ATTACHMENT STYLES AND AGGRESSOR-VICTIM RELATIONSHIPS IN ${\tt PREADOLESCENCE}$

by

Ashley M. Miller

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

The Charles E. Schmidt College of Science
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Florida Atlantic University

Boca Raton, FL

December 2012

ATTACHMENT STYLES AND AGGRESSOR-VICTIM RELATIONSHIPS IN

PREADOLESCENCE

by

Ashley M. Miller

This thesis was prepared under the direction of the candidate's thesis advisor, Dr. David Perry, Department of Psychology, and has been approved by the members of her supervisory committee. It was submitted to the faculty of the Charles E. Schmidt College of Science and was accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

> SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE: David Perry, Ph.D. Thesis Advisor David Bjorklund, Wh.D.

Marissa Greif, Ph.D

David L. Wolgin, Ph.D.

Chair, Department of Psychology

Gary W. Perry, Ph.D.

Dean, The Charles E. Schmidt College of Science

Barry T. Rosson, Ph.D.

Dean, Graduate College

Www.bor 16, 20,2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere thanks to David Perry and the Social Development Lab for the opportunity to work in such a great, supportive environment. The author is grateful for the encouragement of her family and friends throughout the completion of this manuscript.

ABSTRACT

Author: Ashley M. Miller

Title: Attachment Styles and Aggressor-Victim Relationships in

Preadolescence

Institution: Florida Atlantic University

Thesis Advisor: Dr. David Perry

Degree: Master of Arts

Year: 2012

The current study investigated the change in relationship between an aggressor's attachment style (avoidant or preoccupied) and a series of characteristics in their victims' over a school year. Once a semester, participants rated themselves and their classmates on 16 personality characteristics and their aggression levels against other students. Only avoidant girls significantly refined their targets over the course of a school year. They increased their aggression towards girls with low appearance self-efficacy, a high avoidant attachment, high depression, high cross-gender typed behavior, high internalizing behavior, and low global self-worth.

ATTACHMENT STYLES AND AGGRESSOR-VICTIM RELATIONSHIPS IN ${\tt PREADOLESCENCE}$

List of Tables	vii
Introduction	1
Method	7
Participants and Procedure	7
Measures	7
Results	10
Analysis Strategy	10
Boys' Aggression	12
Girls' Aggression	12
Discussion	14
Appendix A	22
Appendix B	29
Appendix C	34
Appendix D	37

Appendix E	42
Appendix F	44
Appendix G	52
Appendix H	54
Appendix I	57
References	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Effect of Each Attachment Style on Change in Aggression Over the School	
Year Toward Each Target Type for Boys	18
Table 2. Effect of Each Attachment Style on Change in Aggression Over the School	
Year Toward Each Target Type for Girls	19
Table 3. Correlations Among Fall Variables for Boys	20
Table 4. Correlations Among Fall Variables for Girls	21

INTRODUCTION

Despite the expansive literature available on attachment theory, relatively little research has focused on attachment to close friends in middle childhood and adolescence. Ainsworth (1989) argued that attachment theory offers an appropriate model for friendship development and functioning (see also: Sroufe & Waters, 1977). As children age, they tend to see their close friends as important attachment figures, supplementing their relationships with their parents (Allen & Land, 1999; Bogaerts, Vanhuele, & Desmet, 2006; Bosacki, Dane, Marini, & YLC-CURA, 2007; Buehler, 2006; Buist, Dekovic, Meeus, & van-Aken, 2002; Fulgini & Eccles, 1993; Furman & Buhrmester, 1992; Harris, 1995; Hazan & Shaver, 1994; Hazan & Zeifman, 1994; Nelis & Rae, 2009; Nickerson & Nagel, 2005; Rubin, Dwyer, Booth-LaForce, Kim, Burgess, & Rose-Krasnor, 2004; Sentse & Laird, 2010). Of course, parental attachment colors a child's relationship with his or her peers, but attachments to friends take on a significance of their own.

The importance of secure attachment to parents is well documented. Children who are insecurely attached to their parents have more interpersonal difficulties, including loneliness (Boivin, Hymel, & Bukowski, 1995; Nangle, Erdley, Newman, Mason, & Carpenter, 2003; Nelis & Rae, 2009; Weiss, 1973, 1989), feelings of anger, guilt, anxiety, and depression (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Craig, 1998; Crick &

Bigbee, 1998; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Marini, Dane, Bosacki, & YLC-CURA, 2006), and they are more likely to develop behavioral problems (Lyons-Ruth, Alpern, & Rapacholi, 1993; Speltz, Greenberg, & DeKlyen, 1990). Children who develop a secure attachment to their parents, mothers in particular, also have more positive qualities in friendships at age 5 (Elicker, Englund, & Sroufe, 1992; Krollmann & Krappmann, 1996; Lieberman, Doyle, & Markewicz, 1999; Park & Waters, 1989), are more likely to have a close friend at age 10 (Freitag, Belsky, Grossmann, Grossmann, & Scheurer-Englisch, 1996), and have more reciprocated classroom friendships in adolescence (Kerns, Klepac, & Cole, 1996). In addition, children tend to transfer their style of attachment to their parents to their relationships with their best same-sex friends. In particular, children with a preoccupied or avoidant style of relating to their parents tend to evidence the same style of relating to their best friend (Hodges, Finnegan, & Perry, 1999).

Children use their best friends as both a safe haven for comfort when stressed and a secure base from which to explore their environments (Agnew, 2003; Fraley & Davis, 1997; Hazan & Shaver, 1994, Nickerson & Nagle, 2005; Seibert & Kerns, 2009). Supportive friendships have positive implications for adolescent emotional and behavioral adjustment (Hartup, 1996). Adolescents with supportive friends are significantly less depressed and anxious than their insecurely attached peers (Bagwell, Newcomb, Bukowski, 1998; Nelis & Rae, 2009; Sentse & Laird, 2010) and have higher levels of school satisfaction (Elmore & Huebner, 2010). They have lower levels of maladaptive internalizing and externalizing behaviors (Buhrmester, 1990; Cohen & Wills, 1985; Hartup, 1996; Kupersmidt & Coie, 1990; Parker & Asher, 1993).

Friends also help protect each other from aggression (Bukowski, Sippola, & Boivin, 1995; Hodges, Malone, & Perry, 1997) and other negative outcomes seen in victimized children (Parker & Asher, 1993). Children who possess risk factors for victimization (e.g., low self-esteem, social withdrawl, physical weakness) are less likely to become victims of peer aggression if they have at least one friend at school (Bukowski, Sippola, & Boivin, 1995; Hanish & Henke, 1999; Hodges et al., 1997; Hodges, Malone, & Perry, 1997; Nelson, 1997; Pellegrini, Bartini, & Brooks, 1999).

It is important to understand what leads children to be victimized by peers because a history of victimization by peers predicts many unfortunate outcomes for children. Victims tend to have poor self-concept and high levels of depression, loneliness, and self-blame (Adler & Adler, 1998; Andreou, 2004; Bosacki, Dane, Marini, & YLC-CURA, 2007; Craig, 1998; Crick & Bigbee, 1998; Crick & Gotpeter, 1995; Duncan, 1999; Egan & Perry, 1998; Graham & Juvonen, 1998; Hartup, 1996; Hess & Atkins, 1998; Marini, Dane, Bosacki, & YLC-CURA, 2006; Mynard & Joseph, 1997; Prinstein, Boergers, & Vernberg, 2001; Salmivalli & Nieminen, 2002). Many of these studies have been longitudinal and show that victimization leads to increases over time in negative outcomes.

Aggressive children tend to select their victims carefully, rather than aggress indiscriminately against their entire peer group (Olweus, 1978; Perry, Kusel, & Perry, 1988). For example, aggressive children sometimes pick victims based on the likely reaction of the peer group: If the peer group frowns on bullying of a potential victim, the bully will not aggress against that target (Hodges, Malone, & Perry, 1997; Hodges,

Finnegan, & Perry, 1999; Veenstra, Lindenberg, Oldehinkel, De Winter, Verhulst, & Ormel, 2005).

However, anticipated reactions of the peer group are not the only influence on an aggressors' choice of victim. Some victims and their aggressor tend to form dyadic aggressor-victim relationships (Dodge & Coie, 1989). There are different types of dyads: Perry, Hodges, and Egan (2001) describe symmetrical and asymmetrical dyads. Symmetrical dyads describe a mutually aggressive relationship. Each member bullies and is victimized by the other member. The symmetrical dyad may reflect a mutual dislike dyad in which each child reports disliking the other individual. The relationship is often marked by high levels of conflict (Abecassis, Hartup, Haselager, Scholte, & Van Lieshout, 2002; Card, 2007; Erath, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates, 2009; Hartup, 2005; Hodges & Card, 2003). Asymmetrical dyads describe the stereotypical bully-victim relationship: One member serves as aggressor, and the other as victim (Perry, Hodges, & Egan, 2001). The bully-victim relationship has been reported as less common than symmetrical dyads (Nansel, Overbeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simon-Morton, & Scheidt, 2001; Veenstra et al., 2005). In the bully-victim dyad, the bully is not punished through retaliation, but instead rewarded with submission of the victim (Card & Hodges, 2007; Coie, Cillessen, Dodge, Hubbard, Schwartz, Lemerise, et al., 1999; Reid, Patterson, & Snyder, 2002; Scwartz, Dodge, & Coie, 1993). These relationships can take on completely different dynamics when considering the idiosyncrasies of the victim: Some victims do not dislike their bullies and may even follow them around or invite aggression (Dodge & Coie, 1989; Troy & Stroufe, 1987).

The purpose of the present study was to see if children's attachment styles influence whom they victimize and who victimize them. In general, preoccupied attachment is associated with clinging to relationship partners, worry about rejection by partners, strong needs for closeness to partners, and internalizing behaviors; however, sometimes preoccupied children (and adults) also exhibit aggression (Cassidy & Shaver, 2008). In contrast, avoidant attachment is associated with emotionally distancing from relationship partners, mistrust of partners, and externalizing, aggressive behaviors (Finnegan, Hodges, & Perry, 1996). Though this research seems to imply that bullies should have avoidant attachment, whereas victims should have preoccupied attachment, both bullies and victims exhibit a full range of attachment styles.

Nonetheless, it is possible that attachment styles play a role in children's choices of victims. In the present study, I looked at a total of 16 possible victim characteristics. I hypothesized that children with avoidant attachment are especially inclined to aggress towards peers who demonstrate a preoccupied attachment because they should feel annoyed by a clingy, needy individual (even if not in a close relationship with the individual). Conversely, children with preoccupied attachment should aggress against peers with avoidant attachment because they should find the coldness and distancing displayed by avoidant children to be frustrating (even if not in a close relationship with these children).

I explored these hypotheses in a short-term longitudinal study. Children in the fourth through seventh grades were tested in both the fall and spring semesters of the school year. At each time point, children responded to a questionnaire assessing their

attachment style to their friends. The degree to which each child aggressed towards each of his or her classmates was assessed using peer-reports. Self-reports and peer-reports also assessed a large number of additional variables. These additional assessments allowed seeing whether children's attachment styles predict children's attack towards many other types of targets (in addition to those with an incompatible attachment style). These additional measures allowed seeing whether children's attachment styles predicted how much their attacks on peers depended on how much they liked the peer, how much they believed the peer liked them, how similar they perceived themselves to be to the peer, how much they were attacked, how much they were liked by the peer, and the peer's scores on depression, narcissism, global self-worth, dominance self-efficacy, social prominence, prosocial behavior, cross-gender typing, coercive tendencies, and internalizing symptoms.

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Fourth through seventh graders of a university laboratory school were invited to participate. Participants were 101 boys and 94 girls who had received written parental consent. The sample was approximately 51% White, 21% Black, 20% Hispanic, and 8% other, and represented 75% of the children in their grades.

The children participated in both a group and an individual testing session in both fall and spring semesters of a single school year. The group sessions were led by a graduate student, and the children were tested in small groups in a spare classroom. A different graduate student conducted the individual session in a library cubicle or other private area. Peer nominations, the most sensitive measure, were collected during the individual sessions.

Measures

Attachment. Scales measuring children's preoccupied and avoidant attachment styles with their peers were adapted from scales used to assess adults' attachment styles with romantic partners (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998). Statements were rated on a 1-5 scale, with 1 representing "Disagree strongly" and 5 representing "Agree strongly." Children rated 30 statements; each attachment style had 15 items. All items can be seen in Appendix B. The items were averaged to get scale totals.

Aggression and victimization. Raw aggression and victimization scores were calculated from the peer nomination data. Children were given a booklet. Each page had a name of a peer at the top, followed by a list of the peer's classmates, both male and female. Next to each of the classmates' names was a place for a child to check "Yes" or "No" in response to the question, "Is (name of the peer at the top of the page) mean to (name of the classmate)?" Participants were instructed to consider many types of aggression, including physical and social aggression; the instructions can be read in Appendix E.

Fourth and fifth graders' booklets included all of their classmates. Sixth and seventh graders only rated a subset of 14-15 students in their grade, because they did not have a single classroom for the entire school day. Participants did not nominate themselves as victim or aggressor.

A child's raw aggression score towards a particular peer was assessed as the proportion of nominators who named the child as mean to that peer. A raw victimization score was procured the same way (i.e., the proportion of nominators who named the child as a victim). An average of the raw aggression scores was used to estimate the child's general aggression towards his or her peers.

Victim characteristics. A variety of measures was used to assess potential victim characteristics. Attachment styles were measured as described above. Children rated how much they liked each peer (see Appendix H), how much they thought each peer liked them (see Appendix H), and how similar they thought they were to each peer (see Appendix I) on 1-4 scales, from "Not at all!" to "A lot!"

Participants completed a number of self-report scales. Self-efficacy in two domains (dominance and appearance) was measured on 4-point scales, along with other domains as seen in Appendix A, where 1 represented "HARD!" and 4, "EASY!" for the child. Global self-worth (Harter, 1985) and narcissism (Thomaes, Stegge, Bushman, Olthof, & Dennisen, 2008) were measured using items on another 4-point scale, from "Not at all true!" to "Completely true!" Those items can be seen in Appendices F and C, respectively. Participants also rated themselves on depression (see Appendix G; Kovacs, 1981); the 10 items were scored from 1-3 (e.g. "I look OK," "There are some bad things about my looks," or "I look ugly.") All scores were averaged for the scale total.

Peer nomination data were also subject to a factor analysis, and they loaded onto 5 factors: Social prominence, prosocial behavior, cross-gender typing, coercive behavior, and internalizing behaviors. The peer nomination questionnaire can be seen in Appendix D.

RESULTS

Analysis Strategy

Analyses were run for children's aggression towards same-sex targets only. This is because during middle childhood children's aggression is aimed nearly exclusively towards peers of their own sex.

A separate Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) analysis was run (for children of each sex) for each combination of participant attachment measure (avoidant and preoccupied) and a potential target characteristic. Because there were two different attachment measures and 16 potential target characteristics, this amounted to 32 HLM analyses for each sex. Because there were two sexes of participants, a total of 64 analyses were run.

Each HLM analysis involved equations at two levels. The Level-1 equation estimated, for each participant, the degree to which the participant increased or decreased over the school year in aggression toward peers who possessed a particular target characteristic (e.g., preoccupied attachment, internalizing symptoms). This Level-1 equation therefore yielded a within-participant beta indicating change in aggression over the school year in the participant's tendencies to aggress towards peers who possessed the particular target characteristic (vs. peers who did not possess it). Thus, the Level-1 equation predicted the participant's raw aggression towards his or her classmates in the spring from the classmates' possession of the target characteristics in the fall. The

equation controlled for three variables: The participant's raw aggression toward each target in the fall (to control for baseline aggression, so that the resulting beta would capture change), each classmate's general victimization in the fall (the average raw aggression the classmate received from the other children; this controlled for the nomothetic influence of the target, or the degree to which the target was generally victimized by all children), and each classmate's raw aggression towards the child in the fall (this controlled for provocation by the target as a possible influence on participant's aggression toward the target). All variables were group-mean centered. This step provided a beta coefficient for each child indicating how that child's aggression changed from fall to spring depending on a particular characteristic of their peers in the fall. The Level-1 equation was:

$$ParAggToTar2ij = b0j + b1j*(ParAggToTar1ij) + b2j*(NomVicOfTar1ij) + b3j*(TarAggToPar1ij) + b4j*(TarCharij) + rij$$

In this equation, ParAggToTar2 is the participant's aggression towards the target in the spring semester, while ParAggToTar1 is the aggression in the fall semester; b0j is the intercept; NomVicOfTar1 is the average raw aggression a classmate received from other children; TarAggToPar1 is the target's aggression towards participant in the fall; TarChar is the target's characteristic score; and rij is the error term. The beta (b4j) yielded by the equation indicated how change in the child's aggression depended on the target's specific characteristic.

The Level-2 equation used the beta from Level-1 (b4j) as the dependent variable in a series of between-child analyses in which the aggressor's two attachment scores took

turns as predictors. These analyses controlled for age of the child and general aggression towards the sex of the target being considered. All variables at this level had been grandmean centered before being entered into the HLM program. The Level-2 equation was:

$$B4j = \gamma 30 + \gamma 31*(ParGeneralAggj) + \gamma 32*(ParAgej) + \gamma 33*(ParAttachj) + u4j$$

In this equation, b4j is the beta from the Level-1 equation; y30 is the intercept; ParGeneralAgg is the participant's general aggression score overall; ParAge is the participant's age in months; ParAttach is a participant's attachment style score; and u4j is the error term. The statistical significance of the coefficient of the participant attachment style (y33) indicates whether the attachment style predicted a change in aggression over time as a function of the peers' characteristics. The HLM program estimates the two equations simultaneously.

Boys' Aggression

The data collected in the current study is continuous. When a reference is made to an avoidant boy or girl that just means the participant was high on the avoidant attachment scale. The same rule is applied to preoccupied children.

Neither attachment style predicted change over the year in boys' tendencies to aggress against boys showing a particular target characteristic. Table 1 presents the relationship of attachment to target characteristics for boys.

Girls' Aggression

For girls, avoidant attachment predicted changes over the year in the tendencies to pick on girls with several specific characteristics. Over the year, avoidant girls increasingly picked on girls with low appearance self-efficacy (y = -.007648, p < .05), a

high avoidant attachment (y = .008519, p < .05), high depression (y = .044437, p < .05), high cross-gender typed behavior (y = .005495, p < .05), high internalizing behavior (y = .012498, p < .05), and low global self-worth (y = -.012260, p < .05). Table 2 presents the relationship of attachment to target characteristics for girls. Preoccupied attachment did not predict girls' tendencies to pick on specific types of peers.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to identify traits of targets of aggression by bullies of certain attachment styles (avoidant vs. preoccupied). The only prediction was that avoidant children of both genders would increasingly pick on preoccupied targets and vice-versa. I failed to find this relationship in the data.

Surprisingly, only avoidant girls showed any reliable preferences to target certain peers over the year, and even picked on other avoidant girls. The rest of their target characteristics were more characteristic of bullies--girls with low appearance self-efficacy and low global self-worth, and girls with high depression, high internalizing behavior, and high cross-gender typed behavior. Few scores under every other combination of aggressor (preoccupied and avoidant boys and preoccupied girls) even approached significance.

Nonetheless, the results imply that avoidant girls do zero in on particular types of targets over the course of a school year. The data only describes a relative change in aggression and possibly sensitivity to a certain set of victim characteristics. Because the equations controlled for general aggression and because types of aggression were not distinguished in the measurements, nothing can be said conclusively about the overall amount, intensity, or type of aggression shown against the targets.

It is conceivable that avoidant girls may have the less common bully-victim dyadic relationship with their target. That is, their aggression may have increased over

the year towards certain targets because the aggressor is rewarded by submission of these particular victims (Card & Hodges, 2007; Coie et al., 1999; Reid, Patterson, & Snyder, 2002; Scwartz, Dodge, & Coie, 1993). Victims overall tend to have poor self-concept and high levels of depression, and those kinds of victims are what the avoidant girls targeted (Adler & Adler, 1998; Andreou, 2004; Bosacki, Dane, Marini, & YLC-CURA, 2007; Craig, 1998; Crick & Bigbee, 1998; Crick & Gotpeter, 1995; Duncan, 1999; Egan & Perry, 1998; Graham & Juvonen, 1998; Hartup, 1996; Hess & Atkins, 1998; Marini, Dane, Bosacki, & YLC-CURA, 2006; Mynard & Joseph, 1997; Prinstein, Boergers, & Vernberg, 2001; Salmivalli & Nieminen, 2002). However, it is possible that these submissive behaviors (such as internalizing behaviors and depression) may have annoyed the avoidant girl and encouraged her to increase aggression over the year (Finnegan et al., 1996).

However, it is also possible that avoidant girls' attacks toward their targets illustrate symmetrical relationships. It is possible that avoidantly attached girls reciprocally attack each other. These girls are exhibiting cross gender qualities (avoidance is more abundant in boys; Finnegan, Hodges, & Perry, 1996; Hodges, Finnegan, & Perry, 1999), and possibly these girls are struggling with each other for positions in a dominance hierarchy. This helps explain targeting of cross-gender typed girls as well, which was a somewhat surprising result, considering that children are more forgiving of cross-gender behavior in girls than boys (Huston, 1983). Correlations run on the present study, seen in Table 4, suggest that this is the case: Avoidant attachment is significantly correlated with cross gender qualities (r = .14, p < .05).

Preoccupied girls and avoidant and preoccupied boys did not increase their aggression based on target characteristics. They probably aggress against specific target characteristics more than others, but the analyses may have failed to pick up on these possibilities because the aggression did not increase much over the course of a year. The change in aggression towards particular characteristics might be more obvious if a participant is followed throughout their school careers, that is, over several years.

The within-year longitudinal design is particularly suited for testing hypotheses about peer relationships in children. During the fall, children meet their peers and start to develop friendships and other, potentially more hostile, relationships. By spring, children have had a full semester to settle into their new relationships. The peer group tends to remain constant through this time period, allowing researchers to track changes between specific dyadic relationships. In the younger grades (4th and 5th), they remain in a single home class unit and are nearly constantly with the same group of peers. In the older grades (6th and 7th), the peer pool was larger to accommodate the entire grade. The older grades had a home room, but they did not stay with a single group of peers for the whole school day. Nonetheless, it is possible that without constant contact, there is less strife between two individuals who might have otherwise entered into an aggressor-victim relationship.

This study looked at 16 victim characteristics, two types of aggressor attachment styles, and only between dyads of the same gender. The victim characteristics were chosen because they appeared in previous literature as very prominent victim characteristics, and the aggressor attachments were chosen because they are the two most

common insecure attachments. Same-gender dyads were the focus because most aggression in middle childhood occurs between individuals of the same gender. All of these choices were made to keep the scope of the study within manageable levels, but future studies could easily expand the foci to include a wide variety of characteristics, both secure and disorganized attachments, and relationships between two individuals of different genders.

Attachment research focuses primarily on the attachments between adult romantic partners and between parent and child. By comparison, very little research ventures into attachments in childhood between peers. It is a subfield ripe for study. This particular study and related ones that explore attachment styles between aggressors and targets can potentially help identify problematic relationships before they begin. Though only a start, it can be of great use in helping to prevent the dire outcomes for victimized children.

Table 1 Effect of Each Attachment Style on Change in Aggression Over the School Year Toward Each Target Type for Boys

)	
Characteristic	M (SD)	Avoidant Y	Preoccupied Y
Amount peers like target	2.85 (.989)	.000647	086000
Amount target likes peers	2.87(1.11)	.002789	.003197
Assumed amount target likes peers	2.86(.957)	.005116	.001350
Similarity to peers	2.15(1.05)	.000483	.006860
Avoidant attachment	2.73 (.561)	.002625	001087
Preoccupied attachment	2.47 (,765)	.000462	.005329
Appearance self-efficacy	2.99 (, 704)	.002075	006048
Dominance self-efficacy	2.71 (.556)	000671	000131
Global self worth	3.60 (,435)	006145	004538
Depression	1.17(.169)	.007325	.016475
Narcissism	1.70 (.524)	.002108	004696
Coercive behavior	237 (.831)	.002295	.001870
Cross-gender typing	180 (7.02)	002166	.001219
Internalizing behavior	.114(.933)	002104	.001452
Prosocial behavior	454 (.806)	003159	.003988
Social prominence	.398(1.06)	004784	.001992

Table 2 Effect of Each Attacinnent Style on Change in Aggression Over the School Tear Toward Each Target Type for Girls

Characteristic	M (SE)	Avoident V	Preocumied V
Amount peers like target	2,83 (7.08)	180700.	.002935
	000000	0 0 0 0	# 5 # # 5 \$ \$
Amount target filtes peers	2.85 (1.06)	.004545	.001404
Assumed amount target likes peers	2.88 (7.03)	.003331	.000149
Similarity to peers	2.22 (1.08)	.002238	003382
Avoidant attachment	2.26 (.606)	0.008519	.000624
Preoccupied attachment	2.63 (.736)	.002047	.000726
Appearance self-efficacy	3.18 (.683)	007648	000582
Dominance self-efficacy	2.58 (.582)	718100.	002069
Globel self worth	3.59 (.427)	012260	001502
Depression	1.22 (.793)	.044437	.005121
Narcissism	1.75 (.527)	-,006649	-,002695
Coercive behavior	249 (1.04)	006285	000554
Cross-gender typing	.092 (.960)	.005495	106000
Internalizing behavior	.042 (7.00)	.012498	.004324
Prosocial behavior	329 (,967)	.001232	.004487
	-,245 (868)	.003859	004193
20			

Note: Significance values < .05 are in boldface.

Table 3 Correlations Among Fall Variables for Boys

		1	61	m	4	W)	9	Ŀ	00	65	10	11	12	13	7	15	90
-	Amount peers like target																
64	Amount target likes peers	4															
673	Assumed amount target libes peers	4	S,														
v	Similarity to peers	36	Ŋ	99.													
Wi	Aveodant attachment	Ħ,	8	-03	707												
9	Preoccupied attachment	90	8	<u>-</u>	40%	Ą											
20	Appearance self-efficacy	93	8	8	8	8	99										
)	Dominance self-efficacy	03	8	9	00-	Ξ.	9	Ŕ									
O.	Depression	ā.	89.	33	90-	Ş	4	66 61	¥ĵ.								
10	Narcissism	60	춍	-03	70	Ŋ	2-j	97	E	04							
Ξ	Coercive behavior	-02	8	80.	90	8	Ξ	Ħ	.16	-03	91.						
12	Cross-gender typing	7	7	600~	-009	7	7	-003	5]	.01	7	607					
13	Global self worth	90	9	5	항	8	90	20	ġ	\mathcal{D}_{j}	90.	77	60.				
Ξ	Internalizing behavior	90	È	907-	90-	Fj	716	7	r,	Ą	Ŋ	10-	=	₫.			
13	Prosocial behavior	<u>6</u>	Ħ	133	20	8	7	-60	2)	99.	90'-	96	Ξ.	Ξ.	91"		
16	Social prominence	13	Ħ	44	FF.	형	-03	g	Ħ	Ę	ş	77	Ę	-02	10:-	æ	
17.7	Allega Chambers and Same of the second	8	100	ののは大きのの													

Note: Significance values < .05 are in boldface.

Table 4

Correlations Among Fall Variables for Girls

		1	et	-	寸	wn.	40	r-	00	65	91	Ξ	12	23	3	53	9
-	Amount peers like target																
64	Amount target likes peers	Ť.															
0%	Assumed amount target libes peers	<u>4</u>	8														
vi	Similarity to peers	86	9	99.													
w	Avoidant attachment	-00	0.	3	00:												
٥	Preoccupied attachment	9	Ş	3	40	E											
21	Appearance self-efficacy	90	507	8	ġ	3	79 77										
00	Dominance self-efficacy	÷0.	8	907	-01		7	T.									
Ø.	Depression	-16	977	7	S T	7	*	ő,	8								
2	Narcissism	80-	8	-107	107	평	03	ħ.	\overline{E}	80.							
Ξ	Coercive behavior	-00	.13	Ę	90'-	Ą	5	200	138	ij	8						
12	Cross-gender typing	10.	8	10.	90'	4	3	~05	7	7	917-	.02					
13	Global self worth	90.	0.01	63	20	F	7	ei No	7	₹	507	29	ē				
Ξ	Internalizing behavior	90-	50	777	-18	Ŗ	ci Ki	9	Ħ	Ŧ	=	ij	<u></u>	Ą			
13	Amount peers like target	.19	₹	$\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{i}$	65	8	9	<u>\$</u>	97	-10	90′	Ą	ej.	3	90		
16	Amount target likes peers	00.	500	ş	90.	₹,	7	9	\mathcal{B}_i	-710	7	.03	7	=	8	.04	
NS.	Motor Significance values < 05 a	08 80	of m ea	in holdfare													

Note: Significance values < .05 are in boldface.

APPENDIX A

About Me Part I Instructions

This questionnaire assesses children's perceptions of self-efficacy for 28 behaviors in five domains (macho dominance, sports, appearance, macho inhibition of tender emotions, and popularity). The behaviors are the same as those used in the prescriptive stereotypes importance ratings. The girls' form and the boys' form are the same except for item 19 ("pretty" vs. "handsome").

Instructions to Child:

For this questionnaire, we want you to tell us how hard or easy it is for you to do various things. You are to read each question carefully and imagine that you are doing what it says. Then <u>circle</u> how hard or how easy it would be for you to do the activity in question.

This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Just try to answer as honestly as possible.

OK, look at this practice item.

When you are playing baseball (or softball), running the bases fast is ______ for me.

HARD! <u>Easy</u> <u>EASY!</u>

If running the bases fast is very hard for you, then circle <u>HARD!</u> in big letters and with the exclamation mark. If doing this is hard for you but not <u>very</u> hard, then circle <u>hard</u> in little letters. If doing this is easy for you but not <u>very</u> easy, then circle <u>easy</u> in little letters. If doing it is <u>very</u> easy for you, then circle <u>EASY!</u> in big letters and with the exclamation mark. Do you understand?

OK, go ahead and circle your answer and then go on to do the rest of the items.

About Me Part I (Girls' Form)

1.	Fighting back whe	en challenged is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>Hard</u>	Easy	EASY!
2.	Throwing a ball fa	r is for m	e.	
	HARD!	<u>Hard</u>	Easy	EASY!
3.	Feeling attractive i	s for me.		
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	Easy	EASY!
4.	Forcing others to o	lo things is	_ for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	Easy	EASY!
5.	Hiding your worri	es from others is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	Easy	EASY!
6.	Having a lot of frie	ends is f	or me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	Easy	EASY!
7.	Doing risky activi	ties is f	or me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	Easy	EASY!
8	Looking good in a	bathing suit is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	Easy	EASY!
9.	Winning at sports	is for me.		
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	Easy	EASY!
10	. Acting tough wh	en afraid on the inside	is for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
11	. Making others fee	l like I am in charge is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
12	. Being well-know	rn is fo	or me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!

13.	Learning a new	sport quickly is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
14.	Doing cool and	dangerous stunts is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
15.	Being good loo	king is for m	ne.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
16.	Hiding your we	aknesses and fears is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
17.	Being liked by m	y classmates is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
18.	Trying exciting	but dangerous activities i	is for me	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
19.	Being pretty is	for me.		
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
20.	Being good at s	ports is for r	me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
21.	Being sociable	is for me.		
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
22.	When I am sad o	or my feelings are hurt, it	is for m	ne to hide it.
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
23.	Bossing others	around is for	r me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
24.	Enjoying talkin	g about sports is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!

25.	Being popular is	for me.		
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
26.	Getting even with peop	le you're mad at is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
27.	Being cool is	for me		
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
28.	Keeping from crying w	hen sad is	_ for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	easy	EASY!

About Me Part I (Boys' Form)

for me.	
<u>easy</u>	EASY!
for me.	
<u>easy</u>	EASY!
me.	
<u>easy</u>	EASY!
for me.	
easy	EASY!
for me.	
easy	EASY!
for me.	
easy	EASY!
for me.	
easy	EASY!
for me.	
easy	EASY!
or me.	
easy	EASY!
nside is for me.	
easy	EASY!
rge is for me.	
<u>easy</u>	EASY!
for me.	
easy	EASY!
	for me. easy me. easy for me.

13.	Learning a nev	w sport quickly is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
14.	Doing cool and	d dangerous stunts is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
15.	Being good lo	oking is for me	e .	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
16.	Hiding your w	eaknesses and fears is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
17.	Being liked by	my classmates is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
18.	Trying excitin	g but dangerous activities is	for me	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
19.	Being handsor	me is for me.		
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
20.	Being good at	sports is for m	e.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
21.	Being sociable	e is for me.		
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
22.	When I am sad	or my feelings are hurt, it is	s for n	ne to hide it.
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
23.	Bossing others	s around is for	me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
24.	Enjoying talki	ng about sports is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!

25.	Being popular is	for me.	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
26.	Getting even with peop	le you're mad at is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
27.	Being cool is	for me		
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	<u>easy</u>	EASY!
28.	Keeping from crying w	hen sad is	for me.	
	HARD!	<u>hard</u>	easy	EASY!

APPENDIX B

What I Am Like With My Friends

This questionnaire contains two scales measuring anxious and avoidant attachment styles with friends.

Instructions to Child:

This questionnaire asks about what you are like with your friends – like how you act and feel around and about them. On this questionnaire, you should base you answers on how <u>you</u> feel concerning your friends. Let's try a practice question. Remember, this is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

PRACTICE QUESTION

I do not like it when my friends try to help me with me problems.

Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly!	a little	nor disagree	a little	Strongly!

If this is not at all how you feel, circle Disagree Strongly! with the exclamation mark. If this sounds a lot like how you feel, circle Agree Strongly! with the exclamation mark. Do you understand?

Go ahead and circle your answer and then go on to the rest of the items.

What I Am Like With My Friends

1. I do not like to show my friends how I feel deep down.

Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!						
2. I like being c	lose to my friend	ds.								
Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!						
3. I need my frie	3. I need my friends to tell me they like me.									
Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!						
4. My friends do	on't want to get	as close as I would lik	e.							
Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!						
5. I do not like t	to be too close to	o my friends.								
Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!						
6. I worry a lot	about my friend	ships.								
Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!						
7. I talk to my f	riends about my	problems								
Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!						
8. I want to get	close to my frie	nds, but I keep pulling	away.							
Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!						

9. I wony ao	out losning my m	ciius.		
Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree	Agree	

Disagree Disagree Neither agree Agree Agree Strongly! A little nor disagree a little Strongly!

10. I get upset when my friends are not around as much as I'd like them to be.

Disagree Disagree Neither agree Agree Agree Strongly! A little nor disagree a little Strongly!

11. I find it easy to get close to my friends.

I warry about loging my friends

Disagree Disagree Neither agree Agree Agree Strongly! A little nor disagree a little Strongly!

12. I want to be close to my friends and this sometimes scares them away.

Disagree Disagree Neither agree Agree Agree Strongly! a little nor disagree a little Strongly!

13. I do not like it when my friends want to be very close.

Disagree Disagree Neither agree Agree Agree Strongly! a little nor disagree a little Strongly!

14. I tell my friends just about everything.

Disagree Disagree Neither agree Agree Agree Strongly! a little nor disagree a little Strongly!

15. I feel insecure when my friends aren't around.

Disagree Disagree Neither agree Agree Agree Strongly! a little nor disagree a little Strongly!

16. I worry that my friends won't care about me as much as I care about them.

Disagree Disagree Neither agree Agree Agree Strongly! A little nor disagree a little Strongly!

17. I do not worry about losing my friends.

Disagree Disagree Neither agree Agree Agree Strongly! A little nor disagree a little Strongly!

18.	get upset	or angry wh	en my friend	ls don't w	ant to han	g out with me.

Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree					
Strongly!	a little		a little	Strongly!					
19. When my frie Disagree Strongly!	ends start to get Disagree a little	close to me, I pull awa Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!					
20. I find it hard to depend on my friends.									
Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree					
Strongly!	a little		a little	Strongly!					
21. I find it unco	mfortable sharin	g my private thoughts	and feelings with	h my friends.					
Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree					
Strongly!	a little		a little	Strongly!					
22. Sometimes I	wish my friends	liked me as much as l	like them.						
Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree					
Strongly!	a little		a little	Strongly!					
23. I worry about	t having no frien	ds.							
Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree					
Strongly!	a little		a little	Strongly!					
24. I don't mind	asking my friend	ds for comfort or help.							
Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree					
Strongly!	a little		a little	Strongly!					
25. Sometimes I	feel like I force	my friends to be close	r to me than they	want to be.					
Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree					
Strongly!	a little		a little	Strongly!					
26. I get nervous	when my friend	s get too close to me.							
Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Agree					
Strongly!	a little		a little	Strongly!					

27. I try to avoid getting too close to my friends.

Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!
28. I do not like	it when my fri	ends spend time away	from me.	
Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!
29. I do not like	opening up to	my friends.		
Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!
30. I worry that	my friends wil	l stop being my friend	ls.	
Disagree Strongly!	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree Strongly!

APPENDIX C

About Me Part II

Instructions

This is the Childhood Narcissism Inventory (Thomaes, Stegge, Bushman, Olthof, Dennisen, 2008)

<u>Instructions to Child:</u>

OK, now this questionnaire asks you to tell some more things about yourself. There are 10 statements in this questionnaire. For each statement, tell us how true or not true the statement is for <u>you</u>. If the statement is never true, circle Not At All True! with the exclamation mark. If the statement is definitely true, circle Completely True! with the exclamation mark. Remember, this is not a test, but a survey. There are no right or wrong answers.

About Me Part II

1. I think it's important to stand out. Not At All True! Not Really True Sort of True Completely True! 0 1 3 2 2. Kids like me deserve something extra. Sort of True Not At All True! Not Really True Completely True! 1 2 3 0 3. Without me, our class would be much less fun. Not At All True! Not Really True Sort of True Completely True! 0 2 1 3 4. It often happens that other kids get the compliments I actually deserve. Not At All True! Not Really True Sort of True Completely True! 0 1 2 3 5. I love showing all the things I can do. Not Really True Not At All True! Sort of True Completely True! 0 1 2 3 6. I am very good at making other people believe the things I want them to believe. Not At All True! Not Really True Sort of True Completely True! 0 1 2 3 7. I am a very special person. Not At All True! Not Really True Sort of True Completely True!

1

2

3

0

8. I am a great example for other kids to follow.

Not At All True!	Not Really True	Sort of True	Completely True!
0	1	2	3
9. I often succee	d at getting admiration.		
Not At All True!	Not Really True	Sort of True	Completely True!
0	1	2	3
10. I like to think	about how incredibly nic	ce I am.	
Not At All True!	Not Really True	Sort of True	Completely True!

APPENDIX D

About My Classmates Part I

Instructions

This is the Peer Nomination Inventory. It contains items measuring a wide range of social behaviors children exhibit in the peer group.

Instructions to child:

(First give the child a ruler, to help the child to keep track of the item he/she is working on.) Read the following to the child:

Here is a ruler that you can use to help you do this next questionnaire. Don't turn over the paper until I tell you to. We have been having boys and girls in school describe things they do. Now we want to know how many boys and girls here at (name the school) do the same sorts of things. So we have written down lots of things that kids do. I want you to check which boys (girls) in your class do these things.

Everything is private and we will not show anybody else what any of you has put down on your paper, and none of you will find out what other kids have put down. If you have any questions about what the items mean, just ask me.

Ok, now turn over your paper. Girls, across the top are the names of the girls in your class. (Boys, across the top are the names of the boys in your class.) I will read them aloud, and I want you to read them out loud with me, so that you are sure you know who each one is. (Read names.) Now <u>find your own name</u> and then mark a line through the column that has your name on it, because you won't put any "X"s under your own name.

Now look down the side of the page. See Number 1. (Have them use the ruler for a guideline.) "He is good at sports." OK, now look across the names. Who is good at sports? Put an "X" under their name. Who else likes to play sports? Put an "X" under their name too. Put an "X" under the name of every kid who likes to play sports. (Pause.) Through with that one? OK, we'll go on to the next one. Remember, for each item you can put an "X" under as many names as you want to. (Read items one by one.)

About My Classmates Part I (Girls' Form)

Abou						 	 		
GIRLS' FORM	9	ąc	te						
	Name of Fernale Classmate	Name of Fernale Classmate	Name of Female Classmate						
	88	55 55	88						
	ᅙ	5	ㅁ						
	를	100	-						
	5	E	E 1						
	E	Ξ.	Ξ.						
	9	0	0						
	- €		.						
	Z	Z	Z						
 She is good at sports. 									
2.60									
She is mean to other kids.									
3. Other kids enjoy watching									
her show off.									
ner snow on.									
She is afraid to do things.									
She always looks nice.									
6. She tries to help kids who									
are sad or afraid.									
7. She is a cool kid.					-		_		
/. She is a cool kid.									
8. She catches a ball well.									
or one entenes a one went									
9. She is good to have in a									
group because she shares									
things and gives other people a									
turn.					L I				
10. She'd rather play with boys									
than with girls.									
~									
11. She is popular.									
								<u> </u>	

							_	_
	Name of Female Classmate	Name of Female Classmate	Name of Female Classmate					
12. She's a good-looking kid.								
13. Other kids are mean to her.								
 She learns a new sport quickly. 								
 She likes to do things that boys usually do. 								
16. She's good at getting others to do what she wants them to do.								
17. She seems unhappy and looks sad often.								
 She helps other kids solve their problems. 								
19. She acts like a boy.								
20. She always manages to get her way.								
21. She is well-liked by her classmates.								
22. She always plays with boys.								
23. She makes other kids laugh.								

About My Classmates Part I (Boys' Form)

BOY'S FORM	2	2	2					
	Name of Male Classmate	Name of Male Classmate	Name of Male Classmate					
	88	55 55	88					
	Ö	5	Ö					
	-2	2	- 2					
	Ž	Ž	Ž					
	₽.	9	. 2					
	8	É	l å					
	ž	ž	ž					
He is good at sports.								
a. and the government of the state								
2. He is mean to other kids.								
3. Other kids enjoy watching								
him show off.								
He is afraid to do things.								
He always looks nice.								
6. He tries to help kids who								
are sad or afraid.								
are sad or arraid.								
7. He is a cool kid.								
8. He catches a ball well.								
9. He is good to have in a								
group because he shares								
things and gives other people a								
turn.								
10. He'd rather play with girls								
than with boys.								
11. He is popular.								

	Name of Male Classmate	Name of Male Classmate	Name of Male Classmate					
12. He's a good-looking kid.								
13. Other kids are mean to him.								
 He learns a new sport quickly. 								
 He likes to do things that girls usually do. 								
16. He's good at getting others to do what he wants them to do.								
 He seems unhappy and looks sad often. 								
 He helps other kids solve their problems. 								
19. He acts like a girl.								
20. He always manages to get his way.								
21. He is well-liked by his classmates.								
22. He always plays with girls.								
23. He makes other kids laugh.								

APPENDIX E

About My Classmates Part II (Formerly Part III)

Instructions

This instrument assesses peer ratings of aggression between dyads.

Instructions to child:

In this section, we want to find out which kids sometimes do mean things to other kids, and who they are doing it to. There are many different ways to be mean to other kids. For example, a kid could hit or punch someone, tease someone or say something mean about them, or do something mean over the cell phone or the internet.

For each kid, we want you to tell us whether he or she is sometimes mean to each other kid on the list. Take a look at the practice item.

SAMPLE ITEM:

Is Billy Smith mean to	Tommy Jones?	Yes	No
------------------------	--------------	-----	----

If you thought Billy was mean to Tommy, you would put a check mark in the YES box. If you didn't think Billy was mean to Tommy, you would put a check mark in the NO box. Remember to put a check mark in one and only one of the boxes each time. Don't think about this too much. Just tell us the first impression that comes to your mind. Whenever you see your name, go ahead and cross it out. We only want to know about everybody else. We're going to ask you about some of your classmates now and we'll ask you about the rest of them in a few minutes.

Remember, everything is private and we will not show anybody else what any of you has put down on your paper, and none of you will find out what other kids have put down. If you have any questions about what the items mean, just ask me.

About My Classmates Part II - SAMPLE

Remember, make sure to check either YES or NO for every kid.

Is Suzie mean to	YES	NO
John?		
Sara?		
Tommy?		
Dave?		
Robby?		
Amy?		
Alex?		
Ashley?		
Chelsie?		

APPENDIX F

What I am Like Part III Instructions

This questionnaire contains three scales measuring Within-Gender Typicality (5 items), Gender Contentedness (5 items), and Global Self-Worth (6 items).

Instructions to child:

This questionnaire contains some statements that describe things about kids, such as who they are, what they like to do, and how they feel about various things. As you can see from the top of your sheet where it says, "What I Am Like," we are interested in what each of you is like, what kind of person you are like. This is a survey, not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Since kids are very different from one another, each of you will be putting down something different.

First let me explain how these questions work. There is a sample question on the first page marked PRACTICE QUESTION. I'll read it aloud and you can follow along with me. (Researcher reads practice question.)

PRACTICE QUESTION

Some kids are good at playing cards

BUT

Other kids aren't good at playing cards.

Very true Sort of Sort of Very true for me true for me true for me

This question talks about two kinds of kids, and we want to know which kids are <u>most</u> like you.

- 1. So, what I want you to decide first is whether <u>you</u> are more like the kids on the left side who are good at playing cards or are you more like the kids on the right side who aren't good at playing cards. Don't mark anything yet, but first decide which kind of kid is <u>most like you</u> and go to that side of the sentence.
- 2. Now, the <u>second</u> thing I want you to think about, now that you have decided which kind of kid is most like you, is to decide whether that is only <u>sort of true for you</u>, or <u>very true for you</u>. If it's only sort of true for you, then circle "sort of true for me"; if it's very true for you, then circle "very true for me".

- 3. For each question, you only <u>circle one statement</u>. Sometimes it will be on one side of the page, and other times it may be on the other side of the page. You can only <u>circle one statement per question</u>. You <u>don't</u> circle one on both sides, just the <u>one</u> side most like you.
- 4. OK, that one was just for practice. Now we have some more questions which I'm going to read aloud. For each one, just circle the statement, the one that goes with what is true for you, what you are most like. Remember that no one else at the school will see your answers, and it is very important that you answer each question honestly.

What I Am Like Part III (Girls' Form)

1.	Some kids are of with themselves	ten <u>unhappy</u>	BUT	Other kids are prwith themselves.	etty <u>pleased</u>
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
2.	Some girls are hat they were born a		BUT	Other girls are were born a girl	not happy they rl.
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
3.	Some girls feel to they like to do in time are similar girls like to do in time	their spare to what most	BUT	Other girls feel they like to do in are different from girls like to do in time.	n their spare time m what most
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
4.	Some kids are has themselves as a		BUT	Other kids are o with themselves	
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
5.	Some girls wish have to be a girl	•	BUT	Other girls are g girl all their life.	•
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
6.	Some girls feel t different from of		BUT	Other girls feel to other girls.	they are <u>similar</u>
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me

7.	Some kids are no with the way the		BUT	Other kids think the things is <u>fine</u> .	e way they do
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
8.	Some girls are g grow up to be a		BUT	Other girls wish the up to be a man.	ey could grow
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
9.	Some girls have feelings that other		BUT	Other girls don't hat feelings that other g	
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
10.	Some kids don't they're leading t	•	BUT	Other kids <u>do</u> like they're leading th	-
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
11.	Some girls don't girl	t like being a	BUT	Other girls don't m girl.	ind being a
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
12.	Some girls like t same toys that or		BUT	Other girls don't lil with the same toys girls do.	
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
13.	Some kids like to person they are	he kind of	BUT	Other kids often wissomeone else.	sh they were
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me

14.	Some girls feel lucky that they are a girl	BUT	Other girls don't fe they are a girl.	el lucky that
	Very true Sort of for me true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
15.	Some girls have the same interests that other girls have	BUT	Other girls don't had interests that other	
	Very true Sort of for me true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
16.	Some kids are very <u>happy</u> being the way they are	g BUT	Other kids wish the <u>different</u> .	ey were
	Very true Sort of for me true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me

What I Am Like Part III (Boys' Form)

1.	Some kids are of with themselves	ten <u>unhappy</u>	BUT	Other kids are prowith themselves.	etty <u>pleased</u>
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
2.	Some boys are h were born a boy	appy that they	BUT	Other boys are not were born a boy.	happy they
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
3.	Some boys feel they like to do in time are similar to boys like to do in time	their spare to what most	BUT	Other boys feel that they like to do in the time are different from the most boys like to dispare time.	neir spare from what
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
4.	Some kids are has themselves as a p		BUT	Other kids are often with themselves.	n <u>not</u> happy
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
5.	Some boys wish have to be a boy	•	BUT	Other boys are glad boy all their life.	d they'll be a
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
6.	Some boys feel t different from ot	•	BUT	Other boys feel the to other boys.	y are <u>similar</u>
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me

7.	Some kids are n with the way the		BUT	Other kids think the do things is <u>fine</u> .	e way they
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
8.	Some boys are g grow up to be a	-	BUT	Other boys wish the grow up to be a wo	
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
9.	Some boys have feelings that oth		BUT	Other boys don't h feelings that other	
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
10.	Some kids don't they're leading t		BUT	Other kids do like they're leading th	
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
11.	Some boys don' boy	t like being a	BUT	Other boys don't n boy.	nind being a
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
12.	Some boys like same toys that o	* *	BUT	Other boys don't li with the same toys boys do.	
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
13.	Some kids like t person they are	he kind of	BUT	Other kids often w someone else.	ish they were
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me

14.	Some boys feel are a boy	lucky that they	BUT	Other boys don't for they are a boy.	eel lucky that
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
15.	Some boys have interests that oth		BUT	Other boys don't h interests that other	
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me
16.	Some kids are verthe way they are		BUT	Other kids wish the different.	ey were
	Very true for me	Sort of true for me		Sort of true for me	Very true for me

APPENDIX G

About Me Part III

Instructions

This questionnaire is the short Children's Depression Inventory (Kovacs). Each item is scored on a 3-point scale, with reverse scoring for items 2, 4, 5, 6, and 10.

<u>Instructions to Child:</u>

OK, this next questionnaire asks you to tell how you feel about yourself. For each item, pick the one statement that describes you best.

About Me Part III

1.	I am sad once in a while. I am sad many times. I am sad all the time.	6.		Things bother me all the time. Things bother me many times. Things bother me once in a while.
2.		7.		
	Nothing will ever work out for me.			I look OK.
	I am not sure if things will work			There are some bad things about my
	out for me.			looks.
	Things will work out for me OK.			I look ugly.
3.		8.		
	I do most things OK.			I do not feel alone.
	I do many things wrong.			I feel alone many times.
	I do everything wrong.			I feel alone all the time.
4.		9.		
	I hate myself.			I have plenty of friends.
	I do not like myself.			I have some friends, but I wish I had
	I like myself.			more.
				I don't have any friends.
5.		10	•	
	I feel like crying some days.			Nobody loves me.
	I feel like crying once in a while.			I am not sure anybody loves me.
	I never feel like crying.			I am sure that someone loves me.

APPENDIX H

About My Classmates Part III

Instructions

This instrument assesses how much each child likes each other child and how much each child feels they are liked by each other child.

Instructions to child:

(First give the child a ruler, to help the child to keep track of the item he/she is working on.) Read the following to the child:

Here is a ruler that you can use to help you do this next questionnaire. Don't turn over the paper until I tell you to. We are interested in finding out how much you like each other kid in your class and how much you think they like you. Everything is private and we will not show anybody else what any of you has put down on your paper, and none of you will find out what other kids have put down. If you have any questions about what the items mean, just ask me.

If you look down the side of the paper, you can see each kid's name in your class. Put your ruler under the first kid's name. Now look at the top of the paper. Do you see the question? How much do you like each kid? Now think about how much you like that first kid? If it's NOT AT ALL!, circle the 1. If it's a little, circle the 2. If it's quite a bit, circle the 3. If it's A LOT!, circle the 4. Now do this for each other kid in you class. Remember, you can use your ruler to keep your place.

On the next piece of paper, there is another question. See it? It says, How much do you think each kid likes you? Now mark 1, 2, 3, or 4 to tell us how much you think each kid in your class likes you.

About My Classmates Part III

		How much do you like each kid?				
	Not at all!	A little	Quite a bit	A lot!		
Suzie	1	2	3	4		
John	1	2	3	4		
Dave	1	2	3	4		
Pat	1	2	3	4		
Rachel	1	2	3	4		
Jim	1	2	3	4		
Steve	1	2	3	4		
Amanda	1	2	3	4		
Ashley	1	2	3	4		
Arian	1	2	3	4		
Chelsea	1	2	3	4		
Alex	1	2	3	4		
Lindsey	1	2	3	4		
Matt	1	2	3	4		
Amy	1	2	3	4		
Chris	1	2	3	4		
Ryan	1	2	3	4		
Chrissi	1	2	3	4		
Kara	1	2	3	4		

	How	How much do you think each kid likes you?				
	Not at all!	A little	Quite a bit	A lot!		
Suzie	1	2	3	4		
John	1	2	3	4		
Dave	1	2	3	4		
Pat	1	2	3	4		
Rachel	1	2	3	4		
Jim	1	2	3	4		
Steve	1	2	3	4		
Amanda	1	2	3	4		
Ashley	1	2	3	4		
Arian	1	2	3	4		
Chelsea	1	2	3	4		
Alex	1	2	3	4		
Lindsey	1	2	3	4		
Matt	1	2	3	4		
Amy	1	2	3	4		
Chris	1	2	3	4		
Ryan	1	2	3	4		
Chrissi	1	2	3	4		
Kara	1	2	3	4		

APPENDIX I

About My Classmates Part IV

Instructions

This instrument assesses how much each child feels that they are similar to each other child.

Instructions to child:

(First give the child a ruler, to help the child to keep track of the item he/she is working on.) Read the following to the child:

Here is a ruler that you can use to help you do this next questionnaire. Don't turn over the paper until I tell you to. We are interested in finding out how <u>you think</u> you are similar to every other kid in your class. Everything is private and we will not show anybody else what any of you has put down on your paper, and none of you will find out what other kids have put down. If you have any questions about what the items mean, just ask me.

If you look down the side of the paper, you can see each kid's name in your class. Put your ruler under the first kid's name. Now look at the top of the paper. Do you see the question? How similar are you to each kid? Now think about how similar you are to that first kid? If it's NOT AT ALL!, circle the 1. If it's a little, circle the 2. If it's quite a bit, circle the 3. If it's A LOT!, circle the 4. Now do this for each other kid in you class. Remember, you can use your ruler to keep your place.

On the next piece of paper, there is another question. See it? It says, How much do you think each kid likes you? Now mark 1, 2, 3, or 4 to tell us how much you think each kid in your class likes you.

About My Classmates Part IV

		How similar are you to each kid?				
	Not at all!	A little	Quite a bit	A lot!		
Suzie	1	2	3	4		
John	1	2	3	4		
Dave	1	2	3	4		
Pat	1	2	3	4		
Rachel	1	2	3	4		
Jim	1	2	3	4		
Steve	1	2	3	4		
Amanda	1	2	3	4		
Ashley	1	2	3	4		
Arian	1	2	3	4		
Chelsea	1	2	3	4		
Alex	1	2	3	4		
Lindsey	1	2	3	4		
Matt	1	2	3	4		
Amy	1	2	3	4		
Chris	1	2	3	4		
Ryan	1	2	3	4		
Chrissi	1	2	3	4		
Kara	1	2	3	4		

REFERENCES

- Abecassis, M. (2003). I hate you just the way you are: Exploring the formation, maintenance, and need for enemies. In E. V. Hodges, & N. Card (Eds.), *Enemies and the darker side of peer relations. New directions for child and adolescent development* (pp. 5–22). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Abecassis, M., Hartup, W. W., Haselager, G. J. T., Scholte, R. H. J., & Van Lieshout, C. F. M. (2002). Mutual antipathies and their significance in middle childhood and adolescence. *Child Development*, 73, 1543–1556.
- Adler, P. & Adler, P. (1998) *Peer power: preadolescent culture and identity* (New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press).
- Agnew, R. (2003). An integrated theory of the adolescent peak in offending. *Youth & Society*, *34*, 263–299.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44, 709-716.
- Allen, J. P., & Land, D. (1999). Attachment in adolescence. In J. Cassidy, & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 319-335). New York: Guilford.

- Andreou, E. (2004). Bully/victim problems and their association with Machiavellianism and self-efficacy in Greek primary school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 297–309
- Armsden, G. & Greenberg, M. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *16*, 427–454.
- Armsden, G., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment:

 Relationships to well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*,

 16, 427–454.
- Bagwell, C., Newcomb, A., & Bukowski, W. (1998). Preadolescent friendship and peer rejection as predictors of adult adjustment. *Child Development*, *69*, 140–153.
- Bogaerts, S. Vanheule, S., & Desmet, M. (2006). Feelings of subjective emotional loneliness: An exploration of attachment. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *34*(7), 797-812.
- Boivin, M., Hymel, S. & Bukowski, W. (1995). The roles of social withdrawal, peer rejection, and victimization by peers in predicting loneliness and depressed mood in childhood. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7, 765–785.
- Bosacki, S., Dane, A., Marini, Z., & YLC-CURA (2007). Peer relationships and internalizing problems in adolescents: mediating role of self-esteem. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 12(4), 261-282.

- Brennan. K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson, W. S. Rholes (Eds.)

 Attachment theory and close relationships (pp. 46-76). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Buehler, C. (2006). Parents and peers in relation to early adolescent problem behavior. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 68, 109–124.
- Buhrmester, D. (1990). Intimacy of friendship, interpersonal competence and adjustment during preadolescence and adolescence. *Child Development*, *61*(4), 1101–1111.
- Buist, K. L., Dekovic, M., Meeus, W., & van-Aken, M. A. (2002). Developmental patterns in adolescent attachment to mother, father and sibling. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *31*, 167–176.
- Bukowski, W.M., Sippola, L.K., & Boivin, M. (1995). Friendship protects "at risk" children from victimization by peers. In J.M. Price (Chair), *The role of friendship in children's developmental risk and resilience: A developmental psychopathology perspective*. Symposium conducted at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.
- Card, N. A. (2007). 'I hated her guts!' Emerging adults' recollection of the formation, maintenance, and termination of antipathetic relationships during high school.

 *Journal of Adolescent Research, 22, 1–26.
- Card, N. A. & Hodges, E. V. E. (2007). Victimization within mutually antipathetic relationships. *Social Development*, *16*, 479–496.
- Cassidy, J. & Shaver, P. R. (1999), Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications. New York: Guilford.

- Cohen, S. & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *98*, 310–357.
- Coie, J. D., Cillessen, A. N., Dodge, K. A., Hubbard, J. A., Schwartz, D., Lemerise, E. A., et al. (1999). It takes two to fight: A test of relational factors and a method for assessing aggressive dyads. *Developmental Psychology*, *35*, 1179–1188.
- Craig, W. M. (1998). The relationship among bullying, victimization, depression, anxiety, and aggression in elementary school children. *Personality & Individual Differences*, *24(1)*, 123–130.
- Crick, N. R. & Bigbee, M. A. (1998). Relational and overt forms of peer victimization: A multiinformant approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66, 337-347.
- Crick, N. & Grotpeter, J. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment, *Child Development*, *66*, 710–722.
- Dodge, K. A. & Coie, J. D. (1989). Bully-victim relationships in boys' play groups.

 Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child

 Development, Kansas City, MO.
- Duncan, R. D. (1999). Maltreatment by parents and peers: The relationship between child abuse, bully victimization, and psychological distress. *Child Maltreatment*, *4*, 45-55.
- Duncan, R. D. (1999). Peer and sibling aggression: An investigation of intra- and extrafamilial bullying. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *14*, 871-886.

- Egan, S. K. & Perry, D. G. (1998). Does low self-regard invite victimization? Developmental Psychology, 34, 299-309.
- Elicker, J., Englund, M., & Sroufe, L. A. (1992). Predicting peer competence and peer relationships in childhood from early parent-child relationships. In R. D. Parke & G. W. Ladd (Eds.), *Family-peer relationships: Modes of linkage* (pp. 77-106). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Elmore, G. M. & Huebner, E. S. (2010). Adolescents' satisfaction with school experiences: Relationships with demographics, attachment relationships, and school engagement behavior. *Psychology in the Schools, 47(6)*, doi: 10.10002/pits.20488
- Erath, S. A., Pettit, G. S., Dodge, K. A., & Bates, J. E. (2009). Who dislikes whom, and for whom does it matter: Predicting aggression in middle childhood. *Social Development*, 18(3), 577-596.
- Finnegan, R. A., Hodges, E. V. E., & Perry, D. G. (1996). Preoccupied and avoidant coping during middle childhood. *Child Development*, 67, 1318-1328.
- Fraley, R. C., & Davis, K. E. (1997). Attachment formation and transfer in young adults' close friendships and romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, *4*, 131–144.
- Freitag, M. K., Belsky, J., Grossmann, K., Grossmann, J. E., & Scheurer-Englisch, H. (1996). Continuity in child-parent relationships from infancy to middle childhood and relations with friendship competence. *Child Development*, *67*, 1437-1454.
- Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1992). Age and sex differences in perceptions of networks and personal relationships. *Child Development*, *63*, 103-115.

- Graham, S. & Juvonen, J. (1998). Self-blame and peer victimization in middle school: An attributional analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, *34*, 587-599.
- Hanish, L.D. & Henke, L.A. (1999). The peer relationships of victimized children: A study of three age groups. Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.
- Harris, J. R. (1995). Where is the child's environment? A group socialization theory of development. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 458–489.
- Hartup, W. W. (1996). The company they keep: Friendships and their developmental significance. *Child Development*, *67*, 1–13.
- Hartup, W. W. (2005). The development of aggression: Where do we stand? In R. E. Tremblay, W. W. Hartup, & J. Archer (Eds.), *Developmental origins of aggression* (pp. 3–22). New York: Guilford.
- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 511-524.
- Hazan, C., & Zeifman (1994). Sex and the psychological tether. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Attachment processes in adulthood: Advances in personal relationships* (Vol. 5, pp. 151-177). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Hess, L. E. & Atkins, M. S. (1998). Victims and aggressors at school: Teacher, self, and peer perceptions of psychosocial functioning. *Applied Developmental Science*, 2, 75-89.

- Hodges, E. V. E. & Card, N. A. (Eds.) (2003). Enemies and the darker side of peer relations: New directions for child and adolescent development. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 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(3)*, 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.
- Huston, A. C. (1983). Sex-typing. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Socialization, personality, and social development (Vol. 4, pp. 388-467). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kerns, K. A., Klepac, L., & Cole, A. (1996). Peer relationships and preadolescents' perceptions of security in the child-mother relationship. *Developmental Psychology*, *32*, 457-466.
- Kovacs, M. (1981). Rating scales to assess depression in school-aged children.

 *ActaPaedopsychiatrica: International Journal of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry,

 46, 305-315.
- Krollmann, M. & Krappmann, L. (1996). Bindung und Gleichaltrigenbeziehungen in dermittleren Kindheit [Attachment and peer relationships in middle childhood].Poster presented at the 11th meeting of the German Psychological Society, Osnabruck, Germany.

- Kupersmidt, J. B. & Coie, J. D. (1990). Preadolescent peer status, aggression, and school adjustment as predictors of externalizing problems in adolescence. *Child Development*, *61*, 1350–1362.
- Liberman, M., Doyle, A. B., & Markiewicz, D. (1999). Developmental patterns in security of attachment to mother and father in late childhood and early adolescence: Associations with peer relations. *Child Development*, 70, 202–213.
- Lyons-Ruth, K., Alpern, L., & Rapacholi, B. (1993). Disorganized infant attachment classification and maternal psych-social problems as predictors of hostile-aggressive behavior in the preschool classroom. *Child Development*, *64*, 572 585.
- Marini, Z. A., Dane, A., Bosacki, S. & YLC-CURA (2006) Direct and indirect bully-victims: differential psychosocial risk factors associated with adolescents involved in bullying and victimization. *Aggressive Behavior*, *32*, 551–569.
- Mynard, H. & Joseph, S. (1997). Bully/victim problems and their association with Eysenck's personality dimensions in 8- to 13 year-olds. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67, 51-54.
- Nangle, D., Erdley, C., Newman, J., Mason, C. & Carpenter, E. (2003). Popularity, friendship quantity, and friendship quality: Interactive influences on children's loneliness and depression. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 32, 546–555.
- Nansel, T. R., Overbeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simon-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and association with

- psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285, 2094–2100.
- Nelis, S. M. & Rae, G. (2009). Brief report: Peer attachment in adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32, 443-447.
- Nelson, D. A. (1997). Family relationships of relationally and overtly victimized children. Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Children Development, Washington, D.C.
- Nickerson, A. B. & Nagle, R. J. (2005). Parent and peer attachment in late childhood and early adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *25(2)*, 223-249.
- Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere (Wiley).
- Park, K. A. & Waters, E. (1989). Security of attachment and preschool friendships. *Child Development*, 60, 1076-1081.
- Parker, J. & Asher, S. (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.
- 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.
- Pellegrini, A. D., Bartini, M., & Brooks, F. (1999). School bullies, victims, and aggressive victims: Factors relating to group affiliation and victimization in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*, 216-224.

- Perry, D. G., Hodges, E. V. E., & Egan, S. K. (2001). Determinants of chronic victimization by peers. In J. Juvonen and S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school* (pp. 73-104). New York: Guilford.
- Perry, D. G., Kusel, S. J., & Perry, L. C. (1998). Victims of peer aggression.

 *Developmental Psychology, 24, 807-814.
- Prinstein, M., Boergers, J. & Vernberg, E. (2001) Overt and relational aggression in adolescents: social-psychological adjustment of aggressors and victims. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 30, 479–491.
- Reid, J. B., Patterson, G. R., & Snyder, J. (2002). Antisocial behavior in children and adolescents. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Rubin, K. H., Dwyer, K. M., Booth-LaForce, C., Kim, A. G., Burgess, K. B., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (2004). Attachment, friendship, and psychosocial functioning in early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *24(4)*, 326-356.
- Salmivalli, C. & Nieminen, E. (2002). Proactive and reactive aggression among school bullies, victims, and bully-victims. *Aggressive Behavior*, *28*, 30–44.
- Seibert, A. C. & Kerns, K. A. (2009). Attachment figures in middle childhood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 33(4),* 347-355.
- Sentse, M. & Laird, R. D. (2010). Parent-child relationships and dyadic friendship experiences as predictors of behavior problems in early adolescence. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 39(6), 873-884.

- Speltz, M. L., Greenberg, M. T., & DeKlyen, M. (1990). Attachment in preschoolers with disruptive behavior: A comparison of clinic-referred and non-problem children.

 *Development and Psychopathology, 2, 31 46.
- Sroufe, L. A., & Waters, E. (1977). Attachment as an organizational construct. *Child Development*, 48, 1184-1199.
- Troy & Stroufe, L. A. (1987). Victimization among preschoolers: Role of attachment relationship history. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 2, 166-172.
- Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehinkel, A. J., De Winter, A. F., Verhulst, F. C., & Ormel, J. (2005). Bullying and victimization in elementary schools: A comparison of bullies, victims, bully/victims, and uninvolved preadolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, 41, 672–682.
- Weiss, R. S. (1973). *Loneliness: The experience of emotional and social isolation*.

 Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Weiss, R. S. (1989). Reflections on the present state of loneliness research. In M. Hojat & R. Crandall (Eds.), *Loneliness: Theory, research and applications* (pp. 51-56).Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.