15

Friends and Enemies

Willard W. Hartup and Maurissa Abecassis

Relationships are the contexts in which our social selves originate. Social referencing, emotional regulation, and language emerge in relationships with family members, friends, and even enemies. Within these contexts, self-awareness emerges along with a variety of attitudes and skills that carry over into other relationships.

Close relationships are usually portrayed by social scientists with an emphasis on harmony, on the one hand, and disharmony, on the other. At one and the same time, however, relationships can be dark as well as bright, constricting as well as actualizing, and constitute both developmental risk and developmental protection. Most relationships have dark sides, and developmental impact is determined by the manner in which these darker elements are intertwined with brighter ones. Other relationships are characterized almost exclusively in terms of hatred, fear, anxiety, aversion, and nonsupportiveness. Although empirical studies are rare, recent work shows that these "negative" relationships are also developmentally significant – by middle childhood if not before.

Friends and enemies, examined together, provide an opportunity to better understand the crosscurrents existing in children's social networks. On the one hand, friends come together and maintain their relationships on the basis of attraction (liking). Attraction stems from common ground and the expectation that cost–benefit ratios across social exchanges will be generally favorable. On the other hand, enemies maintain their relations with one another on the basis of antipathy (disliking). Enmities may derive from bullying and aggression, contractual violations, and expectations that cost–benefit ratios in the social exchange will be unfavorable. Relatively little is known, however, about similarities and differences between enemies as contrasted with friends, distinctive modes of interaction, and the adaptational significance of mutual antipathies as contrasted with mutual attractions. Nevertheless, these two types of relationships are brought together in this chapter based on the argument that, within children's social networks, darker relationships coexist with brighter ones and developmental outcomes derive from both.

We believe that the state of knowledge in these fields can be most clearly described by comparing these relationships with respect to the following issues: (a) children's expectations about friends and enemies and the social provisions they associate with them; (b) relationship formation; (c) the incidence of friends and enemies in children's experience at various ages; (d) similarities (homophilies) between friends and between enemies; (e) distinctive patterns of social interaction associated with these relationships; (f) correlates and consequences of having friends and having enemies, respectively; (g) characteristics of children's friends and enemies and their developmental implications; and (h) socioemotional qualities among friendships and among enmities, along with their developmental significance. One note: The terms "enemies" and "mutual antipathies" are used interchangeably in this chapter even though we recognize that the latter construct is more inclusive than the former. Future studies may well demonstrate that these terms should be used more precisely.

Relationship Expectations

Friends

The friendship expectations of younger and older children are both similar and different. The most striking similarities involve the centrality of *reciprocity* and *mutuality* in the meaning structure. Friends are not described by children as abiding by equivalence norms, in the sense that resource exchanges must be exactly equal or that one individual's behavior must match the other's. Nevertheless, interviews with children show that giving and taking in a broad sense ("symmetrical reciprocity") are emphasized in friendship expectations at all ages (Hartup & Stevens, 1997; Youniss, 1980). Even so, preschool-aged children describe their friends in terms of concrete reciprocities ("We play "); primary-school children describe their friends in terms of loyalty, trustworthiness, and time spent together; and preadolescents emphasize sympathy, self-disclosure, and other aspects of social intimacy (Bigelow, 1977). The cognitive representations of friendships thus undergo extensive change during childhood even though the underlying meaning structure remains the same. Stated another way, continuity marks the friendship "deep structure" but discontinuity its "surface structure" (Chomsky, 1965).

Some of the age changes in friendship expectations reflect increases in the number of psychological constructs children use to describe their friends, their greater complexity, and a re-organization of information and ideas; that is, these changes reflect general changes in cognitive development (Livesley & Bromley, 1973). Changes in friendship expectations may also reflect changes in the developmental tasks that confront children as they grow older. Young children expect their friends to behave in ways that are consistent with their own struggles in mastering new social skills, especially cooperation and conflict management. Older children's concerns, however, shift to intimacy, identity, sensitivity to the needs of others, and what it takes to keep relationships going (Hartup & Stevens, 1997). Both these continuities and discontinuities demonstrate how friendships support the development of social understanding and social skill from early childhood into adolescence.

Children's friendship expectations are different from their expectations about other relationships. Preschool children, for example, recognize the existence of differences in social power between themselves and their parents but not between themselves and their friends; they also expect friends to be less likely to give them help than parents. At the same time, young children expect conflict to occur more frequently with siblings than with either parents or friends (Gleason, 1998). Older children make similar differentiations: Friendships are understood by school-aged children to provide companionship and intimacy more frequently than parent–child relationships, but compliance and control less frequently. Nurturance, in general, is understood by older children to be provided by both friends and parents; overt affection, however, less frequently by friends. Power sharing continues to be seen by school-aged children as a hallmark of relations between friends – not relationships between children and adults (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985). Differentiation between friendships and other close relationships is thus established in early childhood and remains relatively constant thereafter. Elaborations in the way children think about these relationships occur as children grow older, but relationship schemas emerge early and their deep structures are relatively stable across time (Gleason, 1998).

Enemies

Enemies are individuals who mutually dislike one another and perceive one another as threats to desired goals (Abecassis, 1998). Sometimes, a child regards another child as an enemy when this attitude is not reciprocated. Nothing, however, is known about children's use of the word "enemy" – for example, when it enters the working vocabulary and what meanings are attached to it. Although children use the word "friend" by the fourth year, anecdotal evidence suggests that the word "enemy" is not used as soon. Investigators who are experienced in sociometric testing know that young children understand what it means to "not like" somebody; disliking someone, however, is a necessary, but not sufficient criterion for identifying that person as an enemy.

The reasons given by young children for not liking someone are similar to those given by older ones, the main reason being aggressiveness (Hayes, Gershman, & Bolin, 1980; Moore, 1967). Engaging in rule violations and other aberrant behavior are also mentioned, again by both preschool children and preadolescents (preadolescent boys only since girls at that age have not been studied). Older boys also dislike classmates who are insincere and not helpful (Hayes, Gershman, & Halteman, 1996). Such conditions suggest that enmity may be based on aggression or inappropriate behavior directed from one child to another but this extrapolation needs to be made cautiously. Enmities, especially mutual ones, may have intense affects associated with them (e.g., hatred) and complex expectations (that one's enemy is a threat to obtaining one's goals). Beyond these observations, child development research tells us nothing about the social expectations associated with either mutual enmities or mutual antipathies among preschool- or school-aged children.

Becoming Friends and Becoming Enemies

Friends

Friendship formation begins with "propinquity," that is, the condition that children cannot become friends if they never meet. Consequently, the social forces that bring two children together in the same place at the same time need to be taken into account in any workable theory of friendship formation: for example, what draws children and their families to the same neighborhoods, the same schools, and the same playgrounds.

   Although relatively little is known about first encounters, the available evidence indicates that these initial meetings are largely devoted to establishing common ground (or its absence). Social interaction is mostly driven by the activities or tasks at hand; the social exchange is thus task constrained. Emotionally speaking, relationships are superficial in these early stages. As children begin to "hit it off," a shift occurs from an ego-centered to a relationship-centered orientation. Those who get along best show connected communication, successful conflict management, attention to similarities between themselves, and self-disclosure (Gottman, 1983). Relationships, however, are not very stable in this "build-up" stage: Should children not maintain common interests, they must exchange relevant information again, much as they did during their first encounters. Over the long term, friendships are maintained largely through continued validation of common interests and by commitment to the relationship that older children believe friends are obliged to have. Not much is known, however, about commitment and its role in children's social relations.

   Children terminate their friendships for many reasons although disagreements, fights, and commitment violations are less salient than one might expect. Friendships are known to be less stable when the "friendship talk" of the individual children is negative and nonsupportive (Berndt & Perry, 1986). On many occasions children simply drift apart (and sometimes regret it) but cannot explain exactly why. Observations in one first-grade classroom demonstrated that friendships ceased mainly because children stopped interacting; neither emotional outbursts nor arguments foreshadowed these endings, nor did the children make much fuss (Rizzo, 1989).

Enemies

The events that establish mutual antipathies among children are unclear. Survey studies among adults (Wiseman & Duck, 1995) suggest that enmities are unanticipated and often come as a surprise. Sometimes, an aura occurs (bad "vibes," slights, sneers) but some kind of hostile action, viewed as malicious, is the inciting incident that most frequently establishes two individuals as enemies. Enmities carry relatively few social expectations because role responsibilities do not exist in the same sense as in friendship relations. Control issues (including threats to one's rights and privileges) are associated with relationship animosities among many adults.

   Some theorizing suggests that the prehistories of enemy relationships are quite varied:

Some involve falling away from a friendship (see above), some involve dispositional or personality clashes, some are based in encounters between bullies and victims, and some stem from scapegoating (Abecassis, 1998). Although no one knows the extent to which these prehistories are involved in generating enmities between children, each undoubtedly is relevant.

Incidence

Friends

Social preferences can be identified among toddlers (Howes, 1983), but these relationships do not carry the same nuances evinced among older children. By 4 years of age, about three quarters of children are involved in mutual friendships as indicated by time spent together, cooperation and reciprocities in social interaction, and various affective markers (Hinde, Titmus, Easton, & Tamplin, 1985; Howes, 1983). Observations, teachers' reports, and maternal interviews – singly or in combination – have been used to arrive at these estimates. Friendship frequencies rise only slightly through middle childhood (to about 85%). Children who have friends at one age are likely to have them at other ages (Elicker, Englund, & Sroufe, 1992) thus illustrating an important continuity in childhood social relations.

Friendship networks are relatively small among preschool children, averaging 1.7 for boys and 0.9 for girls (Hartup, Laursen, Stewart, & Eastenson, 1988) increasing to 3.0–5.0 during middle childhood, depending on whether one includes unreciprocated choices as well as reciprocated ones (Hallinan, 1980). Time spent with friends increases through the school years, too, rising to its peak (29% of time awake) in adolescence.

The vast majority of children's friendships are gender concordant. Opposite-sex friendships occur in relatively small numbers, even among preschoolers. The proportion of boys and girls who have friends does not differ – among either younger or older children – although friendship networks are likely to be somewhat smaller among girls than among boys (Eder & Hallinan, 1978).

Enemies

More children have friends than enemies. Observational studies have failed to establish that preschool-aged children fight or quarrel disproportionately with certain classmates. To the contrary, aggressive young children tend to "spread it around" rather than quarrel or fight consistently with the same partners (Dawe, 1934; Ross & Conant, 1992). Mutual antipathies, identified by asking children to name other children "whom you dislike more than anyone else," are also rare among young children. In one investigation (Hayes et al., 1980), 59 of the 78 children who were interviewed identified children that they disliked, but mutual antipathies were revealed in only two instances, suggesting either that these nominations are not reliable or that these relationships are very uncommon among young children.

This situation changes during middle childhood. Same-sex mutual antipathies were studied among 8-year-old school children by Hembree and Vandell (2000), with the results revealing that 65% were involved in at least one (half of these in more than one). Mutual antipathies were identified by comparing children's nominations lists of three same-sex classmates whom "you would not like to play with." Although significant concordance was observed between sociometric status and the prevalence of these antipathies, involvement in these relationships occurred in all sociometric groups: Popular children had fewer mutual antipathies (32%) than neglected (39%), average (70%), rejected (95%), or controversial children (100%). Sex differences were not reported nor the incidence of mixed-sex antipathies.

Similar data were obtained with 10 and 14 year olds, using sociometric nominations requiring the children to list three classmates "whom you do not like at all" (Abecassis, Hartup, Haselager, Scholte, & Van Lieshout, 2001). Prevalence rates were established separately for the two sexes and separately for same- and mixed-sex mutual antipathies. In this instance, same-sex mutual antipathies were identified for 9% of the school-aged girls but 25% of the boys, and for 14% of the adolescent girls and 20% of the adolescent boys. Mixed-sex antipathies, however, were identified for 17% and 16% of the school-aged boys and girls, respectively, and for 15% and 14% of young adolescent girls and boys, respectively. Comparisons across these studies are difficult because a more conservative sociometric criterion was used with the older children and the adolescents (Abecassis et al., 2001) than was used earlier with the 8 year olds (Hembree & Vandell, 2000). Moreover, the children differed in country of residence (the Netherlands, and the United States, respectively) as well as chronological age. Since these are the only studies available, it is impossible to conclude now whether or not the incidence of mutual antipathies changes with age.

Similarities Between Friends and Between Enemies

Friends

Since common ground is necessary for the formation and maintenance of friendships from early childhood onwards (Gottman, 1983), friends can be expected to be similar to one another in many ways. The weight of the evidence supports this thesis, beginning in early childhood and extending through the school-aged years. Friends are more concordant than nonfriends in age, gender, ethnicity, and sociometric status. Behavioral concordances occur, too, although not as extensively among preschool-aged children as among their school-aged counterparts. Even so, research shows that the probability that two young children will be friends varies directly as a function of the number of behavioral attributes they share (Kupersmidt, DeRosier, & Patterson, 1995). And, among 8 year olds, initially strangers to one another, greater attraction between children occurs during play sessions when cognitive and play styles are similar than when they are different (Rubin, Lynch, Coplan, Rose-Krasnor, & Booth, 1994).

Behavioral similarity is clearly evident among school-aged friends. Comparisons be-

tween children and their friends and between children and "neutral" classmates show greater similarity between friends in prosocial behavior, antisocial behavior, shyness-dependency, depression, sociometric status, and achievement in both Western and Eastern cultures (French, Jansen, Riansari, & Setiono, 2000; Haselager, Hartup, Van Lieshout, & Riksen-Walraven, 1998; Poulin & Boivin, 2000). Concordant similarities are evinced for children who are victimized: Friends of victimized children are physically weak, have internalizing problems, and are victimized, too (Hodges, Malone, & Perry, 1997).

Friends also share biases in their perceptions of both persons and relationships: For example, when two friends rate other children's behavior, their ratings are more similar to one another than nonfriends' ratings are (Haselager et al., 1998). Friends are also more concordant than non-friends in relationship stance (being "preoccupied" or "avoidant") both with one another and with their mothers and fathers (Hodges, Finnegan, & Perry, 1999).

Similarities between friends come about for a number of reasons. Schools and neighborhoods are organized so children come together in classrooms, on playgrounds, and on street corners with others who are similar to themselves rather than dissimilar. Subsequently, children in these "homophilous pools" are exposed to similar socialization agents in schools and elsewhere. In addition, children are especially attracted to other children who resemble themselves (Kupersmidt et al., 1995; Rubin et al., 1994). Children are also more likely to *dislike* associates who are different from themselves (Rosenbaum, 1986) and to terminate relationships with children who are different rather than similar (Poulin & Boivin, 2000). No evidence exists to suggest that "opposites attract."

While the "similarity-attraction" hypothesis thus explains some of the similarity between children and their friends, no one knows exactly how children go about sorting themselves into friendship dyads. Similarities between friends do not seem to derive from carefully weighed decisions made by the children themselves but from complex assortments that some investigators have called "shopping expeditions" (Dishion, Patterson, & Greisler, 1994). Children seem to make their social choices in terms of what "feels right" and what does not. These shopping expeditions frequently occur within social networks, so that friendship similarities emerge within two interconnected selection systems: dyadic interaction and assortative dialectics.

Friendship similarities are also known to derive from mutual socialization, that is, children become more alike as a consequence of their interaction with one another over time. The relative extent to which mutual selection and mutual socialization contribute to the similarity between friends, however, depends on many conditions including characteristics of the children themselves, the nature of their interaction, and the behavioral characteristics being measured (Kandel, 1978; Poulin & Boivin, 2000; Urberg, 1999).

Enemies

Whether children involved in mutual antipathies are similar or different from one another as compared with neutral associates is not known.

Patterns of Interaction

Friends

Children spend more time with their friends than with nonfriends, suggesting to some researchers that time sharing is a valid means of identifying friendships, especially in early childhood (Hinde et al. 1985). The activities of boys and their friends differ from those of girls and their friends (this is obvious to everyone). The two sexes also differ in the behavioral provisions that children expect from these relationships: Girls anticipate greater affection, intimacy, and instrumental help from their friends than boys do (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985). Moreover, intimacy is more central in girls' talk about friends than in boys' talk, self-ratings of friendships by girls are more intimate than boys' self-ratings, and self-disclosure is more common (Sharabany, Gershoni, & Hofman, 1981). Intimacy has been studied largely, however, with constructs especially applicable to girls (e.g., empathy and self-disclosure) rather than ones applicable to boys (i.e., task mastery and camaraderie). Good reason exists, therefore, to refine the measurement of intimacy before drawing final conclusions about sex differences in children's friendships.

   Social exchanges differ between friends and nonfriends beginning in early childhood. Children identified as friends are more cooperative than nonfriends, and reciprocities are more evident in their interaction (Howes, 1983). Behaviors differentiating friends from nonfriends among school-aged children have been examined in a large number of investigations, and have been scrutinized in both narrative reviews (e.g., Hartup, 1996) and one meta-analysis (Newcomb & Bagwell, 1995). Differences occur in four broad categories: *positive engagement* (friends talk, smile, and laugh more frequently than nonfriends); *relationship mutuality* (friends are more supportive, more mutually oriented, and emphasize equality (parity) more frequently in their exchanges than nonfriends); *task behavior* (friends talk more about the task at hand and spend more time on-task than nonfriends); and *conflict management* (although friends do not have more frequent conflicts than nonfriends, they use disengagement and negotiation proportionally more often and their conflicts are not as intense). These results demonstrate once again that reciprocity and symmetry are the behavioral hallmarks of friendship during middle childhood.

Enemies

The behavior of enemies toward one another has never been systematically described, either in early or middle childhood. In certain instances, investigators have considered two children who fight frequently with one another to be enemies (Ross & Conant, 1992) but the fact of the matter is that not many preschool-aged dyads do this. Since children do not concentrate hostile actions on specific associates, this must mean one of two things: either enemies do not exist among young children (as mentioned above) or enemies consistently use other strategies, for example, avoiding one another. Avoidance indeed seems likely to be a coping mechanism used by children who mutually consider themselves to be enemies or who dislike each other. Adults report that they minimize contact with their enemies and

avoid them whenever possible (Holt, 1989). Demonstrating avoidance with young children, however, is surprisingly difficult.

Motives attributed by children to their enemies are likely to be more hostile than those attributed to friends or acquaintances. In one investigation (Ray & Cohen, 1997), school-aged children were asked to evaluate the victim's attributions in hypothetical scenarios when either a friend, an acquaintance, or an enemy committed a hurtful act under either accidental, ambiguous, or hostile circumstances. In ambiguous situations, an enemy's intentions were evaluated less positively than were the intentions of friends or acquaintances. In accidental situations, victims were believed to be more likely to retaliate when provoked by enemies than by either friends or acquaintances. Finally, self-reported liking for enemies (as provocateurs) was low regardless of motivational condition; in contrast, liking for friends and acquaintances (relatively high prior to the provocation) decreased. School-aged children thus display attribution biases suggesting that they assume "the worst" of their enemies.

Persuasion studies suggest that enemies, in general, are seen as power-assertive, threatening, and uncooperative: 6 and 7 year olds were asked how they would make requests of a friend or an enemy, respectively (Bernicot & Mahrokhian, 1989). Results showed that children were more direct and more imperative in persuading friends (e.g., "give me the toy") than enemies ("gee, that toy looks like it would be fun to play with"). Apparently, children believe that one approaches enemies cautiously when attempting to exert social influence – the same caution they display in attempting to persuade parents and other persons possessing greater power and authority than they do (Cowan, Drinkard, & MacGavin, 1984). While scattered, these findings nevertheless indicate that the "enemy construct" is behaviorally salient by middle childhood.

Having Friends and Having Enemies: Developmental Implications

Friends

Children differ from one another according to whether or not they have mutual friends. Such differences are significant because friendships may be contexts that enhance social competence (Sullivan, 1953); concomitantly, social competence may enhance the likelihood that a child has friends. Indeed, correlational studies suggest such a linkage. Among preschool-aged children, individuals with emotional difficulties are friendless more frequently than better-adapted children, and are less likely to maintain the friendships they have (Howes, 1983). Children with reciprocated friendships enter groups more easily, engage in more cooperative play, are more sociable, more prosocial, and are less aggressive and have fewer conflicts with other children than those who do not have friends (Howes, 1989; Sebanc, 1999). Moreover, these conditions hold true for both Caucasian and African American children in the United States (Vaughn, Azria, Krzysik, Caya, Newell, & Cielinski, 2000). Among young children who have friends, a significant advantage also accrues in having several friendships as opposed to one (Vaughn et al., 2000).

Cross-sectional studies also show that, among school-aged children, those who have

friends are more socially competent than those who do not: They are more sociable, cooperative, altruistic, self-confident, and less lonely (Newcomb & Bagwell, 1995). Children who lack friends are more likely to endorse revenge as an appropriate goal in social relations than those who have friends (Rose & Asher, 1999a) as well as goals involving distancing oneself from other children (Rose & Asher, 1999b). Finally, among children who are at risk of being victimized (owing to both internalizing and externalizing problems), the occurrence of abuse varies negatively with the number of friends the children have: Numerous friends appear to offer physical protection to victimized children, are feared by the child's bullies, and are sources of advice concerning how to handle conflicts and threats (Hodges et al., 1997).

Although research is consistent in showing that children who have friends evince better social adaptation than those who do not (and that having more friends is better than having few), the meaning of these results is not clear. First, the results can be over-interpreted: Having friends may not be as closely linked to social adaptation as certain other measures (e.g., social rejection). In one investigation involving 8 year olds (Gest, Graham-Bermann, & Hartup, 2001), the number of mutual friends was correlated only with leadership, humor, and not being teased whereas peer rejection was correlated with a wide range of different behaviors (e.g., peer rejection was negatively related to cooperation and prosocial behavior and positively to aggression and antisocial behavior). In one other instance (Schwarz, Hess, & Atkins, 1999), the number of the child's friends did not contribute unique variance to any peer-rated behavior except shyness. Second, other close relationships (e.g., family relationships) may moderate the relation between having mutual friendships and psychological well-being. Among older children, for example, having friends is more strongly related to social adjustment among children from noncohesive and nonadaptable families than among children from better family environments. At the same time, family environments are more strongly linked to adjustment among children who do not have mutual friends than among those who do (Gauze, Bukowski, Aquan-Assee, & Sippola, 1996). The outcomes of *either* relationship, then, are moderated by the other. Clearly, univariate studies do not reveal the complex developmental implications of having mutual friends.

Longitudinal studies assist in sorting out these issues. Such studies of preschool-aged children, however, are rare: One investigation shows that social competence is a better predictor of friendship status across time than the reverse (Vaughn et al., 2000) which assists with causal questions. Certain other studies show that the transition to kindergarten is made more easily among children who have friends and keep them (Ladd, 1990). Longer term derivatives of preschool friendships have not been studied, however.

Among older children, having friends increases self-esteem and decreases psychosocial difficulties during changes from lower to middle to high school (Simmons, Burgeson, & Reef, 1988). The relation between behavior problems and increases over time in victimization is attenuated among children who have friends (Hodges, Finnegan, & Perry, 1999). The relation between having friends and later outcomes, however, is complex. For example, having friends in middle childhood predicts adult feelings of self-worth in early adulthood, family attitudes, and the absence of depression but not sociability, school performance, educational aspirations, and job performance, which are better predicted by sociometric status (Bagwell, Newcomb, & Bukowski, 1998). Once again, having a mutual friend pre-

dicts some outcomes but not others. Finally, moderator effects occur in social development: Adjustment outcomes when one gains or loses a friend (either one) are greater among children from nonadaptable families than more adaptable ones (Gauze et al., 1996).

One other consequence of having friends in childhood is success is romantic relationships. First, having same-sex friends during middle childhood forecasts having romantic relationships in early adolescence (Neeman, Hubbard, & Masten, 1995). Second, having friends enhances success in adolescent romantic relationships (Sroufe, Egeland, & Carlson, 1999) as well as successful functioning in romantic relationships in early adulthood (Collins, Hennighausen, & Ruh, 1999). Other-sex friendships are related to romantic affiliations as well, but not until adolescence (Feiring, 1999). The weight of the evidence thus supports Sullivan's (1953) notions concerning the importance of same-sex friendships during "the juvenile era" in generating the intimacy required subsequently for success in opposite-sex relationships.

Enemies

Relatively little attention has been given to the developmental significance of having enemies. Since the central dynamic in these relationships is reciprocal rejection (Hembree & Vandell, 2000), the children involved could be affected by the conflict and aggression associated with being disliked. Alternatively, one can argue that a mutual antipathy is an especially intense and personalized rejection and, as such, increases developmental risk over and beyond the risk that derives from general peer rejection. No one knows whether these conditions represent the phenomenology of mutual antipathies but the possibility makes the linkage between having enemies and social development worth studying.

Neither cross-sectional nor longitudinal studies addressing these questions have been conducted with preschool-aged children. Cross-sectional studies with school-aged children, however, have been carried out separately with 8 and 10 year olds. Hembree and Vandell (2000) examined the relation between involvement in same-sex mutual antipathies (mutual nomination as "someone I don't want to play with") and four composite measures: *social-emotional adjustment*, including prosocial and antisocial behavior rated separately by parents and teachers; *academic adjustment*, including grades, test scores, and work habits; and self-ratings of *perceived competence*. Teacher-rated social adjustment and the measure of academic adjustment were both negatively related to involvement in same-sex antipathies with parent education, single-parent status, *and* peer rejection factored out.

Using assessments of several thousand Dutch 10 year olds, Abecassis et al.,(2001) studied the relation between involvement in mutual antipathies and a wide variety of social and adaptational behaviors. Same-sex and mixed-sex antipathies (defined as children who mutually nominate one another as "someone not liked at all") were both linked to social competence using composite measures based on peer and self-ratings. Sociometric assessment (i.e., peer rejection) was included as a covariate in the analyses in order to determine whether unique adaptational variance was associated with antipathy involvement. Results showed that same-sex antipathies were positively associated with antisocial behavior, especially fighting and bullying, social ineffectiveness, and being victimized; prosocial behavior was not related to involvement in these antipathies. These data are consistent with earlier

findings that both bullies and victims have more enemies than nonbullies or nonvictimized children, respectively (Hodges et al., 1999), but apply to children more widely than to bully–victim dyads.

Mixed-sex antipathies were associated with more dysfunctional behavior in girls than in boys: Girls with mixed-sex antipathies were less antisocial than girls without, but more socially ineffective, less prosocial, more victimized, had fewer friends, and more frequently reported depressive symptoms and somatic complaints. In contrast, boys with mixed-sex antipathies were more antisocial than boys who were not involved in these relationships (including fighting, bullying, and being disruptive), but were also more prosocial, socially effective, less frequently victimized, and suffered no negative consequences in terms of depression or somatic complaints. Taken together, the results show that mutual antipathies are associated with a wide range of socially maladaptive behaviors for school-aged children, carrying predictive variance not shared entirely with peer rejection.

One longitudinal study shows that involvement in same-sex antipathies among 10-year-old boys predicts social behavior when they have become adolescents. Abecassis (1999) found, among boys only, that a group of intercorrelated social behaviors measuring social reservedness and social withdrawal (e.g., noninvolvement in addictive behaviors, nonparticipation in delinquency, fewer somatic complaints, lack of support from parents, and parental unwillingness to respect the adolescent's autonomy) were forecast by earlier involvement in same-sex antipathies. Baseline controls were included in the analyses, so that the results suggest that involvement in same-sex antipathies as children translates into behavior in adolescence that *differs* from the concurrent correlates at either age. Actually, since a *combination* of antipathies involvement and depression among the boys during childhood predicted the social reservedness pattern, developmental trajectories need to be studied more closely. The results demonstrate, however, that involvement in inimical relationships in middle childhood may have long-term significance.

Characteristics of Friends and Enemies: Developmental Implications

Social interaction between friends or between enemies reflects characteristics of both children; each is being socialized simultaneously within these relationships. Consequently, the variance deriving from the characteristics of children's friends or enemies is conflated with characteristics of the children themselves. Only longitudinal studies convincingly demonstrate the extent to which developmental outcome depends on who a child's friends or enemies are.

Friends

Friendships ought to enhance social competence when a child's friend is socially competent but not when friends are incompetent. Friendships may actually contribute deleteriously to developmental outcome when the child's friend is antisocial, not well socialized, or socially rejected. According to these arguments, the social advantage for the individual

child does not reside merely in having friends but in having socially competent, well-adjusted friends.

Several kinds of evidence support these notions: (a) Among 12 year olds, social adjustment improves across a one-year school transition when friends are well adjusted but not otherwise (Berndt, Hawkins, & Jiao, 1999). (b) School-aged children whose friends have conventional social orientations and good social skills become even more likely to endorse normative values as time passes (Kandel & Andrews, 1987). (c) Among children experiencing the stress of marital transitions (e.g., divorce or remarriage of their parents), having socially well-adjusted friends who have few behavior problems promotes resilience whereas having immature friends or friends with behavior problems does not (Hetherington, 1999). (d) "Desisting" delinquency is forecast among children at risk for antisocial behavior more strongly by turning away from antisocial friends to more socially skilled friends than by any other variable (Mulvey & Aber, 1988). (e) Increases in victimization among children at risk are inversely related to the number of externalizing problems evinced by their friends, suggesting that children with externalizing difficulties may retaliate in defense of their friends, thereby protecting them from escalating victimization (Hodges & Perry, 1999). Taken together, these results suggest that friendships with socially well-adjusted children promote better developmental outcomes than friendships with poorly adjusted children. Complicating the situation, however, are social comparison processes occurring between children and their friends: Children's evaluations of their own academic achievement, for example, are more accurate when their friends are low rather than high achievers (Guay, Boivin, & Hodges, 1999). Such results suggest that social comparisons with friends have more positive outcomes when they reflect positively on the child rather than negatively (Tesser, Campbell, & Smith, 1984).

On the other side of the coin, association with antisocial friends increases a child's antisocial behavior, especially among children already identified as aggressive and rejected (Dishion, 1990; Kupersmidt, Burchinal, & Patterson, 1995; Tremblay, Masse, Vitaro, & Dobkin, 1995). One reason is that antisocial friends oftentimes are not socially skilled, and thus lack the capacity to instigate socially competent behavior in their companions. Second, the interaction between aggressive children and their friends is more contentious and conflict-ridden than interaction between matched controls (Dishion, Andrews, & Crosby, 1995). Still other studies show that overtly aggressive children are not notably intimate with one another and are not as exclusive in their relationship attitudes as their nonaggressive counterparts (Grotpeter & Crick, 1996).

Taken together, then, the friendships of some children are mixed blessings: On the one hand, these friends support good developmental outcomes through social support and the increased sense of well-being that accompanies experience in close relationships. On the other hand, aggressive friends are risk factors since the children are not well socialized and instigate aggressive behavior in one another. Whether other socially incompetent children (e.g., extremely shy children) socialize one another toward increased maladaptation is not known. Actually, shy friends may assist one another in alleviating the loneliness that accompanies and exacerbates the risk associated with shyness (Asher, Parkhurst, Hymel & Williams, 1990).

Enemies

The developmental implications of the characteristics of children's enemies are largely unknown. In a cross-sectional study of victimization among 10 to 14 year olds (Card, Isaacs, & Hodges, 2000), the investigators identified children with same-sex mutual antipathies (least like to work or play with) and correlated the children's victimization scores with four theoretically relevant characteristics of their enemies: aggression, physical strength, victimization, and internalizing behaviors. Results show that the first three variables significantly and uniquely predicted victimization. Although not longitudinal in design, these results suggest that making enemies with aggressive, strong, and nonvictimized children may be a risk factor in victimization, supplementing the risk these children experience by virtue of having friends who are themselves physically weak and nonaggressive. Whether children consciously select friends who are different from their enemies (or the reverse) is an interesting inference that can be drawn from the results. Regardless of the limitations on these results, there is a suggestion that the developmental significance of having enemies may lie in who one's enemies are, not merely in whether one has an enemy.

Relationship Quality: Developmental Implications

Friends

Friendships vary in their social and emotional qualities: Some children have supportive and intimate relationships with their friends, some nonsupportive and contentious ones. Differences among the friendships of young children can be measured either with behavioral observations or reports based on the observations of teachers or mothers. The *Dyadic Relationships Q-set* (Park & Waters, 1989) uses detailed behavioral observations and encompasses a two-factor structure including positive and coordinated interactions, respectively. Teacher ratings have been used to differentiate the friendships of young children according to a somewhat more elaborated structure consisting of supportiveness, exclusivity, conflict, and asymmetry (Sebanc, 1999).

Using these measures, several investigators have reported that the quality of relationships between mothers and children is related to the quality of friendships among preschool-aged children. Secure mother–infant relationships in both members of 4-year-old friendship pairs are associated with more harmonious, less controlling, and greater responsivity between the children than when one child has a history of insecure attachment (Park & Waters, 1989) and are more positive and coordinated one year later (Kerns, 1994). Children with secure attachment histories are also less likely to have negative and asymmetrical friendships during the preschool years than children with insecure attachments (Youngblade & Belsky, 1992) and to be sadder when their friends move away (Park, 1992). Mechanisms responsible for these associations have not been clearly identified but

it is clear that certain continuities exist between the mother–child attachment system and friendship quality. Moreover, these extend into middle childhood (Elicker et al., 1992; Sroufe et al., 1999). Other correlates of friendship quality have not been explored extensively among preschool-aged children, although supportive relationships have been linked to prosocial behavior displayed by the children, relationship exclusivity linked to relational aggression, and relationship conflict linked to overt aggression (Sebanc, 1999).

Among older children, friendship qualities have been assessed with instruments that differentiate between "positive" and "negative" relationships (Furman, 1996) although more finely grained assessments are also available (Parker & Asher, 1993). Correlational studies show that: (a) friendship success is positively related to sociability and negatively related to emotionality (Stocker & Dunn, 1990); (b) supportiveness in friendship relations among school-aged children is positively related to popularity and good social reputations (Cauce, 1986), self-esteem (McGuire & Weisz, 1982), social involvement and achievement (Berndt, 1996) and good psychosocial adjustment (Kurdek & Sinclair, 1988; Gauze et al., 1996); and (c) good-quality friendships are negatively related to children's endorsement of revenge, avoidance, and blaming as social goals and strategies in relating to other children (Rose & Asher, 1999a, b). The weight of the evidence thus suggests that supportiveness and harmony in friendship relations are linked to good social adaptation.

Longitudinal studies support the hypothesis that friendship quality affects developmental outcome but also demonstrate that these linkages are complex. In making the transition into kindergarten, for example, children who enter with supportive friendships, as contrasted with nonsupportive ones, are happier at school, perceive classmates as more supportive, and show increasingly positive attitudes toward school over the course of the year; school adjustment difficulties occur less frequently, especially among boys (Ladd, Kochenderfer, & Coleman, 1996). The transition from elementary school to secondary school is also affected by friendship quality: Supportiveness of the child's friends, assessed shortly after school entrance, predicts increasing sociability, positive attitudes about classmates, and popularity over the next year, especially in stable relationships (Berndt et al., 1999).

Oftentimes, however, the developmental effects of friendship quality depend on other conditions and characteristics. For example, friendships that children regard as providing them with companionship, support, security, and closeness compensate for vulnerabilities and stresses that derive from poor family environments (Gauze et al., 1996; Sesma, 2001) but provide fewer benefits when family environments are good. Concomitantly, an adaptive or cohesive family environment helps children with poor quality friendships more than those with good quality relationships (Gauze et al., 1996).

Child characteristics moderate the effects of friendship quality, too: (a) Among aggressive, but not nonaggressive children, increases over time in delinquency are greater for those who have low quality friendships than better quality ones (Poulin, Dishion, & Haas, 1999); and (b) the relation between internalizing behaviors and increases over time in victimization is attenuated when children have a "protective" friendship (Hodges, Boivin, Vitaro, & Bukowski, 1999). Taken together, then, the evidence suggests that good developmental outcomes are most likely when a child has friends, those friends are socially skilled, and these friendships are supportive and intimate. Friendships between children who are aggressive or not well socialized are mixed blessings, as are friendships which are negative and contentious. Moderator effects, however, are common.

Enemies

No one has yet studied qualitative features of mutual antipathies as related to developmental outcome. Certainly, all enmities are not alike either in affective intensity or modes of social interaction.

Conclusion

Several generalizations can be made about friends and enemies in child development: First, both of these relationships account for unique variance in long-term as well as concurrent adaptation. Too little is known, however, about the developmental dynamics of mutual antipathies to be able to determine whether "being friends" and "being enemies" are relationship opposites or relationship orthogonalities in children's experience.

Second, these relationships may not be as important developmentally speaking as whether children are generally accepted or rejected. Comparative studies suggest that being disliked by other children, especially one's same-sex peers, accounts for greater amounts of unique variance than having friends or occupying a central position in the social network. Peer rejection also identifies children at risk across a wider range of social behaviors than friendlessness does. Although the developmental consequences of having good friends encompass self-esteem, success in romantic relationships, and good relationship attitudes, friendships may still have more restricted consequences than peer acceptance/rejection.

Third, children's enemies should not be ignored in developmental research. Effect sizes in the existing data are small and only one longitudinal study suggests that these relationships have long-term consequences, but these relationships may be more important in child development than previously suspected. Mutual antipathies may not predict developmental outcomes as powerfully as being generally disliked and one can guess that these antipathies are more critical to the development of certain behaviors (e.g., antisocial dispositions, victimization) than others. But we do not know these things. One must also consider the possibility that childhood antipathies are more important in the social development of some individuals than others.

Fourth, we know relatively little about the processes (mechanisms) through which friends and enemies influence the development of the individual child. Laboratory studies demonstrate that friends talk more with each other than nonfriends, are more mutually oriented, and manage conflicts more constructively. One can assume that these behaviors are evinced in everyday circumstances when observers are not present. Friends may be better socializers than nonfriends (for example, in the induction of scientific reasoning on difficult tasks through the use of constructive conflicts (Azmitia & Montgomery, 1993)). Few investigators, however, have identified developmental mechanisms like these. We know as little about the processes by which friends and enemies influence the individual child as we do about the processes through which peer rejection brings about its effects (Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1998).

Process-oriented studies of several kinds ought to be conducted: Macro-analytic studies

are needed to show the manner in which relationships with friends and enemies combine over time with temperament and early experience, family relationships, the social context, and emerging social competence in the child. Good beginnings can be made by showing how relationships affect coping and children's encounters with stress. Close examination of naturally occurring stressors such as being victimized or being a child of divorce can greatly enhance our understanding of both friendship and inimical processes.

Micro-analytic investigations are also needed. Models need to be constructed for utilizing information about behavioral mechanisms to predict long-term developmental outcomes. One of the most successful attempts to build a developmental model at both microscopic and macroscopic levels has been "the performance model" of antisocial development developed by Gerald R. Patterson and his colleagues (cf., Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992). Friendship experience is woven into that model and empirical studies have verified some of the processes that may be involved (Dishion et al., 1995). Other models in other domains of social development now need to reflect the same attention to friends and enemies and the mechanisms through which these relationships have (or do not have) developmental effects.

Our review shows that, while much is known about friends and a little is known about enemies, much is not known about these relationships. Investigators need to examine them more closely, tying distinctive modes of interaction to both developmental antecedents and developmental consequences. Attention must also be given to the manner in which different children utilize these relationships to arrive at different adaptations in childhood and beyond.

References

Abecassis, M. (1998). The Hatfields and the McCoys: Understanding the development of enemy relationships. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota.

Abecassis, M. (1999). I dislike you and you dislike me: Prevalence and developmental significance of mutual antipathies among preadolescents and adolescents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Abecassis, M., Hartup, W. W., Haselager, G. J. T., Sholte, R., & Van Lieshout, C. F. M. (2001). Mutual antipathies and their significance in middle childhood and adolescence. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota.

Asher, S. R., Parkhurst, J. T., Hymel, S., & Williams, G. A. (1990). Peer rejection and loneliness in childhood. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), *Peer rejection in childhood* (pp. 253–273). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Azmitia, M., & Montgomery, R. (1993). Friendship, transactive dialogues, and the development of scientific reasoning. *Social Development, 2*, 202–221.

Bagwell, C. L., Newcomb, A. F., & Bukowski, W. M. (1998). Preadolescent friendship and peer rejection as predictors of adult adjustment. *Child Development, 69*, 140–153.

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

Berndt, T. J., Hawkins, J. A., & Jiao, Z. (1999). Influences of friends and friendships on adjustment to junior high school. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 45*, 13–41.

Berndt, T. J., & Perry, T. B. (1986). Children's perceptions of friendship as supportive relationships. *Developmental Psychology, 22*, 640–648.

Bernicot, J., & Mahrokhian, A. (1989). Asking and insisting after a refusal: How do 6- to 7-year olds proceed? *International Journal of Psychology, 24*, 409–428.

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

Card, N. A., Isaacs, J., & Hodges, E. V. E. (2000, August). *The hazards of developing enemies: Relations with peer victimization*. Paper presented at the meetings of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Cauce, A. M. (1986). Social networks and social competence: Exploring the effects of early adolescent friendships. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 14*, 607–628.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of a theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Collins, W. A., Hennighausen, K., & Ruh, J. (1999, April). *Peer competence in middle childhood and behavior in romantic relationships in adolescence and young adulthood*. Paper presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.

Cowan, G., Drinkard, J., & MacGavin, L. (1984). The effect of target, age, and gender on use of power strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*, 1391–1398.

Dawe, H. C. (1934). An analysis of two hundred quarrels of preschool children. *Child Development, 5*, 139–157.

Dishion, T. J. (1990). The peer context of troublesome child and adolescent behavior. In P. Leone (Ed.), *Understanding troubled and troublesome youth* (pp. 128–153). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

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

Dishion, T. J., Patterson, G. R., & Greisler, P. C. (1994). Peer adaptations in the development of antisocial behavior: A confluence model. In L. R. Huesmann (Ed.), *Current perspectives on aggressive behavior* (pp. 61–95). New York: Plenum.

Eder, D., & Hallinan, M. T. (1978). Sex differences in children's friendships. *American Sociological Review, 43*, 237–250.

Elicker, J., Englund, M., & Sroufe, L. A. (1992). Predicting peer competence and peer relationships in middle childhood from early parent–child relationships. In R. Parke & G. W. Ladd (Eds.), *Family–peer relationships: Modes of linkage* (pp. 77–106). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Feiring, C. (1999). Other-sex friendship networks and the development of romantic relationships in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 28*, 495-512.

French, D. C., Jansen, E. A., Riansari, M., & Setiono, K. (2000). Similarities between Indonesian friends and nonfriends during middle childhood. Unpublished manuscript, Illinois Wesleyan University.

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

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

Gauze C., Bukowski, W. M., Aquan-Assee, J., & Sippola, L. K. (1996). Interactions between family environment and friendship and associations with self-perceived well-being during early adolescence. *Child Development, 67*, 2201–2216.

Gest, S. D., Graham-Bermann, & Hartup, W. W. (2001). Peer experience: Common and unique features of number of friendships, social network centrality, and sociometric status. *Social Development*, 10, 23-40.

Gleason, T. R. (1998). Social provisions of real and imaginary relationships in early childhood. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota.

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

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

Guay, F., Boivin, M., & Hodges, E. V. E. (1999). Social comparison processes and academic achievement: The dependence of the development of self-evaluations on friends' performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*, 564-568

Hallinan, M. T. (1980). Patterns of cliquing among youth. In H. C. Foot, A. J. Chapman, & J. R. Smith (Eds.), *Friendship and peer relations in children* (pp. 321–342). New York: Wiley.

Hartup, W. W. (1996). The company they keep: Friendships and their developmental significance. *Child Development, 67*, 1–13.

Hartup, W. W., Laursen, B., Stewart, M. I., & Eastenson, A. (1988). Conflict and the friendship relations of young children. *Child Development, 59*, 1590–1600.

Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1997). Friendships and adaptation in the life course. *Psychological Bulletin, 121*, 355–370.

Haselager, G. J. T., Hartup, W. W., Van Lieshout, C. F. M., & Riksen-Walraven, M. (1998). Similarities between friends and nonfriends in middle childhood. *Child Development, 69*, 1198–1208.

Hayes, D., Gershman, E., & Bolin, L. (1980). Friends and enemies: Cognitive bases for preschool children's unilateral and reciprocal relationships. *Child Development, 51*, 1276–1279.

Hayes, D., Gershman, E., & Halteman, W. (1996). Enmity in males at four developmental levels: Cognitive bases for disliking. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 157*, 153–160.

Hembree, S. E., & Vandell, D. L. (2000). Reciprocity in rejection: The role of mutual antipathy and children's adjustment. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin.

Hetherington, E. M. (1999). Social capital and the development of youth from nondivorced, divorced, and remarried families. In W. A. Collins & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Minnesota symposia on child psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 177–209). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hinde, R. A., Titmus, G., Easton, D., & Tamplin, A. (1985). Incidence of "friendship" and behavior with strong associates versus nonassociates in preschoolers. *Child Development, 56*, 234–245.

Hodges, E. V. E., Bovin, M., Vitaro, F., & Bukowski, W. M. (1999). The power of friendship: Protection against an escalating cycle of peer victimization. *Developmental Psychology, 35*, 94–101.

Hodges, E. V. E., Finnegan, R. A., & Perry, D. G. (1999). Skewed autonomy-relatedness in preadolescents' conceptions of their relationships with mother, father, and best friend. *Developmental Psychology, 35*, 737–748.

Hodges, E. V. E., Malone, M. J., & Perry, D. G. (1997). Individual risk and social risk as interacting determinants of victimization in the peer group. *Developmental Psychology, 33*, 1032–1039.

Hodges, E. V. E., & Perry, D. G. (1999). Personal and interpersonal antecedents and consequences of victimization by peers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 677–685.

Holt, R. (1989). College students' definitions and images of enemies. *Journal of Social Issues, 45*, 33–50.

Howes, C. (1983). Patterns of friendship. *Child Development, 54*, 1041–1053.

Howes, C. (1989). Peer interaction of young children. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 53* (Serial No. 217).

Kandel, D. B. (1978). Similarity in real-life adolescent pairs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 306–312.

Kandel, D. B., & Andrews, K. (1987). Processes of adolescent socialization by parents and peers.

International Journal of the Addictions, 22, 319–342.

Kerns, K. A. (1994). A longitudinal examination of links between mother–child attachment and children's friendships in early childhood. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11*, 379–381.

Kupersmidt, J. B., Burchinal, M., & Patterson, C. J. (1995). Developmental patterns of childhood peer relations as predictors of externalizing behavior problems. *Development and Psychopathology, 7*, 649–668.

Kupersmidt, J. B., DeRosier, M. E., & Patterson, C. P. (1995). Similarity as the basis for children's friendships: The roles of sociometric status, aggressive and withdrawn behavior, academic achievement, and demographic characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 12*, 439–452.

Kurdek, L. A., & Sinclair, R. J. (1988). Adjustment of young adolescents in two-parent nuclear, stepfather, and mother-custody families. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*, 91–96.

Ladd, G. W. (1990). Having friends, keeping friends, making friends, and being liked by peers in the classroom: Predictors of children's early school adjustment? *Child Development, 61*, 1081–1100.

Ladd, G. W., Kochenderfer, B. J., & Coleman, C. C. (1996). Friendship quality as a predictor of young children's early school adjustment. *Child Development, 67*, 1103–1118.

Livesley, W. J., & Bromley, B. D. (1973). *Person perception in childhood and adolescence*. London: Wiley.

McGuire, K. D., & Weisz, J. R. (1982). Social cognition and behavior correlates of preadolescent chumship. *Child Development, 53*, 1478–1484.

Moore, S. G. (1967). Correlates of peer acceptance in nursery school children. In W. W. Hartup & N. L. Smothergill (Eds.), *The young child* (pp. 229–247). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Mulvey, E. P., & Aber, M. S. (1988). Growing out of delinquency: Development and desistance. In R. Jenkins & W. Brown (Eds.), *The abandonment of delinquent behavior: Promoting the turnaround*. New York: Prager.

Neeman, J., Hubbard, J., & Masten, A. (1995). The changing importance of romantic relationship involvement to competence from late childhood to late adolescence. *Development and Psychopathology, 7*, 727–750.

Newcomb, A. F., & Bagwell, C. (1995). Children's friendship relations: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 306–347.

Park, K. A. (1992). Preschoolers' reactions to loss of a best friend: Developmental trends and individual differences. *Child Study Journal, 22*, 233–252.

Park, K. A., & Waters, E. (1989). Security of attachment and preschool friendships. *Child Development, 60*, 1076–1081.

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

Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.

Poulin, F., & Boivin, M. (2000). The role of proactive and reactive aggression in the formation and development of boys' friendships. *Developmental Psychology, 36*, 233–240.

Poulin, F., Dishion, T. J., & Haas, E. (1999). The peer influence paradox: Friendship quality and deviancy training within male adolescent friendships. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 45*, 42–61.

Ray, G., & Cohen, R. (1997). Children's evaluations of provocation between peers. *Aggressive Behavior, 23*, 417–431.

Rizzo, T. A. (1989). *Friendship development among children in school*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rose, A. J., & Asher, S. R. (1999a). Children's goals and strategies in response to conflicts within a friendship. *Developmental Psychology, 35*, 69–79.

Rose, A. J., & Asher, S. R. (1999b, April). *Seeking and giving support within a friendship*. Paper presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.

Rosenbaum, M. E. (1986). The repulsion hypothesis: On the nondevelopment of relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1156–1166.

Ross, H., & Conant, C. (1992). The social structure of early conflicts: Interaction, relationships, and alliances. In C. U. Shantz & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Conflict in child and adolescent development* (pp. 153–185). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W. M., & Parker, J. G. (1998). Peer interaction, relationships, groups. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 619–700). New York: Wiley.

Rubin, K. H., Lynch, D., Coplan, R., Rose-Krasnor, L., & Booth, C. L. (1994). "Birds of a feather…": Behavioral concordances and preferential personal attraction in children. *Child Development, 65*, 1778–1785.

Schwarz, R. L., Hess, L. E., & Atkins, M. S. (1999, April). *Friendships, peer status, and Social networks: Relative contributions to children's adjustment*. Paper presented at the biennial meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.

Sebanc, A. M. (1999). Friendship experiences among preschool children: Links with prosocial behavior and aggression. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Sesma, A. (2001). The conditional significance of friendship intimacy for well-being in childhood and adolescence: Adversity and parent-child outcomes as moderators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Sharabany, R., Gershoni, R., & Hofman, J. E. (1981). Girlfriend, boyfriend: Age and sex differences in intimate friendship. *Developmental Psychology, 17*, 800–808.

Simmons, R. G., Burgeson, R., & Reef, M. J. (1988). Cumulative change at entry to adolescence. In M. Gunnar & W. A. Collins (Eds.), *Minnesota symposia on child psychology* (Vol. 21, pp. 123–150). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sroufe, L. A., Egeland, B., & Carlson, E. A. (1999). One social world: The integrated development of parent–child and peer relationships. In W. A. Collins & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Minnesota symposia on child psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 241–261). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Stocker, C., & Dunn, J. (1990). Sibling relationships in childhood: Links with friendships and peer relationships. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 8*, 227–244.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York: Norton.

Tesser, A., Campbell, J., & Smith, M. (1984). Friendship choice and performance: Self-evaluation maintenance in children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 561–574.

Tremblay, R. E., Masse, L. C., Vitaro, F., & Dobkin, P. L. (1995). The impact of friends' deviant behavior on early onset of delinquency: Longitudinal data from 6 to 13 years of age. *Development and Psychopathology, 7*, 649–667.

Urberg, K. A. (1999). Introduction to invitational issue: Some thoughts about studying the influence of peers on children and adolescents. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 45*, 1–12.

Vaughn, B. E., Azria, M. R., Krzysik, L., Caya, L. R., Newell, W., & Cielinski, K. L. (2000). Friendship and social competence in a sample of preschool children attending Head Start. *Developmental Psychology, 36*, 326–338.

Wiseman, J., & Duck, S. (1995). Having enemies and managing enemies: A very challenging relationship. In S. Duck & J. Wood (Eds.), *Understanding relationship processes, Vol. 5: Confronting relationship challenges* (pp. 43–72). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Youngblade, L. M., & Belsky, J. (1992). Parent-child antecedents of five-year-olds' close friendships: A longitudinal analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 28*, 107–121.

Youniss, J. (1980). *Parents and peers in social development: A Sullivan–Piaget perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.