, New York.
- Ayaji, J. F. (1980) Milestones in Nigerian History, New York.s.
- Brendt, T. J. (1979) "Developmental Changes in Conformity to Peers and Parents." Developmental Psychology 15. 608-616.
- Bloom, M. V. (1980) Adolescent-Parents Separation, Garden Press in New York.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie (1984) Children and Families: Society 18. (January/February): 38-48
- Brown, B. B., (1982) "The Extent and Effects of Peer Pressure among high school students: A retrospective Analysis." Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 11. 121-133.
- Coleman, J. S. (1980) "Friendship and the peer group in Adolescence." Handbook of Adolescent Physiology. J. Adelson, Ed. NY: WI
- Cooper, C. R. Grotevant, H. D. and Gordon, S. M., (1983) Individual and connectedness in the family as a context for adolescent identity formation, and role making stall. In H. D. Grotevant and C. R Cooper Individual Adolescent Development in the Family. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Diaz, R. M. and Berndt, J. J. (1982) Children knowledge of a best friend: Fact or Fancy? Developmental Psychology, 28. 787-794.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968) Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton.
- Enright, R. D., Lepsley, D. K. Drivas, A. E. and Fehr, L. A. (1980) Parental Influence on the Development of Adolescent Autonomy and Identity. Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 10, 11-23.
- Fadley, L. F. and Hosler, V. N. (1979) 'Confrontation is Adolescence' C. V. Mosby Coy. St. Louis.
- Fasick, F. A. (1984) Parents, Peers, Youth Culture and Autonomy in Adolescence. Adolescence. XIX #73
- Fischer, J. L. Transitions in Relationship Style from Adolescence to Young Adulthood, Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 1981. (10) 11-23
- Folunsho, T. A., Alabi. M. O. (1982) "The Adolescent and His Culture" Ibadan Universal Press. Ibadan.
- Freud, (1970) Early Childhood Illusion: Illinois: Prentice-Hall
- Furman, W. and Bierman, K. L. (1984) Children's Conceptions of Friendship: A Multi Method Study of Developmental Changes. Developmental Psychology, 20, 925-931
- Greenberg, M. T., Siegel, J. M., and Leitch, C. J. (1983) "The Nature and Importance of Attachment Relationships to Parents and Peers during Adolescence", Jou. of Youth and Adolescence 12 373-386.
- Hallinan, M. T. (1980) "Patterns of Clinging among Youth." Friendship and Social Relations in Children. H. C. Foot, A. J. Chapman and J. R. Smith, (eds.) New York: Wiley.
- Hartup, W. W. (1981) Peer Relations. In P. H. Mussen (eds.) Handbook of Child Psychology. Socialization, Personality and Social Development. pp. 103-196. Ed. Em. M. Hetherington, NY.
- Hoelter, J.W. (1984) Relative Effects of Significant Others on Self-Evaluation. Social Psychology Qrt. 47. 255-262.
- Hunter, F.T., (1984) "Socializing Procedures in Parent-Child and Friendship Relations during Adolescence." Developmental Psychology. 20(6) 1092-1099
- Jones, W.M. (1982) Loneliness and Social Behavior. In L.A. Peplau and D. Perlman (eds.) Loneliness: A Sourcebook of Current Theory, Research and Therapy: New York: Wiley. 238-252.
- Kandel, Denis, B. Andrew and Kenneth. (1987) Process of Adolescent Socialization by Parents and Peers. Internal Journal of Addictions. 22 (4) 319-342.

- Lacovetta, R.G. (1975) Adolescents-Adult Interaction and Peer Group Involvement. Journal of Adolescence. 10.
- Leahy, R. L. (1981) Parental Practices and the Development of Moral Judgment and Self-Image Disparity during Adolescence. Developmental Psychology. 17. 58
- Marcoen, A., Brumagne, M. (1985) Loneliness among Children and Young Adolescents. Developmental Psychology. 11. 21 (6). 1023-1031
- Modell, J. (1989) "Into One's Own" From Youth to Adulthood. University of California Press. Berkley and Los Angeles.
- Montemayer, R. (1986) Developing Autonomy: The Transition of Youth into Adulthood. In Leigh, A.K. and Peterson, U.W. (eds.) Adolescents in Families South-Western Publishing Co. Cincinnati, OH.
- Obi, N.G. (1985) Adolescents and the Changing of Age. Educational Psychology. 412-510.
- Omolola, K.K. (1985) the Dilemma of Nigerian Cultures. Lagos Printing Press.
- Peterson, A. C., and Taylor, B. (1980) The Biological Approach to Adolescence. In Adelson, J. (eds) Handbook of Adolescent Psychology, Wiley, New York.
- Piaget, J. (1932) the Moral Judgment of the Child. London: Routledge: Kegan.
- Rice, F. P. (1981) The Adolescent: Development, relationship, and Culture (3rd eds): Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Savin-William, R.I. (1980) "Social Interactions of Adolescent Females in Natural Group." Friendship and Social Relations in Children.
- Sebald, H. (1984) "Adolescent's Shifting Orientation toward Parents and Peers: A Curvilinear Trend over Recent Decades." Journal of Marriage and the Family. 48. 5-13.
- Selman, R.L. and Selman, A.P., (1979) Children Ideas about Friendship: A New Theory. Psychology Today. 144-171
- Smith, T.E. (1983) "Adolescent's Reaction to Attempted Parental Control and Influence Technique." Journal of Marriage and the Family. 45. 533-542..
- Sullivan, H.S. (1975) the Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: Norton.
- Volpe, J.S. (1981) the Development of Concepts of Parent- Child and Friend Relations and of Self within the Relations. (Doctoral Dissertation, the Catholic University of America. Abstracts International, 41. 4314-4753 (University Microfilm #8111648).
- White, K.M., Speisman, J. C., and Costos, D., (1983) "Young Adults and Their Parents: Individualization to Maturity" Adolescent Developing in the Family. H.D. Grotevant and C. R. Cooper (eds). San Francisco: Jessey- Bass.
- Wright, P. H. and Keple, T.N. (1981) Friends and Parents of Sample High School Juniors: An Exploratory Study of Relationship intensity and Interpersonal Rewards. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 43. 559-570.
- Youniss, J. (1980) Parents and Peers in Social development. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.