This volume grew out of the symposium International Perspectives on Close Friendship, presented at the 1992 biennial meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence in Washington, D.C. Willard Hartup, although not a participant, graciously agreed to contribute to this volume.

Finally, I express my appreciation to each of the authors and series editor-in-chief William Damon. All were unfailingly cooperative, some despite personal adversity. I also thank my secretarial staff: Mary Davidson, Cislyn Walker, and Karen Voshall.

Brett Laursen
Editor

BRETT LAURSEN is assistant professor of psychology at Florida Atlantic University. He received his Ph.D. in child psychology in 1989 from the Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota.

Friendships represent an important context for adolescent social development. A review of the extant literature reveals that friendships of adolescents differ in several respects from those of younger children. During adolescence, three dimensions of friendship affect the course of individual development: having friends, who one's friends are, and the quality of the friendship. Still, much remains to be learned about the nature and functions of friendship during the second decade of life, and a progressive research agenda is proposed to address this lacuna.

Adolescents and Their Friends

Willard W. Hartup

Considerable evidence now shows that peer relations contribute substantially to both social and cognitive development, and to the effectiveness with which we function as adults. Indeed, the best early predictor of adult adaptation is not IQ, or school grades, or classroom behavior but rather the adequacy with which children and adolescents get along with their contemporaries (Parker and Asher, 1987). Adolescents who are generally disliked, who are aggressive and disruptive, and who cannot establish a place for themselves in the peer culture are developmentally at risk. In this chapter, the significance of adolescent friendships is examined. Questions addressed include the following: How ubiquitous are these relationships? How similar are friends? How stable are these relationships? Does having a friend make a difference in social and emotional development? New directions in research dealing with adolescents and their friends are also discussed.

Ubiquity of Friendships

Friendships can be identified among toddlers (Howes, 1989) and obtain ubiquity by middle childhood. Friendship networks or clusters are also evident in childhood and become highly significant in adolescence.

Best Friends. Most adolescents have one or two "best friends" and several "close friends" or "good friends," the exact number depending on the manner in which best friends, close friends, and good friends are identified

Support for preparation of this chapter was provided by the Rodney S. Wallace Endowment, College of Education, University of Minnesota.

 © Jossey-Bass Publishers

and distinguished (Crockett, Losoff, and Petersen, 1984). Best friends are usually assumed by adolescents to involve mutual attraction, and almost no one admits to not having a best friend, even on anonymous questionnaires. Self-reported best friends are most numerous in early adolescence, averaging between four and five, with this number gradually declining thereafter (Reisman and Shorr, 1978). But stable, reciprocated friendships (mutual choices lasting a year or more) are rarer, characterizing only about one-third of high school students according to one account (Epstein, 1983). Friendships are thus ubiquitous in the teenage culture, although we must recognize that more individuals report that they are involved in reciprocated friendships than actually are.

Contact among best friends usually occurs on a daily basis, and, among American teenagers, these contacts consume several hours each day (Csikszentmihalyi and Larson, 1984). Fewer than 10 percent of American adolescents have no regular contact with their friends outside school. Behavior with friends varies enormously, consisting mostly of "socializing," that is, talking on the telephone (girls more than boys), hanging out, cruising, and having fun. Among adolescents in other cultures (for example, Japan), contacts among friends are not as frequent or as time-consuming as they are among American teenagers (Savin-Williams and Berndt, 1990).

Cliques and Crowds. Friendships are dyadic. Adolescents use the phrase "my friends" to refer to a superordinate entity consisting of more than one of these relationships. Actually, "my friends" refers to an aggregate that includes one's best friends, close friends, and good friends (and perhaps *their* friends as well). These aggregates, sometimes called *cliques* or *networks*, are important structural elements in the adolescent social world and are as ubiquitous as friendships (Brown, 1989). Sometimes normative pressure from a best friend is concordant with normative pressure extending across the social network, but sometimes not. For this reason, what "my friends" think is not a proxy for what "my best friend" thinks, and the research literature must be read in this light.

Larger and looser aggregates, called *crowds*, are also evident in adolescent social relations. Sometimes crowds are regarded as collections of cliques (Dunphy, 1963), sometimes as aggregations of individuals from overlapping cliques who share certain norms (Brown, 1989) such as investment in athletics (the sporties), school achievement (the debaters), or antisocial behavior (the toughs). Even though consensus is not evident concerning the best way to describe these higher-order aggregates, one point is certain: Neither friendship functioning nor social networks can be understood without reference to them.

Cliques and crowds characterize nearly all adolescent societies (at least in the West), but their specific contours very according to community, ethnic, and historical contexts. Generally, the peer pressure associated with both cliques and crowds is multidimensional (encompasses more than a single social norm) and multidirectional (encompasses both socially sanctioned and unsanctioned norms). Pressure varies, too, with age and crowd affiliation (Brown, 1989).

At present, investigators do not have very good models with which to represent the individual adolescent within a hierarchical structure consisting of dyads, cliques, and crowds. Accordingly, we rarely consider adolescent behavior simultaneously in relation to these three contexts. Friendship relations receive more attention than either cliques or crowds probably because dyadic entities seem easier to study than polyadic ones and because most adolescents seem more invested in proximal than in distal social relations. But friendships and their significance in adolescent development cannot be appreciated out of context. Moreover, significant variation among teenagers can be traced to each of these contexts separately. For example, concordance in antisocial attitudes exists between two adolescent best friends (Kandel, 1978b), but similar concordance also exists among adolescents who "hang around together" (Cairns and others, 1988; Dishion, 1990b).

Summary. Friendships are among the most prominent features of the social landscape during adolescence. Although most teenagers consider themselves to have best friends, reciprocated friendship choices are not as common as adolescents claim. What it means to "have a friend," or, conversely, to be "friendless," varies according to the method used to identify these relationships. Cliques and crowds are other features of adolescent socialization that affect the manner in which friendships function. Currently, the interconnections among friendships, clique membership, and crowd membership are not well specified.

Friendship Stability

Friendships vary considerably in their stability. Some last for a long time, others for much shorter periods.

Beginnings, Middles, and Ends. Most friendships have beginnings, middles, and ends. Relatively little is known about the progression from one "stage" to another except that tremendous variation exists across relationships. Some friendships move quickly from beginning to end, others undergo lengthy "buildups"; some are short-lived and others long-lived. These variations are well recognized but seldom studied. Friendship dissolution occurs for myriad reasons. Personal characteristics (for example, emotional difficulties) are sometimes accompanied by friendship instability or friendlessness (Rutter and Garmezy, 1983). Relationship conditions (for example, a decreased sense of "common ground" or emotional support) may lead to friendship dissolution (Bukowski, Newcomb, and Hoza, 1987). Dissimilar attitudes toward important issues in the teenage culture also dispose toward breakup. Finally, exogenous factors may bring about friendship terminations, for example, school transitions (Berndt and Hawkins, 1991) and high school graduations (Shaver, Furman, and Buhrmester,

1985). Sometimes, the breakup is foreseeable: Unstable friends (who will eventually terminate their relationships) talk more frequently about disloyalty and lack of intimacy than do stable friends; they also report fewer contacts with one another (Berndt, Hawkins, and Hoyle, 1986).

How Stable? Although some adolescent friendships terminate, most are relatively stable across time—clearly more stable than the friendships of elementary school children. Some investigators have found that both stability and reciprocity increase from early to late adolescence (Epstein, 1983), whereas others have reported that stability reaches a peak in preadolescence, increasing only a small amount thereafter (Berndt, 1982). Most adolescents in reciprocated friendships, however, report that their relationships have lasted for substantial lengths of time (Crockett, Losoff, and Petersen, 1984); various studies show that the percentage of these relationships that last at least a year ranges upward to 70 percent (Berndt, Hawkins, and Hoyle, 1986). These data suggest that adolescent friendships are far from ephemeral entities.

Since numerous conditions bring about friendship dissolution, it is not surprising to discover that friendship stability is multidetermined. For example, adolescents who have both positive attitudes about their relationships and frequent contacts prior to school transitions are likely to remain friends afterward (Berndt and Hawkins, 1991). Friendship stability thus reflects both how well the relationship "works" and whether or not the two individuals continue to spend time with one another.

Summary. Adolescent friendships are relatively stable. When they fail, friendships are terminated for both endogenous and exogenous reasons. In some instances, the common ground supporting the relationship simply dissolves; in other instances, school or family transitions lead to the termination. In most cases, the stability or instability of these relationships is determined by more than one condition.

Conditions of Friendship

Friendships are based on reciprocity and commitment between individuals who see themselves more or less as equals. In this context, reciprocity implies mutuality in orientations and feelings. But "being friends" also implies a special sensitivity and responsibility for one another; in this sense, friendships are committed or communal relationships (Clark, Mills, and Corcoran, 1989; Collins and Repinski, in press). And friends interact on an equal power base; friendships are thus egalitarian relationships. These three friendship conditions—reciprocity, commitment, and egalitarianism—are first fully understood and appreciated during the adolescent years.

Reciprocity. Among young children, friendship expectations center on common activities and concrete reciprocities. Preschool children, for example, understand that friends share food with one another, whereas this norm does not extend to those who are not friends (Birch and Billman, 1986).

Among young children, friendship expectations center on common activities and concrete reciprocities. Common activities also undergird friendship relations in middle childhood, and adolescents expect to spend time with their friends and share activities too. But between middle childhood and middle adolescence, psychological sharing (intimacy) begins to assume significance in friendship relations (Bigelow and LaGaipa, 1980).

Intimacy differentiates middle childhood from adolescence more sharply than any other aspect of friendship relations. Indeed, the emergence of a need for intimacy (sharing thoughts and feelings with someone else) has long been regarded as the social threshold of adolescence (Sullivan, 1953). Empirical studies show that comments about shared feelings and self-disclosure appear initially in descriptions of friends during the transition to adolescence and increase steadily thereafter (Berndt, 1982; Bigelow and LaGaipa, 1980; Furman and Bierman, 1984; Furman and Buhrmester, 1992). When asked, in one investigation, to describe their relationships with their best friends in terms of self-disclosure and exchange of intimate information (for example, "I know how she feels about things without her telling me"), agreement with such statements increased between the ages of eleven and seventeen among both girls and boys (Sharabany, Gershoni, and Hofman, 1981). Manifestations of intimacy showing the greatest change with age were frankness and spontaneity, knowing and sensitivity, attachment, exclusiveness, and giving and sharing. Adolescents also expect friends, more frequently than anyone else, to meet their intimacy needs (Furman and Buhrmester, 1985).

Boys and girls both recognize that girls' relationships are more intimate than boys' (Bukowski and Kramer, 1986). Girls' assessments of their friendships show greater increases in intimacy from early to late adolescence (Sharabany, Gershoni, and Hofman, 1981); they report more frequent occurrences of self-disclosure (Rivenbark, 1971) and spend more time with their friends, on average, than do boys (Wong and Csikszentmihalyi, 1991). Some researchers have suggested that these differences may be more a matter of style than substance (Buhrmester and Furman, 1987); others have reported that the differences may reflect the greater variability of intimate behavior among boys than among girls. Youniss and Smollar (1985), for example, found that most girls describe their friendships in terms of shared activities, mutual intimacy, and understanding, whereas about 40 percent of boys describe their friendships similarly. Only about 30 percent of male relationships with friends, though, were described as guarded in communication and lacking in mutual understanding. Thus, developmental changes in intimacy must be considered against a background of sex and gender.

Adolescents and their friends thus clearly interact on the basis of reciprocity. Common interests and activities are important; intimacy is expected. Friendship expectations undergo considerable change across the transition to adolescence, but whether these changes represent cognitive

elaborations of one core construct such as reciprocity (Youniss, 1980), structural transformations in the child's understanding of social relation- ships (Selman, 1980), or increased differentiation among relationships (Berndt and Perry, 1986; Collins and Repinski, in press) is not clear. The evidence suggests, however, that reciprocity undergirds friendship relations throughout childhood and adolescence, at the same time that the specific friendship expectations of adolescents differ from those characterizing children.

Commitment. When asked to describe their best friends (or ideal friends), both younger and older adolescents almost always mention loyalty and commitment: "A friend is a person that sticks by you when all the troubles come," and "Friends don't drop you as soon as something goes wrong" (Goodnow and Burns, 1988). Commitment is also cited by adoles- cents as a condition for friendship, and disloyalty is commonly the reason given for termination of a friendship. Children, in contrast, seldom mention commitment in their descriptions of best friends and seldom mention com- mitment issues in relation to either the strengthening or weakening of these relationships (Bigelow and LaGaipa, 1980).

Relatively little is known about the origins of social commitment, but its importance is apparent in the extent to which related constructs such as genu- ineness, loyalty, trust, and "being real" appear among friendship expectations. Collins and Repinski (in press) suggest that trust is one condition that attracts individuals to one another and enhances commitment. But where does trust come from? Theoretically, trust can be both a determinant and an outcome of social interaction. On the one hand, an individual's consistency and sensitivity elicit attributions by others of sincerity, truthfulness, and constancy. On the other hand, trust emerges when two individuals discover through cooperation that they can depend and rely on each other according to consensual norms (Youniss, 1980; Rotenberg and Pilipenko, 1983–1984). Trust is correlated with the quality of communication existing between adolescent friends (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987), and its appearance in adolescent friendship expectations has been linked to the greater stability of friendships among adolescents than among children (Hartup, 1992). Relatively little else, however, is known about this important friendship condition.

Conflict management is salient in the commitments of adolescent friends. Conflicts between friends are recognized as inevitable, but adoles- cents believe that friends have a special commitment to each other in managing conflicts: "A good friend is someone you fight with, but not forever" (Goodnow and Burns, 1988). Once again, effective conflict manage- ment is more than a friendship by-product: Effective management seems to be necessary to the continuation of these relationships and to the satisfaction that one receives from them. Accordingly, adolescents use negotiation rather than power assertion in managing their disagreements with friends, an ordering that differs from the ordering of strategies employed with parents (see Laursen, this volume, Chapter Three).

Conflicts and conflict resolutions are recognized by adolescents as events that sometimes strengthen friendships (Selman, 1980), but, generally, these relationships are seen as delicate balances of exchange in which self- interest must be weighed against consideration for the other, and conflict weighed against cooperation. Conflict management also differs between friends and nonfriends among younger children; age differences have not been directly assessed except in children's understanding of rules and responsibilities in conflicts with friends (Selman, 1980).

Equality. Peer relations are generally understood by children and adolescents to be structured horizontally rather than vertically; socializing is egalitarian, in contrast to the complementary interaction that marks relations with adults (Youniss, 1980). Consequently, both school-aged children and adolescents perceive themselves as having more power in relationships with same-sex friends than in relationships with adults (Furman, 1989). At the same time, the power base existing between same- sex friends is *not* regarded as exactly equal until midadolescence. Ratings, obtained using 5-point scales ranging from "they always [have the most power]" to "I always [have the most power]," showed that ten- and thirteen-year-olds perceived themselves as having a bit *less* power than their friends, whereas exact equivalence was evidenced only among six- teen- and nineteen-year-olds. This age difference was relatively small, but significant nevertheless. These results suggest that children and younger adolescents perceive themselves as yielding to their friends more than vice versa, whereas older adolescents do not. This interpretation is consistent with earlier results showing that conformity to peer pressure generally declines across the adolescent years (Costanzo and Shaw, 1966).

Power imbalances have important implications within relationships in that strategies for conflict resolution are related directly to them. For example, Cowan, Drinkard, and MacGavin (1984) showed that preferred modes of resolving conflicts varied according to perceived differences in relative power between competitors: With friends, both children and adoles- cents preferred negotiation and bargaining (strategies that always predomi- nate when competitors are equally powerful), whereas, with adults, submission was more likely (the usual strategy when one competitor perceives himself or herself to be less powerful than the other).

Summary. The main conditions that support friendships among adoles- cents are reciprocity, commitment, and equality. Similar conditions support friendships among younger children, but specific manifestations differ from those supporting these relationships among adolescents.

Similarities Among Friends

Friends are similar to one another in many respects. These similarities, however, occur for several reasons.

Demographic Concordances. Adolescent friends are similar in age, race,

sex, and social class. Within school grades, age concordances are not especially noteworthy, but, within schools, they are very evident. Racial concordances are also strong, and more extensive in adolescence than in middle childhood (Asher, Singleton, and Taylor, 1988). Concordances in social class are relatively constant from early to late adolescence (Epstein, 1983).

The most clear-cut concordance among adolescent friends relates to sex (see Hartup, 1983). Friendships (especially best friends) are same-sex relationships virtually by definition, so cross-sex friendships are rare. Actually, cross-sex friendships, as distinguished from romantic relationships, account for only about 5 percent of friendships in early to middle adolescence. Romantic relationships, of course, become increasingly common, but the frequency of boy-girl best friendships remains about the same as in middle childhood. Only by late adolescence does this concordance decline; Epstein (1983) reported gender concordances to be a bit more than .90 between grades six and nine, falling to about .70 among high school seniors.

Behavioral Concordances. Behavioral concordances between friends are not as strong as demographic concordances but are nevertheless appreciable. Adolescents are most similar to their friends in two general areas: (1) school-related attitudes, aspirations, and achievement (Epstein, 1983; Kandel, 1978b), and (2) attitudes and behaviors that are significant in the contemporary teenage culture, such as smoking, drinking, drug use, dating, and church attendance (Kandel, 1978b; Epstein, 1983; Karweit, 1983; Urberg, Halliday-Scher, and Tolson, 1991). Personality characteristics and social attitudes are not very concordant; friends are generally dissimilar in self-esteem, sociability, and closeness to parents. Concordances in intelligence are also not strong (Kandel, 1978b).

Similarities among friends are not greatly different for boys and girls. Boys are somewhat more likely than girls to be discordant in social class (Epstein, 1983), but, otherwise, male-female differences in these concordances occur mainly in sexual activity. Among eighth-, ninth-, and tenth-grade girls (both black and white) in the United States, friends were found to be similar in sexual behavior and attitudes, even when age and antisocial attitudes were taken into account. Among boys in these same grades, however, sexual activity (especially sexual intercourse) was not strongly concordant (Billy, Rodgers, and Udry, 1984). The reasons for this sex difference are not clear, although sexual intercourse is more directly related to social reputation among girls than it is among boys. Reputational differences, together with the greater readiness of females to engage in self-disclosure, may account for this sex difference.

Homophiletic Processes. Similarities among friends derive from three main sources: demographic homophilies, selective homophilies, and mutual socialization. Certain similarities result, first, from the manner in which the adolescent social world is organized. Demographic forces, for example, determine the segregation of neighborhoods and schools by social class and race, attitudes and abilities, norms and values. Schools are also age-graded. These demographic realities mean that adolescents have more opportunities for contact with other adolescents who are similar rather than dissimilar to themselves in age, sex, race, and social class. But social class concordances in friendship choice are somewhat reduced when schools are "highly participatory" (that is, when students all know one another and engage in many different activities) (Epstein, 1983). Racial concordances are also somewhat reduced in desegregated as compared to segregated schools (Schofield, 1982).

Similarities among friends also derive from the well-known human tendency for choosing close associates who resemble oneself (Berscheid and Walster, 1969). Socializing with a similar individual is more stimulating and rewarding than socializing with someone whose interests are vastly different; equity and reciprocity in social interaction are more likely; emotional support and consensual validation are more forthcoming; conflict and contention are minimized. Friends are never completely homomorphic, of course, and the importance of differences in friendship functioning should not be ignored, even though there is substantial evidence that friends are similar to one another.

Similarities among friends do not tell us whether adolescents select one another on the basis of similarity or whether they become similar through mutual socialization; cross-sectional data do not disentangle selection and socialization effects. Longitudinal studies reveal, however, that similarities among friends derive from both sources. Kandel (1978a), for example, found that changes in behavior over the course of a school year (in drug use, educational aspirations, involvement in delinquency) stemmed from both selection and socialization, in approximately equal amounts. Other studies have shown that friends socialize one another in their attitudes toward school and academic achievement (Epstein, 1983), sexual behavior (Billy and Udry, 1985), and use of alcohol and cigarettes (Fisher and Baumann, 1988). Relative contributions of selection and socialization to similarities among friends, however, are not always clear in these studies. One exception is that selection seems to be more important than socialization in cigarette and alcohol use (Fisher and Baumann, 1988). Such variations mean that the relative contribution of selection and socialization to friendship relations must be estimated separately for each attribute.

Summary. Friends are notably similar in sex, age, race, and social class. Behavioral similarities are most evident in educational and other normative attitudes. Friends select one another on the basis of these similarities but also socialize one another so as to become even more similar over time.

Friendships and Social Adaptation

The significance of adolescent friendships extends beyond their ubiquity. Many investigators have argued that "having friends" amounts to a develop

mental imperative: Good developmental outcomes depend on having friends and keeping them, friendships furnish the individual with socialization opportunities not easily obtained elsewhere (including experiences in intimacy and conflict management), and these relationships are important in emotion regulation, in self-understanding, and in formation and functioning of subsequent relationships (including romantic relationships). Folk wisdom, however, argues that people are known by the company they keep, suggesting that one's friends may exert negative as well as positive influences. There is also considerable research evidence of these influences. Consequently, *having friends*, the *identity of one's friends*, and the *quality of one's friendships* must be regarded as different variables with different developmental implications. These dimensions in friendship relations are addressed separately in the following sections.

Having Friends. Children who are disliked by other children are at risk in general, mostly for antisocial behavior in adolescence and early adulthood and for early school leaving (Parker and Asher, 1987). Being disliked and being without friends, however, are different attributes, even though rejected children have fewer friends than do popular children (Bukowski and Hoza, 1989). Estimates vary, but between 10 percent and 20 percent of rejected children and adolescents actually have friends (Hartup, 1992).

Correlational studies demonstrate that children who have reciprocated friendships are more socially competent than are children who do not. They evidence more mature perspective taking (Jones and Bowling, 1988), enter groups more easily, engage in more cooperative play, are more sociable, and have fewer difficulties with other children (Howes, 1989). School-aged children who have been referred to guidance clinics are more likely to be friendless than are nonreferred children, and, when they have them, their friendships are less stable over time (Rutter and Garmezy, 1983). Among adolescents, those with stable friendships are more altruistic than those without them (Mannarino, 1976); self-esteem is also greater (Mannarino, 1978; Bukowski, Newcomb, and Hoza, 1987). Friendless children and adolescents, in contrast, report loneliness and depression (Asher, Hymel, and Renshaw, 1984).

Correlational results are difficult to interpret. Having friends may enhance social adaptation, but the reverse may also be true. Alternatively, being sociable and having friends may derive from a common source, such as good social relationships in early childhood. Longitudinal studies assist in disentangling these effects, and research with both children and adolescents suggests that having friends contributes constructively to social adjustment. With data collected from fourth and fifth graders over a one-year interval, Bukowski, Hoza, and Newcomb (1991) showed that having friends was causally related to self-esteem but not to the children's attributions about their own social skills. Being liked (being popular), however, was causally related to self-reports about social competence but not to self-esteem. Self-

worth thus appears to depend on having friends, while self-perceptions of social competence depend on being popular. Concordantly, disturbances in self-concept and social adjustment that are generally associated with school transitions during adolescence are reduced when school changes occur in the company of good friends (Simmons, Burgeson, and Reef, 1988).

Having friends may also contribute to romantic and sexual socialization. First, "having friends" as well as "having a friend to confide in" between the ages of nine and twelve were reported significantly more often by undergraduate students who had a sexual experience in childhood *with another child* than by students who did not report an experience of this kind (Haugaard and Tilly, 1988). Since most of these friendships were same-sex and most of the sexual encounters were cross-sex, these data suggest that friendships are significant in sexual socialization. But "having friends" and "having a childhood sexual experience" may both reflect some common source of variance such as self-esteem or social attractiveness, so a causal connection between them cannot be inferred. Longitudinal data, however, show that having friends between eight and twelve years of age forecasts romantic relationships between fourteen and seventeen years of age, and having a same-sex friend between fourteen and seventeen forecasts having a romantic relationship between eighteen and twenty-three (Neeman, Hubbard, and Kojetin, 1991). Note that significant correlations occurred in only one direction; same-sex friendships forecast romantic relationships, but not the reverse. Consequently, Sullivan's (1953) notions that same-sex relationships facilitate the formation and functioning of cross-sex relationships may be correct. Whether or not friendships are stepping-stones to gay and lesbian relationships is not known.

Research data suggest, then, that having a best friend is causally linked to a good developmental outcome. Friendship quality, however, was not differentiated in the studies cited above. Most likely, in these investigations, having a friend amounted to having a *good, supportive* friend, a confounding that makes it difficult to tell whether the sheer existence of these relationships or their qualities account for the outcomes noted. Friendships are not all alike, and other studies have demonstrated that who one's friends are and what these relationships are like also determine developmental outcomes.

The Company They Keep. Similarities among adolescent friends increase over time, which suggests that the company one keeps bears directly on social adjustment. Socialization effects have been demonstrated for smoking and drinking, drug use, and delinquency, as well as for educational aspirations and achievement. Taken together, these results suggest that children and adolescents who behave more-or-less normatively contribute positively to the socialization of their friends, whereas others may contribute negatively.

Several data sets reveal these dynamics clearly: Ball (1981) reported that among teenagers in lower-ranking academic streams in British schools, many

individuals contributed negatively to the school success of their friends through their disruptiveness and general disinterest in school. Friends were more positive influences in higher-ranking streams, given that they were more likely to discourage disruptive, distracting behaviors and to encourage achievement. Actually, these results highlight two friendship issues: First, friends contribute either positively or negatively to adolescent socialization. Second, societal forces (for example, streaming) frequently restrict friendship opportunities to individuals who resemble one another. As mentioned earlier, friendships derive only partly from choice: Whether two individuals become friends depends on their opportunity to meet, and which individuals meet depends on the organization of the social world.

Friendship networks as well as friendship dyads demonstrate the importance of the company that one keeps. For example, aggressiveness distinguishes children who "hang around together," beginning among boys in middle childhood and becoming evident among both sexes by early adolescence (Cairns and others, 1988). Antisocial behavior (and its more deviant forms) increases among network members who are attracted to one another originally because of shared interests in antisocial activities. Actually, antisocial adolescents originate in families in which parents do not use discipline effectively or monitor their children closely (Dishion, 1990a). Such family circumstances establish children as "troublesome," which, in turn, reduces their attractiveness to others and increases the likelihood that their friends will be antisocial (Snyder, Dishion, and Patterson, 1986). Marijuana use among adolescents also seems to derive from a causal chain that begins with poor parenting, extends to the selection of friends who engage in marijuana use and other delinquent behaviors, and then involves further socialization in deviant behavior (Kandel and Andrews, 1987). Conversely, among adolescents who are at risk for antisocial behavior, "desisting" is predicted more strongly by a turning away from antisocial friends than by any other variable (Mulvey and Aber, 1988). Network socialization among adolescent friends thus resembles "shopping" or "foraging" for companions with whom there is common ground and mutual reinforcement that will sustain the network and the normative behaviors that bind its members together (Patterson and Bank, 1989).

This "shopping" model may not apply in the same way in every circumstance. In Steinberg, Dornbusch, and Brown's (1992) investigation, the academic performance of white, African American, Asian American, and Hispanic American adolescents was studied in relation to support for achievement provided by parents and friends. Students in every group whose families and friends supported academic achievement performed better than those who received support from only one source. But cultural variations were evident in the manner in which family relations and peer pressure were correlated with achievement. Among white youngsters, "authoritative" parent-child relations (that is, firm discipline, warmth, high standards) were

common, disposing the children toward friendship networks that, in turn, encouraged academic success. For reasons not completely understood, however, no correlation existed between parenting practices and network affiliation among the minority students. Dynamics differed across ethnic groups: Among Asian American students, generally strong support for achievement from friends tended to offset generally negative consequences of authoritarian parenting; among African American students, generally weak support for academic achievement from friends undermined the positive effects of authoritative parenting; and Hispanic American students suffered from a combination of both parenting and friendship influences, neither of which disposed the students toward academic achievement.

The company they keep, then, has major significance in adolescents' socialization. One's friends are determined on the basis of a synergy involving both family and peer experiences as well as the organization of the adolescent social world. Different causal models may be needed, however, to describe this synergy across different cultures and for different norms.

Friendship Qualities. Some friendships are secure and smooth-sailing; others are rocky with disagreement and contention. Some friends describe their relationships as supportive and intimate; others describe theirs as rivalrous and absent of intimacy. Qualitative differences such as these are closely related to social and emotional adjustment during the teenage years: The belief that one's friends are not supportive is associated with depression and other symptomatology, especially among girls (Compas, Slavin, Wagner, and Cannatta, 1986; Feldman, Rubenstein, and Rubin, 1988), psychological and school-related problems (Kurdek and Sinclair, 1988), negative perceptions by classmates (Berndt and Hawkins, 1991), lower self-esteem (Mannarino, 1976; McGuire and Weisz, 1982), and less favorable self-perceptions of scholastic, athletic, and social competence than found when friends are considered supportive (Perry, 1987). Adolescents who perceive their friendships as supportive are more likely to be popular and considered socially competent than are adolescents with less supportive friendships (Cauce, 1986); they are also more strongly motivated to achieve, are more involved in school, have higher achievement test scores, receive higher grades, and exhibit fewer behavioral problems (Berndt and Hawkins, 1991; Cauce, 1986).

Once again, correlational findings are difficult to interpret. Satisfying friendships, for example, may constitute rose-colored glasses through which the entire world seems beautiful, as opposed to the darker glasses constituted by unsatisfying friendships. Alternatively, supportive relationships may assist adolescents in stress management and problem solving, thereby enhancing social adjustment. Or good social relations and good social adjustment may simply both be manifestations of general sociability.

Here, too, longitudinal studies assist the disentangling of effects: Berndt and Keefe (1992) asked teenagers in the fall and the spring of a school year about positive and negative qualities in their friendships (for example, emo-

tional support and intimacy, as well as conflicts and rivalry). School involvement and conduct were rated by both the children and their teachers; grades were also studied. Correlations between friendship quality and school adjustment were calculated separately during the fall and the spring and showed again that good friendships and good school adjustment go hand in hand. Most important, regression analyses showed that students whose friendships were most intimate and supportive in the fall became increasingly involved in school, whereas those whose friendships were marred by conflict and rivalry became more disruptive and progressively less involved in school. Qualitative features of these relationships thus forecast *changes* in school adjustment. So, while supportive friendships and good school adjustment may each reflect adolescent adaptation separately, the evidence suggests that friendship quality also directly affects academic attitudes. Whether these effects extend to areas other than school adjustment is not known; additional studies are required before more can be said about friendships and their developmental significance.

Summary. Existing evidence suggests that having friends and having supportive friends are associated with two outcome clusters: (1) feeling good about oneself, feeling socially connected, and being positive (nondepressed) in outlook, and (2) being successful in subsequent relationships, especially romantic ones. The mechanisms responsible for the correlation between having friends and behavioral outcome have not been clearly established, so the findings may mean little more than that good self-attitudes are reflected in good relationships, and vice versa. But other interpretations are plausible; for example, supportive interactions with friends probably furnish adolescents with the kind of feedback and reinforcement needed for generating self-esteem. At the same time, these transactions can serve as exemplars for other relationships, with members of both the same and the opposite sex. According to this interpretation, friendship experience contributes mainly to self-attitudes and "relationship potential" rather than to general sociability or social competence.

The company one keeps (who one's friends are) contributes to adolescent socialization, too, but mainly to the kinds of norms that one internalizes, not to self-esteem or capacities for forming and maintaining relationships. Antisocial friends are likely to be antisocial influences; prosocial friends are likely to be prosocial influences. Both antisocial and prosocial friends can thus contribute positively to social adaptation as long as friendships are supportive and smooth-running. But this state of affairs also means that adolescent friendships may be both "protective" and "risk" factors—at one and the same time.

New Directions

Current research extends beyond the interest of adolescents in their friends and beyond what they expect of them. There are at least four cutting-edge

issues to which investigators need to turn their attention: models for demonstrating developmental significance, processes by which friends socialize one another, qualitative differentiation among adolescent friendships, and cultural diversity in their dynamics and implications.

Developmental Models. One of the most promising new directions in research on children and adolescents is the increased effort to understand the concatenations within families and within friendship relations that together determine the course of social and emotional development. Until recently, family relations and friendship relations were regarded as nearly separate sources of variation in developmental outcome, and friendships were believed to carry relatively little weight. New models and methods, however, are challenging these notions. On the one hand, investigators are specifying the affective and cognitive processes that tie family and friendship experiences together in adolescent development. On the other hand, investigators are examining the causal chains in which family socialization constrains friendship relations, which, in turn, affect the behavior of the individual adolescent. Research in behavioral genetics is also part of this investigative effort, since individual differences in both cooperation and aggression do not seem to be completely determined by environmental variations. Different developmental models, compared and contrasted using complex quantitative methods, are being used. The work thus far indicates that having friends, the company one keeps, and friendship quality each belong in these equations, but much more needs to be done.

Modes of Social Influence. Most theories accounting for the socialization that occurs among friends are little more than theories of conformity, that is, theories dealing with group pressures and the individual's reactions to them (Berndt and Savin-Williams, in press). Social influences among friends are seldom examined as mutual, dyadic, dynamic entities. We must give greater attention to coercion, compliance, and conflict resolution, as well as to reinforcement and support in friendship interaction, considering always that these processes are dyadically regulated and occur in a time series. Finally, we seldom recognize that friends interact within higher-order social structures in which group decision making and other group interactions occur (Berndt and Savin-Williams, in press; Hinde, 1992). We still lack good models to account for the manner in which dyadic interaction between friends is moderated by the social networks to which each individual belongs, and this deficiency must be corrected. Distinctions also must be made between social influences deriving from "my best friend" and those deriving from "my friends." Relatively little is known about this entire range of processes, and relevant studies have not yet been conducted.

Friendship Qualities. One of the most significant recent advances in research dealing with adolescent friendships is the discovery that these relationships are not all alike. Considerable progress has been made in differentiating among them. Using factor analysis, Berndt and Perry (1986) discovered that the simple differentiation of "positive" and "negative"

relationship features greatly assists the study of the correlates and developmental significance of friendships, among both children and adolescents. Scales are also available for differentiating among these relationships in terms of intimacy (Sharabany, Gershoni, and Hofman, 1981) and closeness (Repinski, 1992). Distinctions have also been drawn between interdependent and disengaged relationships (Shulman, this volume). But these are preliminary refinements. Friendships vary along many other dimensions, including security, diversity, the balance of power within them, and commitment (Hinde, 1979; Hartup and Sancilio, 1986). More thorough descriptions of friendships thus remain an important research objective.

Cultural Diversity. The research community still does not fully recognize that friendship processes may vary in terms of cultural and ethnic contexts. Studies have already shown that the combined influences of families and friends on academic achievement during adolescence are different across ethnic groups (Steinberg, Dornbusch, and Brown, 1992). Whatever our progress in race relations over the past forty years in the United States, adolescent societies remain segregated; the vast majority of adolescent friendships involve youngsters of the same race. Social attraction, social influence, and the social implications of adolescent friendships may be similar across ethnic groups in some ways but are undoubtedly different in other ways. At present, what we know about friendships and their developmental significance derives mainly from studies of white children and adolescents. But now that we are aware of the central role of friendship relations in social development and adaptation, some of the newly available federal funds for normative research on minority children and adolescents should be committed to the investigation of cultural diversity.

Conclusion

Current data suggest that the developmental significance of adolescent friendships extends beyond their ubiquity. The conditions giving rise to these relationships—reciprocity, commitment, and equality—are understood differently by children and by adolescents, and the stability of these relationships varies accordingly. Recent studies indicate that three dimensions of adolescent friendships affect the course of the individual's development: having friends, who one's friends are, and the quality of the friendship. The influences of family and friends combine to determine developmental outcomes, but much remains to be learned about these synergies, especially as they are played out during adolescence. Dyadic processes, through which friends influence each other, must be better conceptualized, friendship qualities must be more precisely differentiated, and cultural differences in friendship dynamics must be better documented. The active pursuit of these objectives in the years ahead promises to be fruitful.

References

Armsden, G. C., and Greenberg, M. T. "The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment: Individual Differences and Their Relationship to Psychological Well-being in Adolescence." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence,* 1987, *16,* 427–454.

Asher, S. R., Hymel, S., and Renshaw, P. D. "Loneliness in Children." *Child Development,* 1984, *55,* 1456–1464.

Asher, S. R., Singleton, L. C., and Taylor, A. R. "Acceptance Versus Friendship: A Longitudinal Study of Racial Integration." Unpublished manuscript, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, 1988.

Ball, S. J. *Beachside Comprehensive.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Berndt, T. J. "The Features and Effects of Friendship in Early Adolescence." *Child Development,* 1982, *53,* 1447–1460.

Berndt, T. J., and Hawkins, J. A. "Effects of Friendship on Adolescents' Adjustment to Junior High School." Unpublished manuscript, Psychological Sciences, Purdue University, 1991.

Berndt, T. J., Hawkins, J. A., and Hoyle, S. G. "Changes in Friendship During a School Year: Effects on Children's and Adolescents' Impressions of Friendship and Sharing with Friends." *Child Development,* 1986, *57,* 1284–1297.

Berndt, T. J., and Keefe, K. "Friends' Influence on Adolescents' Perceptions of Themselves at School." In D. H. Schunk and J. L. Meece (eds.), *Student Perceptions in the Classroom.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1992.

Berndt, T. J., and Perry, T. B. "Children's Perceptions of Friendships as Supportive Relationships." *Developmental Psychology,* 1986, *22,* 640–648.

Berndt, T. J., and Savin-Williams, R. C. "Variations in Friendships and Peer-Group Relationships in Adolescence." In P. Tolan and B. Cohler (eds.), *Handbook of Clinical Research and Practice with Adolescents.* New York: Wiley, in press.

Berscheid, E., and Walster, E. *Interpersonal Attraction.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Bigelow, B. J., and LaGaipa, J. J. "The Development of Friendship Values and Choice." In H. C. Foot, A. J. Chapman, and J. R. Smith (eds.), *Friendship and Social Relations in Children.* New York: Wiley, 1980.

Billy, J.O.G., Rodgers, J. L., and Udry, J. R. "Adolescent Sexual Behavior and Friendship Choice." *Social Forces,* 1984, *62,* 653–678.

Billy, J.O.G., and Udry, J. R. "The Influence of Male and Female Best Friends on Adolescent Sexual Behavior." *Adolescence,* 1985, *20,* 21–32.

Birch, L. L., and Billman, J. "Preschool Children's Food Sharing with Friends and Acquaintances." *Child Development,* 1986, *57,* 387–395.

Brown, B. B. "The Role of Peer Groups in Adolescents' Adjustment to Secondary School." In T. J. Berndt and G. W. Ladd (eds.), *Peer Relationships in Child Development.* New York: Wiley, 1989.

Buhrmester, D., and Furman, W. "The Development of Companionship and Intimacy." *Child Development,* 1987, *58,* 1101–1113.

Bukowski, W. M., and Hoza, B. "Popularity and Friendship: Issues in Theory, Measurement, and Outcome." In T. J. Berndt and G. W. Ladd (eds.), *Peer Relationships in Child Development.* New York: Wiley, 1989.

Bukowski, W. M., Hoza, B., and Newcomb, A. F. "Friendship, Popularity, and the 'Self' During Early Adolescence." Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, Concordia University, 1991.

Bukowski, W. M., and Kramer, T. L. "Judgments of the Features of Friendship Among Early Adolescent Boys and Girls." *Journal of Early Adolescence,* 1986, *6,* 331–338.

Bukowski, W. M., Newcomb, A. F., and Hoza, B. "Friendship Conceptions Among Early Adolescents: A Longitudinal Study of Stability and Change." *Journal of Early Adolescence,* 1987, *7,* 143–152.

Cairns, R. B., Cairns, B. D., Neckerman, H. J., Gest, S., and Garieppy, J. L. "Peer Networks and Aggressive Behavior: Peer Support or Peer Rejection?" *Developmental Psychology,* 1988, *24,* 815–823.

Cauce, A. M. "Social Networks and Social Competence: Exploring the Effects of Early Adolescent Friendships." *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 1986, *14,* 607–628.

Clark, M. S., Mills, J. R., and Corcoran, D. M. "Keeping Track of Needs and Inputs of Friends and Strangers." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 1989, *15,* 533–542.

Collins, W. A., and Repinski, D. J. "Relationships During Adolescence: Continuity and Change in Interpersonal Perspective." In R. Montemayor, G. R. Adams, and T. P. Gullotta (eds.), *Advances in Adolescent Development.* Vol. 5: *Personal Relationships During Adolescence.* Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, in press.

Compas, B. E., Slavin, L. A., Wagner, B. M., and Cannatta, K. "Relationship of Life Events and Social Support with Psychological Dysfunction Among Adolescents." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence,* 1986, *15,* 205–221.

Costanzo, P. R., and Shaw, M. E. "Conformity as a Function of Age Level." *Child Development,* 1966, *37,* 967–975.

Cowan, G., Drinkard, J., and MacGavin, L. "The Effects of Target, Age, and Gender on Use of Power Strategies." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1984, *47,* 1391–1398.

Crockett, L., Losoff, M., and Petersen, A. C. "Perceptions of the Peer Group and Friendship in Early Adolescence." *Journal of Early Adolescence,* 1984, *4,* 155–181.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., and Larson, R. *Being Adolescent.* New York: Basic Books, 1984.

Dishion, T. J. "The Family Ecology of Boys' Peer Relations in Middle Childhood." *Child Development,* 1990a, *61,* 874–892.

Dishion, T. J. "The Peer Context of Troublesome Child and Adolescent Behavior." In P. Leone (ed.), *Understanding Troubled and Troublesome Youth.* Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1990b.

Dunphy, D. C. "The Social Structure of Urban Adolescent Peer Groups." *Sociometry,* 1963, *26,* 230–246.

Epstein, J. L. "Examining Theories of Adolescent Friendship." In J. L. Epstein and N. L. Karweit (eds.), *Friends in School.* San Diego: Academic Press, 1983.

Feldman, S. S., Rubenstein, J. L., and Rubin, C. "Depressive Affect and Restraint in Early Adolescence: Relationships with Family Structure, Family Process, and Friendship Support." *Journal of Early Adolescence,* 1988, *8,* 279–296.

Fisher, L. A., and Baumann, K. E. "Influence and Selection in the Friend-Adolescent Relationship: Findings from Studies of Adolescent Smoking and Drinking." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 1988, *18,* 289–314.

Furman, W. "The Development of Children's Social Networks." In D. Belle (ed.), *Children's Social Networks and Social Supports.* New York: Wiley, 1989.

Furman, W., and Bierman, K. L. "Children's Conceptions of Friendship: A Multi-Method Study of Developmental Changes." *Developmental Psychology,* 1984, *20,* 925–931.

Furman, W., and Buhrmester, D. "Children's Perceptions of the Personal Relationships in Their Social Networks." *Developmental Psychology,* 1985, *21,* 1016–1024.

Furman, W., and Buhrmester, D. "Age and Sex Differences in Perceptions of Networks of Personal Relationships." *Child Development,* 1992, *63,* 103–115.

Goodnow, J. J., and Burns, A. *Home and School: Child's Eye View.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1988.

Hartup, W. W. "Peer Relations." In E. M. Hetherington (ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology.* Vol. 4: *Socialization, Personality, and Social Development.* New York: Wiley, 1983.

Hartup, W. W. "Friendships and Their Developmental Significance." In H. McGurk (ed.), *Childhood Social Development.* Hove, England: Erlbaum, 1992.

Hartup, W. W., and Sancilio, M. F. "Children's Friendships." In E. Schopler and G. B. Mesibov (eds.), *Social Behavior in Autism.* New York: Plenum, 1986.

Haugaard, J. J., and Tilly, C. "Characteristics Predicting Children's Responses to Sexual Encounters with Other Children." *Child Abuse and Neglect,* 1988, *12,* 209–218.

Hinde, R. A. *Towards Understanding Relationships.* London: Academic Press, 1979.

Hinde, R. A. "Developmental Psychology in the Context of Other Behavioral Sciences." *Developmental Psychology,* 1992, *28,* 1018–1029.

Howes, C. *Peer Interaction of Young Children.* Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, vol. 53 (serial no. 217). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Jones, D. C., and Bowling, B. "Preschool Friends and Affective Knowledge: A Comparison of Mutual and Unilateral Friends." Paper presented at the Conference on Human Development, Charleston, South Carolina, Mar. 1988.

Kandel, D. B. "Homophily, Selection, and Socialization in Adolescent Friendships." *American Journal of Sociology,* 1978a, *84,* 427–436.

Kandel, D. B. "Similarity in Real-life Adolescent Pairs." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1978b, *36,* 306–312.

Kandel, D. B., and Andrews, K. "Processes of Adolescent Socialization by Parents and Peers." *International Journal of the Addictions,* 1987, *22,* 319–342.

Karweit, N. "Extracurricular Activities and Friendship Selection." In J. L. Epstein and N. Karweit (eds.), *Friends in School.* San Diego: Academic Press, 1983.

Kurdek, L. A., and Sinclair, R. J. "Adjustment of Young Adolescents in Two-Parent Nuclear, Stepfather, and Mother-Custody Families." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* 1988, *56,* 91–96.

McGuire, K. D., and Weisz, J. R. "Social Cognition and Behavior Correlates of Preadolescent Chumships." *Child Development,* 1982, *53,* 1478–1484.

Mannarino, A. P. "Friendship Patterns and Altruistic Behavior in Preadolescent Males." *Developmental Psychology,* 1976, *12,* 555–556.

Mannarino, A. P. "Friendship Patterns and Self-Concept Development in Preadolescent Males." *Journal of Genetic Psychology,* 1978, *133,* 105–110.

Mulvey, E. P., and Aber, M. S. "Growing Out of Delinquency: Development and Desistance." In R. Jenkins and W. Brown (eds.), *The Abandonment of Delinquent Behavior: Promoting the Turn-Around.* New York: Praeger, 1988.

Neeman, J. D., Hubbard, J., and Kojetin, B. A. "Continuity in Quality of Friendships and Romantic Relationships from Childhood to Adolescence." Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle, Apr. 1991.

Parker, J. G., and Asher, S. R. "Peer Relations and Later Personal Adjustment: Are Low-Accepted Children at Risk?" *Psychological Bulletin,* 1987, *102,* 357–389.

Patterson, G. R., and Bank, L. "Some Amplifier and Dampening Mechanisms for Pathologic Processes in Families." In M. Gunnar and E. Thelen (eds.), *Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology.* Vol. 22. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1989.

Perry, T. B. "The Relation of Adolescent Self-Perceptions to Their Social Relationships." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Oklahoma, 1987.

Reisman, J. M., and Shorr, S. I. "Friendship Claims and Expectations Among Children and Adults." *Child Development,* 1978, *49,* 913–916.

Repinski, D. J. "Closeness in Parent-Adolescent Relationships: Contrasting Interdependence, Emotional Tone, and a Subjective Rating." Unpublished manuscript, Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota, 1992.

Rivenbark, W. H. "Self-Disclosure Patterns Among Adolescents." *Psychological Reports,* 1971, *28,* 35–42.

Rotenberg, K. J., and Pilipenko, T. A. "Mutuality, Temporal Consistency, and Helpfulness in Children's Trust in Peers." *Social Cognition,* 1983–1984, *2,* 235–255.

Rutter, M., and Garmezy, N. "Developmental Psychopathology." In E. M. Hetherington (ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology.* Vol. 4: *Socialization, Social Development, and Personality.* New York: Wiley, 1983.

Savin-Williams, R. C., and Berndt, T. J. "Friendship and Peer Relations." In S. S. Feldman and G. R. Elliott (eds.), *At the Threshold: The Developing Adolescent.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.
Schofield, J. W. *Black and White in School: Trust, Tension, or Tolerance?* New York: Praeger, 1982.
Selman, R. L. *The Growth of Interpersonal Understanding: Developmental and Clinical Analyses.* San Diego: Academic Press, 1980.
Sharabany, R., Gershoni, R., and Hofman, J. E. "Girlfriend, Boyfriend: Age and Sex Differences in Intimate Friendship." *Developmental Psychology,* 1981, *17,* 800–808.
Shaver, P., Furman, W., and Buhrmester, D. "Transition to College: Network Changes, Social Skills, and Loneliness." In S. Duck and D. Perlman (eds.), *Understanding Personal Relationships: An Interdisciplinary Approach.* London: Sage, 1985.
Simmons, R. G., Burgeson, R., and Reef, M. J. "Cumulative Change at Entry to Adolescence." In M. Gunnar and W. A. Collins (eds.), *Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology.* Vol. 21. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1988.
Snyder, J., Dishion, T. J., and Patterson, G. R. "Determinants and Consequences of Associating with Deviant Peers During Preadolescence and Adolescence." *Journal of Early Adolescence,* 1986, *6,* 29–43.
Steinberg, L., Dornbusch, S. M., and Brown, B. B. "Ethnic Differences in Adolescent Achievement: An Ecological Perspective." *American Psychologist,* 1992, *47,* 723–729.
Sullivan, H. S. *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry.* New York: Norton, 1953.
Urberg, K. A., Halliday-Scher, K., and Tolson, J. M. "Similarity Between Adolescent Best Friends." Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle, Apr. 1991.
Wong, M. M., and Csikszentmihalyi, M. "Affiliation Motivation and Daily Experience: Some Issues on Gender Differences." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1991, *60,* 154–164.
Youniss, J. *Parents and Peers in Social Development: A Piaget-Sullivan Perspective.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
Youniss, J., and Smollar, J. *Adolescent Relations with Mothers, Fathers, and Friends.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

WILLARD W. HARTUP is professor of child psychology at the Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

The authors propose that popularity and friendship are linked to different forms of adjustment and emotional well-being. A central point of their model is that friendship functions as an important mediator between popularity and loneliness in early adolescence.

Popularity, Friendship, and Emotional Adjustment During Early Adolescence

William M. Bukowski, Betsy Hoza, Michel Boivin

Early adolescence is one of the most challenging developmental periods of the life span. During this time, the nature of interpersonal relationships changes as youngsters begin to function in a vast array of new environments. As part of these changes, the establishment of healthy relations with peers and the development of a sense of emotional well-being become increasingly important. In this chapter, we bring these two aspects of early adolescent development together to show how peer relations and emotional well-being are interrelated during this developmental period. In particular, we present a model of the associations between relationships with peers and feelings of belongingness and loneliness during early adolescence.

Our first goal in this chapter is to describe the two aspects of peer relations that have received the most attention in the social-developmental literature. These two constructs are popularity and friendship. In this discussion, we point to the conceptual distinctions between these two domains of experience with peers and we propose that they may become increasingly distinct forms of experience during adolescence. We also discuss the reasons why it is important to study popularity and friendship simultaneously. Next, we indicate why popularity and friendship are expected to be related to different aspects of adjustment. In this discussion,

This chapter was written with the support of the W. T. Grant Foundation Faculty Scholars Program. Correspondence should be directed to William M. Bukowski, Department of Psychology, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3G 1M8.