



1998

Aggression, Relational Aggression, Sociometric Status and the Quality and Authenticity of Children's Friendships

Carrie C. Finch '98
Illinois Wesleyan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/psych_honproj



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Finch '98, Carrie C., "Aggression, Relational Aggression, Sociometric Status and the Quality and Authenticity of Children's Friendships" (1998). *Honors Projects*. 89.
https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/psych_honproj/89

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Commons @ IWU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this material in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This material has been accepted for inclusion by faculty at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@iwu.edu.

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

Running Head: CORRELATES OF FRIENDSHIP QUALITY AND AUTHENTICITY

Aggression, Relational Aggression, Sociometric Status
and the Quality and Authenticity of Children's Friendships

Carrie C. Finch

Illinois Wesleyan University

Abstract

The purpose of the present study is to assess how aggression, relational aggression, and sociometric status relate to the quality and authenticity of children's friendships. Relations between aggression, relational aggression, and sociometric status as well as between friendship quality and friendship authenticity were also explored. 136 fourth and fifth grade children (69 boys, 67 girls) completed several measures, including a sociometric measure, the aggression section of the Pupil Evaluation Inventory with a few items measuring relational aggression inserted, the Friendship Quality Questionnaire, and a questionnaire assessing friendship authenticity. Children's peer rated levels of aggression and their sociometric status did not contribute to the quality of their friendships. Consistent with past research, children who were rated high in aggression were also rated high in relational aggression and were also less liked by their peers. Strong sex differences were found when correlating aggression, relational aggression, sociometric status, and friendship quality with the authenticity of children's friendships. Girls, not boys, whose best friendships were rated high in authenticity were more accepted by their peers and were rated lower in aggression than those girls with unauthentic best friendships. For boys, friendship authenticity positively correlated with friendship quality. Implications for assessing friendship authenticity are discussed.

Aggression, Relational Aggression, Sociometric Status
and the Quality and Authenticity of Children's Friendships

Friendships are very complex relationships which require a wide variety of skills for their formation and maintenance. For example, Asher, Parker, and Walker (1996) have hypothesized that children must be able to recognize and respect that friendships are based on equality. They also suggested that children must be able to resolve conflicts and work to prevent similar conflicts in the future. These are two examples from the list of skills that Asher, Parker, and Walker (1996) hypothesized are necessary to maintain a successful friendship. So what happens, then, when children lack these skills, or possess personal attributes that could interfere with the success of these friendships? Do these personal characteristics affect all aspects of the friendship, or would some features of children's friendships be affected more than others?

Aggression and popularity are two such characteristics that have been found to be correlated with the quality of children's friendships (Bergout & Draper, 1984; Grotmeter & Crick, 1996; Parker & Asher, 1993). The exact nature of this correlation, however, is still not clear. In addition, research suggests that there is a relation between aggression and sociometric status (Bierman, Smoot, & Aumiller, 1993; Dodge, 1983; French, 1988; Newcomb, Bukowski, & Pattee, 1993) and very little is known on how they might interact to predict friendship quality. To better understand these possible correlations and interactions, it is necessary to review the literature on friendship, aggression, and peer acceptance.

Friendship, Friendship Quality, and Friendship Authenticity

As discussed by Berndt (1996) in his review on the early theories of friendship, the roots

of friendship investigation and the identification of the features of friendship can be traced back to Jean Piaget and Harry Stack Sullivan. Specifically, Piaget named cooperation, mutual respect, and reciprocity as features of friendships. Sullivan also explored the basis of social relations and suggested that intimacy and low competition were important characteristics of friendship.

Since the work of Piaget and Sullivan, many investigators have sought to identify the multiple features unique to peer relations. Early investigators such as Bigelow and LaGaipa (1975) identified as many as 21 characteristics of friendship. In the current literature exploring the characteristics and quality of friendships there is convergent opinion that five to seven features accurately assess the quality of friendships (Furman, 1996). Companionship, instrumental help, conflict, intimacy, and nurturance have all emerged as features of friendship (See Bukowski, Boivin, and Hoza's (1994) Friendship Qualities Scale, Parker and Asher's (1993) Friendship quality questionnaire, Furman and Buhrmester's (1985) Network of relationships inventory, and Furman and Wehner's (1994) Behavioral systems questionnaire).

Although one may assume that friendships consist of only positive features, negative features of friendships may also be identified and utilized in the measurement of the quality of peer relationships. For example, Parker and Asher (1993) reliably identified six features of friendship in their Friendship Quality Questionnaire. The five positive characteristics are the ability to resolve conflict within the friendship, the amount of companionship and recreation they get out of the relationship, the presence of intimate exchange between friends, the feelings of validation and caring, and finally, the amount of help and guidance they receive. The one negative feature of friendship that emerged was the presence of conflict and betrayal in the friendship. The quality of a friendship, then, includes both positive and negative features, with

the higher levels of positive features constituting a higher level of friendship quality and higher levels of conflict and betrayal contributing to poor friendship quality.

In order to assess the quality of a friendship, a friendship must first be identified. This is typically done through a nomination procedure in which a child writes down the names of their three best friends from their class, then from that list, they pick their single very best friend in the class. If the child that they named as their very best friend has also included them on their best friend list, the relationship is said to be reciprocated. Research examining reciprocal friendships of children has found that although involvement in friendship generally increases as group acceptance increases, many low-accepted children have friends and not all high-accepted children have friends (Parker & Asher, 1993).

The present study proposes a new method of assessing friendships. A friendship authenticity questionnaire was developed to scrutinize the depth and strength of children's named best friendships. The benefits to measuring friendships in this manner include not having to limit a child to naming only children in their class as their best friends. The present study allowed children to name anyone in their grade as their best friend. Children were limited to their grade so that researchers were sure that it was a peer relationship that was being measured. Also, all children who received permission to participate and completed all the questionnaires were included in the study. In prior studies exploring children's friendships, children have been excluded if their named friendship was not reciprocated. In order to explore the implications of measuring friendship authenticity, it was correlated with aggression, relational aggression, sociometric status, and friendship quality.

Aggression and Friendship

Aggression has previously been used to describe a wide variety of behaviors that have an aversive affect on others. Aggressive acts may be physical or verbal and may take the form of disruptive, disagreeable, or egocentric behavior (Bierman, 1986). Researchers have set out to study aggression because of its disruptive and stable nature. More importantly, researchers have found that aggression in childhood can reliably predict later juvenile delinquency, adult antisocial personality disorders, alcoholism, and other aversive problems in adulthood (Kohlberg, LaCross, & Ricks, 1972; Parker & Asher, 1987).

Aggressive children rate low on measures of attention and perception (Bierman, Smoot, & Aumiller, 1993) and they tend to distort ambiguous social cues and respond as though they had hostile intent (Dodge, 1980). These perceptual deficits are in addition to their high levels of aggressive behaviors (Dodge, Coie, & Brakke, 1982). It has been suggested that this combination of behaviors leads to subsequent low peer status (Dodge, 1983). The association between aggression and peer status will be discussed in a later section.

In predicting how aggression might correlate with friendship quality, one study that was taken into consideration was Dishon, Andrews, and Crosby's (1995) investigation of antisocial boys and their friendships in early adolescence. Antisocial behavior is different from aggression in that the severity of antisocial behavior is partly determined by levels of delinquent behavior in addition to levels of aggression. Thus, the population in the Dishon, et.al. (1995) study is different from the population of aggressive children in the present study. However, the study is important because they found that the general quality of the friendships of antisocial boys may be compromised. Compared to the control, the relationships of the antisocial boys were shorter

in duration, perceived by the boys as being less satisfying, and the relationships ended in bad terms.

One purpose of the present study was to further explore the relation between aggression and friendship quality. Specifically, levels of aggression were assessed in relation to the six features of friendship identified by Parker & Asher (1993) in an attempt to locate any correlations between these two variables. It was expected that high levels of aggression would predict high levels of conflict and betrayal (the negative feature of friendship) in children's best friendships. This hypothesis was made on the basis of the previous literature review which has suggested that aggressive children engage in high levels of aggression and have deficits in social processing mechanisms (Crick & Dodge, 1996; Dodge, 1980; Dodge, Coie, & Brakke, 1982). It was suspected that these characteristics of aggressive children would increase the amount of conflict within their relationships.

Relational Aggression and Friendship

Grotpeter and Crick (1996) have proposed the subgrouping of aggressive behaviors into the categories of relational and overt aggression. Relational aggression is defined as inflicting harm on others through the manipulation of peer relationships (e.g., the spreading of rumors). Overt aggression is defined as physical aggression or the threat of physical aggression. Some research has suggested that relational aggression is more typically displayed by females whereas overt aggression is more typically displayed by males (Grotpeter & Crick, 1996). Others studying relational aggression have found that boys and girls are equally relationally aggressive (Rys & Bear, 1997), or that the boys were even higher in relational aggression than girls (Tomada & Schneider, 1997). However, Rys and Bear (1997) point out that while they found

that girls and boys may display similar amounts of relational aggression, it was rare for a boy to rate high in relational aggression without also rating high in overt aggression, while it was common for females to only be relationally aggressive.

Grotpeter and Crick (1996) have provided an initial study of the association between relational aggression, overt aggression, and friendship quality. They found that relationally aggressive children reported high levels of intimacy as well as high levels of relational aggression in their relationships. The authors suggested that relationally aggressive children may actually seek out relationships that are high in intimacy in order to gain control over the relationship. They also found that those who were friends with the children who were relationally aggressive reported higher levels of relational aggression and higher levels of conflict and betrayal in their friendships. In contrast to the friendships of relationally aggressive children, the overtly aggressive children and their friends aimed their aggression at those in the larger group and not at one another. They also reported significantly lower levels of intimacy in their relationship. No significant differences in friendship quality were found otherwise. The present study included a measure of relational aggression in addition to the more undifferentiated measure of aggression in an attempt to replicate some of these initial findings on relational aggression.

Social Status and Friendship

Another research area that has flourished in the past couple of decades has been research conducted on sociometric status. Sociometric status reflects the general acceptance of a child by his or her peers. Researchers are interested in sociometric status because of its correlation with later adjustment. In particular, low-acceptance in children has been found to be a predictor

of later school dropout (Parker & Asher, 1987). Also, peer rejected children are more at risk for negative self-perceptions (Bovian & Hymel, 1997) and greater loneliness (Parker & Asher, 1993; Parkhurst & Asher, 1992) than their non-rejected peers.

There are two popular methods of assessing sociometric status: positive and negative nomination procedures and rating-scale measures. Use of a positive and negative nomination procedure requires children to write down the names of three children that they like the most in the class and the three children that they like the least. This allows the researcher to classify children as popular, average, controversial, neglected, and rejected based on the number of positive and negative nominations a child receives.

Authors such as Asher and Dodge (1986) have expressed some concern that the use of positive and negative nominations may be deleterious because it requires participants to actively generate the names of the students they dislike. In response to the concern over the use of peer nominations, Bell-Dolan, Foster, and Sikora (1989) examined the effects of sociometric testing on children's subsequent interactions with preferred and non-preferred peers in addition to assessing feelings of mood and loneliness. The investigators found that the nominations had no effect on neither peer interactions nor feelings of mood and loneliness. The authors concluded that the risks are minimal when using positive and negative peer nominations. However, the authors point out that more testing is needed before a more definitive conclusion can be made.

Despite the apparent lack of negative effects from the use of peer nominations, the rating-scale method of sociometric assessment was chosen for the present study. The rating-scale measure requires children to rate how much they like each child in their class on a scale of 1 to 5. This method allows researchers to label children as of low, high, and average acceptance,

depending on where they fall on the continuum of popularity for their class. The rating-scale method of sociometric assessment has been chosen because its use has generally been considered more ethical than the use of positive and negative nominations (Asher & Dodge, 1986).

Specifically, rating-scale measures are more ethical because no student is required to generate the names of students they like and dislike. In addition to being more ethical, the rating-scale method of sociometric assessment has greater reliability (Asher & Hymel, 1981; Oden & Asher, 1977; Singleton & Asher, 1977) and validity (French, Waas, & Tarver-Behring, 1986; Maassen, van der Linden, & Akkermans, 1997) than nomination procedures. Support for the use of the rating-scale method has also come from French, Waas, and Tarver-Behring (1986) who found that when comparing both methods, there was a great degree of overlap in the identification of rejected and popular children. Thus, because the rating-scale method is effective in identifying children who are low and high accepted by their peers, and is more ethical, reliable, and valid, it has been chosen for use with the current study.

Much of the sociometric status research has focused on low-accepted, or rejected, children and how they compare to their popular or average status peers. The research suggests that these populations differ greatly from one another. In a meta-analytic review of popular, rejected, neglected, controversial, and average sociometric status children and their peer relations, Newcomb, Bukowski, and Pattee (1993) concluded that popular children rate high in sociability and cognitive abilities, were good problem solvers, and had positive social traits and friendship relations. Popular children were also low in aggression and withdrawal. The descriptions of peer rejected children are not as positive. There have been several suggestions that peer-rejected children have greater social-cognitive deficits than children of higher

sociometric status (Dozier, 1988; Hymel, 1983; Newcomb, Bukowski, & Pattee, 1993). For example, peer-rejected children process interpersonal information differently than average children (Dozier, 1988). When asked how another child would behave towards them, rejected children commonly misinterpreted the available behavioral information. This processing deficit was restricted to self-relevant information.

In addition to the social-cognitive deficits described in low-accepted children, deficits have also been found in their behavioral repertoire. In the meta-analysis of Newcomb, Bukowski, and Pattee (1993), peer rejected children were found to be low on most measures of sociability. Also, rejected children rated high on all measures of aggression (disruptive aggression, physical aggression, and negative aggression). When assessed for withdrawal characteristics, rejected children were the most anxious and depressed.

Low and high accepted children also differed in their peer interactions. When assessing friendship differences based observations of positive and negative peer interactions in a group setting, Bierman and McCauley (1987) found that frequency of positive peer interactions were positively correlated with positive sociometric nominations. In contrast, negative peer interactions were associated with negative nominations (Bierman & McCauley, 1987). Also, Berghout and Draper (1984) found that the utterances of popular children were more positive than those of their rejected peers.

In addition to low-accepted children having more negative peer interactions than their popular counterparts, research also suggests the quality of their friendships suffers. Parker & Asher (1993) reported that the friendships of children who have low sociometric status are characterized by less validation and caring, more difficulty in conflict resolution, less help and

guidance behaviors, and less intimacy between the two peers. Although, it is interesting to note that there was no difference between popular and rejected children in the amount of companionship and recreation that they experienced with their best friends than the friendships of their popular peers. The differences in conflict and betrayal were also not significant.

Another aim of the present study was to assess sociometric status and its correlations with friendship quality. It was hypothesized that the positive features of friendship, except for the companionship and recreation feature, would be positively correlated with sociometric status and that there would be no correlation with the negative features of friendship. Specifically, low levels of peer acceptance would predict low scores on measures of validation and caring, conflict resolution ability, help and guidance behaviors, and intimate exchange. Support for this hypothesis comes directly from Parker & Asher's (1993) study on the relation between sociometric status and friendship quality which found that low-acceptance correlated with low scores on the positive features of friendship. Also, Parker and Asher found no significant difference in the companionship and recreation that children experienced, nor in the amounts of conflict and betrayal they felt in their relationships between the low, average, and high accepted children he surveyed. Consequently, I expected to find no predictive power for sociometric status on either of these friendship features.

Aggression and Sociometric Status on Friendship

It has recently been acknowledged that aggression and peer-rejection are not independent characteristics. The relation between aggression and peer rejection has been investigated in studies such as Dodge's (1983) analysis of the behavior of rejected children in unfamiliar groups. He found that when he placed boys into playgroups of unfamiliar peers, those boys who later

became rejected by the children in that group engaged in more aggressive and inappropriate behaviors, such as hostile verbalizations and the exclusion and hitting of other children. This relation between aggression and rejection has also been supported in Newcomb, Bukowski, and Pattee's (1993) meta-analytic review of popular, rejected, neglected, controversial, and average sociometric status children. They found that the peer rejected group had higher ratings of aggression as well as higher levels of social withdrawal. The diversity of the behaviors of peer rejected children led researchers to identify two reliable subgroupings of peer rejected children: Aggressive-rejected children and non-aggressive rejected children (French, 1988; Bierman, Smoot, & Aumiller, 1993).

In general, the rejected-aggressive subgrouping of children display more diverse problems as compared to their non-aggressive rejected and aggressive only counterparts (French, 1988; Bierman, Smoot, & Aumiller, 1993). Specifically, French was able to identify a rejected-aggressive sample of children who were characterized by high levels of aggression, low levels of self-control, and high levels of withdrawn behavior. The non-aggressive rejected population in this study was characterized by high levels of withdrawal only. The aggressive-rejected sample in Bierman, et al's. (1993) study displayed high levels of physical and verbal aggression. They were also argumentative, disruptive, imperceptive, and inattentive, and were less prosocial. The aggression only group in this sample displayed only physical aggression and the rejection only group was shy, passive, insensitive, and atypical. Thus, in addition to acting independently, aggression and peer rejection apparently have some interaction effects.

Although the qualities of friendships of aggressive children and of low-accepted children have somewhat been explored (Grotperter & Crick, 1996; Parker & Asher, 1993), little is known

about how the two interact to affect friendship quality. The aim of the present study was to assess how aggression and sociometric status individually correlate with friendship quality and to also explore any interaction effects that they would have relative to each other on the qualities of children's peer relationships.

Method

Participants

A total of 136 children (69 boys, 67 girls) were recruited from a public elementary school in a small Midwestern town. Fourth and fifth grade teachers volunteered their classes on an individual basis. 55 of the participants were fourth graders and 81 were in the fifth grade. 79.5% of the original subject pool ($N = 171$) both received permission to participate and were in school the day of testing. The elementary school is predominantly white and middle class.

Permission was granted by the Institutional Review Board of Illinois Wesleyan University to conduct the present research involving human subjects. Letters explaining the study and consent forms to be signed were sent home to the parents of the children in the participating classrooms. Before filling out the questionnaires in class, the participants themselves were asked to sign a consent form which explained the procedure and reminded them that they could stop participating at any time. All children completed all measures.

Measures

Level of Acceptance. A rating-scale sociometric procedure (Singleton & Asher, 1977) was used to assess social status. Each child was provided with a list of students in their class and were then asked to rate on a 5 point scale how much they would like to play with that student with 0 being *I wouldn't like to* to 5 being *I'd really like to* (See Appendix A). An average liking

rating received from peers was calculated.

The validity of the rating procedure has been established by research which has assessed the convergent validity between the rating method and the sociometric nomination procedure. Rating scores for sociometric status significantly correlate with both positive and negative nominations and there is significant overlap between the populations identified as rejected and popular by the two methods (French, et.al, 1986, Maassen, et.al, 1977).

The test-retest reliability of the rating scale is superior to that of the nomination procedure. In testing children in third and fourth grade, Oden & Asher (1977) found the median test-retest correlation to be .82. The greater reliability is most likely due to the fact that children's scores from the rating-scale measure is an average of a large number of ratings. Consequently, a few children changing their ratings makes little difference (Asher & Hymel, 1981; Singleton & Asher, 1977).

Aggression. Aggression was assessed using eleven items taken from the Pupil Evaluation Inventory (P.E.I.; Pekarik, Prinz, Libert, Weintraub, & Neal, 1976) (See Appendix B). These eleven items assess classroom disruption, physical aggression, and attention seeking behavior. Children were asked to circle the names of the children in their class who fit the description in each of the eleven items. The present study found the internal consistency for the aggression items to be .97. Pekarik, et.al (1976) found that the test-retest reliability for two 3rd and 6th grade classes was high (.85 for males and .95 for females). The concurrent validity of the measure is supported by the correspondence between teacher and peer ratings of aggression (Pekarik, et.al, 1976).

Relational Aggression. In addition to the items measuring the undifferentiated type of

aggression on the P.E.I., three additional items were added to specifically assess relational aggression. These items were similar to statements used by Crick (1996) and Grottpeter and Crick (1996) to measure relational aggression. The internal consistency for the three items measuring relational aggression was high ($\alpha = .88$). For all items (those measuring both aggression and relational aggression), children were instructed to read each statement and circle the names of students in their class who best fit the description in that statement.

Friendship assessment. The children completed a two-step sociometric nomination procedure in order to establish who the child's best friend is. This procedure asked the children to write down who their three best friends are and then pick their very best friend from that list (See Appendix C). The children were told that the friends they wrote down had to be limited to children in their school and in their grade. The children then used the name of the person they identified as their very best friend when completing the Friendship Assessment and the Friendship Quality Questionnaire.

Friendship authenticity. In research examining children's friendships, it is a common practice to assess children's named best friendships for reciprocity. That is, a child is considered to have a best friend when the person they named as their best friend also named them as one of their best friends. This procedure was not followed in the present study. Children were asked to only name those children in their school and in their grade as their best friends. Because not all children in each grade participated, the reciprocity of children's best friendships could not be assessed.

In order to still assess the authenticity of children's best friendships, but not base the authenticity on reciprocity, a short Friendship Authenticity Assessment was developed to

scrutinize the depth and nature of a child's very best friendship. The questionnaire included questions such as, "How long have you been very best friends with _____?" or "How often do you play with _____ outside of school?" (See Appendix C). The authenticity was rated on a five point scale with 5 being a very authentic and strong friendship and 1 meaning a very weak, almost non-existent, friendship. In order to receive a 5 in authenticity, a child had to report that they had been best friends with their named peer for one year or more, they play at recess three to five times a week, and their reason for being very best friends with this person had to go beyond shared interests. Characteristics of friendships which received a 1 in authenticity include having been best friends for a month or less, playing at recess with each other 2 to 4 times a month or less, and having never played outside of school or having been to each other's houses. Two undergraduate students rated the Friendship Authenticity Assessments. The correlation between the two raters was high, $r = .76$, $p < .001$.

Friendship Quality. The Friendship Quality Questionnaire (FQQ) developed by Parker and Asher (1993) was used to assess the quality of the child's self selected very best friendship. The questionnaire measured six features of friendship: validation/caring, conflict resolution, intimate exchange, companionship/recreation, conflict/betrayal, and help/guidance. There were a total of forty statements on the questionnaire (See Appendix D). The internal consistency for each of the six subscales is reported in Table 1. The internal consistencies reported by Parker and Asher (1993) can be found in parentheses next to those reported by the current study. The present study's alphas are lower than those previously reported, but are still adequate.

Validation evidence for the FQQ as discussed by Furman (1996) includes findings that a child's perceptions of a friendship are moderately to highly related to their partner's perceptions

of that relationship. Furman (1996) also noted that friendship satisfaction is significantly related to all six features.

The children completing the questionnaire were instructed to rate on a 1 to 5 scale how true a statement is of his or her very best friendship. In order to avoid children filling out the questionnaire in reference to an idealized friendship, they were asked to write the name of their very best friend at the top of the questionnaire. They were also be encouraged to mentally say the name of their very best friend in the blank provided for each statement.

Procedure

On the day of testing, children were asked to sign a consent form which stated that they understood that they could stop participating at any time and that they agreed not to discuss the research with their peers. After they signed the consent form, they completed all questionnaires and the sociometric rating as a group in the classroom. An experimenter read all instructions and answered any questions that the participants had. All materials were completed in a single session.

Results

Aggression and Friendship Quality

It was hypothesized that peer ratings of aggression would correlate with self reported levels of conflict and betrayal (a negative feature of friendships) experienced in children's best friendships. No correlations were expected between peer rated aggression and the other, positive, features of friendship. This hypothesis was tested by computing Pearson's correlation

coefficients between children's mean aggression scores and scores from each of the six friendship quality subscales. (These analyses were conducted for the overall sample as well as for boys and girls separately.) The results presented in Table 2 indicate that none of the correlations reached significance. Children's peer rated levels of aggression were not related to children's self reported quality of their friendships.

Sociometric Status and Friendship Quality

Sociometric status was expected to correlate with the positive features of friendship. In other words, children with low peer status were hypothesized to experience low levels of validation and caring, conflict resolution ability, help and guidance, intimacy, and companionship and recreation in their best friendships. None of these correlations reached significance (see Table 2).

Aggression and Sociometric Status

The relation between children's levels of aggression and their sociometric status was assessed by correlating the mean aggression scores and children's social status rating. As shown in Table 3, the correlations were very strong for boys, $r(93) = -.32$, $p < .01$, girls, $r(78) = -.59$, $p < .001$, and overall $r(171) = -.44$, $p < .001$. The lower a child's peer status, the higher the aggression level for that child. Conversely, children with low levels of aggression tend to be more popular.

Given the strong correlation found between sociometric status and levels of aggression, the relations between friendship quality and aggression and between friendship quality and sociometric status were re-assessed using partial correlations. Controlling for either aggression or sociometric status would reveal the unique effects for each variable. Table 4 displays these

results. When assessing aggression scores and friendship quality scores while controlling for sociometric status, only one correlation was significant. As girl's levels of aggression increase, so does the amount of validation and caring they experience in their relationships, $r(64) = .25$, $p < .05$. When aggression was then controlled for and sociometric status was correlated with the six subscales of friendship quality, again only one significant correlation was found. As girl's levels of aggression increased, their ability to use conflict resolution within their best friendship increased, $r(57) = .26$, $p < .05$.

Relational Aggression

There were several hypotheses made in regards to the relational aggression variable. One expectation was that relational aggression would be more common for girls. As is displayed in Table 5, the mean relational aggression score for females was .26 and the mean for males was .28. No difference was found between the two populations.

It was also expected that a correlation would be found between children's levels of relational aggression and the amount of intimacy that they experienced in their best friendships. This was neither true for boys nor girls (see Table 2).

A correlation was computed between relational aggression and the undifferentiated aggression to determine whether children were more likely to display just one of these behaviors, or if the behaviors tended to covary. The two variables, aggression and relational aggression, were strongly correlated for boys, $r(93) = .90$, $p < .001$, girls, $r(78) = .89$, $p < .001$, and overall, $r(171) = .87$, $p < .001$. Thus, those who are high in relational aggression tend to also be high in the more general type of aggression.

The results also suggest that girls who are relationally aggressive are more likely to be

rejected by their peers. Correlations between sociometric status and peer rated relational aggression were strong for girls, $r(78) = -.42, p < .001$, and overall, $r(171) = -.28, p < .001$. This relation between sociometric status and relational aggression was not significant for the male sample.

Authenticity

The authenticity of children's best friendships was assessed in order to be able to determine the strength of the friendship between the participant and his or her identified best friend. No predictions were made in reference to this variable. However, data revealed several correlations between the friendship authenticity rating and other variables. Strong sex differences emerged in these analyses. (See Table 6)

When correlating peer ratings of aggression with self-reported levels of relationship authenticity, significant results were found for both girls, $r(67) = -.33, p < .01$, and overall, $r(135) = -.21, p < .05$. In other words, the more aggressive the child, especially girls, the less likely that their named friendship was authentic. A significant correlation was also found for girls between relational aggression and friendship authenticity, $r(67) = -.29, p < .05$. Those girls who are relationally aggressive had unauthentic friendships. Sociometric status also appears to relate to the authenticity of children's friendships. For girls and children overall, those who are more popular have more true and authentic friendships (girls = $r(67) = .33, p < .01$, overall = $r(135) = .22, p < .05$).

The correlations that were found between the authenticity of children's friendships and their scores on the six subscales of friendship quality were not as straightforward (see Table 6). A significant correlation for children overall, but not for boys and girls individually was found

between the validation and caring friendship subscale and relationship authenticity, $r(135) = .19$, $p < .05$. The more authentic the child's best friend relationship, the greater feelings of validation and caring that they will experience within that relationship. Boys and children overall who have more authentic relationships also tend to experience more help and guidance in their relationships, $r(66) = .39$, $p < .01$ and $r(130) = .29$, $p < .01$, respectively. Finally, feelings of companionship and recreation were positively and significantly correlated for boys, $r(67) = .53$, $p < .001$, and for children overall, $r(134) = .38$, $p < .001$.

Discussion

The present study investigated aggression, relational aggression, and sociometric status, as they correlate with friendship quality and friendship authenticity. In the present study, consistent with past research, aggression, relational aggression, and sociometric status are strongly related. In contrast to expectations, however, aggression, relational aggression, and sociometric status were, in general, unrelated to friendship quality. Interesting sex differences were found with friendship authenticity and how it relates to aggression, relational aggression, sociometric status, and friendship quality.

I will first discuss the correlations that were found between aggression, relational aggression, and sociometric status. Next, I will discuss friendship quality and how each of these variables correlated with the positive and negative features of friendship. I will then move on to friendship authenticity and talk about its relation to each variable. I will conclude with the implications of using the friendship authenticity measure and some suggestions for its future use.

Aggression, Relational Aggression, and Sociometric Status. The strong correlations between aggression, relational aggression, and sociometric status which has been previously established in the literature has been replicated by the present study (See Table 3.) The strong correlation between aggression and relational aggression comes as no surprise. Those who were rated by their peers as being aggressive were also rated as being relationally aggressive. The strong correlation may also be attributed to the similarity of the measures. Both relational aggression and general aggression were measured using the same format. Also consistent with past research was the finding that children who are aggressive are more likely to be rejected by their peers. While all aggressive children were more likely to experience rejection, only the females who were relationally aggressive were more likely to be rejected. This suggests that females are less tolerant of relationally aggressive behaviors at this age.

Friendship Quality

Friendship Quality and Aggression. The prediction that aggressive children would report greater levels of conflict and betrayal within their best friendships was partially based on the idea that aggressive acts displayed by a child may increase the likelihood of conflict within that relationship. The Pupil Evaluation Inventory (Pekarik, et.al., 1976) measured aggression by assessing behaviors such as getting others in trouble, telling other children what to do, making fun of people, giving dirty looks, etc. It was expected that these behaviors would influence the quality of children's best friendships by means of increasing levels of conflict and betrayal. Another basis for the prediction was research from Dodge (1980) which found that aggressive children tended to misinterpret ambiguous social cues and respond as though they had hostile intent. It was hypothesized that if these children were misinterpreting social cues, their best

friendship would suffer from increased conflict.

One major difference between the Dodge (1980) study and the present investigation was that Dodge assessed how aggressive children reacted to unknown peers and the current study was interested in the best friendships of aggressive children. The fact that levels of aggression did not correlate with children's levels of conflict and betrayal within their best friendships suggests that the best friendships of aggressive children are somehow protected from the social impact of a child's aggressive behavior. This claim is supported by research from Grotzinger and Crick (1996) which found that the friendship dyads of aggressive children are characterized by engaging together in aggressive acts towards those outside of the relationship. In other words, the social problems which characterize aggressive children within the group context are not displayed within the dyadic friendship because the dyad is acting aggressively towards the group and not towards one another. In this way, the best friendships of aggressive children may be protected and would explain why the present study did not find that aggression and feelings of conflict and betrayal in children's best friendships did not correlate.

Another factor to keep in mind is that the Friendship Quality Questionnaire is based on self-report. It is possible that aggressive children do, in fact, experience more conflict and betrayal in their best friendships but did not want to report it because it is a negative feature of friendship.

Friendship Quality and Sociometric Status. Based on work by Parker and Asher (1993), it was expected that children with low peer status would experience less validation and caring, more difficulty in conflict resolution, less help and guidance, and less intimacy within their best friendships. The present study failed to reveal similar correlations. A difference in participant

selection could explain the lack of replication.

The present study and the Parker and Asher (1993) study differ greatly in how the authors defined best friendships and which participants were included and excluded from their study based on those definitions. In the Parker and Asher (1993) study, to be defined as having a very best friend, the person who a child named as their single very best friend also had to have them listed as one of their three best friends. When assessing friendship quality, only those students who were considered to have a very best friend were assessed. Consequently, only half of the students met the stringent criteria for having a very best friend and could complete the questionnaires.

The present study did not eliminate students based on the reciprocity of their friendships. However, a friendship assessment was devised to determine how authentic a given friendship really was. The authenticity of a friendship was given a rating of 1 to 5 with a 1 being an unauthentic, almost non-existent, friendship, and a 5 meaning that the friendship was a very strong true friendship. The correlations for sociometric status and friendship quality were reassessed using those students who's authenticity rating was a four or five in an attempt to replicate the stringent definition of very best friendship that was used by Parker and Asher (1993). However, there were still no significant correlations between how popular a child was and how high in quality they rated their very best friendship. It is possible that the two studies measured two different populations, even when only those children who's relationships were rated as a four or five in authenticity were assessed. Future research investigating the correlations between authenticity and reciprocity are warranted here. Other implications for the authenticity of a best friendship will be discussed later.

Friendship Quality and Aggression and Sociometric Status. Due to the strong correlation between aggression and sociometric status, it was suspected that the two variables may have been interacting to affect friendship quality. In order to isolate the individual characteristics of each variable, partial correlations were performed. When correlating aggression and friendship quality while holding sociometric status constant, it was found that aggression, without the influence of popularity, correlated significantly with feelings of validation and caring experienced by girls within their very best friendships. In other words, the more aggressive a female, the more she perceived her best friendship to be caring and validational. It is suspected that this finding is spurious due to the weakness of the significance $p = .04$, the lack of correlations between all of the other subscales of friendship qualities, and also because the lack of explanation for the correlation.

When correlating sociometric status with friendship quality while holding aggression constant, we found that as girls' sociometric status decreased, so did their ability to resolve conflict with their best friend. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis that the positive features of friendship would correlate with sociometric status. Although, its support is weak for a couple of reasons. The first is that even though the correlation is significant, it is not very strong, $r(57) = .26$, $p < .05$., and that a significant correlation was only found for one of the five possible positive features of friendship.

It is also possible that these two correlations that were significant were due to statistical chance. A large number of correlations were computed and it may be that out of the large number of correlations, two of the p values are going to be significant by chance.

Friendship Quality and Relational Aggression. Grotmeter and Crick (1996) also found

that children who exhibit relational aggression tend to have higher levels of intimacy within their best friendships. The present research did not find a relation between amount of intimacy in best friendships and relational aggression.

It is possible that the present study's findings are not consistent with past research on relational aggression because of the way that relational aggression was assessed. Research exploring relational aggression has typically compared it to levels of overt aggression. Overt aggression can be defined as physical aggression or the threat of physical aggression. The present study measured a more general type of aggression that is comprised of a wide variety of acting out behaviors. It is possible that the distinction between overt aggression and relational aggression is much stronger than general aggression and relational aggression, resulting in much stronger findings when comparing overt aggression and relational aggression.

Also, in the past, researchers who have measured relational aggression have placed items pertaining to relational aggression in a row (Crick, 1996; Grotzinger & Crick, 1996). In the present study, the statements assessing relational aggression were intermingled within the statements assessing regular aggression. The high correlation between the two variables, $r(171) = .87, p < .001$, suggests that the children did not really differentiate between their peers who display typical aggressive behaviors compared to those who predominantly display relationally aggressive behaviors.

Friendship Authenticity

The Friendship Assessment was designed to assess how authentic and strong an identified friendship was. By asking children how much time they spent with their best friend in school and at home, what they like to do with their best friend, and why they consider that peer to be

their best friend, raters could decide if the relationship is weak and the children do not spend much time with one another, or whether the best friendship is strong and the playmates spend a lot of time together. These scores were then correlated with aggression, relational aggression, sociometric status, and friendship quality.

Friendship Authenticity and Aggression and Relational Aggression. The results suggested that aggressive girls are more likely to have unauthentic friendships. This means that the duration of their best friendship has been shorter, they do not consistently play with their named best friend during recess, and they do not play with this friend outside of school very often. This pattern of friendship also held true for girls who were high in relational aggression. It is possible that the behaviors that characterize aggressive and relationally aggressive girls are preventing these children from participating in highly authentic friendships. Dishon, Andrews, and Crosby (1995) found that the friendships of antisocial boys, compared to the friendships of their peers, were shorter in duration and ended in bad terms. The authors speculated that it was due to the bossiness and the coercive behavior of the antisocial boys. The Dishon, et.al. (1995) study was limited to a male sample and consequently does not explain why the present study found that the association between aggression and friendship authenticity was limited to females. One speculation as to why the present study found a significant correlation between aggression and friendship authenticity is that aggressive boys may be able to participate in an authentic friendship despite their aggression due to the nature of activities that boys typically engage in. More specifically, when asked on the Friendship Assessment, “What do you and your best friend like to do together during recess?”, the boys typically gave answers such as “play basketball” or “play soccer.” Some typical answers that girls gave include “talk and goof around” and “play

and tell stories.” It is possible that it is easier for aggressive boys to carry on authentic friendships because when they spend time together, it is doing activities in which aggressive behavior is accepted (i.e. sports). Girls, on the other hand, engage in face to face activities in which aggression would be inappropriate and not tolerated. Consequently, the relationships of aggressive girls are strained and less authentic.

Friendship Authenticity and Sociometric Status. Another result that was limited to females was the finding that as popularity increases, so does friendship authenticity. This finding may be limited to females because authenticity of friendships could be a more salient factor for girls than for boys their same age. In other words, as fourth and fifth grade girls, the ability to be a part of an authentic friendship may be an important aspect of peer acceptance, whereas for boys of this age, ability to carry on an authentic friendship may not be as important as say, the ability to participate in sports.

Friendship Authenticity and Friendship Quality. It is interesting to note that the correlations for aggression, relational aggression, and sociometric status with friendship authenticity were only significant for females, while the correlations for friendship authenticity and friendship quality were only significant for males (see Table 4.) Boys who had best friendships that were high in authenticity experienced more help and guidance as well as increased feelings of companionship and recreation within those friendships.

One of the main criteria for friendship authenticity was time spent with the best friend. The more time spent with the friend in school and outside of school, the more authentic a friendship was rated. This may partially explain why boys who have authentic best friendships receive strong feelings of companionship and recreation from those friendships and those boys

whose friendships are not as true, do not feel that they experience much companionship and recreation in their friendships. Because large numbers of boys report engaging in sports related activities with their best friends, spending a significant amount of time with friends is probably important criteria for feelings of companionship and recreation in boys friendships. A boy who only plays basketball with their best friend at recess two days a week is not going to report as high of levels of companionship and recreation as a boy who plays basketball with their best friend everyday during recess and at least three days a week outside of school.

The finding that boys with authentic best friendships are more likely to experience feelings of help and guidance within those friendships is logical. However, the correlation is difficult to explain given that it was only one of two positive features of friendship that significantly correlated with friendship authenticity and it was only limited to boys. The inconsistency in the significant correlations between friendship authenticity and the other variables may be a sign that the friendship authenticity measure is weak and in need of revision. This is a very good possibility given this was the first attempt at measuring friendship authenticity.

The strength of a best friendship as measured by friendship authenticity seems to have some very interesting relations with aggression, relational aggression, sociometric status, and friendship quality. The method of assessing friendship authenticity used in the present study, instead of friendship reciprocity, is suggested for those who wish to investigate the entire range of children's named best friendships and not just those which are reciprocated. One problem with the friendship authenticity measure that is not an issue when best friendships are measured through reciprocity is that the friendship authenticity measure is based on the self-reports of

children. Self-reports leave room for children to inflate the true authenticity of their best friendships.

If the friendship authenticity measure is to be used in the future, the correlations between friendship reciprocity and friendship authenticity need to be investigated. It would be fruitful to know whether the two measures identify similar or different populations. Once this is established, future research can then begin to compare authentic friendships, unauthentic friendships, and reciprocated friendships and identify their similarities and differences.

References

Asher, S.R., & Dodge, K.A. (1986). Identifying children who are rejected by their peers. *Developmental Psychology*, 22, 444-449.

Asher, S.R., & Hymel, S. (1981). Children's social competence in peer relations: Sociometric and behavioral assessment. In J.D. Wine & M.D. Smye (Eds.), *Social Competence* (pp.125-157). New York: Guilford.

Asher, S.R., Parker, J.G., & Walker, D.L. (1996). Distinguishing friendship from acceptance: Implications for intervention and assessment. In W.M. Bukowski, A.F. Newcomb, & W.W. Hartup (Eds.), *The company they keep: Friendship in childhood and adolescence*. (pp. 366-405). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bell-Dolan, D., Foster, S.L., & Sikora, D.M. (1989). The effects of sociometric testing on children's behavior and loneliness in school. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 306-311.

Berghout, A.M., & Draper, D.C. (1984). Verbal interactions of popular and rejected children with their friends and non-friends. *Child Study Journal*, 14, 309-323.

Berndt, T.J. (1996). Exploring the effects of friendship quality on social development. In W.M. Bukowski, A.F. Newcomb, & W.W. Hartup (Eds.), *The company they keep: Friendship in childhood and adolescence*. (pp. 346-365). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bierman, K.L. (1986). The relation between social aggression and peer rejection in middle childhood. *Advances in behavioral assessment of children and families*, 2, 151-178.

Bierman, K.L., & McCauley, E. (1987). Children's descriptions of their peer interactions: Useful information for clinical child assessment. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 16, 9-18.

Bierman, K.L., Smoot, D.L., & Aumiller, K. (1993). Characteristics of aggressive rejected, aggressive (non-rejected), and rejected (non-aggressive) boys. *Child Development*, 64, 139-151.

Bigelow, B.J., & LaGaipa, J.J. (1975). Children's written descriptions of friendship: A multidimensional analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 11, 857-858.

Bovian, M., & Hymel, S. (1997). Peer experiences and social self-perceptions: A sequential model. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 135-145.

Bukowski, W.M., Boivin, M., & Hoza, B. (1994). Measuring friendship quality during pre- and early adolescence: The development and psychometric properties of the Friendship Qualities Scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11, 471-484.

Crick, N.R. (1996). The role of overt aggression, relational aggression, and prosocial behavior in the prediction of children's future social adjustment. *Child Development*, 67, 2317-2327.

Crick, N.R., & Dodge, K.A. (1996). Social information processing mechanisms in reactive and proactive aggression. *Child Development*, 67, 993-1002.

Dishon, T.J., Andrews, D.W., & Crosby, L. (1995). Antisocial boys and their friends in early adolescence: Relationship characteristics, quality, and interactional process. *Child Development*, 66, 139-151.

Dodge, K.A. (1980). Social cognition and children's aggressive behavior. *Child Development*, 51, 162-170.

Dodge, K.A. (1983). Behavioral antecedents of peer social status. *Child Development*, 54, 1386-1399.

Dodge, K.A., Coie, J.D., & Brakke, N.P. (1982). Behavior patterns of socially rejected and neglected preadolescents: The roles of social approach and aggression. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 10, 389-410.

Dozier, M. (1988). Rejected children's processing of interpersonal information. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 16, 141-149.

French, D.C. (1988). Heterogeneity of peer-rejected boys: Aggressive and nonaggressive subtypes. *Child Development*, 59, 976-985.

French, D.C., Waas, G.A., & Tarver-Behring, S.A. (1986). Nomination and rating-scale sociometrics: Convergent validity and clinical utility. *Behavioral Assessment*, 8, 331-340.

Furman, W. (1996). The measurement of friendship perceptions: Conceptual and Methodological issues. In W.M. Bukowski, A.F. Newcomb, & W.W. Hartup (Eds.), *The company they keep: Friendship in childhood and adolescence*. (pp. 41-65). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. *Developmental Psychology*, 21, 1016-1022.

Furman, W., & Wehner, E.A. (1994). Romantic views: Toward a theory of adolescent romantic relationships. In R. Montemayor (Ed.), *Advances in adolescent development, Vol. 6: Relationships in Adolescence*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Grotpeter, J.K., & Crick, N.R. (1996). Relational aggression, overt aggression, and friendship. *Child Development*, 67, 2328-2338.

Hymel, S. (1983). *Social isolation and rejection in children: The child's perspective.*

Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Detroit, Michigan.

Kohlberg, L., LaCross, I., Ricks, D. (1972). The predictability of adult mental health from childhood behavior. In B.B. Wolman (Ed.), *Manual of Child Psychopathology* (pp. 1217-1284). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Maassen, G.H., van der Linden, J.L., & Akkermans, W. (1997). Nominations, ratings, and the dimensions of sociometric status. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 21, 179-199.

Newcomb, A.F., Bukowski, W.M., & Pattee, L. (1993). Children's peer relations: A meta-analytic review of popular, rejected, neglected, controversial, and average sociometric status. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 99-128.

Oden, S., & Asher, S.R. (1977). Coaching children in social skills for friendship making. *Child Development*, 48, 495-506.

Parker, J.G., & Asher, S.R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low accepted children at risk? *Psychological Bulletin*, 3, 357-389.

Parker, J.G., & Asher, S.R. (1993). Friendship and friendship quality in middle childhood: Links with peer group acceptance and feelings of loneliness and social dissatisfaction. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 611-621.

Parkhurst, J.T., & Asher, S.R. (1992). Peer rejection in middle school: Subgroup differences in behavior, loneliness, and interpersonal concerns. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 231-241.

Pekarik, E.G., Prinz, R.J., Liebert, D.E., Weintraub, S., & Neale, J.M. (1976). The pupil evaluation inventory: A sociometric technique for assessing children's social behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 4, 83-97.

Rys, G.S., & Bear, G.G. (1997). Relational aggression and peer relations: Gender and developmental issues. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 43, 87-106.

Singleton, L.C., & Asher, S.R. (1977). Peer preferences and social interaction among third grade children in an integrated school district. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69, 330-336.

Tomada, G. & Schneider, B.H. (1997). Relational aggression, gender, and peer acceptance: Invariance across culture, stability over time, and concordance among informants. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 601-609.

Table 1

Internal Consistencies for Subscales of the Friendship Quality Questionnaire

Subscale	Alpha
Conflict/Betrayal	.74 (.84)*
Validation/Caring	.88 (.90)
Conflict Resolution	.70 (.73)
Help/Guidance	.85 (.90)
Intimacy	.85 (.86)
Companionship/Recreation	.64 (.75)

*note: The numbers reported in parentheses are the internal consistencies reported by Parker and Asher (1993).

Table 2

Correlations for Friendship Quality with Aggression, Relational Aggression, and Sociometric Status

Friendship Subscales	Aggression			Relational Aggression			Sociometric Status		
	Boys	Girls	All	Boys	Girls	All	Boys	Girls	All
Conflict/Betrayal	-.13	-.09	-.14	-.15	-.10	-.13	.08	.06	.09
Validation/Caring	-.01	.15	-.02	.00	.23	.07	.09	.10	.11
Conflict Resolution	.06	.10	.02	.02	.22	.08	-.13	.16	.01
Help/Guidance	.16	.08	.08	.21	.15	.17	.03	.06	.06
Intimacy	.07	.09	-.03	.03	.17	.05	.01	.05	.07
Companionship/Recreation	.05	.04	.04	.13	.03	.09	.07	.12	.09

Table 3

Correlations Between Aggression, Relational Aggression, and Sociometric Status

Variables	Aggression			Relational Aggression			Sociometric Status		
	Boys	Girls	All	Boys	Girls	All	Boys	Girls	All
Aggression	---	---	---	.90***	.89***	.87***	-.32**	-.59***	-.44***
Relational Aggression				---	---	---	-.17	-.42***	-.28***
Sociometric Status							---	---	---

**p < .01.

***p < .001.

Table 4

Partial Correlation Coefficients Involving Aggression, Sociometric Status, and Friendship

Quality

Aggression Scores and Friendship Quality			
Holding Sociometric Status Constant			
Subscales of Friendship Quality	Boys	Girls	All
Conflict/Betrayal	-.11	-.06	-.12
Validation/Caring	.02	.25*	.03
Conflict Resolution	.01	.23	.03
Help/Guidance	.17	.14	.12
Intimacy	.07	.15	-.00
Companionship/Recreation	.07	.13	.08
Sociometric Status and Friendship Quality			
Holding Aggression Scores Constant			
Conflict/Betrayal	.04	.01	.03
Validation/Caring	.09	.23	.12
Conflict Resolution	-.11	.26*	.02
Help/Guidance	.08	.13	.10
Intimacy	.03	.12	.07
Companionship/Recreation	.09	.17	.12

*p < .05.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviation Scores for Aggression, Relational Aggression, Sociometric Status, and Friendship Quality Scores

Variables	Males			Females			All		
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Aggression	1.76	1.90	93	0.91	1.41	78	1.37	1.74	171
Relational Aggression	0.28	0.34	93	0.26	0.31	78	0.27	0.33	171
Sociometric Status	2.54	0.56	93	2.71	0.55	78	2.62	0.56	171
Friendship Quality Subscales									
Conflict/Betrayal	4.34	0.68	69	4.49	0.62	67	4.41	0.65	136
Validation/Caring	4.14	0.73	69	4.36	0.62	67	4.25	0.68	136
Conflict Resolution	3.99	1.00	67	4.28	0.73	60	4.13	0.89	127
Help/Guidance	3.80	0.84	67	4.00	0.74	64	3.89	0.80	131
Intimacy	3.26	1.11	68	3.91	0.87	64	3.58	1.05	132
Companionship/Recreation	4.19	0.76	68	4.22	0.71	67	4.21	0.73	135

Table 6

Summary of How Friendship Authenticity Correlated with Aggression, Relational Aggression, Sociometric Status, and Friendship Quality

Variables	Boys	Girls	All
Aggression	-.09	-.33**	-.21*
Relational Aggression	-.05	-.29*	-.15
Sociometric Status	.09	.33**	.22*
Friendship Quality Subscales			
Conflict/Betrayal	.02	-.02	.01
Validation/Caring	.20	.14	.19*
Conflict Resolution	.10	.15	.12
Help/Guidance	.39**	.15	.29**
Intimacy	.16	.09	.17
Companionship/Recreation	.53***	.20	.38***

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

Appendix A

Name: _____

Teacher: _____

Roster and Rating Measure

Directions: We are interested in how much you like to play with the members of your class. Please circle the number which best describes how much you would like to play with that student. Here are what the numbers mean:

1	2	3	4	5
I wouldn't like to	I wouldn't mind	I'd kind of like to	I'd like to	I'd really like to

How much would you like to play with:

Adam Apples	1	2	3	4	5
Braden Banana	1	2	3	4	5
Chris Cookies	1	2	3	4	5
Danny Doughnuts	1	2	3	4	5
Fay Fudge	1	2	3	4	5
Gary Grapes	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B

Name: _____

Teacher: _____

Pupil Evaluation Inventory

Please circle the name of every child in your class that you believe fits the following descriptions.

You may circle more than one name. **Do not** circle your own name for any of the questions.

- | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|
| 1. Those who are taller than most. | Adam Apples Braden Banana
Danny Doughnuts Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 2. Those who try to get other people in trouble. | Adam Apples Braden Banana
Danny Doughnuts Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 3. Those who start a fight over nothing | Adam Apples Braden Banana
Danny Doughnuts Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 4. Those who tell other children what to do. | Adam Apples Braden Banana
Danny Doughnuts Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 5. Those who, when mad at a person, get even by keeping the person from being in their group of friends. | Adam Apples Braden Banana
Danny Doughnuts Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 6. Those who always mess around and get into trouble. | Adam Apples Braden Banana
Danny Doughnuts Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 7. Those who make fun of people. | Adam Apples Braden Banana
Danny Doughnuts Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 8. Those who try to make other kids not like a certain person by spreading rumors about them or talking behind their backs. | Adam Apples
Danny Doughnuts | Braden Banana
Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 9. Those who bother people when trying to work. | Adam Apples
Danny Doughnuts | Braden Banana
Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 10. Those who laugh more than most. | Adam Apples
Danny Doughnuts | Braden Banana
Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 11. Those who get mad when they don't get their way. | Adam Apples
Danny Doughnuts | Braden Banana
Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 12. Those who, when you tell them a secret, will tell that secret to other people. | Adam Apples
Danny Doughnuts | Braden Banana
Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 13. Those who are rude to the teacher. | Adam Apples
Danny Doughnuts | Braden Banana
Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 14. Those who are mean and cruel to other children. | Adam Apples
Danny Doughnuts | Braden Banana
Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 15. Those who have really long hair. | Adam Apples
Danny Doughnuts | Braden Banana
Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |
| 16. Those who give dirty looks. | Adam Apples
Danny Doughnuts | Braden Banana
Fay Fudge | Chris Cookies
Gary Grapes |

17. Those who want to show off
in front of the class.

Adam Apples	Braden Banana	Chris Cookies
Danny Doughnuts	Fay Fudge	Gary Grapes

Appendix C

Name: _____

Teacher: _____

Friendship Assessment

Write down the names of your three best friends.

Which one of these is your **very best** friend?

Please answer the following questions about the **very best** friend that you just named.

1. How long have you known this person? (circle one)

a few days a week a few weeks a month several months a year over a year

2. How long have you been very best friends with this person? (circle one)

a few days a week a few weeks a month several months a year over a year

3. How often do you play with this person at recess? (circle one)

3 to 5 times a week 1 to 3 times a week 2 to 4 times a month every few months

4. How often do you play with this person outside of school? (circle one)

3 to 5 times a week 1 to 3 times a week 2 to 4 times a month every few months

5. What do you and your very best friend like to do together during school?

6. What do you and your very best friend like to do outside of school?

7. Why do you consider this person your very best friend?

8. Have you ever been over to this person's house? (circle one)

Yes

No

9. Have they ever been over to your house? (Circle one)

Yes

No

8. says "I'm sorry" if he/she hurts my feelings. 1 2 3 4 5

1 = not at all true **2** = a little true **3** = somewhat true **4** = pretty true **5** = really true

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. _____ sometimes says mean things about me to other kids. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. _____ has good ideas about games to play. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. _____ and I talk about how to get over being mad at each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. _____ would like me even if others didn't. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. _____ tells me I am pretty smart. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. _____ and I always tell each other our problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. _____ makes me feel good about my ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I talk to _____ when I'm mad about something that happened to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. _____ and I help each other with chores a lot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. _____ and I do special favors for each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. _____ and I do fun things together a lot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. _____ and I argue a lot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. I can count on _____ to keep promises. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1 = not at all true **2** = a little true **3** = somewhat true **4** = pretty true **5** = really true

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22. ____ and I go to each others' houses. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. ____ and I always play together at recess. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. ____ gives advice with figuring things out. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. ____ and I talk about things that make us sad. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. ____ and I make up easily when we have
a fight. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. ____ and I fight a lot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. ____ and I share things with each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. ____ and I talk about how to make ourselves feel
better if we are mad at each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. ____ does not tell others my secrets. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. ____ and I bug each other a lot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. ____ comes up with good ideas on ways to do
things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. ____ and I loan each other things all the time. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. ____ helps me so I can get done quicker. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1 = not at all true **2** = a little true **3** = somewhat true **4** = pretty true **5** = really true

35. ____ and I get over our arguments pretty quickly. 1 2 3 4 5

36. ____ and I count on each other for good ideas on
how to get things done. 1 2 3 4 5

37. ____ doesn't listen to me. 1 2 3 4 5

38. ____ and I tell each other private things. 1 2 3 4 5

39. ____ and I help each other with school work a lot. 1 2 3 4 5

40. ____ and I tell each other secrets. 1 2 3 4 5

41. ____ cares about my feelings. 1 2 3 4 5