LI... Michi...... U.......y

This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

CHILDREN'S STRATEGIES AND GOALS FOR

ACQUAINTANCESHIP AND FRIENDSHIP FORMATION

presented by

Judith C. Meister

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

_____M.A._____ degree in _Psychology_

Ellen O. Stromman
Major professor

Date_February 22, 1984_

0-12771

CHILDREN'S STRATEGIES AND GOALS FOR ACQUAINTANCESHIP

AND FRIENDSHIP FORMATION

By

Judith C. Meister

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1984

ABSTRACT

CHILDREN'S STRATEGIES AND GOALS FOR ACQUAINTANCESHIP AND

FRIFNDSHIP FORMATION

By

Judith C. Meister

Fourth-grade and seventh-grade boys and girls of four social effectiveness statuses were interviewed about their strategies and goals for acquaintanceship and friendship formation, including an initial social encounter, acquaintanceship formation, friendship maintenance, managing conflict in the context of friendship, and dealing with friendship termination. Separate analyses for children's strategies, goals, and feelings for these situations, based on confirmatory factor analysis and multivariate analysis of variance, revealed several patterns of results. First, children's strategies for initial social encounters and friendship maintenance varied by grade. Second, children's goals for friendship termination varied according to gender. Third, children's feelings about friendship maintenance varied by grade and gender. Finally, children's feelings about friendship termination varied according to gender and social effectiveness status. Developmental differences in children's friendship formation strategies, possible links between these differences and sex role development, and the need for more accurate and stable sociometric classification methods were discussed.

AKCNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the importance of children's friendships and peer
relationships to healthy social and emotional development has been
recognized by both developmental and child-clinical psychologists. Peer
interaction, and particularly friendship relations, have been shown to
facilitate the development of a mutually regulated behavioral repertoire
in which those who are interacting synchronize their conversation and
nonverbal behavior in ways which sustain the interaction and allow it to
flow smoothly, as well as to facilitate the development of social
cognitions which guide interpersonal interaction (Hartup, 1983). One
area of research which seems particularly important to both types of
development is the sociometric correlates of acquaintanceship and
friendship formation. Research in this area has focused on the
behavioral correlates of sociometric status, with a number of
researchers examining the social skills and behaviors which are related
to both positive and negative peer status and to relationship
development (e.g.Dodge, in press; Dodge, Coie, & Brakke, in press;
Gottman, Gonso, & Rasmussen, 1975; Hartup, Glazer, & Charlesworth, 1967;
Putallaz & Gottman, 1981). However, some researchers have recently
taken the position that overt behavior is just one component of
children's peer relations, and as a result, have begun to examine the
role of social knowledge in children's friendships and the effects of
sociometric status on these cognitions (e.g. Asher & Renshaw, 1981;

1

Flavell, 1981; Nelson, 1981; Renshaw & Asher, in press).

The premise guiding some of this research is drawn from cognitive and social problem-solving literature which suggests that children monitor social situations to determine what they wish to accomplish in that situation, and how to go about doing so (Miller, Galanter, & Pribram, 1960; Schank & Abelson, 1977; Nelson, 1981). In other words, children must define for themselves what the situation requires them to do (a goal), and then choose a means of fulfilling that requirement (a strategy). There is some research to suggest that children's abilities to carry out these social tasks varies according to their sociometric status (Ladd & Oden, 1979; Asher, Renshaw & Geraci, 1980; Asher & Renshaw, 1981). For example, Ladd and Oden (1979) studied popular and unpopular third- and fifth-grade children's strategies for dealing with hypothetical situations in which a peer needed help, and found that the children's ideas varied according to their popularity status. When unpopular children were provided with a situation in which the goal was to help a peer who was being teased, or to help a peer with school work, they tended to provide unique or non-normative strategies for solving the dilemma in comparison to their more popular peers. That is, the unpopular children tended to suggest behaviors that were not suggested by any one else, while a more unified consensus on the appropriate strategies for these situations was reached by the more popular children. Similar results were obtained in a study of kindergartener's strategies for hypothetical social interaction situations (Asher & Renshaw, 1981). In this study, children were interviewed for their strategies in three different peer interaction situations. First, the children's strategies for initiating a social relationship were

elicited. Second, they were asked to provide strategies for maintaining an already ongoing interaction with a peer, and finally, they were asked to provide strategies for managing a social conflict. The unpopular children not only provided unique, non-normative strategies for these three situations in comparison to their more popular peers, but also, the unpopular children's strategies tended to be inappropriately negative, vague, and in the conflict situation, aggressive.

Renshaw and Asher (in press) extended this research to include not only children's strategies for hypothetical social interaction situations, but also children's goals for those situations. Thus, they were interested in both the various goals that a child might choose to pursue in a given situation as well as the strategies he/she would formulate to achieve those goals. The premise here was that social situations are often rather unstructured, and therefore may warrant the production of a variety of goals as well as a variety of strategies for achieving those goals. In this study, Renshaw and Asher (in press) interviewed third-, fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade children about hypothetical social situations in which they distinguished strategies as "what the child would do or say" in a particular situation, and goals as "why the child would use the various strategies" in that situation. Four hypothetical situations were used--contact, in which the child was to imagine that he/she had recently moved to a new school and that he/she was about to go out on the playground with the new classmates; entry, in which the child imagined attempting to join two already interacting peers who commented that they had not asked the child to join them; friendship, in which the child imagined seeing a friend playing with a peer during recess whom the child did not like; and

conflict, in which the child imagined watching television with a new neighborhood child who changed the channel in the middle of a program without asking permission to do so. In comparing the responses of popular children to those of their less popular peers, Renshaw and Asher (in press) found that only the friendship situation produced clear results; popular children provided friendly, outgoing goals and strategies while unpopular children provided goals and strategies which had a nonsocial, avoidance theme, such as leaving the situation, or which were related to their experience of unpleasant emotions in the situation at hand.

Additional results of this study were related to differences in children's goals and strategies with increasing age. Specifically, Renshaw and Asher (in press) found that older children provided friendly strategies that tended to be indirect or accomodating while younger children provided more direct stategies. Older children's goals in using these accomodating strategies appeared to be related to attempts to protect their image in the event that their peers rebuffed them. In addition, older children appeared to recognize that they needed to consider their peer's perspective when formulating social goals for conflict situations while younger children did not recognize this need. Thus, older children's goals for the conflict situation were focused on making or maintaining the friendship, while younger children's goals were focused on their personal rights in the situation.

The results of Renshaw and Asher's work (in press) and those of previous studies (Ladd & Oden, 1979; Asher, et al., 1980) point not only to the importance of examining the effects of children's social status on their social knowledge, but also to the importance of including a

developmental perspective in research on children's social goals and strategies. Older children appear to have distinctly different ideas about the requirements of various social situations than do younger children. This developmental difference could be important in understanding the ways in which children's age and sociometric status interact in influencing their use of social knowledge for behavioral interaction.

Research focusing on the development of person perception and friendship conceptions (Bigelow & LaGaipa, 1975; Bigelow, 1977; Forbes, 1978; Furman & Bierman, 1981, 1983; Peevers & Secord, 1973), which suggests that a shift in children's descriptions of social interaction and of friendships occurs with age, provides further support for this issue. Specifically, it has been shown that in completing story recognition, peer description, and questionnaire tasks, children between the ages of four and thirteen differ in their definitions of friendship in a stage-like progression beginning with behaviorally based constructs in early childhood--descriptions of peers based on perceptually obvious and observable characteristics, common activities, and frequent contact--and moving to contractually based constructs in middle childhood, and finally to abstract, dispositionally based concepts relating to the functional, social, and cultural features of friendship--intimacy, support, trust, loyalty, and affection--during adolescence (Bigelow, 1977; Forbes, 1978; Furman & Bierman, 1981, 1983). These results, in conjunction with those obtained by Renshaw and Asher (in press), support the notion that with development, children's social knowledge, which influences the goals and strategies they choose for various social situations, becomes less directed toward self-serving

ends and more focused on achieving mutually satisfying interactive ends.

The present study attempts to examine this notion by extending the scope of studies such as those completed by Asher and his colleagues (Ladd & Oden, 1979; Asher, et al., 1980; Asher & Renshaw, 1981; Renshaw & Asher, in press). In particular, the present study examines the effects of developmental and sociometric status differences on fourth- and seventh-grader's strategies and goals for five acquaintanceship and friendship formation situations. Sociometric status in the present study is conceptualized in a more detailed manner than that used in previous studies; rather than considering sociometric status as a measure of popularity--i.e. the extent to which a child is desired as a playmate (Renshaw & Asher, in press)--it is considered as a two-dimensional construct relating to a child's acceptance by his/her peers and to his/her impact upon or visibility among his/her peers (Newcomb & Bukowski, 1983). It was expected that this distinction, which allows the identification of four social effectiveness groups, would be useful in illuminating differences in social goals and strategies which may have been masked in Renshaw and Asher's (in press) work due to their rather general conceptualization of children's sociometric status as popular or unpopular.

A further extension of previous studies examining children's social goals and strategies (Ladd & Oden, 1979; Asher, et al., 1980; Asher & Renshaw, 1981; Renshaw & Asher, in press) is to examine children's goals and strategies for the process of friendship formation. Research has shown that children of different social effectiveness groupings differ in the ways in which they attempt to develop friendships or other peer-oriented relationships (Hartup, et al., 1967,

Gottman, et al., 1975; Putallaz & Gottman, 1981; Dodge, in press; Dodge, Coie, & Brakke, in press). Specifically, children who are more highly accepted by their peers tend to be friendlier, more agreeable, and more likely to provide constructive alternatives for action in peer conflict situations than their less well accepted counterparts, while the less popular children tend to call attention to themselves and ask informational questions when attempting to join a group of peers (Putallaz & Gottman, 1981). In addition, popular children are more likely than rejected children to refrain from peer-directed aggression and context-inappropriate behavior both in the classroom and on the playground (Dodge, in press; Dodge, et al., in press). Popular children seem to engage in behaviors which heighten the probability that their peers will respond positively to them, and they seem to avoid engaging in behaviors which are likely to elicit negative peer responses. In contrast, rejected children engage in higher rates of inappropriate and aggressive acts which are likely to elicit negative peer responses, and engage in fewer prosocial behaviors which are likely to produce positive peer responses (Dodge, in press).

In terms of actual friendship development, Gottman's (1983) recent examination of how children ranging in age from 3 to 9 years become friends demonstrated that children who "hit it off" and became friends were more likely to exchange information successfully, manage conflict appropriately, and establish common ground activities in their initial meeting than were children who did not "hit it off". This data, in conjunction with the theoretical and empirical research on acquaintanceship and friendship development conducted among adolescents and adults (Newcomb, 1956, 1961; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Duck, 1976; Duck

& Craig, 1977, 1978; Scanzoni, 1978) which suggests that individuals begin a relationship by establishing commonalities and exchanging personal information of a very superficial nature, provides a starting point for examining children's knowledge about relationship development. In addition, the theories tested by Duck and his colleagues (Duck, 1976; Duck & Craig, 1977, 1978) and by Newcomb (1956, 1961) which suggest that the quality of social interaction changes with increasing degrees of acquaintance, provide more extended areas in which children's social knowledge of relationship development may be studied. In particular, the theories of adult and adolescent relationship development suggest that as individuals become better acquainted, their interactions alter in focus from rather superficial, objective types of exchange to a more personally intimate type of exchange. In addition, it is thought that as the friendship between two individuals deepens, the participating individuals become more tolerant of one another's negative attributes and behaviors than they would have been at earlier points in the relationship (Duck, 1976; Duck & Craig, 1977, 1978; Scanzoni, 1978). Therefore, in addition to examining the effects of sociometric status on children's goals and strategies in social situations, the theoretical and empirical work on acquaintanceship and friendship development (Newcomb, 1956, 1961; Duck, 1976; Duck & Craig, 1977, 1978; Putallaz & Gottman, 1981; Dodge, in press; Dodge, et al., in press) provide an additional arena for the study of children's social knowledge. In particular, rather than focusing on isolated events within the context of established friendship (Renshaw & Asher, in press), the present study incorporates five of the steps in the friendship development process outlined in the theoretical and empirical work with adolescents and

adults (Newcomb, 1956, 1961; Duck, 1976; Duck & Craig, 1977, 1978), including the initial social meeting, acquaintanceship development, friendship maintenance, conflict management, and friendship termination.

These two extensions of Renshaw and Asher's (in press), in addition to re-examining their work from a developmental perspective, provided the bases for two sets of hypotheses. First, it was hypothesized that children who were classified as stars, and who were highly accepted by their peers, would produce social strategies and goals for the friendship formation situations which were friendlier, more outgoing, and more socially appropriate than children who were classified in the other three sociometric groups. In addition, previous research on the behavioral correlates of sociometric status and relationship development (Putallaz & Gottman, 1981; Dodge, in press; Dodge, et al., in press), as well as Asher's work with children's strategies and goals (Asher, et al., 1980; Asher & Renshaw, 1981; Renshaw & Asher, in press), provided the basis for expecting that children who were classified as rejected--poorly accepted by their peers--would provide a greater number of non-normative, unique goals and strategies for friendship formation than would their more highly accepted peers, and that these goals and strategies would be less socially appropriate and more likely to be aggressive in the conflict and termination friendship situations than would the goals and strategies of other children. Children classified as being neglected--little noticed by their peers--were expected to produce fewer numbers of goals and strategies than children classified as stars, average, or rejected, and these responses were expected to be less well defined than those of star and average children. This

hypothesis was based on the premise that since neglected children are selected by few of their peers as either a friend or a least-liked peer, they probably have had fewer opportunities for social interaction which would facilitate their development of a large pool of social knowledge; therefore, they would have fewer experiences upon which they could rely in formulating their responses to the friendship formation situations. Despite this possible lack of social experience and social knowledge, there was no reason to expect that the neglected children's goals and strategies would be socially inappropriate or aggressive. In fact, Dodge and his colleagues (Dodge, in press; Dodge, et al., in press) have found that at least in their social interactions, neglected children do not display the aggressive and socially inappropriate behavior which is evidenced in rejected children's interactions with their peers.

The recent work of Asher and his colleagues which has included a developmental perspective on children's social goals and strategies (Ladd & Oden, 1979; Asher, et al., 1980; Renshaw & Asher, in press), along with research in other areas of social cognition which has examined the development of children's freindship conceptions (Bigelow, 1977; Forbes, 1978; Furman & Bierman, 1981) provided the bases for the second set of hypotheses in the present study. In the present study, responses of fourth- and seventh-graders were compared since it has been shown that children's descriptions of friendship and social interaction sequences progress from the use of concrete observable constructs to the use of more abstract, sophisticated, and relationship-oriented constructs (Bigelow, 1977; Forbes, 1978; Furman & Bierman, 1981). It was expected that the fourth-graders would more frequently rely on more concrete constructs such as frequent contact and play-related goals and

<u>strategies</u> <u>than</u> <u>would</u> <u>seventh-graders</u>. In addition, since children's friendship descriptions and their social goals and strategies within the context of established relationships have been shown to become increasingly relationship-oriented with age (Bigelow, 1977; Forbes, 1978; Renshaw & Asher, in press), <u>it</u> <u>was</u> <u>expected</u> <u>that</u> <u>the</u> <u>seventh-graders</u> <u>would</u> <u>focus</u> <u>on</u> <u>these</u> <u>more</u> <u>abstract</u> <u>concepts</u> <u>in</u> <u>formulating</u> <u>their</u> <u>friendship</u> <u>formation</u> <u>goals</u> <u>and</u> <u>strategies</u>. More specifically, it was expected that the <u>older</u> <u>children</u> <u>would</u> <u>show</u> <u>greater</u> <u>conern</u> <u>for</u> <u>the</u> <u>peer</u> <u>portrayed</u> <u>in</u> <u>the</u> <u>friendship</u> <u>formation</u> <u>situations</u>, <u>and</u> <u>would</u> <u>focus</u> <u>on</u> <u>the</u> <u>more</u> <u>interpersonal</u> <u>aspects</u> <u>of</u> <u>the</u> <u>situation</u> <u>relating</u> <u>to</u> <u>trust</u>, <u>loyalty</u>, <u>and</u> <u>value</u> <u>concurrence</u>, <u>than</u> <u>would</u> <u>the</u> <u>younger</u> <u>children</u>. Finally, <u>no</u> <u>gender</u> <u>differences</u> <u>were</u> <u>hypothesized</u>, as there was no evidence from previous research suggesting that boys and girls would differ in their goals and strategies for these situations.

To test these hypotheses, groups of fourth- and seventh-graders selected to represent star, average, neglected and rejected social effectiveness statuses were asked to respond to five interview questions related to the process of friendship development. These questions were designed to elicit the children's feelings, strategies, and goals for an initial encounter with a previously unknown peer, becoming acquainted, maintaining a friendship, handling a conflict, and terminating the friendship with the peer. Further tests of the hypotheses related to children's increasing concern with the interpersonal aspects of relationships with increasing age were included by having the children provide reasons for choosing another child as a best friend.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects for the present study were recruited from six fourth-grade classrooms and from the entire seventh grade in a lower-middle class suburban Detroit school district. An incentive system was used in recruiting subjects at each grade level in order to facilitate the children returning their permission letters for participation in the study. At each grade level, the first homeroom to have 90 percent of the permission letters returned, regardless of whether or not participation was granted, received a 25 dollar prize. The second homeroom in which 90 percent of the permission letters were returned received a 10 dollar prize. Using this incentive system, an initial sample of 249 children was acquired, consisting of 77 male and 55 female fourth-graders (Total N = 132) and 52 male and 65 female seventh-graders (Total N = 117).

Procedure

Sociometric questionnaire. Each child in the initial sample completed a group administered sociometric questionnaire during a homeroom period. Fourth grade children selected from among their same-sex classmates (i.e., children in their homeroom) the three children who were their best friends, and the three children whom they liked the least. Seventh graders completed a similar questionnaire with

the exception that they made their best friend and least-liked peer

selections from among their same-sex grademates (i.e., all of the

children in the seventh grade). In addition, the children ranked their

best friends in descending order from first to third best friend by

placing the numerals one, two, and three next to their choices (See

Appendix A).

Next, four nomination scores were computed from the children's

sociometric questionnaire data. First, a raw liked score and a raw

disliked score were computed by tabulating the frequency with which each

child was selected by his/her peers as a best friend and as a

least-liked peer. These scores were subsequently converted to z-scores,

with the fourth graders' scores being standardized by homeroom and sex,

and the seventh graders' scores being standardized by sex. Using these

z-scores, two additional scores were computed--a social preference

score, which is the difference of the liked and disliked nomination

z-scores, and a social impact score, which is the sum of the liked and

disliked nomination z-scores. These social preference and social impact

scores were then restandardized by homeroom and sex for the

fourth-graders, and by sex for the seventh graders.

These four scores--raw liked, raw disliked, social preference, and

social impact--were then used to group the children in the original

sample into four social effectiveness groupings based on the binomial

probability method derived by Newcomb and Bukowski (1983). This method

is based on a binomial probability distribution which is applied to the

raw liked, raw disliked, social preference, and social impact scores,

and which uses the size of the group nominating a child as liked or

disliked, in order to determine rare (less than chance) scores on the

social preference and social impact dimensions. Since the fourth-graders nominated only same-sex children in their homeroom, thereby reducing the number of children from which they could make their choices, the nominating group size factor played a larger role in determining rare social preference and social impact scores than it did for the seventh graders, who made their nominations from among all of their same-sex grademates. This method allowed for the selection of a second sample of children (N = 96), six each from each grade and sex in each of the four social effectiveness groupings, who would participate in the social goals and strategies interview. The four social effectiveness groups were labeled star, average, neglected and rejected, and the minimum probability criterion value for the scores which determined a child's membership within a group was set at $p < .05$.

Stars were children whose liked scores were rare, whose disliked score was below the mean, and whose social preference z-score was greater than +1.0. Children assigned to the Average group had liked and disliked scores that would be expected by chance and preference and impact z-scores which fell between -1.0 and +1.0. Neglected social effectiveness status was implicated for children whose social impact score was rare (i.e., less than -1.0), and children assigned to the Rejected group had a rare disliked score, a liked score below the mean, and a social preference z-score less that -1.0. Table 1 presents the mean liked, disliked, preference, and impact scores for the 96 children chosen to participate in the strategies and goals interview, organized by grade, sex, and social effectiveness. Six children from each grade and sex were chosen for each of the social effectiveness groupings, resulting in a 2 X 2 X 4 design.

Table 1

Mean Liked, Disliked, Social Preference and Social Impact Scores
by Grade, Gender, and Social Effectiveness Grouping

Grade	Gender	Social Effectiveness	Liked	Disliked	Preference	Impact
7	Male	Star	5.50	1.00	1.64445	1.45505
		Average	2.00	1.67	.11966	.28776
		Neglected	0	0	-.07676	-1.10512
		Rejected	.67	6.00	-1.80577	1.28918
	Female	Star	6.33	1.17	1.44031	1.48060
		Average	2.50	1.17	-.02419	-.09939
		Neglected	.67	.83	-.49266	-1.14194
		Rejected	1.33	6.00	-1.70497	.94760
4	Male	Star	7.83	.50	1.54767	1.10681
		Average	3.00	2.50	.12207	-.01892
		Neglected	.50	.83	-.13547	-1.67123
		Rejected	.50	9.17	-1.87112	1.14346
	Female	Star	6.67	.33	1.37413	.91311
		Average	2.67	2.67	.01957	-.08367
		Neglected	1.17	1.33	-.05018	-1.52499
		Rejected	.17	7.17	-1.50123	.98157

Social strategies and goals interview. The aim of this part of the study was to assess children's strategies and goals for a variety of situations related to the process of friendship formation by eliciting their responses to an individually administered interview. The interviews were conducted throughout the school day by the investigator, three fellow graduate students, and two undergraduate research assistants, each of whom had been previously trained in interviewing children and who had been previously familiarized with the interview instrument. All of the interviewers were blind to the children's social effectiveness groupings. Children's responses to the interview questions were audio-taped in order to expedite data collection and minimize the amount of time children were absent from their classrooms. The interview process was explained to each child, and his/her written permission for audio-taping was sought prior to beginning the interview. In addition, children were assured of the confidentiality of the information contained on their tapes, and any questions the children had about the various parts of the study were answered.

The interview consisted of five social situations in which the interviewee imagined playing a major role. Situation 1 required the child to imagine himself/herself in an initial social encounter with a previously unknown same-sex peer. In situation 2, the child was required to imagine a scene in which he/she became better acquainted with the peer encountered in situation 1. Situation 3 occurred in a school setting, and dealt with the child's attempt to maintain the friendship he/she had thus far developed with the peer. Situation 4 took place in the peer's home, and involved a conflict situation, and in situation 5, the child was required to deal with the peer's desire to

terminate the friendship (see Appendix B). For each of these five situations, the interviewer first presented the child with a 4 inch by 6 inch index card which outlined the vignette, and then elicited three types of information from the child about the vignette. First, the interviewer asked how the child would feel if the presented situation had actually occurred. Then the child was asked to determine what he/she would do or say if the vignette had actually occurred--i.e., the child was asked to provide strategies for dealing with the situation. Third, the interviewer asked the child why he/she would use each of the strategies that had been generated--i.e., the child was asked to provide a goal corresponding to each of the strategies. This procedure was repeated for the five friendship formation vignettes, after which the interview was terminated by eliciting from the child his/her reasons for choosing a particular child as his/her best friend on the previously administered sociometric questionnaire. This question was designed to determine the factors which are important in children's conceptions of close friendships.

Interview measures

Prior to developing the coding schemes for the strategies and goals interview, the tapes were transcribed by the investigator and two undergraduate research assistants. The children's responses were transcribed verbatim, and all transcribers were blind to the children's social effectiveness grouping. Five coding schemes were derived from the children's protocols, each dealing with the probes used by the

interviewer in eliciting children's responses to the vignettes--"How would you feel if this happened?", "What would you do or say if this happened?", and "Why would you do or say each of these things?". The children's responses to these probes were divided into idea units by the investigator for each of the five friendship formation vignettes. Idea units were defined as a complete thought expressed by the interviewee, and could be as short as one word or as long as a sentence, depending on the length of the child's thought. These idea units were used by the coders as the items to be coded. Coding for each coding scheme was completed by the investigator, while an undergraduate research assistant coded one-third of the transcripts (N = 32) in order to establish inter-coder reliability. Reliability figures for each of the five coding schemes were computed using Cohen's (1960) kappa statistic, and appear in parentheses at the end of the coding schemes' descriptions. During the coding process, both the principal coder and the reliability coder were blind to the children's social effectiveness groupings.

Feelings - Strategies - Goals Coding Scheme. The first coding scheme classified children's responses to the five friendship formation vignettes presented in the interview as to whether they reflected Feelings, Strategies, or Goals. This Feelings-Strategies-Goals coding scheme, is detailed in Appendix C. The same three codes, Feelings, Strategies, or Goals were used for responses to all three questions for each of the five vignettes. This coding scheme was developed as a precursor to three of the subsequent four coding schemes because the children's responses to the interviewer's three probes were not always neatly sequenced in the order that the probes were asked. That is, children sometimes provided strategies and/or goals when asked "How

would you feel if this happened?", or provided feelings and/or goals in response to the question "What would you do or say if this happened?", or provided feelings and/or strategies when queried about their goals for each of the strategies they had generated (k = .81).

Strategies Coding Scheme. This coding scheme was developed to provide an exhaustive categorization of the strategies identified by the feelings-strategies-goals coding of responses to the friendship formation vignettes. The coding scheme consisted of 58 codes, each of which is defined in Appendix D. Every effort was made to derive codes which were mutually exclusive; however, a number of codes were very similar, and therefore had the potential to be confusing (k = .82).

Goals Coding Scheme. This coding scheme categorizes those responses to the friendship formation vignettes which were identified by the feelings-strategies-goals coding as goals. As with the strategies coding scheme, every attempt was made to develop a mutually exclusive and exhaustive coding scheme for the children's goals; the 64 code definitions appear in Appendix E (k = .60).

Feelings Coding Scheme. The codes for this coding scheme were derived from the children's responses to the five social vignettes which were identified by the feelings-strategies-goals coding as feelings. The 35 codes in this coding scheme are mutually exclusive and exhaustive and cover a range of emotions as dictated by the demands of the friendship formation vignettes. Definitions of these codes appear in Appendix F (k = .90).

Best Friend Coding Scheme. Unlike the previous four coding schemes, this coding scheme is not based on the five vignettes. Rather, it is based on the final interview question--"I noticed that you chose

(child's name) as your best friend. What is it about (child's name) that made you chose him/her as your best friend?", and deals with the children's conceptions of what a best friend is like. The 40 codes in this coding scheme, detailed in Appendix G, are mutually exclusive and exhaustive, and cover a range of ideas from the frequency of contact the child has with the best friend to the extent of intimacy experienced in the friendship (k = .61).

RESULTS

The analyses of the interview measures were organized in two ways. First, the frequency data from each of the coding schemes, with the exception of the feelings-strategies-goals coding scheme, were submitted to confirmatory factor analyses in order to reduce the number of variables to be used in data analysis. Second, the frequencies of the final factors resulting from the factor analysis iterations were used as dependent measures in a series of 2 X 2 X 4 multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) examining the effects of the subjects' grade, gender, and social effectiveness grouping on the factors for each of the five friendship formation vignettes.

Derivation of dependent measures through factor analyses

The large number of codes in four of the five coding schemes--strategies, goals, feelings, and best friend--presented a high variable-to-subject ratio problem which needed to be resolved prior to conducting any of the analyses. In order to reduce the variable-to-subject ratio, two procedures were employed. First, it was noted that a number of codes could, on conceptual grounds, be combined with other similar codes and still represent the same, or a similar concept. Therefore, the first code reduction process was to combine codes on a conceptual basis. Second, a number of codes occurred with a low frequency (fewer than 15 occurrences) and could not be combined with

other codes on conceptually firm grounds. These infrequently occurring

codes were dropped from the analysis. Following these procedures,

factor analyses of the reduced coding schemes were completed, using

communalities in the diagonals (Hunter, 1977), as a means of deriving a

small number of meaningful dependent measures for use in testing the

present study's hypotheses.

Strategy codes. The frequency of occurrence of each of the 58

original strategy codes varied greatly, with a range across all of the

vignettes of one occurrence to as many as 142 occurrences. Using the

previously described code reduction processes, the strategies coding

scheme was reduced to a total of 27 codes which were used in the factor

analysis. The combinations of the strategies codes and the original

codes which were dropped from the analyses due to infrequent occurrence

are detailed in Appendix H. The original frequencies of each of the

original codes are presented in parentheses following each of the code

names in the right-hand column.

Following the code reduction process, the strategy codes were

grouped into three conceptually-derived factors and submitted to a

confirmatory factor analysis. Using a correlation of r = .35 as a

minimum criterion for the part-whole correlations between items and

their factors, five iterations of the factor analysis were completed

before a final factor solution including three primary factors and a

residual category was derived. The first factor, Acquaintanceship

Facilitators, included information exchange, defer to other's wishes,

and empathy. The reliability of this factor, assessed by standardized

coefficient alpha, was adequate, a = .57. The second factor, consisting

of seven items--invite to play, help, compromise, get along, walk away,

mutual activity, and express a preference—was labeled <u>Maintain Harmony</u>; this factor had good reliability, <u>a</u> = .72. The third factor, <u>Conflict Resolution</u>, had adequate reliability, <u>a</u> = .54, and consisted of three items—greet, desire an explanation for action, and find other companions. The part-whole correlations of the items in the three factors, along with the part-whole correlations of the items in the residual category are presented in Table 2.

    <u>Goal codes</u>. The original goal coding scheme, consisting of 65 codes ranging in frequency of usage by the children from one to 111 occurrences, was reduced to a total of 30 codes as detailed in Appendix H. Frequencies of each of the original codes are presented in parentheses following each code name in the right-hand column. In factor analyzing the codes from the goals coding scheme, three primary factors and a residual factor consisting of one item were originally conceptualized. Three primary factors and a residual category were subsequently derived through seven factor analysis iteration. The part-whole correlations of the items with the factors, and the part-whole correlations of the residual items appear in Table 3. The first factor, <u>Friendship Development Facilitators</u>, consisted of seven items—information exchange, reference to possessions, acquire reason for action, concern for peer's well-being, conversation, judgements of peer's personality, and get along. Three items comprised the second factor, <u>Good Manners</u>—nice, don't know what else to say, and good manners. The third factor consisted of three items—references to self image, existence of other companions, and references to expressing feelings—and was labeled <u>Conflict Resolution</u>. The reliabilities of these factors, assessed by standardized coefficient alpha, ranged from

Table 2

Strategy item factor loadings after varimax rotation

Items	Factor			
	1	2	3	R
Acquaintanceship Facilitators				
04. Information exchange	.38	.16	-.14	.13
20. Submit to other	.58	.12	.25	.77
27. Empathy	.73	.27	.11	.48
Maintain Harmony				
05. Invite to play	.35	.50	.26	-.06
07. Help	.26	.40	.13	.56
08. Compromise	-.01	.51	.02	.20
10. Get along	.00	.37	-.10	.25
12. Walk away	.20	.69	.21	.44
17. Mutual activity	.15	.66	.24	-.19
Conflict Resolution				
02. Greet	.02	.24	.76	.53
15. Desire an explanation	.19	-.08	.44	.10
22. Find other companions	.01	.23	.43	.33
Residual				
06. Ask to make friends	.27	.12	-.07	-.07
09. Make up/renew loyalty	-.11	.17	.08	-.15
11. Retaliate	.06	.02	-.01	.27
13. Do nothing	.15	-.01	.07	.08
14. Observe discrepancies	.23	.07	.12	.02
16. Acquire info from others	.24	.20	-.16	-.18
20. Conversation	.19	.04	.06	.27
21. Ask other to submit	.32	.19	.27	.11
23. Ask other's preference	-.17	-.11	.19	.52
24. Compliment	-.01	.06	-.10	.11
25. Express feelings	.08	.07	.26	.47
26. Hide feelings	.20	-.10	.34	.31

Table 3

Goal item factor loadings after varimax rotation

Items	Factor			
	1	2	3	R
Friendship Development Facilitators				
02. Information exchange	.49	-.04	.27	.49
13. Reference to possessions	.55	.03	.09	.53
15. Acquire reason for action	.54	.14	.20	.15
16. Concern for peer	.59	.11	.33	.43
20. Conversation	.60	.24	.03	.63
21. Judge peer's personality	.49	.20	.16	.46
28. Get along	.64	.23	.29	.88
Good Manners				
08. Nice	.15	.55	.26	.20
11. Don't know what else to say	-.05	.39	-.05	-.06
30. Good manners	.28	.71	.38	.25
Conflict Resolution				
14. Reference to self image	.13	.32	.57	.32
23. Other companions	.29	.26	.83	.19
29. Refer to expressing feelings	.28	.16	.61	.32
Residual				
01. Acquainting behavior	.26	.30	.18	.32
03. Facilitate friendship	.27	.00	.19	.21
04. Help	.03	-.09	.19	.14
05. Compromise	.11	-.13	.13	.10
06. Loss of friendship	.18	.11	.09	.18
07. Apologize	-.02	.08	.19	.15
09. Avoid conflict/argument	.28	.12	.26	.25
10. Retaliate	.24	.03	.01	.31
12. Point out discrepancies	.29	-.08	-.09	.26
17. Mutual activity	.10	.09	-.01	.25
18. Express a preference	.20	-.08	-.09	.27
19. Submit to other	.13	.11	-.11	.26
22. Ask other to submit	.09	.06	.22	.16
24. Friendly	.30	.02	.10	.25
25. Retain liking	.28	.16	.01	-.03
26. Ask other's preference	.16	.15	.05	.07
27. Commonalities	.31	-.01	.10	.34

adequate to good, .70, .55, and .70 for Friendship Development Facilitators, Good Manners, and Conflict Resolution, respectively.

Feelings codes. Children's usage of the 36 original feelings codes ranged from one to 94 occurrences. Details of the code reduction process for this coding scheme, as well as the frequencies of the original codes are presented in Appendix H. Confirmatory factor analyses of the reduced coding scheme were based on five conceptually derived factors which were reduced to four primary factors and a residual category after eight iterations of the factors. The first factor was labeled Mood, and consisted of four items--sad, wish to make acquaintance, happy, and hurt. Three items comprised the second factor, labeled Uneasiness--fearful of losing friend, terrible/rejected, and curious/reflective. Two items--concerned about other and playmate--were grouped under a factor labeled Sensitivity to Other, and three items--excited, cheated/unconsidered, and confused--comprised the fourth factor, labeled Self-oriented Feelings. Standardized coefficient alpha reliability figures for these factors were adequate to good--.57, .70, .56, and .59 for Mood, Uneasiness, Sensitivity to Other, and Self-oriented Feelings, respectively--and part-whole correlations of the items in the factors and residual category are presented in Table 4.

Best friend codes. This coding scheme originally consisted of 40 items, and was reduced to 23 codes using the same combination and elimination procedures previously described. Details of the code reductions as well as the original code frequencies, shown in parentheses following each code name in the right-hand column, appear in Appendix H. Four primary factors incorporating the 23 items were submitted to confirmatory factor analysis and five iterations of the

Table 4

Feelings item factor loadings after varimax rotation

Items	Factor 1	2	3	4	R
Mood					
05. Sad*	.54	.24	-.04	.05	-.13
09. Wish to make acquaintance	.47	-.05	.13	-.01	-.07
15. Happy*	.50	.06	.07	.13	.32
18. Hurt	.51	-.03	-.08	.02	.11
Uneasiness					
11. Fearful of losing friend	.07	.64	-.07	-.09	-.14
14. Terrible/rejected	.07	.46	-.05	-.13	.05
20. Curious/reflective	.09	.93	.07	.01	.17
Sensitivity to other					
12. Concerned about other	-.01	-.05	.64	.15	-.10
23. Playmate	.06	-.07	.64	.28	-.02
Self-oriented feelings					
06. Excited	.03	-.09	.19	.72	.20
19. Cheated/unconsidered	.07	-.08	-.02	.39	.29
21. Confused	.07	.00	.42	.62	-.09
Residual					
02. Bad	.15	.14	.01	.00	.07
03. Upset*	-.12	.10	-.36	.21	.63
04. Shy	-.09	-.04	-.08	.08	.23
07. Enjoyable situation	.04	-.07	-.07	.05	.08
08. Undisturbed/nonchalant	.09	-.04	.01	-.02	.41
10. Jealous/selfish*	-.01	-.09	.06	.08	-.01
13. Great	-.09	-.06	-.03	-.03	.35
16. OK/mediocre*	.12	-.09	.18	.17	.04
17. Desire to develop friendship	.33	.19	.02	.03	.21
22. Pleased with self*	-.16	.03	.06	-.06	.17

*Items reverse scored

originally conceptualized factors resulted in a three factor solution
with a residual category. The three factors and the items comprising
the factors are presented with their part-whole correlations in Table 5,
and included the following: Unique Qualities of Friendship--share,
comparison to other peers; Personality Characteristics--helps, nice,
honest, sensitive to other's feelings; and Degree of
Acquaintance--length of acquaintance, depth of acquaintance, and role of
others in the acquaintance process. The reliability figures for these
factors were measured by standardized coefficient alpha, and ranged from
adequate to excellent--.85, .58, and .48 for Unique Qualities of
Friendship, Personality Characteristics, and Degree of Acquaintance.

Multivariate Analyses of Variance

Following the creation of a meaningful set of dependent measures
for each coding scheme, multivariate analyses of variance were conducted
as a means of testing the various hypotheses. Five separate MANOVAs
were completed for each coding scheme, using grade, gender, and social
effectiveness grouping as the independent variables, and the mean
frequencies of occurrence of the factors derived from the factor
analyses for each of the coding schemes as the dependent measures.

Feelings - Strategies - Goals codes. The first series of MANOVAs
was completed using the three general codes from this coding
scheme--feelings, strategies, and goals--as the dependent measures.
Separate MANOVAs were completed for each of the five social vignettes
since each of these represented different situations. As shown in Table
6, only the MANOVA for the friendship termination vignette was
significant, with a main effect of gender. Subsequent univariate
analyses of the dependent variables using gender as an independent

Table 5

Best Friend item factor loadings after varimax rotation

Items	Factor			
	1	2	3	R
Unique Qualities of Friendship				
15. Share	.87	.02	.00	.39
20. Comparison to other peers	.87	.03	.01	.19
Personality Characteristics				
06. Helps	-.02	.53	.03	.53
09. Nice	.08	.46	-.06	.07
12. Honest	-.03	.69	-.08	.19
14. Sensitive to other's feelings	-.01	.38	-.03	-.32
Degree of Acquaintance				
10. Length of acquaintance	-.04	-.09	.40	-.09
17. Depth of acquaintance	.09	.03	.74	.39
21. Role of others in acquaintance	-.04	-.05	.36	.09
Residual				
02. Sense of humor*	.06	.05	.15	-.01
03. Commonalities*	-.13	.16	.11	.23
04. Compatibility	.27	.26	.05	-.11
05. Agree*	.04	-.01	.10	.31
07. Frequent contact	-.11	-.17	.02	.33
08. Partners	.31	-.07	-.05	.63
11. School acquaintance	.10	-.04	-.04	.39
13. Understands other friendships	-.04	.25	-.10	-.11
16. Mutual liking	.08	.02	-.10	.11
18. Good personality*	.06	.07	.05	-.06
19. Close proximity*	.06	.04	.06	.14
22. Empathy*	.01	.06	.16	-.08
23. Sweet/kind*	-.03	-.13	.13	.26

*Items reverse scored

variable revealed a significant difference for the goals code, $F(1,80)$ = 10.18, p < .002, with girls using a greater number of these codes than boys, M = 3.06 vs. M = 1.85 for girls and boys, respectively. This analysis demonstrates that in general, children do have goals for social situations as well as strategies (Renshaw & Asher, in press), and suggests that girls may be more adept than boys at generating a variety of goals for such situations.

Strategy codes. The five MANOVAs using the mean frequencies of the three strategy factors—Acquaintanceship Facilitators, Maintain Harmony, and Conflict Resolution—as dependent variables, revealed main effects of grade on the initial encounter vignette and the friendship maintenance vignette (see Table 6). Subsequent univariate analyses using the four strategy factors as dependent variables, and grade as the independent variable revealed a significant difference on the Maintain Harmony factor, $F(1,80)$ = 8.25, p < .005, and a marginally significant difference for the Conflict Resolution factor, $F(1,80)$ = 3.52, p < .06, for the initial social encounter vignette, and a significant difference on the Acquaintanceship Facilitators factor, $F(1,80)$ = 9.15, p < .003, for the friendship maintenance vignette. Means for these univariate analyses are presented in Table 7. It appears that seventh graders have a larger repetoire of acquaintanceship facilitating strategies for initiating and maintaining friendships as well as a larger repertoire of conflict management strategies for initial social encounters than do fourth graders. In contrast, fourth graders appear to have a greater repertoire of harmony maintenance strategies for initial social encounters than do their seventh-grade counterparts.

Table 6

Significant MANOVAs by vignette and coding scheme

Vignette	Coding Scheme	Effect	F	df
1. Initial social Encounter	Strategies	Grade	4.74***	4,77
2. Acquaintanceship Formation	None	---	----	----
3. Friendship Maintenance	Strategies	Grade	3.07**	4,77
	Feelings	Grade X Gender	2.64**	5,76
	Feelings	Grade	3.18***	5,76
4. Conflict	None	---	----	----
5. Friendship Termination	FSG	Gender	3.01**	4,77
	Goals	Gender	3.49***	4,77
	Feelings	Gender X Social Effectiveness	1.77**	15,210
	Feelings	Gender	2.71**	5,76

Table 7

Strategy Factors by Grade

Vignette/Factor	Grade 4 M	Grade 7 M	$F(1,80)$
Initial social encounter			
a. Acquaintanceship Facilitators	.83	1.10	ns
b. Maintain Harmony	1.35	.54	8.25
c. Conflict Resolution	1.31	1.77	3.52
Friendship Maintenance			
a. Acquaintanceship Facilitators	.10	.58	9.15
b. Maintain Harmony	2.13	1.75	ns
c. Conflict Resolution	.00	.04	ns

*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .01

Goal codes. The mean frequencies of the three goal factors,
Friendship Development Facilitators, Good Manners, and Conflict
Resolution, were used as dependent variables in the series of MANOVAs
examining the use of the goal codes in each of the friendship formation
vignettes. As shown in Table 6, only one significant multivariate
effect was found--gender was significant on the fifth vignette which
dealt with friendship termination. Table 8 details the results of the
subsequent univariate analyses using the three goal factors as dependent
variables and gender as the independent variable. Significant
differences were found for two of the goal factors, Friendship
Development Facilitators and Conflict Resolution, suggesting that girls
are more likely than boys to attempt to resolve the conflicts or
re-establish the friendship when a peer wishes to terminate the
relationship.

Feelings codes. Table 6 also summarizes the MANOVAs which
incorported the mean frequencies of the four feelings factors, Mood,
Uneasiness, Sensitivity to Other, and Self-oriented Feelings, as the
dependent variables. Four significant multivariate effects resulted
from these analyses, two each for the friendship maintenance and
friendship termination vignettes. As shown in Table 6, a significant
interaction of grade and gender, $F(5,76) = 2.64$, $p < .03$, and a
significant main effect of grade, $F(5,76) = 3.18$, $p < .01$, occurred for
the friendship maintenance vignette. Subsequent univariate ANOVAs
completed for these effects revealed significant differences on the Mood
factor, $F(1,80) = 10.89$, $p < .001$, and $F(1,80) = 8.00$, $p < .006$, for the
grade by gender interaction and for the main effect of grade,
respectively. Post-hoc analyses of the interaction between grade and
gender for the friendship maintenance vignette, using Scheffe's test,

Table 8

Goal Factors by Gender
Friendship Termination Vignette

	Boys M	Girls M	F(1,80)
a. Friendship Development Facilitators	.54	1.15	6.82***
b. Good Manners	.02	.14	3.33*
c. Conflict Resolution	.04	.38	4.67**

Table 9

Feelings Factors by Grade by Gender
Friendship Maintenance Vignette

Factor	Gender	Grade 4 M	Grade 7 M	F(1,80)
Mood	Boys	.54	0	10.89****
	Girls	.17	.21	
Uneasy	Boys	.13	.08	ns
	Girls	0	0	
Sensitivity to other	Boys	0	.04	ns
	Girls	0	0	
Self-oriented feelings	Boys	0	0	ns
	Girls	.04	0	

*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .01, ****p < .001

revealed that fourth-grade boys provided significantly more mood related feelings than did fourth-grade girls, seventh-grade boys, and seventh-grade girls (p < .01). Means for these differences are presented in Table 9, and the means for the differences between groups on the mood factor for the main effect of grade are presented in Table 10. It appears that overall, fourth-graders are more expressive about mood related feelings than are seventh-graders, but that this factor is affected by the child's gender, and may be related to sex role stereotypes prescribed by our society in interaction with developmental factors.

A significant interaction of grade and social effectiveness, F(15,210) = 1.77, p < .04, and a main effect of gender, F(5,76) = 2.71, p < .03, resulted from the multivariate analyses of the friendship termination vignette (see Table 6). Subsequent univariate ANOVAs using the gender and social effectiveness as the independent variables revealed significant differences on two of the feelings factors, Mood, F(3,80) = 2.89, p < .04, and Uneasiness, F(3,80) = 2.97, p < .04. The means for these results are presented in Table 11. Post-hoc analyses of these results using Scheffe's test revealed that star girls referred to the mood factor significantly more frequently than star boys (p < .01), neglected boys (p < .05), and rejected girls (p < .05). In addition, neglected boys referred to feelings of uneasiness significantly more frequently than star boys, star girls, average boys, and neglected girls (all p's < .05). In examining the main effect of gender for this vignette, univariate ANOVAs using the four feelings factors as dependent variables revealed significant differences for the Mood factor, F(1,80) = 10.67, p < .002; means for this analysis are presented in Table 12.

Table 10

Feelings Factors by Grade
Friendship Maintenance Vignette

Factor	Grade 4 M	Grade 7 M	F(1,80)
Mood	.35	.10	3.18**
Uneasy	.06	.04	ns
Sensitivity to other	0	.02	ns
Self-oriented feelings	.02	0	ns

Table 11

Feelings Factors by Gender by Social Effectiveness Grouping
Friendship Termination Vignette

Factor	Gender	Social Effectiveness Grouping				
		Stars M	Average M	Neglected M	Rejected M	F(1,80)
Mood	Boys	.17	.42	.25	.42	2.89*
	Girls	.92	.67	.67	.33	
Uneasy	Boys	0	0	.50	.08	2.97*
	Girls	0	.08	0	.08	
Sensitivity to other	Boys	0	0	0	0	ns
	Girls	0	.17	0	0	
Self-oriented feelings	Boys	.25	0	0	0	ns
	Girls	.08	.25	0	.08	

Table 12

Feelings Factors by Gender
Friendship Termination Vignette

Factor	Boys M	Girls M	F(1,80)
Mood	.31	.65	10.67***
Uneasy	.15	.04	ns
Sensitivity to other	0	.04	ns
Self-oriented feelings	.06	.10	ns

*p < .05, **p< .01, ***p < .001

Although these findings do not directly support the hypotheses related to producing the most sophisticated and socially appropriate goals and strategies for the friendship formation vignettes, they do suggest that at least star girls are less inhibited than any of the other groups of children in expressing their feelings, particularly about friendship termination situations. It appears, also, that neglected boys are particularly inhibited by this situation, and as a result, experience and/or express uneasiness about terminating a friendship.

Best Friend codes. Since these codes pertain only to the final interview question, as opposed to pertaining to the five friendship formation vignettes, only one MANOVA was completed for this analysis. As with the other analyses, grade, gender, and social effectiveness grouping served as the independent variables, while the mean frequencies of the three factors derived from the reduced coding scheme—Unique Qualities of Friendship, Personality Characteristics, and Degree of Acquaintance—served as the dependent variables. No significant main effects or interaction effects were found with this analysis; however, a marginally significant main effect of grade occurred, $F(4,77) = 2.24$, $p < .07$. Using grade as the independent variable and the three best friend factors as dependent variables in a subsequent univarite ANOVA examining this effect, a significant difference for the Degree of Acquaintance factor was found, $F(1,80) = 3.93$, $p < .05$. It appears that seventh graders refer to the degree of their acquaintance with their best friend more often than do fourth graders, $M = .67$ vs $M = .27$. These findings support the hypothesis that older children tend to focus on the more interpersonal and intimate aspects of friendship relations than do younger children.

Discussion

Overall, the results of the present study directly support two of the five originally stated hypotheses. There is no direct support for the hypotheses related to differences in children's strategies and goals for the friendship formation vignettes as a function of the children's social effectiveness grouping. There was support for the age-related hypotheses. Specifically, it was found that fourth-graders tended to be bound by more concrete constructs related to play activities and the maintenance of these activities while seventh-graders were more flexible in their strategies for friendship formation. In particular, seventh-graders' strategies reflected the hypothesized concern for the peer's experience, as well as the overall focus on the interpersonal aspects of relationship development including factors such as empathy, information exchange, and conflict resolution. These developmental differences in children's friendship formation strategies were not, however, reflected in the children's goals for friendship formation, thus resulting in only partial support of the aforementioned hypotheses.

Although not specifically hypothesized, the grade differences in the feelings variables lends further support to the notion that with development, children become more concerned with the interpersonal and mutually beneficial aspects of friendships, and less concerned with the personal-gain aspects of friendships particularly in the case of

37

friendship maintenance. Specifically, fourth-graders' more frequent use of mood variables, in comparison to their seventh-grade counterparts, would suggest that the younger children tended to focus on their own personal emotional reactions to the situation, while the older children were less concerned with this aspect of the situation. By implication, the older children may have been more concerned with the peer's experience as indicated by their more frequent, though non-significant, use of "sensitivity to other" variables.

Indirect support for the hypothesized differences in children's cognitions about the various friendship formation vignettes as a function of social effectiveness grouping may be drawn from the findings that in their use of the feelings variables for friendship termination, children differed according to social effectiveness grouping and gender. In particular, the star, average, and neglected girls' more frequent use of mood variables for this vignette supports the notion that these children are more able to define and express their feelings about negative situations than rejected children. Although indirectly supported in the present study, this suggests that the star, average, and neglected children may be more adept at assessing social situations and devising plans and goals for behavior in these situations. In addition, the neglected girl's similar use of mood related variables, and the neglected boy's non-significantly less frequent use of these same variables, in comparison to the use of these variables by average children suggests that neglected children's repertoires for social situations may be more similar to the repertoires of the average social effectiveness child than those of the rejected social effectiveness child. Although this conclusion would support Dodge's findings that

neglected children do not display the aggressive and
context-inappropriate behaviors exhibited by rejected children in social
interaction (Dodge, in press; Dodge, et al., in press), further testing
of these hypotheses is needed due to the only minimal and indirect
support found in the present study.

The seventh-graders' more frequent use of conflict resolution
strategies in the initial social encounter situation, acquaintanceship
facilitating strategies for friendship maintenance, and both friendship
development and conflict resolution goals for dealing with friendship
termination corroborates the findings of previous research which
suggests that as children grow older, they become more attuned to the
interpersonal aspects of relationships with others (Bigelow, 1977;
Forbes, 1978; Furman & Bierman, 1981, 1983; Renshaw & Asher, in press).
In contrast, the fourth-grader's more frequent use of harmony
maintenance strategies for initial social encounters suggests that they
are somewhat more attuned to the ways in which relationships can
personally benefit them (Asher, et al., 1980; Renshaw & Asher, in
press). The fourth-grader's more frequent use of mood related emotions,
such as expressions of happiness, sadness, hurt, and wishing to make
friends with the peer, in the friendship maintenance vignette provides
further evidence that younger children are more attuned to the
self-serving aspects of relationships than they are to the mutually
beneficial aspects of friendships. Apparently, the older children were
more aware than the younger children of the need to consider the peer's
perspective as well as their own in each of the situations, and this
greater awareness led them to choose strategies which were likely to
enhance not only their own experiences in the relationship, but also

those of the peer. The younger children's apparently lesser awareness of the need to consider the peer's perspective resulted in their choosing strategies which were likely only to enhance their own personal experience of the relationship. The peer's experience may or may not have been enhanced by these strategies, depending on their outcome.

The results of the present study also suggest that children as young as 9 years are aware of at least some of the strategies which are likely to facilitate the development of acquaintanceships. For example, a number of researchers studying friendship development among adults and older adolescents have found that early social interactions involve exchange of superficial information about oneself as well as establishing some type of common ground or similarity (Newcomb, 1956, 1961; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Duck, 1976; Duck & Craig, 1977, 1978). In addition, behavioral research with children between the ages of 3 and 9 years suggests that children who become successfully acquainted with a new peer are likely to engage in behaviors such as information exchange, conflict management, and the establishment of a mutual, common ground activity (Gottman, 1983). The fourth-grader's harmony maintenance strategies--inviting to play, helping, compromising, getting along, walking away, expressions of preference, and suggestions for mutual activities--which were provided for the initial social encounter vignette in the present study, represent similar types of constructs, and provide evidence that elementary school-aged children's knowledge of social relationship initiation strategies is beginning to resemble the behavioral strategies for acquaintanceship formation used by older adolescents and adults. The fact that the seventh-graders in the present study, in comparison to their younger peers, provided an even

greater number of relationship initiation strategies, as well as goals and strategies for maintaining and terminating relationships similar to those which have been suggested in theories of interpersonal attraction among adults (Newcomb, 1956, 1961; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Duck, 1976) would appear to reflect these children's more extensive peer experience and the influence of development on the their social knowledge base.

The gender differences in children's goals for the friendship termination vignette, as well as the gender differences in children's feelings about this vignette were unexpected. Girls not only expressed mood related emotions about this situation more often than boys, but they also provided a greater number of friendship development and conflict resolution goals for this situation. One possible explanation for these results is that the children's responses to the friendship termination situation reflect sex-role stereotypes. In particular, the socialization of girls still tends to be focused on their learning how to relate to other people, while boys' socialization tends to be focused on their becoming self-sufficient and independent (Hetherington & Parke, 1979). As a result, it is likely that girls would express greater sensitivity to the issue of losing a friend, and would try to recover that friendship through attempting to resolve an implied conflict or by attempting to reinstate the previously achieved level of friendship with the peer. Boys, in contrast, might express less sensitivity to the loss of the friendship and be more likely to adopt a more independent attitude by establishing other friendships or dealing with their feelings on their own.

Sex-role stereotypes and the influence of development also provide an explanation for the grade X gender interaction of feelings for the

friendship maintenance vignette. For this vignette, fourth-grade boys expressed more mood related feelings than did any of the other children, followed by the seventh-grade girls, fourth-grade girls, and finally seventh-grade boys. Apparently, by seventh-grade, girls have reached a point in the socialization process where they feel comfortable in expressing their feelings openly, while seventh grade boys have learned to suppress their emotions in various social situations. However, the extent of this socialization appears not to have been reached by fourth grade. In fact, boys at this age may still feel free enough to express their emotions to their peers, and this is reflected in their more frequent use of mood related feelings in the friendship maintenance vignette. Accordingly, the fourth-grade girls' less frequent expression of mood emotions in this case may reflect their not yet having entirely acquired the emotional-expression role exhibited by the older girls.

A second unexpected result of the present study was the gender X social effectiveness grouping interaction for the feelings variables in the friendship termination vignette. Girls classified as stars reported mood related feelings more frequently than any other children, followed by average and neglected girls, and then rejected boys. Star boys reported the fewest mood related feelings, with neglected boys also reporting few mood related feelings. However, neglected boys reported uneasy feelings more frequently than any other group, with rejected boys and girls and average girls reporting fewer uneasy feelings. On the average star boys and girls, average boys, and neglected girls reported no uneasy feelings for the friendship termination vignette. These results may in part reflect stereotypic responses such as those described above; however, some other factor, such as peer experience,

appears to be involved as well. The star boys' fewer mood responses, and the star girls' more frequent mood responses, may reflect more quickly acquired emotion-related sex roles resulting from these children having had a greater number of successful peer experiences from which to learn the components of these roles. In contrast, the neglected boy's and rejected girl's fewer mood related responses, in comparison to those of star girls, may reflect slower acquisition of these sex roles as a result of having had fewer or less positive peer experiences from which to learn some of the components of these roles. In addition, for neglected boys at least, and perhaps in small measure, though not significantly so in the present study, for the rejected children, their expressions of uneasiness for the friendship termination situation may reflect a general feeling of uneasiness in social interaction which hinders them from having positive peer experiences. This, in turn, would affect their ability to draw upon such experiences in acquiring the roles currently prescribed for them in the socialization process.

A final unexpected outcome of the present study relates to the overall pattern of results. When examined carefully, it was noted that only two of the five friendship formation vignettes revealed significant differences--the friendship maintenance vignette (#3) and the friendship termination vignette (#5), and that the hypothesized social effectiveness differences did not occur. There are several possible explanations for this result. First, it seems likely that the friendship maintenance and friendship termination situations are generally unfamiliar or less salient to children and that they do not often think about the component processes of friendship maintenance once a friendship has developed. In addition, it is also likely that

friendship termination is so seldom experienced, at least in the form
presented in this study, that the children do not have the repertoire of
responses for these situations that they have for the more familiar
acquaintanceship and conflict management situations. Alternatively, the
children's responses to the initial encounter, acquaintanceship
formation, and conflict management situations may have been reflections
of a repertoire of socially appropriate, polite responses which do not
fit the friendship maintenance and termination situations so easily.
Thus, their responses to these less frequently encountered situations
were more diverse than their responses to the more familiar situations,
resulting in significant outcomes for the friendship maintenance and
termination vignettes. Finally, a possible though less strong
explanation for the significant results on only two of the five
vignettes is that the subject sample was too small to reflect any real
differences among groups, particularly with the use of factor analytic
techniques used in the present study to reduce the variable-to-subject
ratio. Although a firm consensus has not been reached in research which
uses factor analytic techniques, some authors (Crawford, 1975; Comrey,
1978; Baggaley, 1982; Loo, 1983) suggest that factor analysis should not
be used in studies having fewer than 200 subjects.

The small sample size may have also contributed to the lack of
social effectiveness grouping differences in the present study.
However, a more likely explanation is that the method used in
categorizing the children into the four social effectiveness groups was
inaccurate. In fact, studies of the short-term and long-term stability
of the groups derived from the binomial probability classification
procedure suggest that the groups are not stable, and that fluctuations

in group membership are especially likely to occur among children who fall at the extreme edges of their social effectiveness group (Newcomb & Bukowski, 1983; Bukowski & Newcomb, in press). Therefore, a child who falls near the average-rejected borderline may be classified at one point in time as rejected and at another point in time as average. Similar instability is likely to occur at the star-average and neglected-rejected borderlines as well.

Although it has not been specifically studied as yet, another possible reason for the failure to find social effectiveness group differences in the present study is that children nominating one another as "best friends" and "least-liked peers" may make very different interpretations of these phrases as they complete their nominations. That is, some children may evaluate the meaning of "friend" or "least-liked peer" in terms of the nominee's social skills while another child interprets these phrases in terms of the nominee's athletic or academic prowess. Other children may consider all of these factors in combination with other factors such as frequency of interaction opportunities and physical appearance in making their nominations. These diverse interpretations in conjunction with the failure to include these factors in the binomial probability classification procedure may have resulted in diverse within group differences among the children in each of the groups which would have masked any differences in the children's responses to the friendship formation vignettes which might otherwise have been due to differences in their social effectiveness status.

Despite these difficulties, the results of the present study are important in several respects. First, they provide some support for the

point made by Renshaw and Asher (in press) that children's goals for social situations need to be considered along with their strategies when attempting to understand the extent of children's social knowledge base. In addition, the present study's results further contribute to the literature which suggests that elementary school-aged children's acquaintanceship and friendship formation goals and strategies include some concepts which are similar in nature to those of adolescents and adults (Newcomb, 1956, 1961; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Duck, 1976; Duck & Craig, 1977, 1978; Gottman, 1983; Newcomb & Meister, 1983; Newcomb, Packard, & Smith-Winberry, 1983). The fact that children's concern with the peer's experience in the various friendship formation situations seemed to become more important with age is consistent with the notion that children's criteria for evaluating friendships become more focused on interpersonal than self-centered factors with increasing age (Bigelow, 1977; Forbes, 1978; Furman & Bierman, 1981, 1983). Factors which might be considered in future research in this area include a more accurate and stable method of classifying children into social effectiveness groups which includes a variety of social skill and ability dimensions, a larger sample size, and additional friendship formation situations. Regarding this final addition, it would be particularly helpful to determine whether or not children do have a repertoire of responses available for friendship termination situations when those situations consist of more familiar events than those presented in the current study. One possible situation might include the ways in which friendship is terminated or extended when the peer moves to a different area of the country or to a different school district. In a case such as this, children might have a more extended

and uniform repertoire than they had for the friendship termination
vignette presented in the current study.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SOCIOMETRIC QUESTIONNAIRES

APPENDIX A

Sociometric Questionnaire for Fourth Graders

MSU Social Relations Study   Page 1
PERMISSION FORM

This study has been explained to me and I am willing to participate in it.

My name is_____.

My teacher's name is_____.

Circle the names of the three boys(girls) in your class that you like the most.

                        Name 1
                        Name 2
                        Name 3
                        Name 4
                        etc.

Now put a number 1 beside the name of your first best friend.
Put a number 2 beside the name of your second best friend.
Put a number 3 beside the name of your third best friend.

Circle the names of the three boys(girls) in your class that you like the least.

                        Name 1
                        Name 2
                        Name 3
                        Name 4
                        etc.

Sociometric Questionnaire for Seventh Graders

MSU Social Relations Study   Page 1
                        PERMISSION FORM

This study has been explained to me and I am willing to participate in
it.
My name is_____.
My teacher's name is_____.

Write the names of the three seventh-grade boys(girls) that you like the most.

1) _____
2) _____
3) _____

Write the names of the three seventh-grade boys(girls) that you like the least.

1) _____
2) _____
3) _____

APPENDIX B

SOCIAL STRATEGIES AND GOALS INTERVIEW

APPENDIX B

Strategies and Goals for Friendship Formation Interview

MSU Social Relations Interview   Page 1
                         PERMISSION FORM

This study has been explained to me and I am willing to participate in
it.
My name is_____.
Today's date_____.

1. You are outside in your front yard one day after school. You see a boy(girl) about your age that you don't know. He(she) is alone in his(her) front yard, across the street from yours, watching his(her) dog play. You would like to meet him(her).
   a. How would you feel if this happened?
   b. What would you do or say if this happened?
   c. You said that you would_____. Why would you do or say that?

2. A new boy(girl) has come to your class at school today. The new boy's(girl's) name is Kevin(Kristi). At recess, you see Kevin(Kristi) out on the playground talking to two other boys(girls) who are in your class. You decide that you would like to become friends with Kevin(Kristi).
   a. How would you feel if this happened?
   b. What would you do or say if this happened?
   c. You said that you would_____. Why would you do or say that?

3. You and Kevin(Kristi) have become friends. Today you and Kevin(Kristi) have asked the teacher if the two of you may do your weekly science project together. While you and Kevin(Kristi) work on the science project in school this week, you want to make sure that you stay friends with Kevin(Kristi).
   a. How would you feel if this happened?
   b. What would you do or say if this happened?
   c. You said that you would_____. Why would you do or say that?

4. You and Kevin(Kristi) are watching television at Kevin's(Kristi's) house on Saturday morning. You are watching a show that you really like. Kevin(Kristi) stands up and changes the channel to a show that he(she) really likes but that you don't like very much.
   a. How would you feel if this happened?
   b. What would you do or say if this happened?
   c. You said that you would_____. Why would you do or say that?

5. You and Kevin(Kristi) are still friends. One day at school, you ask Kevin(Kristi) if he(she) will walk home with you after school. Kevin(Kristi) says to you, "I don't want to walk home with you because I don't want to be your friend anymore."
   a. How would you feel if this happened?
   b. What would you do or say if this happened?
   c. You said that you would_____. Why would you do or say that?

I noticed that you chose_____ as your first best friend. What is it about him/her that made you choose him/her as your best friend?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

FEELINGS-STRATEGIES-GOALS CODING SCHEME

APPENDIX C

Feelings-Strategies-Goals Coding Scheme

In this coding scheme, you are simply making a judgement as to whether a child's response to a question represents a feeling, strategy, or goal. As you know, an attempt was made in the interview to separate out these different responses. However, despite the interviewers' valiant efforts, some children provided strategies for feeling or goal questions, goals for strategy or feelings questions, or feelings for strategy and goal questions. As a result, your task is to determine which of the child's responses represent feelings, which represent strategies, and which represent goals. Each of these concepts is defined below, with a code number to its left. You will use each of the code numbers to record the child's responses on the coding sheet. Each response has been numbered on the transcribing sheet in red ink, and slash marks have been used to divide separate responses where necessary.

Codes for Feelings-Strategies-Goals scheme:

1. <u>Feelings</u> – This code represents a child's expression of an affective state or disposition. In other words, a child's expression of emotion is coded as feelings. Examples include: good, normal, happy, sad, mad, angry, confused, excited, and so on.

2. <u>Strategies</u> – Any reponse which designates some action the child <u>would take</u> or something that the child would say in a particular situation will be coded as a strategy. Examples include: Say hi, Go over, Introduce myself, Tell her she has pretty eyes, Ask him to turn it back, Ask him why he doesn't want to be my friend anymore, Punch her in the face, Just leave, and so on.

3. <u>Goals</u> – A goal represents a child's reason or explanation for performing a particular behavior or saying a particular thing. Very frequently, although NOT always, these responses begin with a word such as "so", "because", "well", "cuz", "just", etc. Be sure to read the reponses carefully and follow the line of the child's thought in coding this and the other to categories of responses.

9. <u>No response</u>, <u>Don't know</u>, <u>or Repitition of the question asked by the interviewer</u> – This category is coded whenever the child has not given a reponse to the interviewer's question, or when he/she has responded by saying "I don't know." In addition, if the child in some manner repeats the interviewer's question, code this particular category—i.e. record a code of "9".

APPENDIX D

STRATEGY CODING SCHEME

APPENDIX D

Strategy Coding Scheme

In this coding scheme, you are asked to code each of the child's strategy responses. A master list of all responses that have been designated as strategy responses is attached at the back of this booklet, and you will use this list as a guideline for which responses to code. This booklet contains a list of codes for you to use in coding the children's strategies, along with a definition of each of these codes. In addition, a master list of the codes is provided for your use during coding. You should read this booklet carefully, and learn the definitions of the codes before you begin to code. If you have any questions, please see Judy before you begin coding.

Codes for Strategies:

01. <u>Approach</u> – Approach will be coded whenever a child indicates that he/she would in some way physically approach a peer. In other words, if a child indicates that he/she would walk up to another child, stand next to that child, or in some way attempt to get physically nearer to a peer, this code should be used. Examples of this code include: Go over; Walk up to him/her; Sit/stand next to him/her; Get in a circle, etc.

02. <u>Greet</u> – This code is used to indicate that a child would use some form of greeting in his/her interactions with a peer. Examples include: Hi; Hello; how are you; I heard you're a new kid; I'd yell across the street hi; Try to meet him/her, What are you guys doing?, etc.

03. <u>Introduce self or other</u> – This code is used whenever a child indicates that he/she would tell a peer his/her name or tell them who he/she is. In addition, this code is used when the child indicates that he/she would introduce a peer to other peers. Examples include: Tell him/her who I am; Tell him/her my nam;, My name is Johnny; Introduce myself; He'd introduce himself; etc.

04. <u>Ask other for information about him/herself</u> – Whenever a child says that he/she would ask a peer questions about him/herself, this code will be used. Typically, these questions would be personal questions related to the child, his/her family, his/her residence, information about the child's academic or sports records, hobbies, and other such information. Examples include: Ask him about his life; I hear that your name is Kevin; Ask how old he/she is; Ask how she does things; Ask what he/she likes to do; What's your name; How he was doing in school; What's your dog's name; Ask for his phone number; Ask him stuff about school; Does she have any brothers and sisters; See if she likes pets; etc.

05. <u>Give information about self</u> – This code is similar to the one above, except that it refers to the child's giving information about him/herself to the peer. This code also refers to personal information, but in this case it is information that the child volunteers to others rather than asking for information from

56

others. Examples include: Tell him where I live; I'm nice; I live
over there; Tell her what I like to do; Tell her my hobbies; Tell
her what grade I'm in; I'd tell her I wasn't the kind of kid who
went around smoking or anything like that; etc.

06. Ask/invite other to play/join - When a child indicates that he/she
would attempt to include a peer in an activity, or invite a peer to
play, this category of codes should be used. Examples include:
Ask if I could play with his dog too; Want to play baseball; See if
we could play games; Ask her if she want to play a game; Ask if
he'd like to stay the night; Bring him over to my house; Do you
wanna do something; Try and get her alone; Ask him if he wants to
come over to your house; See if we could all play games; etc.

07. Ask to make friends or maintain friendship - If a child indicates
that he/she would like to make friends with a peer, or wishes to
maintain an ongoing friendship, this code should be used. Examples
include: I'd like to be your friend; Then she can be my friend;
Can I be your friend; Would you become my friend; Tell her/him that
you'd like to be friends; She should know I want to be her friend
if I tell her that; If he walks away I know he means no; Still be
friends if he asked; etc.

08. Help other - When a child refers to providing aid to a peer or in
some way helping that peer, code this category. Examples include:
Help him out alot; Pull each other through; Do more things for her;
Tell her what all the teachers are about; Help each other with
homework; Show him where his classes were; Show her around the
school; etc.

09. Share with other - Offering to let a child borrow one's
possessions, or offering to share one's possessions with a peer is
considered sharing. Examples include: Share everything with him;
I'd let her borrow things; Like borrow my crayons; etc.

10. Compromise - When a child is willing to meet his/her companion
half-way in a conflict situation, and when he/she expects the
companion to do likewise, this is coded as a compromise. Examples
include: Ask if he wants to watch somethin else besides either of
the two shows that we both like; Ask if I could watch that for a
little bit longer and watch his show ther rest of the time; I'd
feel that she can watch what she wants and when the time comes that
she says I can watch I can watch; Maybe after we're done watching
my show we could get in the middle of yours; Watch mine for half an
hour and his for half an hour; Maybe during commercials she could
turn it back; Make a deal with him; Try to compromise; Is there
another show on that we both like; Try to be careful to say hey
let's do this instead of that; etc.

11. Apologize or express sorrow at loss of friendship - Any instance of
a child expressing regret for an action or regret at losing
friendship should be coded within this category. Examples include:
I'm sorry; I didn't mean to say that; I'm sorry that you don't want
to be my friend; etc.

12. Try to make amends (make up) or to renew loyalty - If a child
indicates that he/she would try to make up for or compensate for a
transgression, or would try to renew his/her loyalty to a friend,
code this category. Examples of this code are: I would try to be
true to her; Try and get friends with him again; We can still be
friends; Maybe tomorrow I can walk home with you and then we can

start there again; If I did something bad I'd say I still want to be friends; etc.

13. Be nice, kind, don't hurt other - Any reference to being nice to the peer, being kind to the peer, or trying to avoid hurting the person should be coded here. Examples include: I wouldn't do nothing to hurt her; Say nice things to him/her; Be good to him/her; Try not to do something wrong; Try to be as nice as I could to her; Show her that I care; Not tell personal jokes; I don't think that was nice; etc.

14. Have frequent contact with other - Responses which imply or indicate a desire to increase or continue the amount of contact a child has with his/her peer should be coded within this category. Examples are: Go over to his house every day; Call him up, etc.

15. Avoid conflict, argument, anger, or loss of friendship - This category of codes includes references to a child's desire to not "rock the boat". In other words, the child wishes to maintain his/her relationships with peers on an even keel without incurring the anger of the peers. In addition, the child wishes to avoid arguments or conflicts with his/her peers. Examples of this code include: I would just get along; Not make him mad at me; Tell her I'll never fight with her; I would never argue with her; Don't make him/her upset; Don't say nothin to make him mad; I'd be careful not to lose her; Just tell animal jokes that wouldn't offend them; I might say the wrong things; I really wouldn't try to argue; etc.

16. Retaliate - If a child indicates that he/she would try to "get back" at a peer for something that the peer said or did that hurt the child or made him/her mad, code this category. Examples include: Tell him fine with me; Change it back to my channel; Well if you don't want to be my friend I won't talk to you play with you or come over anymore; If you don't want to be my friend that's your problem; Alright I don't want to walk with you either; If she was being a snot I'd say something different; I'd probably say fine buzz off; etc.

17. Appeal to authority figures - Any references to appeals to parents, teachers or some other more powerful person or adult in order to resolve a conflict should be coded as an appeal to authority figures. Some examples are: I would tell her mother; Her mother would tell us to compromise; Maybe I'd go tell somebody; etc.

18. Walk away - Attempts to resolve a conflict or disagreement by leaving the situation will be coded as walking away. Examples of this code are: Say ok then bye; Just say fine then we're not friends anymore; I'd just walk away from him; Watch the show I wanted to watch at my house; Go home; Well if she wasn't gonna answer me I'd sorta let her be on her own; If she gave me a snotty reaction I'd just lay off her; etc.

19. Do nothing - When a child indicates that he/she would not take any action in a conflict situation or otherwise, code this category. Examples are: I'd just sit there; Nothing; It depends on what he says when I ask him why; If she said no there's really nothing I can do about it; I wwuldn't say anything yet; Let him go; Wait till she tells me by herself; Just look at him; etc.

20. Point out discrepancies - Here, a child observes to his/her peer that a discrepancy exists in the situation, but he/she takes no action to resolve of fix the discrepancy. Some examples of this

code: I'd say I want to be your friend but you don't want to be mine; I was watching something else; Me and you were watching the show before it and you changed the channel; It don't matter if they don't like me it's your friend; We were watching that show; etc.

21. Make reference to other's possessions - If a child points out that something belongs to or is owned by his/her peer, it should be coded as a reference to other's possessions. Examples are: It's your (his/her) house; It's your (his/her) TV; But this is your house so you can change it; It's over his house; etc.

22. Express confusion or disbelief - A child's expressions of surprise at another's actions, disbelief in those actions, or confusion over the reason for those actions should be coded here. Some illustrtations include: What?!?; I don't see why you don't want to be friends anymore; 'Cuz you and me were friends; Me and you were friends before and now you don't want to be with me; I don't believe it!; I thought we were friends; Wouldn't know what to say; etc.

23. Request/give reason for action - When a child asks a peer for an explanation of an action, or when the child gives the peer an explanation for his/her own actions, it should be coded here. Some illustrations of this code are: Say she said somebody else didn't like me; Ask why she's mad at me; Find out if others have told those kind of things about me; Did I say anything wrong to offend you or get you mad?; Ask why; What happened; Ask him/her what I did wrong; etc.

24. Make reference to other's loneliness - Any references about a peer experiencing loneliness or being alone and without friends should be coded here. Some illustrations of this code are: He's all alone; He's lonely; He needs someone to play with; You seem lonely; etc.

25. Acquire information from other friends - Attempts by a child to find out about a peer by asking his/her other friends about that peer will be coded as acquiring information from others. Included as examples are: One of my friends told me; Ask my friends how is he, nice?; Ask my friends what she's like or how they like her; Go talk to the other two girls; I might go to my friend first; Ask them to introduce me to her; Ask the other guys about Kevin; etc.

26. Engage in mutual activity - References to the child and a peer engaging in the same activity together or playing with one another should be coded in this category. This category does not include invitations to play. Examples of this code are: And we would do it together; Play games with him/her; Go to the movies the next day; Do something with her; Try to play with her; Ask if we could all be partners; We could work on the science project at my house or at his house; Ride bikes; Take him places; Kevin, we can keep working on the project; After school we'd do things; etc.

27. Express a preference - When the child indicates that he/she would express his/her own preference for a particular activity,or expresses a liking for a particular thing,code it in this category. Illustrations here include: I would say that I didn't really like this channel; I'd just say I didn't want to hang aroung the wrong people; Say that I like the other program better; I would rather watch the other one; Say to myself "I don't really like it"; etc.

28. Submit or defer to other's wishes without active disagreement -

This category should be coded whenever the child says that he/she would go along with the peer's wishes without actively disagreeing and without actively expressing a preference for something else. Some illustrations: If you really like it, I'd try to get used to it; Just let him get his own way; It really doesn't matter if I watch it, but I don't agree; If he wanted to do something, I'd let him do it; I'd just watch his show; Just watch what Kevin was satching; I'd let her on top a little more; I'd let her have her way a little more; I can stand watching one show; I'd just sit there and finish watching the show; Try to make allowances for her; We can watch your program if you're sure you don't like mine; He can change it if he wants; etc.

29. Begin/continue a conversation - If the child says that he/she would start talking to a peer, or would try to continue a conversation that was currently in progress, it would be coded here. Some examples: Then go on talking; Most of the time talk strictly on the science project; Talk to him alot; Start talking to them; What are you talking about?; I'd talk right back to her; Try and talk to her; etc.

30. Make a judgement about the peer's personality - When a child makes a remark about the other person's personality, or about what that person is like, code it here. Some examples include: See how I like her; Tell him he was pretty rude; I don't think that was nice; That's not nice to say things about other people; If you don't like 'em, you shouldn't say nothin'; She'd tell people probably, and I couldn't play with no one else; etc.

31. Ask other to submit to your wishes - This code will be recorded when a child indicates that he/she wants his/her peer to do something the he/she suggests, rather than going along with what the peer wants. In other words, the child is expressing a desire to engage in a particular activity and asks the peer to go along with that wish. Some examples are: Ask him/her to turn it back; Can you switch it back; I'd tell him to turn it back; Please put it back; etc.

32. Find other companions - Record this code if the child indicates that he/she would go play with or find some other friends in the face of conflict with his/her current peer. Here are some examples: I would just say that I'd go find another friend; That's not the only friend I have; I'll just go play with my other friends; Make friends; Make more friends; Or if she just decided to go with someone else and to be their best friend; Maybe just hang around with someone else; And if he didn't, I'd ask one of my other friends to walk home with me; etc.

33. Be friendly - Displays of warmth and friendliness should be coded as being friendly. Some examples are: Try to be friendly; Talk to him friendly; I have other friends if she wants to meet them; Take him to see some other friends; etc.

34 Agree with other - Any attempts made by the child to be agreeable and to agree with his/her peer's suggestions in an active manner, as opposed to passively submitting to the peer's wishes, are to be coded here. Illustrations include: Try to agree with him/her; Try to agree on things; Try not to disagree; Agree on some of her ideas; Might agree with him on something; etc.

35. Expression of liking for other - A child's expressions of fondness

for a peer, or of liking for a peer, should be recorded in this category. Examples of liking for another child include: Kristi, I like you; I really do like you for a friend; You are my very best friend; I like you; Tell her I liked her; etc.

36. **Ask other's preference** - You should code this response category if the child indicates that he/she would seek his/her peer's opinion about something before acting, or seeks his/her peer's preferences about an activity before beginning it. Examples of this code include: Ask him if he liked the other show; Ask them if they wanted to watch another TV show or watch this one; Are you sure you don't want to be my friend; Ask her what she wants to watch instead of that; What he wants to do on the project; Didn't you like that show; etc.

37. **Equality/reciprocity in relationship** - Any indications that the children involved in the relationship have equal roles, or that they would expect one another to behave in ways that would be of benefit to both participants would be coded as equality. Illustrations here are: I would not want to be the boss; I would like her to do the same thing to me; And he would let me do what I wanted to do; etc.

38. **Resolve conflict/argument** - All attempts to work out disagreements in a mutually satisfying manner are considered attempts to resolve a conflict, and should be coded as such. Examples of attempts to resolve conflicts include: If we get into an argument, try to work it out; Try to talk it over; Maybe we can work it out; We'd see what the problem was; etc.

39. **Avoid self embarrassment** - This code is recorded when a child indicates that he/she would act in some way so as to not become embarrassed or flustered. Avoiding self embarrassment includes: Try not to say something dumb; Make a good impression; Try not to do something wrong myself; I wouldn't say anything bogue; etc.

40. **Establish commonalities** - A child's attempts to determine if he/she has anything in common with a peer fall into this category. This includes comments such as: See what we have in common; See if we have the same interests; I'd say, "I have a dog just like that"; If we had something in common say, "Boy, I like this too!"; We could find out each other's interests in science; etc.

41. **Bribe/not bribe other** - Any references to trying to buy another child's friendship, or to avoiding such actions, fall in this category. Illustrations of this code include: Some people buy 'em things, but I don't do that; etc.

42. **Acknowledge other's presence** - This code is recorded whenever a child responds to a peer in such a way that the peer would know that the child is aware of his/her presence. This code is similar to a greeting, except that the actions are nonverbal instead of verbal. Some examples include: If she glanced over I'd probably wave to her; I wouldn't just ignore her; I'd join her in on the conversation; I wouldn't just ignore her like I had other friends; etc.

43. **Refrain from retaliation** - When a child avoids trying to "get back" at his/her peer when that peer does something the child dislikes, this code should be used. An example of this code is: But I wouldn't walk up and change it though, etc.

44. **Compliment other** - Any expressions of praise or admiration for a

child's peer or for that peer's possessions should be coded as a compliment. Compliments include: I'd say, "You're nice"; I like your dog; I'd start complimenting them; You're doing a good job on the science project; You have pretty hair; You have pretty eyes; etc.

45. Avoid physical/verbal aggression - Any indication that the child wishes not to use physical force or verbal degradation in order to resolve a conflict or deal with a situation should be coded as an avoidance of aggression. Illustrations are: Try not to yell; Wouldn't punch him; Instead of going up and saying, "You're no good"; Not tell personal jokes; Try not to say anything offensive to her that would make her mad; I wouldn't say anything bad; If I didn't like any of her ideas, I wouldn't yell, "I don't like that"; etc.

46. Enjoy each other's company - Expressions of a child's having fun with his/her peers, and of liking to be with them, engaging in mutual activities should be coded here. Some examples of this code include: Just enjoy yourself while you're doing the project; I'd have fun playing and talking with her; etc.

47. Take other's point of view - Attempts to understand the situation at hand from the peer's perspective, and to act according to that perspective should be coded here. Some examples are: We would try and understand each other's feelings; If we do disagree, I would try to see her point and not just stay stubborn with my own; I'd try harder to make allowances for her, etc.

48. Engage in physical aggression - If a child indicates that he/she would take hostile physical action against a peer, it should be coded here. An obvious example is: Punch her in the face.

49. Avoid exclusive friendship - This code refers to a child's attempts to allow both his/her peer and him/herself to maintain friendshps outside of the relationship between that child and the peer he/she is currently with. Examples of this code are: I would tell her that we can be friends without saying that each other can't play with someone else; Tell her not to be jealous of each other; etc.

50. Expressions of feelings - If a child indicates that as a strategy he/she would express his/her feelings or affective state to a peer, it should be coded in this category. This does not include expressions of liking for a peer. Examples include: I would probably let it (my feelings) out; If she told me why, I would be surprised; I'd just say alright; I'd just say OK; I would get mad at her; It's OK, you don't have to walk with me; I don't mind if you guys don't want to play with me; It would be OK; etc.

51. Provide support/understanding - Provision of emotional support (as opposed to helping a peer), or of a child and his/her peer "sticking up for" one another should be coded as providing support or understanding. Examples include: Stick up for him/her; If you're stuck on something I'll always be there to help you through; If he'd tell me, maybe I'd understand it more; etc.

52. Respect each other's privacy/silence - This code includes a child's attempts not to pry into his/her peer's feelings, and not to push them into giving an explanation for a confusing situation. Examples are: I wouldn't butt into their business; If they don't want me talking to 'em, I'll just walk away; etc.

53. Forgive other - If the child indicates that he/she would excuse

his/her peer's inappropriate behavior, code it in this category. An example is: If she hurt my feelings, I'd tell her it's alright.

54. Hide feelings - All attempts to conceal one's actual emotions or affective state from the peer fall into this category. Examples are: I wouldn't tell her; I would keep it to myself; I would say to myself I don't really like it; etc.

55. Be yourself - A child's attempts to act normally and not to put on any airs in front of his/her peers are coded as attempts to "be yourself". An example is: Try to act normal.

56. Ignore other - If a child indicates that he/she would not pay attention to the peer, it should be coded as ignoring. An example is: Ignore her if she got on my nerves.

57. Imitate others - This code should be used in cases where the child indicates that he/she would try to emulate his/her peer, or would try to copy the peer's behavior. An example is: I'd do the same thing as the other kids.

99. No response or uncodable response - Use this code if the child has failed to provide any strategies for a given question, or if their response cannot be coded within one of the above categories. This code should rarely be used as most children gave at least one strategy for each interview question.

APPENDIX E

GOALS CODING SCHEME

Goals Coding Scheme

In this coding scheme, you are asked to code each of the child's goal responses. A master list of all responses that have been designated as goal responses is attached at the end of this booklet. Use this list as a guideline for which responses to code. This booklet contains a list of codes for you to use in coding the children's goals, along with a definition of each of these codes. In addition, a master list of the codes is provided for your use during coding. You should read this booklet carefully, and learn the definitions of the codes before you begin to code. If you have any questions, please see Judy before you begin coding.

Codes for Goals:
01. Approach/Greet - Use this code whenever a child says that he/she performed a particular behavior in order to physically approach and/or greet another child. For example: Because if I called her over she probably wouldn't come; Because she said hi first; Because I would want to go over there; Hi is a greeting; etc. would be coded as Approach/Greet.
02. Meet/Get better acquainted - If a child indicates that his/her goal is to meet a peer, or to get better acquinated with that peer, use this code. Getting better acquainted may be specifically referred to, or it may be referred to in the form of the child wanting to "get to know" the peer. Examples of this code include: I like meeting new kids; I think I would like to know him better; So you could know each other; 'Cuz I wanted to meet her; You'd probably get to meet him; You want to know her; And we'd get to know each other; To find out about her; etc.
03. Introduction to self or others - A child's goal may be to introduce him/herself to a peer, or to introduce the peer to his/her family or friends. Examples are: To meet my parents; To let him know my name; Because he would probably like to know my name; Because I say my name in class; Maybe she didn't know a lot of other people; So you know what your name is; Because I would want to introduce myself; etc.
04. Acquire knowledge about other - The child's goal is to acquire personal or objective information about a new peer. This includes information about the peer's family, name, interests, etc. Therefore, statements such as: So I could know what his name is; To see what she likes to do; In case I wanted to go over his house and ask for him; If I became better friends with him, I'd know where he lived; Just in case I don't know the movie; I'm supposed to ask what their name is; If I don't know the show, I won't know what's gonna happen; etc. are coded in this category.
05. Other asks for and/or receives information about self - Here, the child's goal is to in some manner provide his/her peer with personal or objective information about him/herself. This may occur as a result of the peer having requested the information, or because the child has chosen to volunteer the information.

Examples include: One day he'll probably ask my name; To let her know what kind of things I do like and don't like; If I'm her friend, if I wasn't her friend maybe she really doesn't know much about me; And one day she may ask more about me and I'll tell her that maybe she'll like me more; So she might ask you your name; 'Cuz he wouldn't know it if I didn't tell him; So she'll know what I like; etc.

06. **Facilitate interaction by joining/coming over/asking to play** - This code should be used in instances where the child's goal is to initiate interaction between him/herself and the peer by joining the peer, asking the peer to play, or having the peer over to the child's house. Statements like: If I didn't have nobody to play with I'd like to ask her to play; He mignt wanna come over someday; If there's nobody else left I might be able to play with her; 'Cuz he asked me to come over; And see if she'll play with me; Because I wanted to play with her; To see if they wanna play with you; etc. fall in this category.

07. **Make friends/Maintain friendship** - Record this code in cases where a child indicates that his/her goal is to make friends with a peer, or that he/she wishes to maintain a friendship at the same level of intimacy as that which it is currently. This code should not be used when the child wishes to become better acquainted with a peer (02), or when he/she wishes to increase the intimacy level of a relationship (63). Some examples: Because I want to make friends with him; Well, that you're a good friend; So he'd know I'd be a friend; Become good friends; So we can keep friends; So I would have a new friend and he would have a new friend; They could get to be good friends; 'Cuz it's always good to make new friends instead of keeping old ones; So we can start being friends; And stay close together; We four could be best friends; etc.

08. **Help other** - The child's goal here is to give assistance to his/her peer or to receive assistance from that peer. Examples are: Well if I was a bad student maybe she'd like to help me; So he's not late for the bell; If I was good in something maybe I could help her; She probably didn't know what to make so I decided on two things; Because if I don't know what else to put in it maybe she'd have some ideas; etc.

09. **Share** - Here, the child has given an explanation for an action which indicates a desire to pool resources, or take turns at an activity. Statements belonging to this code include: She's not the only person with changing channels or anything she wants; She has to give her friend a turn too; All the people I like I let borrow things from me; etc.

10. **Compromise** - Goal statements indicating a willingness on the child's part to give the partner leeway in a conflict situation, but which also imply an expectation that the partner will give the child similar flexibility should be coded in this category. Some examples: So you're not just doing what you wanna do; So if we liked two different things we could combine them; But what they wanna do too; Maybe we can find cartoons we both like; Well if you're at a friend's house and they say you can change it, that's something different; So we can each get a piece of the show; etc.

11. **Loss of friendship or companionship** - If the child's goal reflects the expectation that he/she will lose a peer's friendship or

companionship (i.e. the friend will not continue to associate with the child), use this code. Examples: Because he didn't want to be my friend anymore; 'Cuz she already left; He might not like ya; She'd leave; Because he said he wouldn't walk with me; Because if I didn't have any other friends and she didn't like me, I think maybe I'd never have a friend again; If he doesn't want to be friends with me I guess I can't be friends with him; etc.

12. Apologize, make amends, renew loyalty - If the child's goal is to become friends with a peer again, correct a mistake, or apologize for some wrongdoing, use this code. Illustrations include: See if I could correct that; I could be friends with him again; Maybe he would've changed his mind about not making friends; If it's for some reason that I should know about it I'd want to change it; To correct it; etc.

13. Attempts to be nice/kind/not hurt - Any reference to trying not to hurt a peer's feelings, being sensitive to the fact that other's feelings can be hurt, and attempting to avoid doing so, while being nice or kind instead, should be coded here. These goal statements might be like the following: Because it wouldn't be nice to tell her I don't like her; I don't feel like hurting other person's feelings; I kinda feel sorry for him; It's nice to say hello before you ask what's your name; It would probably be nice; Because she's nice to me; Because if I said it it might hurt her feelings; etc.

14. Frequent contact - The child's goal may be to increase the amount of time he/she spends with a certain peer. If this is so code it here. Examples: So we keep in touch; If he spends the night we could have the whole night together; So I could get in contact with him; So I would know where he was; So I'd know if I'd see him more often; etc.

15. Avoid conflict/argument/anger/loss of friendship - The child's goal is often to avoid engaging in an argument with his/her friends, or to maintain the relationship on an even footing and not make the friend angry. Use this code if the child responds in such a manner: I didn't want to lose my best friend; I wouldn't want to argue with him; If I do that then he'd probably get mad; And not get mad when we're friends; Because I wouldn't feel like telling her and starting an argument with her; etc.

16. Retaliate - Use this code if the child indicates that his/her goal is to "get back at" a peer for some offense, or if the child believes that the friend will try to "get back at" him/her for some offense; Examples: Because I thought maybe he got mad at me and knew I didn't like a show he liked and turned it; Because if she didn't want to walk with me then I didn't want to walk with her; To get back at her; etc.

17. Appeal/refer to authority figures - A child's goal may be embedded within a reference to authority figures, particularly parents. Some illustrations: Maybe they'll say she can stay the night; That's how my ma taught me to begin to talk to someone that I never met; etc.

18. Walk away - This goal refers to the child's taking leave of his/her peer by walking away. Examples: So I'd leave him; You don't want to hang around somebody who keeps telling you off; etc.

19. Don't know what else to say - Here a child indicates that he/she has no real explanation for his/her behavior other than that they

couldn't think of anything else to say. Examples are: Just kinda a habit of mine; That's what they say sometimes; That's how people ask; Because I don't have no other thing; It's just one of the things I say when I make friends; There's nothing else to do; 'Cuz if you wanna be friends it's probably one of the best things to do; etc.

20. Point out discrepancy - The child's goal in this situation is to inform his/her peer that a discrepancy exists in their interaction, although no action to correct the discrepancy is implied. Examples include: Because we were in the middle of my show and yours is just starting; Because he changed the channel without asking from something I liked; Because he's the one who changed it; He just broke up with me and I liked him; Because she'd been my friend for awhile; But I would be the guest; Someone can't just walk up and say I don't want to be your friend; It was kinda funny that he wouldn't walk home with me; etc.

21. Reference to possessions - In this instance, the child's goal is to explain his/her behavior or the behavior of a peer by referring to the peer's possessions, or to the child's own possessions. Some examples: We're at his house; So like if they don't have it she'd be able to try it; Because she owns the TV; Because the dog would probably be friendly; This could be his friend's house or something; etc.

22. Outsider's judgement of self - The child explains his/her behavior or that of his/her peers by referencing his/her perceptions of how other children feel about him/her. In other words, the child is providing his/her perceptions of what other children think he/she is like as a person. Illustrations include: Why I said that is that a lot of people don't want to play with me; Some people don't think I'm nice; Oh, because some people might think you're stuck up; And you don't wanna make friends with new kids; If I was talking to another friend about her, but not bad, and the other friend said something different t her that I said something bad, she might you know, get it confused; Like if I said she was pretty and another girl went up to her and said that I said that she was really ugly and mean, she might....; etc.

23. Acquire/give reason for action - Here the child's goal is to find out why a particular event occurred or to explain why a particular event occurred. In most cases, this code is used when the child is attempting to discover why his/her peer behaved in a certain manner. The following examples qualify for this code: So I can see what's wrong; Tell him why he's mad at me; Because I'd like to find out what I did to her; To see how come she didn't like it; Because I'd be curious to know; I don't want just little parts that happened if she got sick or things like that; I'd want to know why she changed her mind on me; etc.

24. Reference to peer's loneliness/solitary state - A child's explanation of behavior for this code makes reference to the fact that a peer is alone, or that the peer is lonely. Examples are: Because he did...he's just watching his dog play; He was lonely; 'Cuz she only had two friends; He did not have any friend outside; And he was playing out in his front yard with his dog; If she was that type, didn't have any brothers or sisters, she would like to have some; In case he doesn't have no friends so far and he wants

somebody to meet him; etc.

25. <u>Acquire information from other friends</u> - The explanation for behavior in this instance is that the child has behaved as reported because of some bit of information he/she has acquired from other peers. Examples: Because one of my friends told me that there's a new kid on the street; They'll give him information, etc.

26. <u>Mutual activity</u> - The child's desire in this situation is to become engaged in mutual activity with a peer, and is explaining his/her behavior as an attempt to accomplish this goal. Some illustrations: In case we have another one of these and want to do it again together; He plays with me; Maybe you wanna play a game and you need two people; So you can play a game; Because you want to play with her; Do some sorts of activities with me; etc.

27. <u>Express a preference</u> - The child's goal here is to let the peer know the he/she wishes to engage in a particular activity, although it may not be an activity in which the peer also wishes to engage. Thus, the child is expressing his/her preference for, or choice of, an activity. Examples: See if I like it or not; So I could watch the other show; I probably didn't get along and agree because it wasn't my favorite show; I hate watching shows I don't like; It's kinda boring; So I'd say, "Want to know what my idea is?"; Because I wouldn't want to walk home by myself; So he'd know what it is you want to do; Because I was liking the movie; So she has the idea that I like it; etc.

28. <u>Give other leeway/Submit to other</u> - The child's explanation for his/her actions revolve around giving into the peer's preference without engaging in an argument. Examples include statements such as: It's only natural for someone to like someone who always gets their own way than someone who's always arguing; To let him do whatever he wanted; 'Cuz maybe the show would be interesting; If he doesn't want to walk with me I'd just let him do that; She should be allowed to watch what she wants; That way if he doesn't want to meet me he doesn't have to; She can do whatever she wants; etc.

29. <u>Begin/continue a conversation</u> - Getting a conversation off the ground, or attempting to maintain an ongoing conversation is the child's goal. Statements included are: That's a nice way of starting a conversation up; Because that's the best way of starting what you want to say first; 'Cuz if they were talking I'd just say; Because I would want to talk to her alot; It wouldn't be a very good conversation if you didn't know her name; etc.

30. <u>Judgements about the peer's personality</u> - Here the child's explanation of his/her behavior is based on a judgement he/she has made about the peer's personality, or of what the peer is likely to do. In addition, the peer may make judgements of the child's personality which fall into this code. Examples: Because she might be nice; I'd tell her because how she acts and her attitude; Because she said I was nice; I don't like people that say things; So he'd know that you're nice; Because some people yell when they're working; She might look like that type, an animal lover; She might be too shy to talk to you; That would be kinda mean if he did that; etc.

31. <u>Gaining preferred choice</u> - The child's goal in this situation is to gain his/her preferred choice at the expense of the peer's choice of activity. Examples include statements such as: He let me watch

my stuff a little bit of the stuff that I was watching; So she might change it back; To watch the movie I like; So I could watch what I was watching; 'Cuz maybe he never saw this cartoon; And I said maybe he'd like it; So we can watch something I like; etc.

32. <u>Find other companions</u> - The child's goal is to find companions to replace those whom he/she has lost. Examples: If I don't have anyone else to play with I might ask someone else to play; 'Cuz if he says he wants to be my friend, then no, I have another friend; And like that friend instead of me; In my class I have friends named Beth, Heather, Kathy; Because I got a lot more friends; etc.

33. <u>Be friendly</u> - The child's goal is to let the peer know that he/she is, or wishes to be, warm and friendly. Illustrations include the following: If I'm friendly she might like me; Waving's sorta friendly; It's a friendly greeting; Hi might think that you're friendlier; So she'd think I was more friendly; etc.

34. <u>Agree with other</u> - In making specific reference to being agreeable, the child's goal is to get along without making waves. He/she wishes to maintain the status quo by agreeing with partner. Examples: I just agreed with him that I didn't want to be his friend; If I agree with her she might like me; Because agreeing is better than arguing; etc.

35. <u>Retain liking for one another</u> - Maintaining a peer's regard or admiration, or the child's wish to retain his/her own regard for the peer represents the child's goal for this code. Thus, the child wishes to continue to like the peer, and wishes to maintain the peer's liking for him/her. Statements such as: So she knew that I like her; So maybe he would still like me; If I tease him he'll thing I don't like him; I had a friend...I told her I liked her like a sister; To see maybe if I like her before I go on talking to her; Because I really like her alot; Then he won't like me; You like 'em; Because if you did, why not tell her; etc. fall into this category.

36. <u>Refer to/ask for other's preference</u> - Use this code whenever the child's goal is to seek his/her peer's preferences before taking action, or when the child explains his/her behavior by referring to his/her peer's wishes. Examples: So maybe he would like to watch something else for a little while; He might think it's a good idea for his project; But he didn't want to; I thought he liked it; She probably didn't want to walk with me and she probably wanted to walk by herself; Because that's what she likes; So I don't just say "How about this", and start right in on it; etc.

37. <u>Equality/Reciprocity</u> - The goal is to express equality in the relationship as a reason for an action, or to express give and take in the relationship. Statements included are: When I say it he might want to be nice and say it back to me; Because it's something that each do; They should tell me before they say anything; etc.

38. <u>Resolve conflict</u> - Settling an argument or resolving a conflict is the child's goal for into this code. Examples include: So maybe we can get our problem straightened out; Maybe you can work it out; etc.

39. <u>Avoid embarassment</u> - The child explains his/her behavior as a means of avoiding feeling ill at ease. Illustrations of this code include: So I don't say nothing wrong; So I wouldn't be embarrassed; etc.

40. Establish commonalities/similarities - Here the child's goal is to
    determine the extent to which he/she and his/her peer share common
    interests or attributes. Statements included in this code are:
    Maybe he's my age; He's like me; We could see if we could trade
    clothes if we wore the some size; If he's my age it'll be a better
    friend to play with; To see if we like the same things; He's just a
    kid like me; we could see how each other are; etc.
41. Not take advantage of - Use this code when a child indicates that
    his/her goal is to not try to buy a peer's friendship. Some
    examples: Not to use him or anyting; 'Cuz it's like trying to buy
    a friendship; If she started to use you you wouldn't be friends
    anymore; You'd just be using each other, etc.
42. Acknowledge peer's presence - This code should be used when the
    child's goal is to acknowledge that he/she is aware of a peer's
    presence, or when the child wishes other's to acknowledge that
    he/she is present. An example is: So they'd notice me.
43. Give gifts to friends - The child's reason for a given action is
    that it would allow him/her to give the friend a gift, or for the
    friend to give him/her a gift. Examples of this code are: So if
    he had a birthday party I could buy him something; She might wanna
    give you stuff; etc.
44. Compliment/Admiration - In this situation, the child's goal is to
    express admiration for a peer's attributes, or for something the
    peer has done, by complimenting the peer. Examples are: In case
    while we're doing it together and he's thinking of more answers and
    he's doing better questions, then he would be good to work with; So
    it would be good to do it because he has a lot better things; To
    make her think that her eyes were pretty; Because she probably did
    a better job on her project; 'Cuz she looks pretty; She would
    probably say I did a little better on my project; etc.
45. Avoid physical/verbal aggression - Any references to avoiding a
    fight or avoiding physical contact in the form of hitting one
    another which are given as reasons for a child's behavior should be
    coded here. Examples are: I wouldn't want to say anything mean to
    get him fighting; That you want to beat 'em up; And take all their
    money; So we don't get in a fight; etc.
46. Get along/Enjoy each other's company - The child's goal here is
    specifically to get along well with his/her peers, and to be sure
    that both parties experience a mutually enjoyable time together.
    Examples: It's buddy-buddy stuff; Because he'd probably want to
    have fun with me; That would be one way of getting along and having
    fun with each other; Well people who are good friends come over and
    have fun; You might want to laugh a little bit; You have fun to
    death; etc.
47. Take other's viewpoint - Here the child's goal is to examine the
    situation from his/her peer's point of view when determining how to
    behave. Statements coded here include: That's not a very good way
    to stay friends if you don't listen to 'em; Because I could be
    wrong; To be considerate; I know how it feels; I've had my feelings
    hurt before; etc.
48. Engage in physical/verbal aggression - The child's goal is to get
    into an argument with his/her peer, or to engage in some sort of
    physical altercation with the peer. Examples are: 'Cuz me and him
    would probably get in a fight; We might get in an argument;

Everybody gets angry when somebody tells them off; etc.

49. Avoid exclusive friendship - This code should be used if the child's goal is to allow the peer freedom to develop friendships outside of the relationship between the child and that peer. In addition, the child expects to be allotted the same privelege. Some examples include: So we can have other friends; And if I didn't have anyone to play with they would be the people I could play with in school days; In case someone tells her not to play with me or work together with me or do projects with me; It would maybe make my other friends like me better; You really don't gotta keep to yourself; etc.

50. Reference to expressing feelings - The child explains his/her actions in terms of the emotions he/she is experiencing in the situation. Examples: Well, I can't keep it to myself always; I have to tell it sometime; So I don't want to feel sad for myself; Because I don't feel good watching something I don't like; Because if she started saying things about me I'd feel very sad; etc.

51. Support/Understanding/Feeling wanted - The child explains his/her behavior in a situation as being related to the desire to provide support and/or understanding for the peer, or to make the peer feel welcome and desirable as a friend. Some statements in this category are: He should understand like me; To make him feel like he used to be where he had friends; To make her feel like her ideas are OK too; To make her feel like you want to; So he won't feel bad when he moved away; Like you're not just comin' because you have to but you want to; 'Cuz I'd be with him so long that I'd know what he feels and what he's been through; etc.

52. Reference to fairness - The child's goal is to establish an interaction which is equitable for each of the persons involved. Illustrations include: Because that wouldn't be fair if I asked one of them and not the rest; 'Cuz it's not right just to play with Kristi and not the other girls; Because that's more fair than just letting me or her watch it and not take turns; It's not right; etc.

53. Avoid boredom - The child specifically refers to the desire to avoid being bored. Examples: Because if you talk strictly about science that week, it might get boring; If he was bored in the first place, it might get unbored; Not just sit around and be bored to death; It's boring if you just sit around talking; etc.

54. Ease of interaction - This code will be used when the child's goal is to make the interaction between him/herself and the peer more comfortable. Examples include: It's probably the easiest way; It's faster; It's easier to sit next to her; I'd feel more comfortable with someone I knew than with someone I didn't know; etc.

55. Activities with non-agemates - The child's goals for behavior reference the difficulties of interacting with older or younger peers. Illustrations include: Because I don't like playing with older people; They boss me around; I don't like playing with little kids at heart; Because if I think she's a little bit older than me then I'll say to someone that I meet again that she, um, introduced her to someone; It ain't really fun if you're playing with bigger kids; etc.

56. Not ignore other - Record this code if the child's goal is to pay attention to the peer and not ignore what that peer has to say.

Statements included here: You don't ignore someone you want to get to know; You don't walk up to someone and say nothing; etc.

57. Reference to peer's state of physical/mental health - This response is usually used as a reason for the child's strategy of asking a peer "How are you?". The goal is to determine whether or not the peer is feeling well, or what the peer's state of mind is. Examples: Because he might be sick or something; To see how he felt; To see how he's feeling, etc.

58. Reference to the peer being new in the area - The child's behavior is explained in terms of the peer never having lived in the area before, or being new to the environment. Some examples are: Maybe she'd been in the house all the time she'd lived there; Well he hasn't been here alot around here; I would probably watch it because he's a new kid on the street; I've never seen her out there before; 'Cuz maybe he's new; Because if I was a new kid I wouldn't have no one to play with; etc.

59. Reference to good manners - The child's goal is to maintain good manners and to be polite and appropriate. Examples: Because I think it's very rude to say that; It's not polite to do it; It would probably come out and it wasn't supposed to; Because I'm not supposed to say "Hey girl"; You should ask them before you do it; If he's busy I don't want to interrupt him; etc.

60. Reference to self abilities/personality - Here the child explains his/her behavior by refering to an ability or to the type of person that he/she perceives him/herself to be. Examples are: Something I was good at; Just because I'm that type of person; etc.

61. Reference to finishing school work/chores - The child's explanation of behavior deals with the desire to finish work, or to aid the process of work being done by the child or peer. Examples include: We may not get our science project done; So we can get ahead on our science project; So we'd get done faster; etc.

62. Reference to self loneliness - The child explains his/her behavior as being related to loneliness or to being alone. Examples are: Because I don't have anyone else on the street; Because I don't meet friends very good when other people are around; Because that's the only friend I have, the new friend; etc.

63. Friendship development and increasing intimacy - The child's goal in this situation is to increase the closeness or intimacy of the relationship with the peer. This goal is usually referred to in specific terms and includes statements like: Because that could make a friendship grow; So we could be closer; Just so we could get closer; So we can get more friends; Because if we became better friends we might become best friends; etc.

64. Hide feelings/attempt to cope - Here, the child wishes to conceal his/her true feelings from the peer, or to cope with a bad situation as best he/she can. Examples are: So he won't know my feelings; Just go on living without her; etc.

99. No response/Don't know/Uncodable response - Although this code will rarely occur, it should be used in instances where a child has failed to provide a goal response, is unable to think of an adequate goal response, or the response given does not fit into any of the above categories.

APPENDIX F

FEELINGS CODING SCHEME

Feelings Coding Scheme

In this coding scheme, you are asked to record the child's responses to a question about how he/she would feel in particular situations. The coding scheme provided here outlines the codes to be used in evaluating the children's responses. It is a comprehensive coding scheme, and the children's responses are generally straightforward. Use this code book as a guideline for your coding, and see Judy before you begin coding if any questions should arise.

Feelings codes:

01. Good in general - Use this code when the child responds by saying that he/she would feel good about the situation. The child tends not to be any more specific in his/her response, other than possibly giving an explanation about why he/she feels good. Examples: Good; Pretty good; Feel good 'cuz I'm going to meet him; Same; I'd feel good that he's my friend already; You'd feel nice, well good that we got to work together; etc.

02. Bad in general - This code is similar to #01 except that it is the opposite emotion. Thus, the child feels generally bad, or not good, but again does not specify a more differentiated emotion. Examples: Bad; Not too good; Probably not too good 'cuz he changed the channel; I wouldn't feel any good anymore; etc.

03. Angry/Upset - Here the child indicates that he/she would be mad at a peer, or angry about the state of the situation. Examples: Angry; Mad; Upset; Sort of mad; Kind of mad that he wouldn't be my friend; I wouldn't like it; My first reaction would be to be angry; etc.

04. Shy/Nervous - The child indicates that he/she is unsure about what to do in the situation, and therefore is either shy about making a move, or nervous about doing something. Examples: Shy; Nervous; Anxious; Not sure; Sometimes it's hard for me to meet people; They were really shy when they came to school the first time; I'd feel like waiting till he's alone; Sometimes I'm too shy to ask people; I'd feel like maybe I'd be intruding if I walked over; etc.

05. Sad/Unhappy - If the child indicates that the situation would be sad, or would make him/her feel unhappy, use this code. Examples: Sad; Unhappy; Disappointed; Real sad; If we really didn't get along I'd feel sad; Not very happy; etc.

06. Excited/Anticipatory - The child is anticipating a desireable outcome, and is excited to have that outcome occur. Examples: Excited; Eager to be her friend; Like this is gonna be exciting; Anxious to meet her; I would probably feel friendly; etc.

07. Enjoyable/fun situation - This code is used when the child feels that the situation is or will be fun, and that the friend and the child both feel wanted by one another. Exmamples: I'd feel that she was sorts good to me; Fun to have a new friend; Boy, you're a great friend; etc.

08. Undisturbed/Nonchalant - The child feels that the situation is not worth worrying about, and expresses a feeling of not being

73

disturbed by it. Examples: That would be fine; I wouldn't care; It wouldn't bug me; I'd feel that she can watch what she wants; I wouldn't mind very much; etc.

09. **Wish to meet/make acquaintance** - Here the child feels the desire to meet a child whom he/she doesn't currently know, and/or wishes to become acquainted, although doesn't necessarily desire to become friends with that peer (see #19). Examples: Like maybe I should go meet him; Like I'd want to meet him/her; I'd probably like to say hi; Like I should go over; etc.

10. **Jealous/Selfish** - If the child would feel jealous of a peer's other friends, or if the child wishes to keep that peer to him/herself, use this code. Examples: I guess I'd be selfish because I'd want Kristi to myself; Jealous; Feel like trying to keep him away from other people; etc.

11. **Fearful of losing a friend** - Here the child indicates a desire to keep a friendship, and would feel sad or sorry if it broke up. Examples: Then you won't want to play with me anymore; I might lose Kevin; That I wouldn't want to lose him; Sorry he wouldn't want to talk to me; etc.

12. **Happy for other** - The child is concerned with the peer's welfare, and feels glad that something positive has happened to that peer. Examples: I'd be glad for him; Good 'cuz she had friends; etc.

13. **Strange/Uneasy** - Use this code if the child indicates that the situation would be in some way uncomfortable or odd. Examples: Kinda strange; Quite strange; I'd feel kinda different; Icky; etc.

14. **Great/Terrific** - This is a stronger emotion than just feeling good or happy. Rather, the child finds the situation quite pleasant and feels especially good about it. Examples: Terrific; Real, real happy; very good; real great; I'd feel great because I have a new friend; etc.

15. **Terrible/Awful** - Like #14, this emotion is quite strong. The child feels very bad and finds the situation very unpleasant. Examples: Very, very bad; Terrible; A little bit horrible; etc.

16. **Happy/Glad** - Here the child experiences joy that is stronger and more specific than just feeling good, but not as ecstatic as he/she feels for code #14. Thus the child feels happy or glad in the situation at hand. Examples: Glad that I went over to meet her; Sorta glad; Glad that the teacher said yes; Happy; Happy to meet her; I'd like it; I like little kids; Glad to be her partner; etc.

17. **Nice** - For this code, the child feels good about the other person, or about him/herself, and he/she is more specific about that feeling than would be the case in code #01. In general the child specifically refers to being nice. Examples: Feel like she's pretty nice; Have to be nice; etc.

18. **OK/Mediocre** - The child indicates that he/she feels no different than normal. Thus he/she is not feeling any specific emotion. Examples: I'd probably feel OK; Alright I guess; Fine; Normal; Not happy or sad, just in between; Not happy but not sad either; I'll feel myself again; I'll feel like I'm normal; etc.

19. **Desire to develop friendship** - If the child indicates that he/she would like to become friends with a peer, or to become closer to that peer, code the response here. Examples: I'd like to be his friend; Feel like I'd want to make friends with her; I've got a new friend; I'd feel maybe I'd just made another friend; Like I would

wanna be good friends; etc.

20. <u>Frustrated</u> - The child feels trapped by the situation and is <u>frustrated</u> with how it has turned out. Examples: Mad at myself; A little frustrated at myself; etc.

21. <u>Hurt</u> - The child indicates that the peer has hurt his/her feelings. <u>Examples</u>: Hurt; Hurt 'cuz I think we would have a good relationship; I would feel hurt because we got to be such good friends; etc.

22. <u>Lonely/Sad for other</u> - The child is empathizing with the peer, and feels sorry that the peer has no friends or is alone. Some examples: I'd feel lonely for her; I'd feel bad because she was all by herself; Like he's lonely; etc.

23. <u>Cheated/Unconsidered</u> - The child feels that the peer has cheated him/her or has not taken the child's wishes into consideration. Examples: I feel like changing it back; I'd feel that my friend is cheating me; Like it was something mean to do; That he shouldn't have done that; etc.

24. <u>Curious</u> - The child feels puzzled by the situation, but is motivated to find out what will happen. Example: Curious about what I would do.

25. <u>Confused/Challenged</u> - The child is strongly puzzled by the situation or feels that the situation is challenging. Examples: Like this kid is really changing; Confused; This is a real toughy; Wanting to know what I did; It would be kinda weird to me if I hurt her feelings; etc.

26. <u>Pleased with self</u> - Here the child feels a sense of determination and/or pride. Examples: Proud; Determined to go meet her; I'd probably feel relieved that she's my friend; Successful that I made another friend; etc.

27. <u>Partner</u> - The child indicates a sense of partnership with the peer. <u>Examples</u>: Like we're going to work on something together; Feel that we gotta work on it together; etc.

28. <u>Playmate</u> - Here the child indicates a desire to have someone to <u>play with</u>. Examples: He needs somebody to play with; Like I wanted to play with him; I'd feel like playing with them; And ask them if they wanted to play; etc.

29. <u>Bored</u> - The child finds the situation boring. Examples: Like this is gonna be a little bit boring; etc.

30. <u>Rejected/Unwanted</u> - The child feels as if the peer does not want his/her friendship. Examples: Rejected; And he/she is beginning to hate me; etc.

31. <u>Reflective</u> - The child is thinking about what to do in the situation without indicating that he/she is unsure or anxious about what to do. Examples: I'd just wonder what would happen; I'd just think what would happen if we weren't friends; etc.

32. <u>Clumsy/Dumb</u> - The child is feeling stupid or inept at handling the situation. Examples: Then you'll think I'm dumb or something; I'd feel like I did somethin stupid in school; etc.

33. <u>Aggressive</u> - The child feels like he/she wants to express anger through physical aggression toward the peer. Example: Feel like beating him up.

34. <u>Responsible for others</u> - The child feels responsibility for the outcome of the situation and that he/she would be to blame if the outcome were negative. Examples: But if they fall over I might be

to blame; Like little kids I might hurt 'em; I'd feel like I wasn't helping her enough; etc.

35. <u>Concerned</u> <u>about</u> <u>other</u> - Use this code if the child feels that <u>he/she needs</u> to protect the peer or to avoid hurting the peer. Examples: I feel protective; I don't want to hurt her feelings; etc.

99. <u>Uncodable</u> - This code should be used only in the rare case that a <u>child's</u> response can not be coded within any of the above categories.

APPENDIX G

BEST FRIEND CODING SCHEME

Best Friend Coding Scheme

01. Reciprocity/Equality - This code should be used in all cases where
the child describes the relationship with the best friend as having
an element of give and take, or an element of equality to it. Each
of the partners contributes equal amounts to the friendship, and
each is willing to compromise in the relationship. Examples of the
code: I do what he wants to do and he does what I want to do; If
he feels like playing football, I do too; She doesn't boss me
around; I don't boss her around; She does things I wanna do;
Everytime I tease him, he teases me back; She treats me really good
and I try to do the same to her; etc.

02. Sense of humor - Comments indicating that the best friend is
amiable and enjoys fun should be coded here. Examples: He's funny
and stuff; He's sorta silly; He does a lot of crazy things; He
always makes me laugh; etc.

03. Commonalities/Similarities - The best friend is described in terms
of hobbies, interests, or attributes which he/she has in common
with the child. Thus, the two children are friends because they
share something in common. Examples: He's my friend at baseball;
I asked him if he wanted to join baseball; He likes games I play;
She's more like me; We do the same things almost everytime; We're
the same; He's in Mills room; We have a lot of the same interests;
etc.

04. Compatibility - Comments related to gettng along and avoiding
arguments or fights should be coded here. Examples are: Me and
him barely get into fights; I like him 'cuz he doesn't fight; We
get along most of the time; Whenever me and him fight it's just
pushing around and wrestling for kicks, never anything real; He
makes a good partner for me; She hardly ever gets mad at me; etc.

05. Agree - A child's comments about his/her best friend's tendency to
agree with the child or to be agreeable to the child's suggestions
are coded as agree. Examples: She's almost always agreeable; We
both agree on everything; etc.

06. Help each other - As best friends, the two children engage in
helping behavior by giving aid to one another in various
situations, including schoolwork, chores at home, and aid during
times of need. Some examples: He helps me; Sometimes I help him;
Sometimes she helps me with my work if I need help; If I'm sick
she'll get my homework for me; We do things for him; She does
favors for me; etc.

07. Frequent contact - For this code, the child has indicated that
he/she and the best friend spend a great deal of time together,
usually in the form of visiting one another's homes or going places
together. Examples are: I go over his house alot; I can always
play with her 'cuz she's at my grandma's; She takes me everywhere;
We usually do everything together; When she wants to stay the night
my mom says yes because this is my best friend, and my mom knows
her; Because everytime that I did something that someone else
liked, and maybe I didn't like and they didn't want me to play, Sam

would come over and ask me if I wanted to play with her; I used to go over his house; She talks to me alot; We always walk home together; etc.

08. **Mutual activity/play partners** - This code is used when the child indicates that he/she and the best friend engage in activities together, and/or are frequent play partners. This code is distinguished from #07 in its reference to play activities. Examples include: Asks me to play baseball with him; He's on my teams and things; We'll start playing together; Sometimes I ask her to eat lunch with me and she'll eat lunch with me; She goes with you; He's captain of the team and he usually picks me; We started to play alot; We go on boat rides; etc.

09. **Nice** - If the best friend is referred to as being nice, or as being a nice person, use this code. Examples 'Cuz she's nice; He's not mean; She's a nice kid; He's not like a bully to the other kids; He doesn't push them around; But in the 7th grade he's real nice to me; She's not mean to people; etc.

10. **Length of acquaintance** - References to the amount of time the children have known each other should be coded here. Examples: I knew her for a long long time; We just knew each other since kindergarten; Well since I was a little girl here she started to like me alot; We've always been together; Because when I first cames to this school, he started being my friend; etc.

11. **School acquaintance** - If the child specifically refers to the friend as being a school-based friend, code the response here. Examples include: We like to talk together in school; Me and him go to the school; He's my friend in school; etc.

12. **Honest** - If the friend is honest and non-deceiving, use this code. Illustrations are: When she goes someplace, she doesn't always keep it to herself; She tells me; I'll ask can I come with you, and she'll say I'm sorry, I have another partner going; He don't tell lies; He don't steal; etc.

13. **Friendly** - Responses in this category make note of the best friend's outgoing personality and friendliness. Fxamples: He's friendly; He sat right in front and when I walked in he said, "Hi, my name's Jamie"; She's friendly; etc.

14. **Understanding of other friendships** - Here, the friend accepts and understands the fact that the child may have other friends with whom he/she may ocassionally wish to associate. In turn, the child understands and accepts that the best friend may have other friendships as well. Examples: I had a different best friend before she came along; Sometimes I play with other friends; Her name was Carrine, and she got in a fight with me; I hang around with mostly 8th graders; She's got a lot of other friends; etc.

15. **Sensitivity to others feelings** - This code should be used when the child indicates that the friend is aware of others' feelings and tries not to upset that person, or to hurt that person's feelings. Illustrations are: She doesn't hurt feelings; He doesn't pick on me; She don't make fun of me 'cuz I have a problem; She usually tries to make me feel real good; He doesn't do anything bad to hurt me; etc.

16. **Includes in activities** - Use this code when the child indicates that the friend attempts to include the child in his/her ongoing activities. Example: She included me in games.

17. <u>Share</u> - The best friend is described as being willing to pool resources with the child or to take turns when resources are limited. Some examples of sharing are: We share things; She shared ideas with me; Everytime I get a project he always comes over and says, "Can I copy off of you 'cuz I forgot what was the thing", and I let him copy; He let's me borrow stuff; etc.

18. <u>Consideration of other's preferences</u> - The child describes his/her best friend as being willing to listen to and/or spontaneously consider others' points of view. Illustrations include: Every time we wanna do things she always asks me what I wanna do first; She'll do what you wanna do; etc.

19. <u>Mutual liking</u> - Here the child indicates that he/she and the best friend share a common liking or affection for one another. Examples: I like her alot; She likes me very much; She likes me for a friend; I like her for a friend; But Jack likes me; etc.

20. <u>Good person</u> - Reponses which imply a favorable judgement of the friend as a person should be coded in this category. Examples: Because he's a good guy to be with; She's a good person; She doesn't hang around with the wrong people; etc.

21. <u>Good manners</u> - For this code, the child has indicated that his/her best friend is a desirable companion because he/she is well mannered, and typically polite. Examples include: She's polite to me; etc.

22. <u>Depth of acquaintance</u> - Responses in this category refer to the closeness of the child's relationship with the best friend. Although it does not go so far as to imply love or deep intimacy, the relationship is definitely a friendship that is close and probably exclusive to the pair of children. Examples are: He's my friend; She's my best friend; He's always been friends; 'Cuz we're very close; He's close by me; And she stayed my friend; Debby got really close; We feel kinda close; Just got to know each other pretty well; She's one of my closest friends; During those times we've grown to like each other; etc.

23. <u>Not stuck up/Good personality</u> - The child refers to the friend as having a good personality or as not being conceited. Examples: He doesn't think he's bigger than anyone else in the class; He has a good personality; She's got a good personality; etc.

24. <u>Exchange gifts</u> - One of the activities mentioned by the child as a characteristic of the best friend relationship is that the two children exchange gifts with one another. Examples are: He gives me stuff sometimes; I give him stuff sometimes; He gives me Kool-Aid or pop when I go over; etc.

25. <u>Close proximity</u> - This code includes comments indicating that the child's best friend lives nearby, or is within close distance of the child. Examples: Because we live right across the street from each other; He was about the only kid on the street I knew; He lives a mile away; It's kinda tiring (to ride to his house); We sit next to each other in every class; She's my locker partner; etc.

26. <u>Work partners</u> - The child indicates that he/she and the best friend work together on chores or projects. Examples include: Me and him always do our work together; He asks me to do projects with him; Sometimes we do work together; He always makes a good partner for me, etc.

27. <u>Loyalty</u> - Any comments referencing the friend's faithfulness is

regarded as loyalty, and should be coded here. Sample responses: 'Cuz she's not like some girls who say they're friends and the next day they're turning their nose away from you; We got in a fight.....and she came back to me; I think that's it, she's loyal; She doesn't talk about people; etc.

28. Comparison to other peers - Here the child points out how the best friend is different from other peers or acquaintances. These characteristics make the relationship seem more stable or closer than other relationships. Examples include: All the other kids tease me alot; Most other friends don't do that; All the other kids keep saying all these bad things about me 'cuz sometimes a little bit if they get, if they tease me I tease them back; See we really can't do that for a day or something like my other friends if we break up; All the other kids that hang around don't like me and pick on me; The other kids don't usually let me play baseball; Not like everybody else; etc.

29. Admiration of abilities - The child is pointing out that his/her best friend has a talent that the child admires. Examples: He's good at things; She's usually good in everything; etc.

30. Parent's acquaintance - Either the child or the child's parents are acquainted with the best friend's parents. Examples: My mom and his dad had a lot in common; They went to school together and were real good friends; His mom gets along with me; His mother knows my ma, and they do alot of things; etc.

31. Enjoyable company - Responses in this category reference the fact that the friend is a fun person to be with and makes an enjoyable companion. Examples are: She's fun; And (we) laugh once in awhile; Really fun to be around; We have a lot of fun; Fun to be with; etc.

32. Supportive - The child makes reference to the fact that the friend is around in times of need, and provides suport and encouragement as needed. Some examples are: He's there when I need him; She's there whenever I need her; etc.

33. Became acquainted through other peers - The child is referring to the way in which he/she met and became friends with the best friend; in this case, the two children met through mutual acquaintance. Examples: Through another good friend Lynn; Met her through Tony; I was hangin' around Tony and then Debbie started hangin' around too; etc.

34. Empathy - The child talks with his/her best friend about things he/she would not normally discuss with other friends. The friend discusses similar things with the child, and each empathizes with and understands the other. Examples include: Like with some people like I used to have this best friend and we never talked, like really talked like me and Trisha do; We talk about our families and our problems; If something's going wrong in her family, we talk about it; It makes you feel better; Somebody I can talk to with my problems; We both understand each other; You know, we talk; When I'm down she cheers me up; etc.

35. Deep intimacy/Love - Here the child indicates that he/she loves the best friend, or is very close to the friend in a way which makes ther relationship a special one to be cherished. Examples include: We love each other like sisters; She's special to me; She's really special; etc.

36. Sweet/Kind - Specific references to the best friend's kindness, or that the best friend is a "sweet" person fall into this category and include: She's sweet; He/she is kind; etc.

37. Not selfish - This code is used when the child says that the friend puts him/herself after others. An example: She puts others first before herself.

38. Caring - The child makes specific reference to the fact that the friend cares for the child. Example: She cares.

39. Friend's posessions - The child refers to animate or inanimate object owned by the friend. Examples are: He has a boat; He has pets; etc.

40. Contact with friend's siblings - Here the child refers to contact he/she has with the friend's brothers and/or sisters. Some examples: His brothers are nice when I go over there; She has good looking brothers; etc.

APPENDIX H

CODES COMBINED FOR FACTOR ANALYSES

Strategy Codes Combined for Factor Analysis

Factor Analysis Codes	Original Codes
01. Approach	01. Approach (88), 42. Acknowledge other's presence (4)
02. Greet	02. Greet (142)
03. Introduce self/other	03. Introduce self/other (104)
04. Information exchange	04. Ask for information (121), 05. Give information (36), 40. Establish commonalities (8)
05. Invite to play	06. Invite other to play/join/come over (142)
06. Ask to make friends	07. Ask to make friends/maintain friendship 80)
07. Help	08. Help other (25)
08. Compromise	10. Compromise (40)
09. Make up/renew loyalty	12. Try to make amends/renew loyalty (15)
10. Get along	09. Share with other (7), 11. Apologize/express sorrow at loss of friendship (13), 13. Be nice/kind/don't hurt (56), 15. Avoid conflict/argument/loss of friendship (21), 33. Be friendly (7), 34. Agree with other (6), 35. Express liking for other (13), 38. Resolve conflict (7), 45. Avoid physical & verbal aggression (5), 46. Enjoy each other's company (4), 53. Forgive other (1)
11. Retaliate	16. Retaliate (34)
12. Walk away	18. Walk away (20)
13. Do nothing	19. Do nothing (34)
14. Observe discrepancies	20. Point out discrepancies (9), 21. Refer to other's possessions (7)
15. Desire explanation	22. Express confusion/disbelief (8), 23. Request/give reason for action (112)
16. Acquire info from others	25. Acquire info from others (19)
17. Mutual activity	26. Engage in mutual activity (67)
18. Express a preference	27. Express a preference (28)
19. Submit to others wishes	28. Submit/defer to other's wishes (55)
20. Conversation	29. Begin/continue conversation (50)
21. Ask other to submit	31. Ask other to submit (50)
22. Find other companions	32. Find other companions (17)
23. Ask other's preference	36. Ask other's preference (39)
24. Compliment	44. Compliment other (21)
25. Express feelings	50. Expression of feelings (40)
26. Hide feelings	54. Hide feelings (16)
27. Empathy	37. Equality/reciprocity (5), 47. Take

other's point of view (3), 51. Provide support & understanding (6), 52. Respect other's privacy or silence (11)

Strategy Codes deleted from analyses

14. Have frequent contact (7)	45. Avoid physical/verbal aggression (5)
17. Appeal to authority figures (4)	48. Engage in physical aggression (6)
24. Refer to other's loneliness (3)	49. Avoid exclusive friendship (2)
30. Judge other's personality (11)	55. Be yourself (3)
39. Avoid self embarrassment (4)	56. Ignore other (1)
41. Bribe/don't bribe other (2)	57. Imitate others (1)
43. Refrain from retaliation (1)	99. Uncodable responses (3)

Goal Codes Combined for Factor Analysis

Factor Analysis Codes	Original Codes
01. Acquainting behavior	01. Approach/Greet (16), 02. Meet/get better acquainted (111), 03. Introduction to self/others (78), 14. Frequent contact (11)
02. Information exchange	04. Acquire knowledge about other (88), 05. Other asks for or receives information about self (20), 25. Acquire information from others (6)
03. Facilitate friendship	06. Facilitate interaction by joining/inviting to play (53), 07. Make friends/maintain friendship (152), 63. Friendship development/increasing intimacy (15)
04. Help	08. Help other (17)
05. Compromise	10. Compromise (23)
06. Loss of friendship	11. Loss of friendship/companionship (44)
07. Apologize	12. Apologize/make amends/refer to renewing loyalty (21)
08. Nice	13. Attempts to be nice/kind/not hurt peers (61)
09. Avoid conflict	15. Avoid conflict/argument/loss of friendship (72), 45. Avoid physical/verbal aggression (4)
10. Retaliate	16. Retaliate (11), 17. Appeal/refer to authority figures (2), 48. Engage in physical/verbal aggression (2)
11. Don't know what else to say	19. Don't know what else to say (16)
12. Point out discrepancy	20. Point out a discrepancy (27)
13. Reference to possessions	21. Reference to possessions (33)
14. Reference to self image	22. Outsider's judgement of self (5), 39. Avoid embarrassment (1), 62. Reference to self loneliness/solitary state (10)
15. Acquire reason for action	23. Acquire/give reason for action (89)
16. Concern for peer	24. Reference to peer's loneliness/solitary state (38), 47. Take other's viewpoint (11), 51. Support/Understanding (13), 57. Reference to peer's state of physical/mental health (6), 58. Reference to peer being new in the area (9)
17. Mutual activity	26. Mutual activity (23)
18. Express a preference	27. Expression of a preference (60)

19. Submit/Give leeway

20. Conversation
21. Judge peer's personality

22. Ask other to submit

23. Other companions

24. Friendly
25. Retain liking for other

26. Ask other's preference

27. Commonalities

28. Get along

29. Refer to expressing feelings (15)
30. Good manners

28. Give other leeway/submit to other (20)
29. Begin/continue a conversation (32)
30. Judgements about peer's personality (43)
31. Gaining preferred choice/ask other to submit (30)
32. Find other companions (12), 49. Avoid exclusive friendship (7), 55. Activities with non-agemates (4)
33. Be friendly (53)
35. Retain other's liking/liking for other (40)
36. Refer to/ask for other's preference (27)
40. Establish commonalities/similarities (31)
34. Agree with other (4), 46. Get along/enjoy each other's company (31), 53. Avoid boredom (9), 54. Ease of interaction (6)
50. Reference to expressing feelings

59. Reference to good manners (45)

Goal codes deleted from analysis

09. Share (2)
18. Walk away (1)
37. Equality/reciprocity (1)
38. Resolve conflict (2)

41. Not take advantage of (4)

42. Acknowledge other's presence (1)

43. Give gifts to friends (3)

44. Compliment (9)
52. Reference to fairness (3)
56. Not ignore other (2)
60. Reference to self abilities/personality (1)
61. Reference to finishing school work/chores (9)
64. Hide feelings/attempt to cope (1)

Feelings Codes Combined for Factor Analysis

Factor Analysis Codes	Original Codes
01. Good in general	01. Good in general (94)
02. Bad in general	02. Bad in general (32)
03. Upset	03. Angry/upset (67), 20. Frustrated (2)
04. Shy/Uneasy	04. Shy/nervous (33), 13. Strange/uneasy (3)
05. Sad	05. Sad/unhappy (50)
06. Excited	06. Excited/anticipatory (8)
07. Enjoyable situation	07. Enjoyable situation (5)
08. Undisturbed/nonchalant	08. Undisturbed/nonchalant (13)
09. Wish to make acquaintance	09. Wish to meet/make acquaintance (44)
10. Jealous/selfish	10. Jealous/selfish (5)
11. Fearful of losing friend	11. Fearful of losing friend (4)
12. Concerned about other	12. Happy for other (3), 22. Lonely/sad for other (2), 34. Responsible for others (4), 35. Concerned about other (2)
13. Great	14. Great/terrific (10)
14. Terrible/rejected	15. Terrible/awful (5), 30. Rejected/unwanted (1), 32. Clumsy/dumb (3)
15. Happy	16. Happy/glad (45)
16. OK	18. OK/mediocre (36)
17. Desire to develop friendship	19. Desire to develop friendship (18), 27. Partner (3)
18. Hurt	21. Hurt (12)
19. Cheated/unconsidered	23. Cheated/unconsidered (9)
20. Curious/reflective	24. Curious (2), 31. Reflective (4)
21. Confused	25. Confused/challenged (9)
22. Pleased with self	26. Pleased with self (8)
23. Playmate	28. Playmate (6)

Feelings codes deleted from analysis
17. Nice (2)
29. Bored (1)
33. Aggressive (1)
99. Uncodable response (2)

Best Friend Codes Combined for Factor Analysis

Factor Analysis Codes	Original Codes
01. Reciprocity/equality	01. Reciprocity/equality (12)
02. Sense of humor	02. Sense of humor (11)
03. Commonalities/similarities	03. Commonalities/similarities (32)
04. Compatibility	04. Compatibility (38), 13. Friendly (4), 31. Enjoyable company (2)
05. Agree	05. Agree (8)
06. Help each other	06. Help each other (10)
07. Frequent contact	07. Frequent contact (33)
08. Partners	08. Mutual activity/play partners (19), 26. Work partners (4)
09. Nice	09. Nice (63)
10. Length of acquaintance	10. Length of acquaintance (19)
11. School acquaintance	11. School acquaintance (6)
12. Honest	12. Honest (6)
13. Understands other friendships	14. Understanding of other friendships (6)
14. Sensitivity to other's feelings	15. Sensitivity to other's feelings (5), 18. Consideration of other's preferences (2), 32. Supportive (2), 37. Not selfish (1), 38. Caring (2)
15. Share	17. Share (6)
16. Mutual liking	19. Mutual liking (15)
17. Depth of acquaintance	22. Depth of acquaintance/close friends (16), 35. Deep intimacy/love (4)
18. Good personality	23. Not stuck up/good personality (4), 27. Loyalty (4)
19. Close proximity	25. Close proximity (9)
20. Comparison to other peers	28. Comparison to other peers (8)
21. Role of others in acquaintance	30. Parent's acquaintance (4), 33. Became acquainted through other peers (3)
22. Empathy	34. Empathy (18)
23. Sweet/kind	36. Sweet/kind (6)

Best friend codes deleted from analysis

16. Includes in activities (1)	29. Admiration of abilities (2)
20. Good person (3)	39. Friend's possessions (2)
21. Good manners (1)	40. Contact with friend's siblings (2)
24. Exchange gifts (3)	99. Uncodable response (2)

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Altman, I. and Taylor, D.A. (1973). Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.

Asher, S.R., and Renshaw, P.D. (1981). Children without friends: Social knowledge and social-skill training. In S.R. Asher and J.M. Gottman (Eds.), The development of children's friendships. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Asher, S.R., and Renshaw, P. D. (1981). Social skills and social knowledge of high- and low-status kindergarten children. Cited in S.R. Asher and J.M. Gottman (Eds.), The development of children's friendships. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Asher, S.R., Renshaw, P.D., and Geraci, R.L. (1980). Children's friendships and social competence. International Journal of Linguistics, 7, 27-39.

Baggaley, A.R. (1982). Deciding on the ratio of number of subjects to number of variables in factor analysis. Multivariate Experimental Clinical Research, 6, 81-85.

Bigelow, B.J. (1977). Children's friendship expectations: A cognitive-developmental study. Child Development, 48, 246-253.

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

Bukowski, W.M., and Newcomb, A.F. (in press). The stability and determinants of sociometric status and friendship choice: A longitudinal perspective. Developmental Psychology.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20, 37-46.

Comrey, A.L. (1978). Common methodological problems in factor analytic studies. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 648-659.

Crawford, C.B. (1975). Determining the number of interpretable factors. Psychological Bulletin, 82, 226-237.

Dodge, K.A. (in press). Behavioral antecedents of peer social status. Child Development.

Dodge, K.A., Coie, J.D., and Brakke, N.P. (in press). Behavior patterns of socially rejected and neglected preadolescents: The role of social approach and aggression. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology.

Duck, S. (1976). Interpersonal communication in developing acquaintance. In G.R. Miller (Ed.), Explorations in interpersonal communication. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Duck, S.W., and Craig, G. (1977). The relative attractiveness of different types of information about another person. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 16, 229-233.

Duck, S.W., and Craig, G. (1978). Personality similarity and the development of friendship: A longitudinal study. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 17, 237-242.

Flavell, J. H. (1981). Monitoring social cognitive enterprises: Something else that may develop in the area of social cognition. In J.H. Flavell (Ed.), Social cognitive development: Frontiers and

possible futures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Forbes, D. (1978). Recent research on children's social cognition: A brief review. In W. Damon (Ed.), Social Cognition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Furman, W. and Bierman, K.L. (1981, April). A features model theory of children's conceptions of friendship. Paper presented at the meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Boston, Massachusetts.

Furman, W. and Bierman, K.L. (1983). Developmental changes in young children's conceptions of friendship. Child Development, 54, 549-566.

Gottman, J.M. (1983). How children become friends. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 48(3, Serial No. 201).

Gottman, J., Gonso, J., and Rasmussen, B. (1975). Social interaction, social competence, and friendship in children. Child Development, 46, 709-718.

Hartup, W.W. (1983). The peer system. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.-in-chief), and E.M.Hetherington (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology, (Vol. 4). New York: Wiley.

Hartup, W.W., Glazer, J. A., and Charlesworth, R. (1967). Peer reinforcement and sociometric status. Child Development, 38, 1017-1024.

Hetherington, E.M. and Parke, R.D. (1979). Child psychology: A contemporary viewpoint. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Hunter, J.E. (1977). Cluster analysis: Reliability, construct validity and the multiple indicators approach to measurement. Paper delivered at a meeting of the U.S. Civil Service Commission Panel on

Advanced Statistics, Washington, D.C.

Ladd, G.W., and Oden, S. (1979). The relationship between peer acceptance and children's ideas about helpfulness. Child Development, 50, 402-408.

Loo, R. (1983). Caveat on sample sizes in factor analysis. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 56, 371-374.

Miller, G.A., Galanter, E., and Pribram, K.H. (1960). Plans and the structure of behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Nelson, K. (1981). Social cognition in a script framework. In J.H. Flavell (Ed.), Social cognitive development: Frontiers and possible futures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newcomb, A.F., and Bukowski, W.M. (1983). Social impact and social preference as determinants of children's group status. Developmental Psychology, 19, 856-867.

Newcomb, A.F. and Meister, J.M. (1983). The initial social encounters of high and low social effectiveness school-aged children. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University.

Newcomb, A.F., Packard, T.N. and Smith-Winberry, C.L. (1983) A model for the initial social encounters of neglected and average social standing children. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University.

Newcomb, T.M. (1956). The prediction of interpersonal attraction. American Psychologist, 11, 575-586.

Newcomb, T.M. (1961). The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Peevers, B.H., and Secord, P.F. (1973). Developmental changes in attribution of descriptive concepts to persons. Journal of

<u>Personality</u> <u>and</u> <u>Social</u> <u>Psychology</u>, <u>27</u>, 120-128.

Putallaz, M., and Gottman, J. M. (1981). An interactional model of children's entry into peer groups. <u>Child</u> <u>Development</u>, <u>52</u>, 986-994.

Renshaw P.D. and Asher, S.R. (in press). Children's goals and strategies for social interaction. <u>Merrill</u> <u>Palmer</u> <u>Quarterly</u>.

Scanzoni, J. (1978). Social exchange and behavioral interdependence. In T.L. Huston and R.L. Burgess (Eds.). <u>Social</u> <u>exchange</u> <u>in</u> <u>developing</u> <u>relationships</u>. New York: Academic Press.

Schank, R.C. and Abelson, R. (1977). <u>Scripts</u>, <u>plans</u>, <u>goals</u> <u>and</u> <u>understanding</u>. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.