

False positives using social cognitive mapping to identify childrens' peer groups

ZACHARY P. NEAL and JENNIFER WATLING NEAL and RACHEL DOMAGALSKI
Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI USA

Abstract

Children and adolescents interact in peer groups, which are known to influence a range of psychological and behavioral outcomes. In developmental psychology and related disciplines, social cognitive mapping (SCM) is the most commonly used method for identifying peer groups from peer report data. However, we know nothing about its risk of false positives, that is, the risk that it will identify peer groups from peer report data that contain no evidence of peer groups. By applying SCM to empirical peer report data with a ground truth - synthetic random peer report data - we demonstrate that although it can detect true positives (i.e. peer groups that exist), it has an unacceptably high rate of false positives. We conclude by recommending that social cognitive mapping should not be used to identify peer groups, and discuss cognitive social structures and bipartite backbone extraction as promising alternatives.

1 Introduction

Decades of research demonstrate the importance of peers for child and adolescent development and psychological well-being (Bukowski *et al.*, 2018; Gifford-Smith and Brownell, 2003). Children and adolescents interact in peer groups with structural and behavioral features that are associated with a wide range of psychological, social, and academic outcomes (Birkett and Espelage, 2015; Espelage *et al.*, 2003; Ryan, 2001). However, identifying peer groups can be challenging and represents a critical measurement task for developmental and clinical researchers (Kindermann and Gest, 2018). To overcome these challenges, Cairns and colleagues proposed social cognitive mapping (SCM), a method of peer group identification that involves identifying peer groups using multiple peer reports of groups of children that interact together in a setting such as a classroom (Cairns and Cairns, 1994; Cairns *et al.*, 1988).

SCM has become a dominant method for identifying childrens' peer groups from peer report data. The data are easy to collect, the ability to triangulate from peers reduces the impact of non-response, the analysis is easy to perform, and there is some evidence for its validity (Gest *et al.*, 2003). However, nothing is known about the extent to which SCM can yield false positives, that is, where it identifies childrens' peer groups even when the peer report data do not contain evidence of peer groups. In this paper, we show that SCM has an unacceptably high rate of false positives, assigning on average two-thirds of children to peer groups when the raw data contain no evidence of peer groupings. We conclude

that researchers *should not use SCM to identify childrens' peer groups*, and show that two bipartite backbone extraction methods offer promising alternatives (Neal, 2014).

The remainder of the paper is organized in four sections. In the background section, we review the purpose and development of SCM, discussing when and where the technique has been used, and the types of empirical findings it has been used to support. In the method section, we describe how SCM is currently used to identify childrens' peer groups, providing a complete empirical example from a 7th grade classroom known via observation to contain peer groups. In the results section, we examine SCM's performance when applied to synthetic peer report data that has been randomized to eliminate evidence of peer groups. Finally, in the discussion section, we discuss the implications of SCM's false positive rate, and discuss alternative methods.

2 Background

Experiences in peer groups play a significant role in childhood and adolescent development (Howe, 2010; Kindermann and Gest, 2018; Rubin, Bukowski and Bowker, 2015). Specifically, aspects of peer group structure (e.g., size, hierarchy) or behavior (e.g., norms) have been linked to psychological (e.g., depression), social (e.g., aggression, homophobic name calling, prosocial behavior, resource control) and academic (e.g., motivation, achievement) outcomes (Birkett and Espelage, 2015; Espelage *et al.*, 2003; Ryan, 2001; Zhao *et al.*, 2016; Zbaratany *et al.*, In press). However, identifying peer groups presents a range of challenges in developmental studies. For example, self-report methods are sensitive to self enhancement bias and missing data, while observational methods are resource intensive (Cairns and Cairns, 1994; Kindermann and Gest, 2018; Neal and Neal, 2013a). To overcome some of these challenges, Cairns and colleagues proposed SCM as an alternate method for identifying of peer groups (Cairns *et al.*, 1988; Cairns and Cairns, 1994). SCM relies on peer informants to provide reports of groups of children in a particular setting, such as a classroom, that hang out together. Through a series of aggregating and filtering transformations described in detail in section 3, SCM uses these peer-reported data to identify peer groups. Specifically, SCM is intended to answer two questions: *first*, do the children in this setting interact with one another in peer groups, and *second*, if so, which children are members of which groups?

SCM has developed in roughly three phases. First, during the *development* phase in the late 1980s, a research team at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill led by Robert Cairns and Beverley Cairns experimented with ways to triangulate multiple childrens' reports of peer groups into a single picture of a setting's social structure and its peer groups (Cairns *et al.*, 1985; Cairns *et al.*, 1988; Cairns *et al.*, 1989). This work concentrated on examining a matrix of childrens' co-occurrence in reported peer groups, evolving from "a decision rule procedure [in which] arbitrary standards were adopted" to a more objective set of steps "with minimal reliance on intuitive judgements" (Cairns *et al.*, 1988, p. 817). Second, during the *formalization* stage in the early 1990s, these steps were refined into a consistent procedure that appeared in an essentially identical form across multiple papers that included fully-worked examples (Farmer and Cairns, 1991; Farmer *et al.*, 1993; Cairns and Cairns, 1994). This phase also included the development

of software to facilitate the use of SCM (Juliussan, 1991; Leung, 1998)¹. Finally, the *application* phase from the mid-1990s onward has involved the use of SCM throughout developmental psychology and related fields focused on studying childrens' peer relations and groups, as well as the development of variations on the steps developed during the formalization stage. In particular, two of Cairns' colleagues developed their own minor variations: Kindermann developed an approach relying on conditional probabilities and a binomial z test (Kindermann, 1993), while Gest developed an approach relying on principal components analysis (Gest *et al.*, 2007).

To determine how widespread the SCM method of identifying peer groups is, and the specific variant of SCM that is most commonly used, we undertook a systematic literature search. We used Google Scholar to locate all papers (a) published since 1991 when SCM was formalized, (b) in the 30 top-ranked journals classified by Web of Science as "Psychology, developmental" (c) that contained the phrase "social network" and one or more network-relevant keywords (e.g. density, centrality, clique, etc.). We reviewed each paper and identified 73 that attempt to identify network-based peer groups or cliques. A majority of these papers ($N = 46$, 63%) used SCM to identify peer groups. Among those using SCM, most ($N = 38$, 83%) used the specific variant described by Cairns and Cairns (1994), with more than half published in the last ten years ($N = 24$, 63%)². Finally, among the papers using Cairns and Cairns' version of SCM, nearly half ($N = 16$, 42%) explicitly noted that they used **SCM 4.0**, a DOS-based program that implements this version of SCM. Based on these findings, we focus on SCM as described by Cairns and Cairns (1994) and implemented in **SCM 4.0** (Leung, 1998), which is the most widely and currently used SCM method.

To determine the extent to which SCM is used outside developmental psychology, where it was first developed, we undertook a second targeted literature search. Using Google Scholar, we located recent uses of SCM in such youth-focused fields as school psychology (Farmer *et al.*, 2010), social psychology (Wolfer *et al.*, 2011), special education (Avramidis, 2010), STEM education (Radovic *et al.*, 2017), and substance use (Sheppard *et al.*, 2012). We also observed that it is used outside North America, by researchers in Latvia (Levina and Ivanova, 2012), Korea (Ahn and Shin, 2011), Norway (Fandrem *et al.*, 2010), and Spain (Bacete and Perrin, 2013). In each of these studies, the authors explicitly adopted Cairns and Cairns' (1994) formalization of SCM, and conducted the analysis using **SCM 4.0**.

Researchers use the peer groups identified by SCM in a multiple ways. First, some researchers use SCM-derived peer groups to generate group-level behavioral norms, then estimate mixed models to examine associations between these group norms and individual psychological and social outcomes (Chung-Hall and Chen, 2010; Zhao *et al.*, 2016). Second, some researchers study the association between compositional (e.g., ethnic com-

¹ Farmer and Cairns (1991) report the software developer's name as Jullinson, but elsewhere the name is reported as Juliussan (Cairns and Cairns, 1994). We have been unable to obtain the software developed by Juliussan but have obtained **SCM 4.0**, a software developed by Leung (Leung, 1998)

² Of the remaining papers, 3 use the variant described by Kindermann (1993), 2 use the variant described by Gest (2007), and 3 provide insufficient detail to determine the variant

position) or organizational features (e.g., hierarchization) of SCM-derived peer groups and psychological or social outcomes (Shi and Xie, 2014; Zarbatany *et al.*, In press). Finally, some researchers have used SCM-derived peer groups to examine the extent to which teachers are accurate observers of classroom peer relationships (i.e. teacher attunement) (Gest, 2006; Hoffman *et al.*, 2015).

Although SCM is widely used in many fields and countries, and has been used to draw conclusions about childrens' behavior and development, its properties as a method of network measurement or group identification remain understudied. Pijl *et al.* (2011) compared SCM to the identification of peer groups from a network of reciprocated self-reported friendships. They found that compared to the reciprocated friendship approach, SCM yielded networks with no isolates and higher density, and assigned all children to a peer group, which was "quite surprising, as it is known from the literature that 4-10% of children do not have friends in primary classrooms" (p. 484). Similarly, Neal and Neal (2013a) presented a toy example in which "distinct peer groups always appear to be present, no matter what responses children give" during data collection (Neal and Neal, 2013b, p. 605). Guided by these past studies, we hypothesize that SCM has a high rate of false positives, measuring edges in a peer network and identifying peer groups when they do not exist in the raw data.

3 Method

SCM begins by collecting peer reports of peer groups by asking participating children a question like *Are there people in school who hang around together a lot? Who are they?* Each participating child is permitted to report any number of groups, and each group they report can contain any number of children including themselves. For example, Child A might report the existence of a hanging around group composed of children A, B, and C (report 1), and another group composed of children W, X, Y, and Z (report 2). Then a series of aggregations and transformations are applied to these raw data to define a peer network and identify peer groups.

First, these peer report data are organized as a bipartite "recall matrix" \mathbf{R} that contains a row i for each child in the setting and a column for each report j , so that each cell in the matrix R_{ij} contains a 1 if child i appeared in report j , and otherwise is 0.

Second, the reports in the recall matrix \mathbf{R} are aggregated into a "co-occurrence" matrix \mathbf{C} via projection

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{R}' \quad (1)$$

where C_{ij} contains the number of times the i^{th} and j^{th} children were reported to be in the same group, and C_{ii} contains the number of times the i^{th} child was reported to be in any group. In this step, SCM mirrors Breiger's (1974) bipartite projection example in which childrens' potential interactions are inferred from their co-participation in school clubs.

Third, \mathbf{C} is transformed into a "similarity" matrix \mathbf{S} via Pearson correlation

$$\mathbf{S} = \text{cor}(\mathbf{C}) \quad (2)$$

where S_{ij} is the Pearson correlation coefficient of the i^{th} and j^{th} columns (or rows) of \mathbf{C} . In this step, SCM mirrors Breiger *et al.*'s (1975) CONvergence of iterated CORrelations

(CONCOR) algorithm for group detection. However, unlike Breiger *et al.* (1975) who recommend repeatedly computing the correlation of the matrix, SCM performs this operation only once.

Fourth, a binary peer network \mathbf{N} is constructed by defining an edge as present between child i and child j if $S_{ij} > 0.4$, where the threshold value of 0.4 was recommended by Cairns and Cairns (1994) and is used in subsequent applications of their SCM method. Given \mathbf{R} , \mathbf{N} can be computed in the \mathbf{R} software as:

```
N <- apply(cor(R %*% t(R)), 1, '>', .4) + 0
```

Cairns and Cairns (1994) reported that these steps yield a peer network “primarily because of the logic of the model and the robust nature of the phenomena under investigation, not because of the mathematics” (p. 104). However, it seems that the construction of \mathbf{N} from \mathbf{R} can be directly reduced to a series of mathematical transformations.

The final step involves identifying peer groups in \mathbf{N} . Cairns and Cairns (Cairns and Cairns, 1994) do not describe a specific method, and seem to suggest that the identification of groups in \mathbf{N} is a trivial task that can be performed by visual inspection. Farmer *et al.* (1993) suggested that peer groups be defined so that each member of the group is connected to “at least 50% of the members in the cluster” (p. 234), which some subsequent SCM studies report using (Avramidis, 2010; Fandrem *et al.*, 2010; Rodkin *et al.*, 2006). However, none of these papers describe an algorithm for identifying such groups, and the necessary Clique Augmentation Algorithm was not introduced until 2018 (Wagenseller *et al.*, 2018).³ In practice, most researchers applying SCM identify peer groups using **SCM 4.0** (Leung, 1998). This DOS-based program performs all of the steps described above, and detects peer groups from \mathbf{N} using a method that is not documented. Several authors report that it implements Farmer *et al.*’s (1993) 50% definition (Avramidis, 2010; Fandrem *et al.*, 2010; Kindermann and Gest, 2018), however inspecting the output in yields in our analyses below, we have determined that is not the case. For example, we observed instances in which **SCM 4.0** identified a 3-member peer group that was composed of one dyad and one isolate. Although the exact peer group detection method it implements is undocumented, it is nonetheless widely used; our systematic search of developmental psychology journals identified 16 papers, while our targeted search identified 9 more. Therefore, we focus on this method of peer group identification in our analysis.

To investigate SCM’s false positive rate, we use a benchmark dataset originally used by Cairns and Cairns (1994) to demonstrate SCM. These data consist of a set of 61 peer reports collected from 17 children in a 26 child 7th grade classroom known by observation to contain distinct peer groups.⁴ Representing these data as a recall matrix \mathbf{R} , we create a randomized recall matrix \mathbf{R}^* using the “curveball” algorithm (Strona *et al.*, 2014). This

³ The **NEGOPY** software was introduced in 1987 and did detect groups using this criterion. However, it is not mentioned by any papers reporting the use of SCM, and also imposed two additional requirements: (a) “There is some path, lying entirely within the group, from each member to all the other members” and (b) “It is not possible to cause the group to become disconnected by removing tenpercent of the members of the group” (Richardson, 1995, p. 9)

⁴ The original classroom contained 27 children, but one (Pam) was not reported as belonging to any groups, and therefore is excluded from these analyses because all methods would view her as an isolate.

preserves the number of times each child was named in a group and the number of children named in each group (i.e. the marginals of \mathbf{R}), but yields a \mathbf{R}^* that should contain no evidence of a peer group structure. We then apply SCM to 100 replicates of \mathbf{R}^* , identifying peer groups using **SCM 4.0** and, for the sake of comparison, modularity-maximizing community detection (Brandes *et al.*, 2008). To evaluate SCM’s rate of false positives, for each replicate, we compute the proportion of children assigned to a peer group of 3 or more members.⁵ This value should be near zero because the data are random and contain no evidence of peer group structure; values larger than zero are false positives because they reflect the identification of peer groups in random data.

4 Results

Before turning to the analysis of false positives in random peer report data, we first present the results of SCM in the original non-randomized empirical data. Given \mathbf{R} containing 61 reports about the groups in which 26 children “hang out,” SCM yields the network \mathbf{N} illustrated in figure 1. The large colored polygons mark the boundaries of peer groups that are identified in this network using both the undocumented approach implemented in **SCM 4.0** and a modularity-maximizing partition. Both group identification methods find the same five peer groups, which mirror the groups Cairns and Cairns (1994) report being observed in this classroom. Our statistic of interest – the proportion of children assigned to a peer group of 3 or more members – is 1 (i.e. all children are assigned to a peer group), which correctly reflects that \mathbf{R} contains evidence that the children interact in peer groups.




Fig. 1. Applying SCM to peer group report data from a 7th grade classroom. All children are assigned to a peer group, which matches the observational ground truth.

⁵ The requirement that peer groups contain at least 3 members is common in the developmental psychology literature (Shi and Xie, 2014; Zhao *et al.*, 2016; Zarbatany *et al.*, In press), and here ensures that trivial isolated dyads are not counted as peer groups, which would inflate our count of false positives.

Figure 2 summarizes the results of applying SCM to 100 sets of peer report data that have been randomized, and therefore contain no evidence of peer groups. The left panel illustrates that on average **SCM 4.0** assigns two-thirds of children to peer groups ($M = 0.67$, $SD = 0.12$) when applied to random data. The middle panel similarly illustrates that on average a modularity maximizing partition assigns two-thirds of children to peer groups ($M = 0.66$, $SD = 0.13$) when applied to a network derived from random data using SCM. These findings indicate that whether peer groups are identified using the **SCM 4.0** software or using modularity maximization, SCM yields many false positives, finding peer groups in random data. The right panel illustrates one example of a network and set of peer groups identified by SCM from random data, and highlights that SCM can yield plausible looking peer networks and peer groups when applied to random data. Inspection of the proportion of children assigned to peer groups (which is much larger than 0), or of the network or structure of identified groups (which look reasonable), would not provide a researcher any indication that SCM had yielded false positives. Quite to the contrary, a researcher inspecting these results would confidently but *erroneously* conclude that the peer report data includes strong evidence of peer groups.




Fig. 2. Applying SCM to 100 sets of random peer group report data. Most children are assigned to a peer group by both **SCM 4.0** (left) and modularity maximization (middle), and SCM yields plausible looking peer networks and peer groups even when applied to random data (right).

5 Discussion

Social cognitive mapping (SCM) is a method for constructing a peer network and identifying peer groups via triangulation from multiple peer reports of peer groups. As formalized by Cairns and Cairns (1994) and implemented in **SCM 4.0** (Leung, 1998), it is the most common method for identifying peer groups in developmental psychology, and is widely used in other fields including school psychology, social psychology, special education, and substance use. In this paper, we have summarized SCM in graph theoretic terms as involving first a bipartite projection (Breiger, 1974), then a single iteration of CONCOR (Breiger *et al.*, 1975), then a universal threshold dichotomization (Neal, 2014), and finally community detection (Brandes *et al.*, 2008).

SCM has previously been shown to correctly identify peer groups in settings where the peer groups were confirmed by direct observation (Gest *et al.*, 2003), and thus to yield true

positives. In this paper, we have investigated the opposite case, exploring whether SCM identifies peer groups in data where evidence of peer groups is *not* present (in our analysis, because the data is known to be random), and thus yields false positives. Applying SCM to 100 sets of random peer report data, we found that it on average it assigns two-thirds of children as members of peer groups, and almost *always* assigns a majority of children as members of peer groups. These findings mean that when SCM is used to determine whether a specific child is a member of a peer group it has a false positive rate of 50-66%, but when used to determine whether a setting contains peer groups it has a false positive rate approaching 100%. Moreover, the networks and peer groups identified by SCM in random data appear plausible, and therefore these false positives are likely to be undetected. For these reasons, we conclude that *researchers should not use social cognitive mapping to identify peer groups*.

However, identifying peer groups is critical to answering many research questions that arise in developmental psychology and related youth-focused fields. Recognizing that measuring childrens' peer networks directly via self-report is often infeasible due to low participation rates, how should developmental researchers proceed? One possibility involves using Cognitive Social Structures (CSS) to triangulate a peer network from multiple childrens' reports (Krackhardt, 1987; Neal, 2008), then applying a community detection algorithm to identify peer groups. Unlike SCM which asks participating children to report on their peers' group memberships, CSS asks participating children to report on their peers' social relationships. The advantage to CSS is its more direct assessment of edges in a peer network, rather than inferring them indirectly from peer reported group memberships. But, collecting CSS data can be time intensive because each participating child must report on the presence or absence of a relationship between all pairs of children in the setting (e.g. in our 26 child classroom example, 325 dyads).

Because the type of peer reported group membership data used by SCM is relatively fast to collect, and because these data can be viewed as a variety of bipartite data, a second possibility involves analyzing these data using methods of bipartite backbone extraction rather than SCM. Many methods of bipartite backbone extraction exist, but here we briefly consider the hypergeometric filter (HF) and stochastic degree sequence model (SDSM) as possible alternatives to SCM (Neal, 2014). Applied in this context, both the HF and SDSM aim to extract a peer network from peer report data by asking whether two children were reported to co-occur in a group more often than would be expected if peer reports of group membership were random. The difference lies in how they constrain the null model used to determine the expected number of co-occurrences. The HF null model holds constant the number of times each child was reported to be a member of any group (i.e. the row marginals of \mathbf{R}). The SDSM null model holds roughly constant both the number of times each child was reported to be a member of any group and the number of children reported to be a member of each group (i.e. the row and column marginals of \mathbf{R}).

Figure 3 illustrates the peer network and peer groups identified by applying the HF (left) and SDSM (right) to Cairns and Cairns' (1994) 7th grade classroom data, using a two-tailed $\alpha = 0.05$ threshold for testing the statistical significance of edges. Comparing to figure 1, it is clear that both methods yield nearly identical networks and peer group assignments as SCM, and thus that they are able to detect true positives (i.e. peer groups known to exist).




Fig. 3. Applying Hypergeometric Filter and SDSM to peer group report data from a 7th grade classroom. Most children are assigned to a peer group, and the identified peer groups match the observational ground truth.

Figure 4 summarizes the application of these methods to the same 100 sets of random peer report data examined in section 4. We find that in about half of the random datasets both the HF and SDSM correctly assign no children as members of peer groups, and in an additional one-third of random datasets they assign only 3 children to a peer group. Neither method ever assigned more than one-third of children as members of peer groups. The right panel of figure 4 illustrates one example of a network and set of peer groups identified by SDSM from random data, and highlights that the SDSM-derived peer network is empty. Thus, we find that when applied to random data that contains no evidence of peer social structure, both HF and SDSM correctly return true negatives in the form of an empty peer network and lack of childrens' assignment to peer groups. Because they return true positives from data known to contain evidence of peer groups, and true negatives from data known *not* to contain evidence of peer groups, HF and SDSM may offer useful alternatives to SCM for identifying peer groups from peer report data.

These findings must be interpreted in light of some limitations. First, although we find that SCM (see figure 1) and both HF and SDSM (see figure 4) identify peer groups that match those that were directly observed, this is only preliminary evidence of these methods' validity. These methods, and the newer HF and SDSM in particular, must be empirically evaluated in more youth settings before conclusions can be drawn about their actual ability to correctly identify peer groups. Second, our findings that SCM has a high rate of false positives (see figure 2), and that HF and SDSM do not (see figure 4), are based on comparisons using random peer report datasets with similar characteristics. Future investigations of these methods' rates of false positives should examine data that vary in the number of children, number of reporters, and number of reports.

However, despite these limitations which identify future directions for methods to identify peer groups, we find strong evidence that SCM has an unacceptably high rate of false positives (66% to nearly 100% depending on its purpose). Specifically, we find that SCM




Fig. 4. Applying Hypergeometric filter and SDSM to 100 sets of random peer group report data. No or few children are assigned to a peer group by either Hypergeometric filter (left) or SDSM (middle), and both approaches yield mostly empty peer networks that clearly contain no structure (right).

will lead a researcher to conclude that a youth setting is structured around peer groups *no matter what*, and even if the empirical peer report data is entirely random. We therefore conclude that SCM should be avoided as a method for identifying peer groups. When self-report is infeasible due to low participation rates, CSS may offer a more direct way than SCM to measure a peer network within which peer groups can be identified, while still limiting the impact of non-response. When CSS is infeasible due to its time intensiveness, we find that HF and SDSM are potential alternatives to SCM for identifying peer groups from peer report data because they perform similarly to SCM for identifying known peer groups, and have near-zero rates of false positives.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors have nothing to disclose.

References

- Ahn, I.-H. and Shin, M.-S. (2011). A study on the relevance of social cognitive map analysis to peer subgrouping of elementary school students. *Korean Journal of Elementary Counseling*, 10: pp. 151-165.
- Avramidis, E. (2010). Social relationships of pupils with special educational needs in the mainstream primary class: peer group membership and peerassessed social behaviour. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 25: pp. 413-429.
- Bacete, F.J.G. and Perrin, G.M. (2013). Social cognitive maps. Un metodo para identificar los grupos sociales en contextos naturale. *Psychosocial Interventions*, 22: pp. 61-70.
- Birkett, M. and Espelage, D.L. (2015). Homophobic name-calling, peer-groups, and masculinity: The socialization of homophobic behavior in adolescence. *Social Development*, 24: pp. 184-205.
- Brandes, U., Delling, D., Gaertler, M., Gorke, R., Hofer, M., Nikoloski, Z., and Wagner, D. (2008). On modularity clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 20: pp. 172-188.
- Breiger, R.L. (1974). The duality of persons and groups. *Social Forces*, 53: pp. 181-190.
- Breiger, R.L., Boorman, S.A., and Arabie, P. (1975). An algorithm for clustering relational data with application to social network analysis and comparison with multidimensional scaling. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 12: p. 328-383.

- Bukowski, W.M., Laursen, B., and Rubin, K.H. (2018). Peer relations: Past, present, and promise. In W.M. Bukowski, B. Laursen, and K.H. Rubin (editors), *Handbook of Peer Interactions, Relationships, and Groups* (2nd edition). pp. 3-20. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Cairns, R.B., and Cairns, B.D. (1994). Social networks and the functions of friendships. In R. B. Cairns, and B. D. Cairns (editors), *Lifelines and risks: Pathways of youth in our time*, pp. 911-29. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cairns, R.B., Perrin, J.E., and Cairns, B.D. (1985). Social structure and social cognition in early adolescence: Affiliative patterns. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 5: pp. 339-355.
- Cairns, R.B., Cairns, B.D., and Neckerman H.J. (1989). Early school dropout: Configurations and determinants. *Child Development*, 60: pp. 1437-1452.
- Cairns, R.B., Cairns, B.D., Neckerman, H.J., Gest, S.D., and Garipis, J. (1988). Social networks and aggressive behavior: Peer support or peer rejection? *Developmental Psychology*, 24: pp. 815-823.
- Chung-Hall, J., and Chen, X. (2010). Aggressive and prosocial peer group functioning: Effects on children's social, school, and psychological adjustment. *Social Development*, 19: pp. 659-680.
- Espelage, D.L., Holt, M.K., and Henkel, R.R. (2003). Examination of peer-group contextual effects on aggression during early adolescence. *Child Development*, 74: pp. 205-220.
- Fandrem, H., Ertesvag, S.K., Strohmeier, D., and Roland, E. (2010). Bullying and affiliation: A study of peer groups in native and immigrant adolescents in Norway. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 7: pp. 401-418.
- Farmer, T.W. and Cairns, R.B. (1991). Social networks and social status in emotionally disturbed children. *Behavioral Disorders*, 16: p. 288-298.
- Farmer, T.W., Stuart, C.B., Lorch, N.H., and Fields, E. (1993). The social behavior and peer relations of emotionally and behaviorally disturbed students in residential treatment: A pilot study. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 1: p. 223-234.
- Farmer, T.W., Hall, C.M., Petrin, R., Hamm, J.V., and Dadisman, K. (2010). Evaluating the impact of a multicomponent intervention model on teachers awareness of social networks at the beginning of middle school in rural communities. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 25: pp. 94-106.
- Gest, S.D. (2006). Teacher reports of children's friendships and social groups: Agreement with peer reports and implications for studying peer similarity. *Social Development*, 15: pp. 248-259.
- Gest, S.D., Farmer, T.W., Cairns, B.D., and Xie, H. (2003). Identifying children's peer social networks in school classrooms: Links between peer reports and observed interactions. *Social Development*, 12: pp. 513-529.
- Gest, S.D., Moody, J., and Rulison, K.L. (2007). Density or distinction? The roles of data structure and group detection methods in describing adolescent peer groups. *Journal of Social Structure*, 6.
- Gifford-Smith, M.E., and Brownell, C.A. (2003). Childhood peer relationships: social acceptance, friendships, and peer networks. *Journal of School Psychology*, 41: pp. 235-284.
- Hoffman, A.S., Hamm, J.V., and Farmer, T.W. (2015). Teacher attunement: Supporting early elementary students social integration and status. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 39: pp. 14-23.
- Howe, C. (2010). *Peer groups and children's development*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley.
- Juliussen, H. (1991). Composite Social-Cognitive Map [computer software]. University of Alabama at Birmingham, Developmental Psychology.
- Kindermann, T.A. (1993). Natural peer groups as contexts for individual development: The case of children's motivation in school. *Developmental Psychology*, 29: pp. 970-977.
- Kindermann, T.A. and Gest, S.D. (2018). The peer group: Linking conceptualizations, theories, and methods. In W.M. Bukowski, B. Laursen, and K.H. Rubin (editors), *Handbook of Peer Interactions, Relationships, and Groups* (2nd edition), pp. 84-105. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Krackhardt, D. (1987). Cognitive social structures. *Social Networks*, 9: pp. 109-134.

- Leung, M-C. (1998). SCM 4.0 [computer software]. Center for Developmental Science, University of North Carolina.
- Levina, J. and Ivanova, N. (2012). The self-concept of adolescents with different social status in peer cliques. *Baltic Journal of Psychology*, 2012: pp. 98-112.
- Neal, J.W. (2008). "Kracking" the Missing Data Problem: Applying Krackhardts Cognitive Social Structures to School-Based Social Networks. *Sociology of Education*, 81: pp. 140-162.
- Neal, Z.P. (2014). The backbone of bipartite projections: Inferring relationships from co-authorship, co-sponsorship, co-attendance, and other co-behaviors. *Social Networks*, 39: pp. 84-97.
- Neal, J.W., and Neal, Z.P. (2013a). The multiple meanings of peer groups in social cognitive mapping. *Social Development*, 22: pp. 580-594.
- Neal, Z.P., and Neal, J.W. (2013b). Opening the black box of social cognitive mapping. *Social Development*, 22: pp. 604-608.
- Pijl, S.J., Koster, M., Hannink, A., and Stratingh, A. (2011). Friends in the classroom: a comparison between two methods for the assessment of students friendship networks. *Social Psychology of Education*, 14: pp. 475-488.
- Radovic, D., Black, L., Salas, C.D., and Williams, J. (2017). Being a girl mathematician: Diversity of positive mathematical identities in a secondary classroom. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 48: pp. 434-464.
- Richardson, W.D. (1995). NEGOPY 4.30 Manual and Users Guide. Simon Fraser University.
- Rodkin, P.C., Farmer, T.W., Pearl, R., and van Acker, R. (2006). They're cool: Social status and peer group supports for aggressive boys and girls. *Social Development*, 15: pp. 175-204.
- Rubin, K.H., Bukowski, W.M., and Bowker, J.(2015). Children in peer groups. In R. M. Lerner (Editor-in-Chief), M.H. Bornstein (Vol. Ed.), and T. Leventhal (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science: Vol. 4. Ecological settings and processes* (7th edition, pp. 175-222. New York: Wiley.
- Ryan, A. (2001). The peer group as a context for the development of young adolescent motivation and achievement. *Child Development*, 72: pp. 1135-1150.
- Sheppard, C.S., Golonka, M., and Costanzo, P.R. (2012). Evaluating the impact of a substance use intervention program on the peer status and influence of adolescent peer leaders. *Prevention Science*, 13: pp. 75-85.
- Shi, B. and Xie, H. (2014). Moderating effects of group status, cohesion, and ethnic composition on socialization of aggression in childrens peer groups *Developmental Psychology*, 50: pp. 2188-2198.
- Strona, G., Nappo, D., Boccacci, F., Fattorini, S., and San Miguel-Ayanz, J. (2014). A fast and unbiased procedure to randomize ecological binary matrices with fixed row and column totals. *Nature Communications*, 5: 4114
- Wagenseller, P., Wang, F., and Wu, W. (2018). Size matters: A comparative analysis of community detection algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, 5: pp. 951-960.
- Wolfer, R., Bull, H.D., and Scheithauer, H. (2012). Social integration in youth: Insights from a social network perspective. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 16: pp. 138-147.
- Zarbatany, L., Ellis, W.E., Chen, X., Kinal, M., and Boyko, L. (in press). The moderating role of clique hierarchical organization on resource control by central clique members. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*.
- Zhao, S., Chen, X., Ellis, W., and Zarbatany, L. (2016). Affiliation with socially withdrawn groups and childrens social and psychological adjustment. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 44: pp. 1279-1290.