INFORMAL STATUS AMONG ADOLESCENTS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Ákos Bocskor[1]

ABSTRACT: *The paper provides a systematic review of the literature related to informal (or peer) status among adolescents. First, the most important sociological, developmental, and evolutionary perspectives of informal status are presented, followed by a review of the behavioral and personality correlates most widely discussed in the empirical literature. These correlates are athleticism, aggression, prosocial behavior, risk behavior, academic performance, academic engagement, physical attractiveness, involvement in romantic relationships, leadership abilities, and the Big Five personality traits. Since the bulk of the empirical literature comes from the educational context, where adolescents spend the largest portion of their time, this literature and its most frequently used status dimensions (acceptance, coolness, popularity) are the focus of the paper. The review also pays attention to ethnic and gender differences in status dynamics while acknowledges the importance of different cultural contexts. Implications of our current knowledge and future directions for research are also discussed.*

KEYWORDS: *acceptance, coolness, informal status, peer status, popularity*

INTRODUCTION

Status among adolescents has attracted significant scholarly attention in the last few decades. An extensive body of research has demonstrated that adolescents who have high status among their peers, and popular adolescents

1 *Ákos Bocskor* is assistant lecturer at Department of Sociology and Social Policy, Corvinus University of Budapest and junior research fellow at Centre for Social Sciences CSS-RECENS, in Budapest, Hungary; email: akos.bocskor@gmail.com. Writing of this paper has been financed by the ÚNKP-18-3-IV-BCE-81 "New National Excellence Programme" of the Ministry of Human Capacities.

in particular, are profoundly influential in setting the norms of groups and have huge influence on the behavior of their groupmates (e.g. Brechwald–Prinstein 2011; Dijkstra–Gest 2015; Sandstrom 2011). Additionally, research suggests that certain forms of peer status, such as popularity or coolness, as well as the desire to attain them, predict later engagement in risk behavior and academic adjustment problems (e.g. Allen et al. 2014; Mayeux et al. 2008; Schwartz–Hopmeyer Gorman 2011). On the other hand, unpopular and rejected children and adolescents also face similar risks, in addition to an increase in the probability of mental health problems (Parker et al. 2006; Rubin et al. 2015). Moreover, research has unveiled that status differences in wider society, such as those related to gender, race, or physical appearance, are often rapidly reproduced and maintained in small group interactions (e.g. Berger et al. 1980; Ridgeway et al. 2009).

In the empirical literature, peer status has been associated with a variety of behavioral and personality correlates involving athleticism, aggression, prosociality, risk behavior, academic engagement, physical attractiveness, leadership abilities, agreeableness, and extraversion. In addition to these general trends, important gender, ethnic, and cross-cultural differences have been unveiled. Therefore, the review will pay particular attention to ethnic and gender differences while also complementing the predominantly 'Western' literature with findings from other cultural contexts (Hungary and China). Since the research on peer status, to our knowledge, has been carried out almost exclusively in the school context, this will be the focus of our review. Throughout the paper, we will often refer to status among peers as informal or peer status in order to distinguish it from other applications of the term *status* – for instance, from socioeconomic status.

THEORIES OF INFORMAL STATUS

Status is generally understood as the *prestige* or *esteem* individuals enjoy relative to the prestige or esteem individuals at a different level of the *status hierarchy* have (e.g. Anderson et al. 2015; Leary et al. 2014; Ridgeway 2014). Status and the status hierarchy can be related to small, face-to-face groups (e.g. school classes or workgroups), larger groups, and wider society as well. Importantly, individuals with a higher position in the status hierarchy are assumed to have larger influence or power than their peers in lower status positions. Due to the prevalence of status differences, scientists from various fields have been interested in the emergence and maintenance of these

differences. The following sections will present a brief overview of the related sociological, social psychological, developmental, and evolutionary accounts of status with a focus on small, face-to-face groups and the peer context.

Sociological and social psychological perspectives

Since the investigation of social stratification has been one of the most central concerns for sociological research, research related to social status has a long tradition in this field. As is well known, Max Weber distinguished social status from social class as a distinct form of social stratification, and defined status as '*an effective claim to social esteem in terms of positive and negative privileges*' typically based on *lifestyle* and *prestige* (Weber 1978: 305–306). He defined 'status order' as the way in which 'social honor' is distributed in a community between different status groups (Weber 1978: 927). In the decades after Weber, many sociologists gave a predominantly functionalist account of the status/prestige difference, relating this to the (assumed) functional importance of a position and scarcity of the necessary skills (e.g. Davis–Moore 1945) as well as to individual achievement (e.g. Parsons 1940). Critical approaches have extensively challenged such assumptions, arguing that social inequalities along such dimensions as class, race, and sex are maintained and reproduced through different social practices that benefit the advantaged groups while also legitimizing these inequalities, (see for instance Bourdieu (1984), Collins (1971), Dahrendorf (1959) among many others). These social practices are, to a great extent, related to the development of status beliefs about differences between social groups with regard to their overall worth and capacities, which in turn creates and maintains status-based group differences, in particular in societies that otherwise value meritocracy and formally constrain explicit discrimination (Ridgeway 2014).

Theories related to status development in small, face-to-face groups reproduce many of these macro-level arguments. For instance, Peter Blau argues in his *theory of social integration* that social interactions may be considered exchange processes wherein individuals with qualities that enable them to provide valuable services to the group receive 'the respect and deference' of others, which grants them 'superordinate status' in exchange for these services (Blau 1960: 555–56). On the other hand, *expectations states theory* (Berger et al. 1972, 1980) and *status construction theory* (Ridgeway 1991; Ridgeway and Balkwell 1997) provide detailed theoretical accounts of how external status differences, unrelated to the task in question, are reproduced and maintained in task-oriented face-to-face groups. These theories predict that individuals

belonging to the higher status groups in society (e.g. men, Whites, physically attractive individuals) have a larger chance of obtaining high status in face-to-face groups *both* among peers with high and low status characteristics. For these assumptions to be true, however, a general acceptance of this status order is needed by *both* groups. If the subordinate group(s) challenge this order, based on theories of intergroup conflict, we could predict in-group favoritism in the attribution of status (see, for instance, social identity theory, Tajfel (1974) and Tajfel–Turner (1979).

In the sociological tradition of adolescent peer relations research, *popularity* is the most frequently used social construct that represents status within the peer group (e.g. Adler–Adler 1998; Coleman 1961b; Eder 1985). These sociological works emphasize that both the precise meaning of popularity and the factors that make someone popular depend on the given peer group and culture (see for instance Coleman 1961b: 43; Eder 1985: 155–56). Consequently, this line of research generally relies on the participants' own construction of popularity. However, in spite of the important empirical contributions, hardly any sociological theory addresses directly the acquisition and functioning of popularity (status) among adolescents. Nevertheless, most theories about the acquisition and maintenance of informal status, such as the small group theories presented above, intend to provide models applicable to a variety of contexts, and many of them explicitly list schools among their examples. In line with these theories, Pál and colleagues argue that in the school context high status peers are the ones who make decisions for the group, while low status students are expected to adjust their opinions to the group and decrease their participation in decision-making (Pál et al. 2016: 806).

Recently, William Bukowski has provided a contextual (sociological) approach to popularity (Bukowski 2011). He argues that in order to understand popularity and the way it functions in a group, we need to understand the context in which it is embedded. He identifies four layers of context that need to be considered:

– the level of individualism or collectivism;
– group norms;
– socioeconomic status (SES);
– the level of secularization and the existence of a pluralistic value system.

He argues that groups that are high in *individualism* ascribe popularity to members who are self-assertive and excel at achievement-related tasks, while groups high in *collectivism* ascribe it to members that are caring and trustworthy. Since he considers popularity as an achievement, he argues that it is more important in the individualistic context. Additionally, he assumes that popularity is of higher importance in the *middle-class context* than in the low-SES context,

and in the *pluralistic secular context* than in the non-secular one, where cohesion is already strengthened by a shared political or religious value system.

Furthermore, theoretical proposals that address differences in peer experience between specific social groups can also be drawn on. For instance, *the 'acting White' hypothesis* (Fordham–Ogbu 1986) proposes that members of 'involuntary' ethnic/racial minorities in a subordinate social position may consider their academically well-performing members as becoming acculturated into the White American 'cultural frame of reference' at the expense of their own minority culture (Fordham–Ogbu 1986: 182–183). Consequently, academic success can be 'resisted' both socially and psychologically, and students who are thought to be 'acting White' can receive a variety of sanctions (ranging from disapproval to physical violence) from the same-ethnicity peers. Although the theory was developed to account for Black students' school experience in the United States, it may be extended to other socially disadvantaged racial/ethnic groups in other contexts (see the review of the empirical literature below). Similarly, Paul Willis in his famous ethnographic study documented how the White working-class boys (the 'lads') he observed developed a *'counter-school culture'* wherein they could obtain high peer status by adhering to the often violent, counter-school values of this subculture (Willis 1977).

Developmental perspectives

Peer relations have been extensively studied by developmental scientists. Developmental approaches focus on the ways peer relations shape children's and adolescents' social, cognitive, and emotional development and adjustment, interpreting these changes and dynamics in the context of the relevant developmental stage, ranging from early childhood to late adolescence (Newcomb et al. 1993; Parker et al. 2006; Rubin et al. 2015). Similarly to the sociological perspectives, developmental approaches interpret peer status among adolescents most typically through the construct of *popularity*. However, psychological research traditionally conceptualized popularity as being liked by peers (see for instance Coie et al. 1982). This changed in the late 1990s when some studies demonstrated that youngsters who are perceived as popular by their peers are not necessarily the ones who are widely liked (e.g. LaFontana–Cillessen 1998; Parkhurst–Hopmeyer 1998), which led to the distinction between *popularity* (a status dimension related to power, prestige, and visibility) and *acceptance* (a status dimension related to social preference) (Cillessen–Marks 2011). Empirical findings extensively support the argument that the two status dimensions are, starting from early adolescence, only moderately correlated

distinct constructs (for a meta-analysis of 20 years of empirical research see Van den Berg et al. (2020)).

Although some forms of peer relations (e.g. friendship) are extensively covered by developmental theories, there are only a few theories that directly address popularity. One such theory is the *gender prototypicality theory* of popularity (Mayeux–Kleiser 2019) which argues that popularity as a status dimension distinct from social preference emerges in early adolescence as a 'byproduct' of intensifying cross-sex interactions and cross-sex attention. This explains, according to the proponents of the theory, why popularity gets disproportionately ascribed to those peers who are 'gender-typical' with regard to their appearance and behavior – it is they who are most likely to attract opposite-sex attention (Mayeux–Kleiser 2019).

Another developmental theory, *maturity gap theory,* associates adolescent popularity with the increasing gap between biological maturity and the limited social opportunities in adolescence (Dijkstra et al. 2010; Moffitt 1993). According to this theory, youngsters ascribe popularity to those peers who can 'close' this gap by demonstrating biological maturity (e.g. through sports, physical attractiveness, or sexual activity) and/or independence from adult rules (e.g. through smoking or alcohol and other substance use).

Finally, Antonius Cillessen proposes a tentative *theory of popularity* (Cillessen 2011) in the closing chapter of the book *Popularity in the Peer System*. This proposal intends to synthetize the multiple approaches and research findings presented in the book. Cillessen argues that the acquisition and maintenance of popularity are two distinct processes and thus should be distinguished. He identifies four factors that can play a role in the *acquisition* of popular status:

– social attention-holding power;
– motivation to be popular;
– behavioral skills (a mixture of prosocial and antisocial skills, in particular relational aggression), and
– psychobiological factors (e.g. stress resistance).

Cillessen argues that the ability to attract attention is essential as popularity implies visibility, which can be achieved through physical attractiveness (good looks or dressing well), achievement (academic, athletic, etc.), or behavior (leadership, bullying, etc.). Additionally, Cillessen argues that an agentic orientation (independence, autonomy, leadership) and agentic, power, and dominance goals are needed for becoming popular, while a communal orientation and communal, intimacy, and affiliation goals are needed for becoming widely accepted/liked.

He also identifies four factors that can play a role in the *maintenance* of popularity:

– resource-holding power (successfully challenging others and defending one's position against other challengers);
– self-awareness (the awareness of one's popularity);
– social-cognitive skills (high levels of social intelligence);
– flexible adjustment to the group.

The last point includes understanding when a change of group goals and norms can happen and taking the lead in these changes.

Evolutionary perspectives

Evolutionary psychological and biological approaches apply the Darwinian theory of evolution to human behavior (Barkow 2006). These approaches typically focus on sexual selection and reproduction as well as on the biological basis of group formation and competition (e.g. De Bruyn et al. 2012; Gilbert et al. 1995). According to these perspectives, the status hierarchy in groups emerges as a result of individuals challenging others for resources and defending their resources against other challengers (Gilbert et al. 1995). An important reward of high status is assumed to be more mating opportunities and consequently increased reproductive success (Barkow (1989) cited by De Bruyn et al. (2012)).

In the peer relations context, evolutionary theories consider status (popularity) among peers as a form of *social dominance*, which involves competition for such limited resources as friendships or cross-sex contacts (Hawley 1999, 2003; Pellegrini 2008). From this perspective, *aggression* is not considered as dysfunctional but, if used strategically, an important tool in the competition for these resources (Pellegrini 2008; Pellegrini–Long 2002). Once 'group-level dominance hierarchies' are constructed, the level of aggression is assumed to decrease, as the use of it would be costly both for dominant and subordinate individuals (Pellegrini et al. 2011). This hierarchy is assumed to be beneficial for group members as within-group aggression is minimized and the risk of greater, group-destabilizing aggression is also reduced (Pellegrini et al. 2011).

BEHAVIORAL AND PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF PEER STATUS

This section provides an overview of the empirical literature related to the most frequently discussed behavioral and personality correlates of peer status. As we have seen above, peer-relations research typically distinguishes an affective status dimension related to social preference and a reputational dimension related to social prestige and dominance. The former is most frequently measured by the construct of *acceptance* (preference, likeability), while the latter by (perceived) *popularity.* Additionally, some researchers have captured the reputational dimension through some alternative constructs, most prominently by *coolness* (e.g. Bellmore et al. 2011; Jamison et al. 2015; Kiefer–Wang 2016; Wilson–Jamison 2019). The review below will focus on these three constructs.

Athleticism

Virtually all quantitative (e.g. Chase–Machida 2011; Kennedy 1995; Shakib et al. 2011), qualitative (e.g. Adler et al. 1992; Adler–Adler 1998; Eder–Parker 1987; Francis et al. 2010), and mixed (Coleman 1961b; Eder–Kinney 1995) studies have found that athletic ability is one of the strongest predictors of reputational peer status (popularity, coolness) for boys. Some studies have also found a positive but weaker association between athleticism and popularity for girls (for an overview see Lindstrom–Lease (2005: 228–230) and Rose et al. (2011: 110)). This is in line with the theoretical assumption that relates popularity to dominance, prestige, and visibility within the peer group, as sports participation provides visibility, while competitive sports can be related to dominance, which is traditionally considered a masculine trait. Qualitative research also suggests that as girls enter adolescence, the tension between athletic participation and maintaining status increases (Shakib 2003). Similarly, quantitative research including more sports indicates that predominantly 'sex-appropriate' sports (e.g. football or wrestling for boys, gymnastics or volleyball for girls) contribute to higher status as well as more friendship and dating preference for both sexes (Eder–Kinney 1995; Holland–Andre 1994).

Kennedy (1995) and Shakib and colleagues (2011) investigated the association between (self-rated) popularity and athleticism on representative samples in the United States. Kennedy found among eighth graders that popularity had the strongest association with athletic status for all demographic groups (Black, White, Asian, Hispanic), expect for Black females, for whom it was second after

academic status (Kennedy 1995). Shakib and colleagues found in their sample, which included third to twelfth grade students, that regardless of race, gender, and SES, athletes reported higher popularity than non-athletes (Shakib et al. 2011). While Black athletes were *less* likely to report popularity than athletes from other racial/ethnic groups, there was no such gender difference. Although several studies suggest that Black and low-SES students may consider sport more important than their White or higher-SES peers as it can provide a channel for upward social mobility (for an overview see Shakib et al. 2011), the two representative surveys imply that these differences may not be reflected in peer popularity.

Social acceptance has also been positively associated with athletic ability for both genders (e.g. Daniels–Leaper 2006; Dijkstra et al. 2010; LaFontana–Cillessen 2002; Lubbers et al. 2006; Newcomb–Bukowski 1983; Vannatta et al. 2009). When taking into consideration the gender of the nominator, Dijkstra and colleagues found in a Dutch sample of adolescents that athleticism was more strongly associated with same-gender likeability for boys and cross-gender likeability for girls (Dijkstra et al. 2010).

It is important to note that these findings come predominantly from the United States, where sports occupy a particularly highly valued social position (Coleman 1961a; Shakib et al. 2011). Nevertheless, research from other parts of the world seems to have reached similar conclusions. Niu and colleagues found in a Chinese adolescent sample that athletic skills were positively associated with both popularity and social preference for both genders (Niu et al. 2016). On the other hand, Dong and colleagues found no statistically significant association between popularity and athleticism (Dong et al. 1996). Hungarian research among early adolescents has also found that athletic ability was positively associated with both coolness and acceptance (Bocskor–Havelda 2019; Pethes 2015). However, Bocskor and Havelda found that athleticism was only associated with coolness in the case of boys, while there were no ethnic differences between Roma and non-Roma students.

Aggression

Aggression has been extensively researched in relation to peer status. A large body of evidence suggests that it is positively associated with coolness/popularity and negatively with acceptance/preference (e.g. Bellmore et al. 2011; Cillessen–Mayeux 2004; Kiefer–Wang 2016; Prinstein–Cillessen 2003; Rodkin et al. 2006; Schwartz et al. 2006) (for a review of the literature see Mayeux et al. 2011). Newcomb and colleagues conducted a meta-analytic

review of earlier literature on the characteristics of the classical sociometric status groups and found that 'sociometrically' popular (i.e. widely liked) children showed a lower than average level of aggression, while rejected and 'controversial' children showed higher than average levels (Newcomb et al. 1993). Since the 'controversial' status group contains pupils who score high on the dimension of social impact (i.e. are both liked and disliked by many peers), this group may be closer to our current understanding of popularity. Indeed, more recent research has distinguished two subtypes of (perceived) popular students: one that is high both on popularity/coolness and acceptance and one that is high on popularity/coolness but average or lower on acceptance (De Bruyn–Cillessen 2006; Rodkin et al. 2000; Van den Berg et al. 2015). The two groups show distinct behavioral profiles: popular-accepted students are usually prosocial, academically engaged, and non-aggressive, while popular but not particularly liked pupils tend to be aggressive and academically disengaged.

In order to provide a more refined picture about the relationship between aggression and peer status, it is important to distinguish between different forms of aggression, such as *overt* (direct) and *relational* (indirect) aggression (Crick–Grotpeter 1995) as well as *proactive* and *reactive* aggression (Dodge–Coie 1987). Relational (or social or indirect) aggression refers to behavior that is intended to damage another person's social relationships or social position through manipulation – for instance by sabotaging the target person's friendships or romantic relationships, spreading gossip, or by exclusion from activities (Card et al. 2008; Crick–Grotpeter 1995). To our knowledge, one meta-analytic review has investigated the association between indirect aggression and popularity (Casper et al. 2020), two reviews between indirect aggression and acceptance (Card et al. 2008; Casper et al. 2020), and one review between direct aggression and acceptance (Card et al. 2008). The results show that popularity is positively associated with indirect aggression, acceptance is negatively associated with direct aggression, while the negative association between indirect aggression and acceptance becomes nonsignificant if we control for direct aggression. Empirical studies have also found a positive association between direct/overt aggression and popularity (see the literature review by Mayeux–Kleiser 2019). However, some studies suggest that the effect of indirect/relational aggression is stronger (Cillessen–Mayeux 2004; Prinstein–Cillessen 2003), while other studies have found that after controlling for relational aggression, the effect of overt aggression becomes nonsignificant (Rose et al. 2004; Waasdorp et al. 2013). With regard to reactive and proactive aggression, Stoltz and colleagues found that proactive (strategic) aggression was positively while reactive aggression negatively associated with popularity (Stoltz et al. 2016). Prinstein and Cillessen combined the two dimensions and found that the strategic use of

both direct and indirect aggression was positively associated with popularity, while reactive direct aggression was negatively associated with both popularity and acceptance (Prinstein–Cillessen 2003).

Bullying is a special form of aggression, which can be defined as "a subtype of aggressive behavior, in which an individual or a group of individuals repeatedly attacks, humiliates, and/or excludes a relatively powerless person" (Salmivalli 2010: 112). It can be viewed as a form of instrumental, proactive aggression with the goal of attaining status and dominance (Pellegrini et al. 2011). There is a growing body of evidence that suggests that skillful bullies tend to have high levels of popularity and low levels of acceptance, while victims have both low levels of popularity and acceptance (e.g. Duffy et al. 2017; Pouwels et al. 2016; Pronk et al. 2017; Rodkin–Berger 2008; Sijtsema et al. 2009; Veenstra et al. 2005). More refined analysis of the different roles has found that followers of bullies were also associated with higher levels of popularity and lower levels of acceptance, while defenders were associated with higher levels of acceptance and in some cases higher levels of popularity (Duffy et al. 2017; Pronk et al. 2017).

With regard to gender differences, although an earlier review (Rose et al. 2011) suggested that significant gender differences were typically found in the ethnographic but rarely the quantitative literature, a more recent review (Mayeux–Kleiser 2019) argues that overt and relational aggression contribute to boys' and girls' popularity differently. Indeed, some quantitative studies have found the association between overt aggression and popularity/coolness to be stronger (Waasdorp et al. 2013) or only significant (Kiefer–Wang 2016; Xie et al. 2003) in the case of boys. Similarly, some studies suggest that relational aggression is more strongly (e.g. Cillessen–Mayeux 2004) or only (Kiefer–Wang 2016) associated with girls' coolness/popularity. Additionally, popularity has been more strongly associated with bullying for boys (De Bruyn et al. 2010). When taking into consideration the gender of both the bully and the victim, Rodkin and Berger found that same-sex bullying contributed to popularity, boys bullying girls to unpopularity, while bullies were disliked regardless of whom they targeted (Rodkin–Berger 2008). Additionally, Veenstra and colleagues found that male same-gender bullying was positively associated with female acceptance (Veenstra et al. 2010). The ethnographic literature also underlines the importance of physical strength and 'toughness'– the ability to intimidate and dominate others- in boys' popularity, as well as the role of social manipulation and verbal intimidation in girls' popularity (e.g. Adler et al. 1992; Eder 1985; Merten 1997).

Some research also suggests ethnic/racial differences in the association between aggression and peer status. For instance, some studies have found a strong association between aggression and popularity in the case of African

American students in Black-majority schools, and a stronger association for African American than European American students in multi-ethnic settings (e.g. Farmer et al. 2003; Luthar–McMahon 1996; Meisinger et al. 2007; Rodkin et al. 2000; Waasdorp et al. 2013).

The empirical evidence that shows an association between some forms of aggression and popularity is in line with predictions of evolutionary theories, which propose that aggression is used strategically to gain and maintain status. In particular, 'bistrategic' youth (Hawley 2003) – i.e. pupils who use both aggression and prosocial behavior –, have been found to have the highest level of popularity (e.g. Closson–Hymel 2016; Dijkstra et al. 2009; Hartl et al. 2020; Kornbluh–Neal 2016) (for an overview of primarily the evolutionary research see Pellegrini et al. 2011). Research by sociologists Robert Faris and Diane Felmlee also underlines the role of aggression in status competition; the authors measured peer status by social network centrality in friendship networks and found that increased network centrality predicted increases in aggression up to the highest levels of network centrality, where aggression decreased (Faris–Felmlee 2011, 2014).

In 'non-Western' cultural contexts, the relationship between peer status and aggression may be more controversial. Some research among Chinese students found a positive association between popularity and aggression (Lu et al. 2018a; Niu et al. 2016; Schwartz et al. 2010) and a negative association between acceptance and aggression (Niu et al. 2016; Schwartz et al. 2010), while other studies found negative association between popularity and aggression (Owens et al. 2014; Tseng et al. 2013; Xi et al. 2016). In Hungary, Bocskor and Havelda found among early adolescents no association between physical aggression and coolness and a positive association between verbal aggression and coolness only in the case of non-Roma students (Bocskor–Havelda 2019). Similarly, they found that acceptance was negatively associated with verbal aggression. Interestingly, verbal aggression had a stronger positive association with girls' coolness and a stronger negative association with their acceptance. Kisfalusi investigated bullying among sixth graders in the same database and found an inverted U-shaped relationship between physical and verbal bullying and coolness nominations among sixth graders: students were more likely to be nominated as perpetrators up to a certain level of coolness (Kisfalusi 2018).

Prosocial behavior

Prosocial behavior is voluntary behavior intended to benefit others (Eisenberg et al. 1999; Wolters et al. 2014), which has been conceptualized by characteristics

such as empathy, concern for others, and interest in enhancing personal relationships (Aikins–Litwack 2011). It has been found to correlate strongly with both peer acceptance and popularity (e.g. De Bruyn–Cillessen 2006; Dijkstra et al. 2009; Kornbluh–Neal 2016; Peters et al. 2010; Wolters et al. 2014). As mentioned above, peers that use a mixture of prosocial and (strategic) aggressive behavior tend to be the most popular. Qualitative studies have found that, in addition to kindness and helpfulness, popular girls also used manipulative tactics and 'meanness' (indirect and verbal aggression) to maintain their status (e.g. Currie et al. 2007; Duncan 2004; Merten 1997; Wiseman 2002), while popular boys were also engaged in demonstrations of physical dominance, ranging from pushing to physical fights (e.g. Adler et al. 1992; Francis et al. 2010). Although an earlier review (Rose et al. 2011) suggested that the quantitative literature had not found gender differences in this domain, Kornbluh and Neal found that popularity had a stronger positive association with prosociality for girls (Kornbluh–Neal 2016).

Sociometric studies among Chinese adolescents also found that both popularity and acceptance were positively associated with prosociality (Lu et al. 2018b; Niu et al. 2016; Wang et al. 2019). Interestingly, those two studies that investigated both status dimensions showed that prosociality was more strongly associated with popularity than with acceptance (Lu et al. 2018b; Niu et al. 2016), which Niu and colleagues attribute to Confucian principles prescribing morally responsible behavior. Two studies that focused on students' perception of popularity determinants and used samples from multiple countries found that Chinese students more strongly associated popularity with prosociality than American (Li et al. 2012) or Australian (Owens et al. 2014) pupils. Owens and colleagues attribute this difference to the collectivist cultural context in China, which also puts stronger emphasis on social harmony.

Risk behavior

Several researchers have been interested in the relationship between peer status and different forms of risk-taking activities. Although this concept can cover a wide scope of behaviors, primarily aggression, substance use/abuse, and sexual behavior have been discussed in relation to adolescent peer status (Schwartz–Hopmeyer Gorman 2011). Since aggression has already been discussed above, we will not cover it in the current section. Overall, popularity has been positively associated with substance use (Franken et al. 2017; Hawke–Rieger 2013; Killeya-Jones et al. 2007; Mayeux et al. 2008; Prinstein et al. 2011) and sexual activity (Hawke–Rieger 2013; Mayeux et al. 2008; Prinstein et al.

2003, 2011) for most groups of adolescents. Hawke and Rieger investigated a wide range of risk behaviors among Australian grade 9 students and found, in addition to the results described already, antisocial activities (vandalism, shoplifting, skipping classes, breaking school rules) to be typical of the high-on-popularity-low-on-acceptance group of students, in particular boys (Hawke–Rieger 2013). Social acceptance has not been associated with risk behavior for most groups (Franken et al. 2017; Hawke–Rieger 2013; Mayeux et al. 2008; Prinstein et al. 2003), although Franken and colleagues found that risk behavior was negatively associated with acceptance for girls, while Hawke and Rieger found that boys with high levels of acceptance were those most likely to be engaged in sexual activity, whereas girls with high levels of acceptance were the least likely. The maturity gap hypothesis (Moffitt 1993) can provide a good explanation for the positive relationship between risk behavior and popularity. In particular in the case of those activities that are legal/accepted for adults but not so much for adolescents (tobacco and alcohol use, sexual activity), those peers who engage in such activities can be seen as demonstrating independence and autonomy and thus closing the gap between biological maturity and (the lack of) social maturity.

Academic performance and engagement

Traditional sociometric research has extensively found that 'sociometrically' popular (i.e. accepted) students perform well academically, while members of the 'controversial' group perform around average (Newcomb et al. 1993). As we have seen above, more recent research distinguished two subgroups of (perceived) popular pupils; one that is highly accepted, nonaggressive, and academically engaged, and another that is average or low on acceptance, aggressive, and usually academically disengaged (De Bruyn–Cillessen 2006; Rodkin et al. 2000; Van den Berg et al. 2015). It may be due to this ambiguity that quantitative studies have found controversial results with regard to the relationship between academic *performance* (GPA) and popularity: some studies showing negative association (e.g. Hopmeyer Gorman et al. 2002), while other studies showing no association at all (e.g. Boyatzis et al. 1998; Meijs et al. 2010). In one study, LaFontana and Cillessen measured academic ability with peer nominations of smartness among early adolescents and found it to be positively associated with both popularity and acceptance (LaFontana–Cillessen 2002). The ethnographic studies by Adler and colleagues found that in the case of boys, both high and low academic achievement had a negative relationship with popularity (being labelled 'nerdy' or 'dummy'), whereas

popular girls did not suffer any stigma for performing well academically (Adler et al. 1992; Adler–Adler 1998). Other qualitative studies also confirmed that academically successful popular boys had to 'balance' popularity and school achievement (e.g. Francis et al. 2010). Although the association between grades and acceptance has typically been found to be positive (Wentzel 2009), Meijs and colleagues found no main effect of academic achievement on acceptance (Meijs et al. 2010). However, they found that in vocational classrooms the combination of high social intelligence and low achievement were associated with popularity, while in college-preparatory classrooms it was the combination of high social intelligence and high achievement.

Academic engagement is generally understood as a multidimensional construct that can be divided into subcategories such as behavioral (e.g. following the rules), emotional (e.g. sense of belonging and appreciation), and cognitive engagement (investment in learning) (Fredricks et al. 2004). Most studies have investigated the relationship between some aspects of behavioral engagement and peer status, and typically found a negative association between popularity/coolness and behavioral engagement (e.g. De Laet et al. 2014, 2015; Hopmeyer Gorman et al. 2002; Kiefer–Wang 2016; Schwartz et al. 2006; Troop-Gordon et al. 2011). Engels and colleagues conducted a very refined analysis of the relationship between academic engagement and peer status on a Belgian sample and found that behavioral engagement was negatively whereas behavioral disaffection positively associated with popularity, while the emotional dimensions were not associated with popularity (Engels et al. 2017). Additionally, acceptance was positively associated with both emotional and behavioral engagement (Engels et al. 2017). Finally, the developmental aspect also needs to be taken into consideration. For instance, Galván and colleagues found that increases in coolness were associated with increased academic engagement (raising hands, participating in class, following class rules) in grade 5, but with increased disengagement (copying homework, coming to class late, getting in trouble in class) in grades 7-8 (Galván et al. 2011).

With regard to racial and ethnic differences, the *'acting White' hypothesis* (Fordham–Ogbu 1986) proposes that for many African American students academic success can lead to sanctions from same-ethnicity peers (see the theoretical chapter above). Although some ethnographic studies at the time corroborated Fordham and Ogbu's findings (e.g. Miller 1989: 181), other, more recent ethnographic studies (e.g. Horvat–Lewis 2003; Tyson et al. 2005) and semi-structured interviews (Xie et al. 2006) did not. Similarly, some quantitative studies on large-scale American samples found support for the hypothesis (Fryer–Torelli 2010; Fuller-Rowell–Doan 2010), while others did not (Ainsworth-Darnell–Downey 1998; Cook–Ludwig 1997; Wildhagen 2011).

Importantly, these studies conceptualized social standing as self-reported popularity (Ainsworth-Darnell–Downey 1998; Cook–Ludwig 1997), self-reported social acceptance (Fuller-Rowell–Doan 2010), or friendship networks (Fryer–Torelli 2010), and none of them used peer-nominated acceptance, popularity, or coolness. Research on other sociodemographic groups, including Latin American students (Flores-Gonzalez 2005) and ethnic minority pupils in Germany (Stark et al. 2017), has also yielded controversial results for the 'acting White' hypothesis.

Finally, similarly to earlier sections, the importance of cross-cultural differences also needs to be emphasized. In the Chinese context, not only acceptance, but also popularity have been found to be positively associated with academic achievement (Li et al. 2012; Niu et al. 2016). In Hungary, Bocskor and Havelda found among early adolescents a minimal but statistically significant negative association between academic engagement and coolness, and a minimal but statistically significant positive association between engagement and acceptance, and GPA and acceptance among early adolescents (Bocskor–Havelda 2019). Additionally, three studies have tested the 'acting White' hypothesis on ethnic Roma students in Hungary (Habsz–Radó 2018; Hajdu et al. 2019; Kisfalusi 2018), but none of them found evidence of an ethnic oppositional culture. However, a vignette experiment found that Roma students in classes with *high ethnic diversity* rated *hypothetical* peers with good GPA as less cool (Keller 2020).

Physical attractiveness and involvement in romantic relationships

Qualitative studies have extensively demonstrated the strong relationship between *physical attractiveness*, being fashionable, and high status, especially in the case of girls (e.g. Adler et al. 1992; Eder 1985; Francis et al. 2010; Merten 1997). Quantitative studies have found attractiveness to be positively associated with both popularity and acceptance for both sexes (e.g. Boyatzis et al. 1998; Dijkstra et al. 2010; LaFontana–Cillessen 2002; Lease et al. 2002; Vaillancourt–Hymel 2006), while some studies found it to be more strongly associated with girls' popularity (e.g. Closson 2009). However, what counts as physically attractive may differ for the two sexes: Wang and colleagues found that lower levels of popularity were associated with a larger body shape for girls, while for boys both thin and heavier body shapes were associated with lower levels of popularity (Wang et al. 2006). Similarly, the importance of romantic relationships, and at a more general level being 'at ease' in cross-sex

interactions, have also been shown by several qualitative studies (e.g. Adler et al. 1992; Eder, 1985; Francis et al. 2010). Quantitative research has also found that involvement in dating/romantic relationships is positively associated with popularity and acceptance (Carlson–Rose 2007; Houser et al. 2015; Miller et al. 2009). One study among Chinese elementary school students (grade 5) found that cross-sex interaction was negatively associated with popularity (Li et al. 2012), while another piece of research among adolescents (grade 8) found that dating was positively associated with both popularity and acceptance (Niu et al. 2016). In Hungary, Bocskor and Havelda found that physical attractiveness was positively associated with both acceptance and coolness; however, it was more strongly associated with coolness for boys (Bocskor–Havelda 2019).

Leadership abilities and the Big Five personality traits

There are several dimensions to personality and several taxonomies of personality traits in psychology. Although many of them may be relevant to peer status, relatively few studies have investigated the relationship between personality and peer status, and these studies almost exclusively used the *Big Five factors* (Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism) (e.g. Ilmarinen et al. 2019; Jensen-Campbell et al. 2002; Lubbers et al. 2006; Mervielde–Fruyt 2000; Van der Linden et al. 2010; Wolters et al. 2014). A recent review suggests that out of the five factors extraversion is positively associated with both popularity and acceptance, agreeableness is positively associated with acceptance, neuroticism is negatively associated (in some studies) with both forms of status, while openness and conscientiousness is typically not associated with status (Van Aken–Asendorpf (2018) cited by Ilmarinen et al. (2019)). Van der Linden and colleagues found that when all Big Five dimensions were tested simultaneously, most of the statistical significance was lost, which suggested that the dimensions had overlapping variance (Van der Linden et al. 2010). They created a higher-order factor, the General Factor of Personality (GFP), to grasp this shared variance, and this factor was positively associated with both popularity and acceptance. Wolters and colleagues simultaneously investigated behavioral, personality, and communicative predictors of the two status dimensions among adolescents (Wolters et al. 2014). Out of the two personality traits they investigated (extraversion and agreeableness), only extraversion was found to be a distinct predictor of popularity. Additionally, they found that prosocial behavior only predicted popularity if it was associated with high levels of extraversion, while antisocial behavior was also associated with higher levels of popularity in case of students high on extraversion.

In addition to the Big Five personality traits, some studies have investigated the role of leadership abilities, in particular the extent to which it can moderate the association between popularity and relational aggression. Waasdorp and colleagues found that both popularity and acceptance were positively associated with leadership, and popular pupils who used relational aggression were more likely to be seen as leaders (Waasdorp et al. 2013). Puckett and colleagues found that leadership moderated the positive association between relational aggression and popularity, but not the negative association between relational aggression and acceptance (Puckett et al. 2008), while Gangel and colleagues found that in the case of girls only those relationally aggressive pupils were popular who also scored highly for perceived leadership ability (Gangel et al. 2017).

THE EFFECTS OF PEER NORMS AND GROUP COMPOSITION

The paper was so far intended to provide a brief but comprehensive overview of the relevant theoretical approaches and the most widely discussed behavioral and personality correlates of peer status among adolescents. Due to space limitations, this section cannot aim to provide a similarly comprehensive review of the effects of local and social contexts. Therefore, only some key findings related to peer norms and group composition will be highlighted to complement the picture provided by the discussion of the individual correlates above.

Among adolescents, several studies have demonstrated that *peer/classroom norms* have a significant impact on behavior (e.g. Dijkstra et al. 2008; Dijkstra–Gest 2015; Laninga-Wijnen et al. 2018). Dijkstra and Gest outlines a distinction between descriptive norms (the extent to which a given behavior is prevalent in the classroom) and salient norms (or 'norm salience' – the extent to which a behavior is associated with popularity) (Dijkstra–Gest 2015). They found among Dutch adolescents that behavior associated with popularity in a given classroom (academic achievement, prosocial behavior, bullying) had a larger effect on the relationship between that behavior and acceptance than the classroom prevalence of that behavior (Dijkstra et al. 2008; Dijkstra–Gest 2015). Similarly, Rambaran and colleagues demonstrated the importance of norm salience in the spread of risk attitudes (e.g. smoking, skipping school, damaging things) among Dutch adolescents (Rambaran et al. 2013). However, it is not only the prevalence and salience of a given norm that matters, but also the *perception* of this norm (e.g. Allen et al. 2005; Galván et al. 2011; Romera et al. 2019). An earlier review of peer influence processes suggested that adolescents' behavior is more strongly associated with the perception of peer norms than peers' actual (self-reported) behavior (Brechwald–Prinstein 2011).

Another important factor is the *socio-demographic composition* of a class – in particular, its racial/ethnic composition; students who are in the numerical majority may receive more popularity/acceptance nominations as the result of *same ethnicity bias*. For instance, Bellmore and colleagues found that European, Asian, and Latin American students demonstrated *positive* same ethnicity bias (more acceptance and fewer rejections of same-ethnicity peers), while African American students demonstrated *global* same-ethnicity bias (nominating more same-ethnicity peers for both acceptance and rejection) (Bellmore et al. 2007). Since racial/ethnic segregation is prevalent even in desegregated classes (e.g. Moody 2001), pluralistic status systems are often created along racial/ethnic lines (Brown 2011). For instance, Rock and colleagues found that in the case of African American students, high ethnic identity centrality was associated with high levels of peer acceptance and popularity when rated by other African American students, while their acceptance and popularity were unrelated to ethnic identity centrality when rated by European American peers (Rock et al. 2011). Similarly, some studies found in Hungary that Roma students were more likely to dislike (Boda–Néray 2015), bully (Kisfalusi et al. 2018) or consider less clever (Kisfalusi et al. 2019) those peers whom they perceived as Roma but who self-identified as non-Roma.

CONCLUSION

The paper has provided a review of the theoretical perspectives and most frequent correlates of peer status among adolescents. Even though this topic has been studied by a variety of disciplines (including sociology, psychology, and biology), it seems to be somewhat undertheorized, as there are only a few theories that directly address peer status (Mayeux–Kleiser 2019). Nevertheless, theoretical perspectives that address other aspects of peer experience (e.g. friendships) or provide a more general model of group processes can also be drawn on. Sociological perspectives typically conceptualize peer status with *popularity* and emphasize that its precise meaning and dynamics are defined by the peer group itself. Research on specific socio-demographic groups and cross-cultural comparisons, as well as more recent studies on the effects of peer norms greatly support these views. Additionally, sociological and social psychological theories of group formation predict that either members with resources/services valuable to the group (e.g. Blau 1960) or members who have attributes associated with higher status in wider society (e.g. Berger et al. 1972; Ridgeway 1991) obtain higher peer status. Alternatively, theories of

intergroup conflict (e.g. Tajfel–Turner 1979) predict in-group favoritism in the case of different ethnic/racial groups. The empirical research reviewed in this paper mostly provides evidence for the latter, although the application of social network techniques (as contrasted with the now prevalent more traditional statistical methods) and in-depth ethnographic studies in multiethnic settings could add valuable insight and clarification about this issue (Grow et al. (2016) and Kisfalusi et al. (2019) have already investigated the gendered and ethnic aspects of ability attributions with the application of social network techniques).

While sociological and social psychological approaches emphasize the context- and group-specific aspects of peer status, developmental and evolutionary theories make more universal predictions. Findings about the association between peer status and prosociality sit well with general developmental theories, while the association between risk behavior and popularity is in line with the predictions of maturity gap theory (Moffitt 1993). Similarly, findings about the association between (strategic) aggression and popularity, and in particular between popularity and the mixture of prosocial and aggressive behavior, are in line with the predictions of evolutionary theories. Nevertheless, we have seen that even in the case of these more universal associations, the importance of sociodemographic and cross-cultural differences cannot be neglected.

Consequently, more research from 'non-Western' contexts, and in particular research involving multiple samples and cross-cultural comparison are highly needed to refine the picture. Similarly, more research that takes into consideration peer norms as well as different classroom popularity hierarchies (e.g. Laninga-Wijnen et al. 2019) would greatly contribute to our understanding of peer dynamics. Finally, research involving novel methodological approaches (e.g. social network analysis), as well as the application of mixed research methods (e.g. Bocskor 2021) would also provide valuable contributions to our understanding of peer status.

REFERENCES

Adler, P. A. – P. Adler (1998) *Peer Power: Preadolescent Culture and Identity*. New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press

Adler, P. A. – S. J. Kless – P. Adler (1992) Socialization to gender roles: Popularity among elementary school boys and girls. *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 65, No. 3., pp. 169–187, DOI: 10.2307/2112807

Aikins, J.W. – S. D. Litwack (2011) Prosocial skills, social competence, and popularity. In: Cillessen, A. H. N. – D. Schwartz – L. Mayeux (eds.): *Popularity in the Peer System*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 140–162.

Ainsworth-Darnell, J. W. – D. B. Downey (1998) Assessing the oppositional culture explanation for racial/ethnic differences in school performance. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 63, No. 4., pp. 536–553, DOI: 10.2307/2657266

Allen, J. P. – M. R. Porter – F. C. McFarland – P. Marsh – K. B. McElhaney (2005) The two faces of adolescents' success with peers: adolescent popularity, social adaptation, and deviant behavior. *Child Development*, Vol. 76, No. 3., pp. 747–760, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00875.x

Allen, J. P. – M. M. Schad – B. Oudekerk – J. Chango (2014) What ever happened to the 'cool' kids? Long-term sequelae of early adolescent pseudomature behavior. *Child Development*, Vol. 85, No. 5., pp. 1866–1880, DOI: 10.1111/cdev.12250

Anderson, C. – J. A. D. Hildreth – L. Howland (2015) Is the desire for status a fundamental human motive? A review of the empirical literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 141, No. 3., pp. 574–601, DOI: 10.1037/a0038781

Barkow, J. H. (1989) *Darwin, Sex, and Status: Biological Spproaches to Mind and Culture.* Toronto (Canada), University of Toronto Press.

Barkow, J. H. (2006) Introduction: Sometimes the Bus Does Wait. In: Barkow, J. H. (ed.): *Missing the Revolution: Darwinism for Social Scientists*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–60.

Bellmore, A. – A. Nishina – M. R. Witkow – S. Graham – J. Juvonen (2007) The influence of classroom ethnic composition on same- and other-ethnicity peer nominations in middle school. *Social Development*, Vol. 16, No. 4., pp. 720–740, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00404.x

Bellmore, A. – V. M. Villarreal – A. Y. Ho (2011) Staying cool across the first year of middle school. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Vol. 40, No. 7., pp. 776–785, DOI: 10.1007/s10964-010-9590-x

Berger, J. – B. P. Cohen – M. Zelditch (1972) Status characteristics and social interaction. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 37, No. 3., pp. 241–255, DOI: 10.2307/2093465

Berger, J. – S. J. Rosenholtz – M. Zelditch (1980) Status organizing processes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 6, No. 1., pp. 479–508, DOI: 10.1146/annurev.so.06.080180.002403

Blau, P. M. (1960) A theory of social integration. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 65. No. 6., pp. 545–556.

Bocskor, Á. (2021) Reputational status dynamics from a mixed methods perspective: Coolness and popularity in a Hungarian primary school sample. *Youth & Society*, May 2021, DOI: 10.1177/0044118X211012815

Bocskor, Á. – A. Havelda (2019) Status dynamics: Popularity and acceptance in an ethnically diverse Hungarian primary school sample. *Intersections. East European Journal of Society and Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 4., pp. 110–138, DOI: 10.17356/ieejsp.v5i4.581

Boda, Z. – B. Néray (2015) Inter-ethnic friendship and negative ties in secondary school. *Social Networks*, Vol. 43, No. 1., pp. 57–72, DOI: 10.1016/j.socnet.2015.03.004

Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press

Boyatzis, C. J. – P. Baloff – C. Durieux (1998) Effects of perceived attractiveness and academic success on early adolescent peer popularity. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, Vol. 159, No. 3., pp. 337–344, DOI: 10.1080/00221329809596155

Brechwald, W. A. – M. J. Prinstein (2011) Beyond homophily: A decade of advances in understanding peer influence processes. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, Vol. 21, No. 1., pp. 166–179, DOI: 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00721.x

Brown, B. B. (2011) Popularity in Peer Group Perspective: The Role of Status in Adolescent Peer Systems. In: Cillessen, A. H. N. – D. Schwartz – L. Mayeux (eds.): *Popularity in the Peer System*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 165–192.

Bukowski, W. M. (2011) Popularity as a Social Concept: Meanings and Significance. In: Cillessen, A.H.N. – D. Schwartz – L. Mayeux (eds.): *Popularity in the Peer System*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 3–24.

Card, N. A. – B. D. Stucky – G. M. Sawalani – T. D. Little (2008) Direct and indirect aggression during childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic review of gender differences, intercorrelations, and relations to maladjustment. *Child Development*, Vol. 79, No. 5., pp. 1185–1229, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01184.x

Carlson, W. – A. J. Rose (2007) The role of reciprocity in romantic relationships in middle childhood and early adolescence. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, Vol. 53, No. 2., pp. 262–290, DOI: 10.1353/mpq.2007.0008

Casper, D. M. – N. A. Card – C. Barlow (2020) Relational aggression and victimization during adolescence: A meta-analytic review of unique associations with popularity, peer acceptance, rejection, and friendship characteristics. *Journal of Adolescence*, Vol. 80, pp. 41–52, DOI: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2019.12.012

Chase, M. A. – M. Machida (2011) The role of sport as a social status determinant for children. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, Vol. 82, No. 4., pp. 731–739, DOI: 10.1080/02701367.2011.10599810

Cillessen, A. H. N. (2011) Toward a Theory of Popularity. In: Cillessen, A. H. N. – D. Schwartz – L. Mayeux (eds.): *Popularity in the Peer System*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 273–299.

Cillessen, A. H. N. – P. E. L. Marks (2011) Conceptualizing and Measuring Popularity. In: Cillessen, A. H. N. – D. Schwartz – L. Mayeux (eds.): *Popularity in the Peer System*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 25–56.

Cillessen, A. H. N. – L. Mayeux (2004) From censure to reinforcement: Developmental changes in the association between aggression and social status. *Child Development*, Vol. 75, No. 1., pp. 147–163.

Closson, L. M. (2009) Status and gender differences in early adolescents' descriptions of popularity. *Social Development*, Vol. 18, No. 2., pp. 412–426, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00459.x

Closson, L. M. – S. Hymel (2016) Status differences in target-specific prosocial behavior and aggression. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Vol. 45, No. 9., pp. 1836–1848, DOI: 10.1007/s10964-016-0481-7

Coie, J. D. – K. A. Dodge – H. Coppotelli (1982) Dimensions and types of social status: A cross-age perspective. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 18, No. 4., pp. 557–570, DOI: 10.1037/0012-1649.18.4.557

Coleman, J. S. (1961a) Athletics in high school. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 338, No. 1., pp. 33–43. DOI: 10.1177/000271626133800105

Coleman, J. S. (1961b) *The Adolescent Society: The Social Life of the Teenager and Its Impact on Education*. New York, NY, Free Press

Collins, R. (1971) A conflict theory of sexual stratification. *Social Problems*, Vol. 19, No. 1., pp. 3–21. DOI: 10.2307/799936

Cook, P. J. – J. Ludwig (1997) Weighing the "burden of 'acting White':" Are there race differences in attitudes toward education? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Vol. 16, No. 2., pp. 256–278, DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1520-6688(199721)16:2<256::AID-PAM4>3.0.CO;2-H

Crick, N. R. – J. K. Grotpeter (1995) Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, Vol. 66, No. 3., pp. 710–722, DOI: 10.2307/1131945

Currie, D. H. – D. M. Kelly – S. Pomerantz (2007) 'The power to squash people:' Understanding girls' relational aggression. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 28, No. 1., pp. 23–37, DOI: 10.1080/01425690600995974

Dahrendorf, R. (1959) *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press

Daniels, E. – C. Leaper (2006) a longitudinal investigation of sport participation, peer acceptance, and self-esteem among adolescent girls and boys. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, Vol. 55, No. 11–12., pp. 875–880, DOI: 10.1007/s11199-006-9138-4

Davis, K. – W. E. Moore (1945) Some principles of stratification. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 10, No. 2., pp. 242–249, DOI: 10.2307/2085643

De Bruyn, E. H. – A. H. N. Cillessen (2006) Popularity in early adolescence: Prosocial and antisocial subtypes. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, Vol. 21, No. 5., pp. 607–627, DOI: 10.1177/0743558406293966

De Bruyn, E. H. – A. H. N. Cillessen – I. B. Wissink (2010) Associations of peer acceptance and perceived popularity with bullying and victimization in early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 30, No. 4., pp. 543–566, DOI: 10.1177/0272431609340517

De Bruyn, E. H. – A. H. N. Cillessen – G. E. Weisfeld (2012) Dominance-popularity status, behavior, and the emergence of sexual activity in young adolescents. *Evolutionary Psychology*, Vol. 10, No. 2., pp. 296–319, DOI: 10.1177/147470491201000209

De Laet, S. – S. Doumen – E. Vervoort – H. Colpin – K. Van Leeuwen – L. Goossens – K. Verschueren (2014) Transactional links between teacher-child relationship quality and perceived versus sociometric popularity: A three-wave longitudinal study. *Child Development*, Vol. 85. No. 4., pp. 1647–1662, DOI: 10.1111/cdev.12216

De Laet, S. – H. Colpin – E. Vervoort – S. Doumen – K. Van Leeuwen – L. Goossens – K. Verschueren (2015) Developmental trajectories of children's behavioral engagement in late elementary school: Both teachers and peers matter. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 51, No. 9., pp. 1292–1306, DOI: 10.1037/a0039478

Dijkstra, J. K. – S. D. Gest (2015) Peer norm salience for academic achievement, prosocial behavior, and bullying: implications for adolescent school experiences. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 35, No. 1., pp. 79–96, DOI: 10.1177/0272431614524303

Dijkstra J. K. – S. Lindenberg – R. Veenstra (2008) Beyond the class norm: Bullying behavior of popular adolescents and its relation to peer acceptance and rejection. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, Vol. 36, No. 8., pp. 1289–1299, DOI: 10.1007/s10802-008-9251-7

Dijkstra, J. K. – S. Lindenberg – F. C. Verhulst – J. Ormel – R. Veenstra (2009) The relation between popularity and aggressive, destructive, and norm-breaking behaviors: Moderating effects of athletic abilities, physical attractiveness, and prosociality. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, Vol. 19, No. 3., pp. 401–413, DOI: 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2009.00594.x

Dijkstra, J. K. – A. H. N. Cillessen – S. Lindenberg – R. Veenstra (2010) Same-gender and cross-gender likeability: associations with popularity and status enhancement: The TRAILS study. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 30, No. 6., pp. 773–802, DOI: 10.1177/0272431609350926

Dodge, K. A. – J. D. Coie (1987) Social-information-processing factors in reactive and proactive aggression in children's peer groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 53, No. 6., pp. 1146–1158.

Dong, Q. – G. Weisfeld – R. H. Boardway – J. Shen (1996) Correlates of social status among Chinese adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 27, No. 4., pp. 476–493, DOI: 10.1177/0022022196274006

Duffy, A. L. – S. Penn – D. Nesdale – M. J. Zimmer-Gembeck (2017) Popularity: Does it magnify associations between popularity prioritization and the bullying and defending behavior of early adolescent boys and girls? *Social Development*, Vol. 26, No. 2., pp. 263–277, DOI: 10.1111/sode.12206

Duncan, N. (2004) It's important to be nice, but it's nicer to be important: Girls, popularity and sexual competition. *Sex Education*, Vol. 4, No. 2., pp. 137–152, DOI: 10.1080/14681810410001678329

Eder, D. (1985) The cycle of popularity: Interpersonal relations among female adolescents. *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 58, No. 3., pp. 154–165, DOI: 10.2307/2112416

Eder, D. – D. A. Kinney (1995) The effect of middle school extra curricular activities on adolescents' popularity and peer status. *Youth & Society*, Vol. 26, No. 3., pp. 298–324, DOI: 10.1177/0044118X95026003002

Eder, D. – S. Parker (1987) The cultural production and reproduction of gender: The effect of extracurricular activities on peer-group culture. *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 60, No. 3., pp. 200–213, DOI: 10.2307/2112276

Eisenberg, N. – I. K. Guthrie – B. C. Murphy – S. A. Shepard – A. Cumberland – G. Carlo (1999) Consistency and development of prosocial dispositions: A longitudinal study. *Child Development*, Vol. 70, No. 6., pp. 1360–1372, DOI: 10.1111/1467-8624.00100

Engels, M. C. – H. Colpin – K. Van Leeuwen – P. Bijttebier – W. V. Den Noortgate – S. Claes – L. Goossens – K. Verschueren (2017) School engagement trajectories in adolescence: The role of peer likeability and popularity. *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 64., pp. 61–75, DOI: 10.1016/j.jsp.2017.04.006

Faris, R. – D. Felmlee (2011) Status struggles: Network centrality and gender segregation in same- and cross-gender aggression. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 76, No. 1., pp. 48–73, DOI: 10.1177/0003122410396196

Faris, R. – D. Felmlee (2014) Casualties of social combat: School networks of peer victimization and their consequences. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 79, No. 2., pp. 228–257, DOI: 10.1177/0003122414524573

Farmer, T. W. – D. B. Estell – J. L. Bishop – K. K. O'Neal – B. D. Cairns (2003) Rejected bullies or popular leaders? The social relations of aggressive subtypes of rural African American early adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 39, No. 6., pp. 992–1004, DOI: 10.1037/0012-1649.39.6.992

Flores-Gonzalez, N. (2005) Popularity versus respect: school structure, peer groups and Latino academic achievement. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol. 18, No. 5., pp. 625–642, DOI: 10.1080/09518390500224945

Fordham, S. – J. U. Ogbu (1986) Black students' school success: Coping with the 'burden of acting White.' *The Urban Review*, Vol. 18, No. 3., pp. 176–206, DOI: 10.1007/BF01112192

Francis, B. – C. Skelton – B. Read (2010) The simultaneous production of educational achievement and popularity: How do some pupils accomplish it? *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 2., pp. 317–340, DOI: 10.1080/01411920902919265

Franken, A. – Z. Harakeh – R. Veenstra – W. Vollebergh – J. K. Dijkstra (2017) Social status of adolescents with an early onset of externalizing behavior: The SNARE study. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 37, No. 8., pp. 1037–1053, DOI: 10.1177/0272431616636478

Fredricks, J. A. – P. C. Blumenfeld – A. H. Paris (2004) School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 74, No. 1., pp. 59–109, DOI: 10.3102/00346543074001059

Fryer, R. G. – P. Torelli (2010) An empirical analysis of 'acting White.' *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 94, No. 5., pp. 380–396, DOI: 10.1016/j.jpubeco.2009.10.011

Fuller-Rowell, T. E. – S. N. Doan (2010) The social costs of academic success across ethnic groups. *Child development*, Vol. 81, No. 6., pp. 1696–1713, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01504.x

Galván, A. – A. Spatzier – J. Juvonen (2011) Perceived norms and social values to capture school culture in elementary and middle school. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 32, No. 6., pp. 346–353, DOI: 10.1016/j.appdev.2011.08.005

Gangel, M. J. – S. P. Keane – S. D. Calkins – L. Shanahan – M. O'Brien (2017) The association between relational aggression and perceived popularity in early adolescence: A test of competing hypotheses. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 37, No. 8., pp. 1078–1092, DOI: 10.1177/0272431616642327

Gilbert, P. – J. Price – S. Allan (1995) Social comparison, social attractiveness and evolution: How might they be related? *New Ideas in Psychology*, Vol. 13, No. 2., pp. 149–165, DOI: 10.1016/0732-118X(95)00002-X

Grow, A. – K. Takács – J. Pál (2016) Status characteristics and ability attributions in Hungarian school classes: An exponential random graph approach. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 79, No. 2., pp. 156–167, DOI: 10.1177/0190272516643052

Habsz, L. D. – M. Radó (2018) Ez egy gyönyörű barátság kezdete? Az iskolai ellenkultúra hiánya a magyarországi roma tanulók körében. *Szociológiai Szemle*, Vol. 28, No. 2., pp. 52–74.

Hajdu, T. – G. Kertesi – G. Kézdi (2019) Inter-ethnic friendship and hostility between Roma and non-Roma students in Hungary: The role of exposure and academic achievement. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis and Policy*, Vol. 19, No. 1., DOI: 10.1515/bejeap-2017-0289

Hartl, A. C. – B. Laursen –S. Cantin – F. Vitaro (2020) A test of the bistrategic control hypothesis of adolescent popularity. *Child Development*, Vol. 91, No.3., pp. e635–e648, DOI: 10.1111/cdev.13269

Hawke, S. – E. Rieger (2013) Popularity, likeability, and risk-taking in middle adolescence. *Health*, Vol. 5, No. 63., pp. 41–52, DOI: 10.4236/health.2013.56A3007

Hawley, P. H. (1999) The ontogenesis of social dominance: A strategy-based evolutionary perspective. *Developmental Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1., pp. 97–132, DOI: 10.1006/drev.1998.0470

Hawley, P. H. (2003) Prosocial and coercive configurations of resource control in early adolescence: A case for the well-adapted Machiavellian. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, Vol. 49, No. 3., pp. 279–309, DOI:10.1353/mpq.2003.0013

Holland A. – T. Andre (1994) Athletic participation and the social status of adolescent males and females. *Youth & Society*, Vol. 25, No. 3., pp. 388–407, DOI: 10.1177/0044118X94025003005.

Hopmeyer Gorman, A. – J. Kim – A. Schimmelbusch (2002) The attributes adolescents associate with peer popularity and teacher preference. *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 40, No. 2., pp. 143–165, DOI: 10.1016/S0022-4405(02)00092-4

Horvat, E. M. – K. S. Lewis (2003) Reassessing the 'burden of "acting White":' The importance of peer groups in managing academic success. *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 76, No. 4., pp. 265–280, DOI: 10.2307/1519866

Houser, J. J. – L. Mayeux – C. Cross (2015) Peer status and aggression as predictors of dating popularity in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Vol. 44, No. 3. pp. 683–695, DOI: 10.1007/s10964-014-0174-z

Ilmarinen, V. – M. Vainikainen – M. Verkasalo – J. Lönnqvist (2019) Peer sociometric status and personality development from middle childhood to preadolescence. *European Journal of Personality*, Vol. 33, No.5., pp. 606–626, DOI: 10.1002/per.2219

Jamison, R. S. – T. Wilson – A. Ryan (2015) Too cool for school? The relationship between coolness and academic reputation in early adolescence. *Social Development*, Vol. 24, No. 2., pp. 384–403, DOI: 10.1111/sode.12097

Jensen-Campbell, L. A. – R. Adams – D. G. Perry – K. Workman – J. Furdella – S. Egan (2002) Agreeableness, extraversion, and peer relations in early adolescence: Winning friends and deflecting aggression. *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 36, No. 3., pp. 224–251. DOI: 10.1006/jrpe.2002.2348

Keller, T. (2020) Differences in Roma and non-Roma students' ratings of their peers' popularity: An inquiry into the oppositional culture in Hungarian schools with the use of a survey experiment. *Quality & Quantity*, Vol. 54, No. 4., pp. 1233–1255, DOI: 10.1007/s11135-020-00983-x

Kennedy, E. (1995) Correlates of perceived popularity among peers: A study of race and gender differences among middle school students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 64, No. 2., pp. 186–195, DOI: 10.2307/2967241

Kiefer, S. M. – J. H. Wang (2016) Associations of coolness and social goals with aggression and engagement during adolescence. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 44, pp. 52–62, DOI: 10.1016/j.appdev.2016.02.007

Killeya-Jones, L. A. – R. Nakajima – P. R. Costanzo (2007) Peer standing and substance use in early-adolescent grade-level networks: A short-term longitudinal study. *Prevention Science: The official journal of the Society for Prevention Research*, Vol. 8, No. 1., pp. 11–23, DOI: 10.1007/s11121-006-0053-2

Kisfalusi, D. (2018) Bullies and victims in primary schools: The association between bullying, victimization, and students' ethnicity and academic achievement. *Intersections. East European Journal of Society and Politics*, Vol. 4, No. 1., pp. 133–158, DOI: https://doi.org/10.17356/ieejsp.v4i1.372

Kisfalusi, D. – J. Pál – Z. Boda (2018) Bullying and victimization among majority and minority students: The role of peers' ethnic perceptions. *Social Networks*. Vol. 60, Jan. 2020, pp. 48–60, DOI: 10.1016/j.socnet.2018.08.006

Kisfalusi, D. – B. Janky – K. Takács (2019) Double standards or social identity? The role of gender and ethnicity in ability perceptions in the classroom. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 39, No. 5., pp. 745–780, DOI: 10.1177/0272431618791278

Kornbluh, M. – J. W. Neal (2016) Examining the many dimensions of children's popularity: Interactions between aggression, prosocial behaviors, and gender. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, Vol. 33, No. 1., pp. 62–80, DOI: 10.1177/0265407514562562

LaFontana, K. M. – A. H. N. Cillessen (1998) The nature of children's stereotypes of popularity. *Social Development*, Vol. 7, No. 3., pp. 301–320, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00069

LaFontana, K. M. – A. H. N. Cillessen (2002) Children's perceptions of popular and unpopular peers: A multimethod assessment. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 38, No. 5., pp. 635–647.

Laninga-Wijnen, L. – Z. Harakeh – J. K. Dijkstra – R. Veenstra – W. Vollebergh (2018) Aggressive and prosocial peer norms: Change, stability, and associations with adolescent aggressive and prosocial behavior development. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 38, No. 2., pp. 178–203, DOI: 10.1177/0272431616665211

Laninga-Wijnen L. – Z. Harakeh – C. F. Garandeau – J.K. Dijkstra – R. Veenstra – W. A. M. Vollebergh (2019) Classroom popularity hierarchy predicts prosocial and aggressive popularity norms across the school year. *Child Development*, Vol. 90, No. 5., pp. e637–e653, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13228

Leary, M. R. – K. P. Jongman-Sereno – K. J. Diebels (2014) The Pursuit of Status: A Self-presentational Perspective on the Quest for Social Value. In: Cheng, J.T. – J.L. Tracy – C. Anderson (eds.): *The Psychology of Social Status*. New York, NY, Springer, pp. 159–178, DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4939-0867-7_8

Lease, A. M. – C. A. Kennedy – J. L. Axelrod (2002) Children's social constructions of popularity. *Social Development*, Vol. 11, No. 1., pp. 87–109, DOI: 10.1111/1467-9507.00188

Li, Y. – H. Xie – J. Shi (2012) Chinese and American children's perceptions of popularity determinants: Cultural differences and behavioral correlates. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, Vol. 36, No. 6., pp. 420–429, DOI: 10.1177/0165025412446393

Lindstrom, W. A. – A. M. Lease (2005) The role of athlete as contributor to peer status in school-age and adolescent females in the United States: From pre-title IX to 2000 and beyond. *Social Psychology of Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2., pp. 223–244, DOI: 10.1007/s11218-004-6734-4

Lu, T. – S. Jin – L. Li – L. Niu – X. Chen –D. C. French (2018a) Longitudinal associations between popularity and aggression in Chinese middle and high school adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 54, No. 12., pp. 2291–2301, DOI: 10.1037/dev0000591

Lu, T. – L. Li – L. Niu – S. Jin – D. C. French (2018b) Relations between popularity and prosocial behavior in middle school and high school Chinese adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, Vol. 42, No. 2., pp. 175–181, DOI: 10.1177/0165025416687411

Lubbers, M. J. – M. P. C. Van der Werf – H. Kuyper – G. J. Offringa (2006) Predicting peer acceptance in Dutch youth: A multilevel analysis. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 26, No. 1., pp. 4–35, DOI: 10.1177/0272431605282747

Luthar, S. S. – T. J. McMahon (1996) Peer reputation among inner-city adolescents: Structure and correlates. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, Vol. 6, No. 4., pp. 581–603.

Mayeux, L. – M. Kleiser (2019) A gender prototypicality theory of adolescent peer popularity. *Adolescent Research Review*, Vol. 5, No.2., pp. 295–306, DOI: 10.1007/s40894-019-00123-z

Mayeux, L. – M. J. Sandstrom – A. H. N. Cillessen (2008) Is being popular a risky proposition? *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, Vol. 18, No. 1., pp. 49–74, DOI: 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2008.00550.x

Mayeux, L. – J. J. Houser – K. D. Dyches (2011) Social Acceptance and Popularity: Two Distinct Forms of Peer Status. In: Cillessen, A. H. N. – D. Schwartz – L. Mayeux (eds.): *Popularity in the Peer System*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 79–102.

Meijs, N. – A. H. N. Cillessen – R. H. J. Scholte – E. Segers – R. Spijkerman (2010) Social intelligence and academic achievement as predictors of adolescent popularity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Vol. 39, No. 1., pp. 62–72, DOI: 10.1007/s10964-008-9373-9

Meisinger, E. B. – J. J. Blake – A. M. Lease – G. J. Palardy – S. F. Olejnik (2007) Variant and invariant predictors of perceived popularity across majority-Black and majority-White classrooms. *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 45, No. 1., pp. 21–44, DOI: 10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.005

Merten, D. E. (1997) The meaning of meanness: Popularity, competition, and conflict among junior high school girls. *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 70, No. 3., pp. 175–191, DOI: 10.2307/2673207

Mervielde, I. – F. D. Fruyt (2000) The Big Five personality factors as a model for the structure of children's peer nominations. *European Journal of Personality*, Vol. 14, No. 2., pp. 91–106, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0984(200003/04)14:2<91::AID-PER356>3.0.CO;2-Z

Miller, R. L. (1989) Desegregation experiences of minority students: Adolescent coping strategies in five Connecticut high schools. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, Vol. 4, No. 2., pp. 173–189, DOI: 10.1177/074355488942006

Miller, S. – J. E. Lansford – P. Costanzo – P. S. Malone –M. Golonka – L. A. Killeya-Jones (2009) Early adolescent romantic partner status, peer standing, and problem behaviors. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 29, No. 6., pp. 839–861, DOI: 10.1177/0272431609332665

Moffitt, T. E. (1993) Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, Vol. 100, No. 4., pp. 674–701.

Moody, J. (2001) Race, school integration, and friendship segregation in America. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 107, No. 3., pp. 679–716, DOI: 10.1086/338954

Newcomb, A. F. – W. M. Bukowski (1983) Social impact and social preference as determinants of children's peer group status. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 19, No. 6., pp. 856–867, DOI: 10.1037/0012-1649.19.6.856

Newcomb, A. F. – W. M. Bukowski – L. Pattee (1993) Children's peer relations: A meta-analytic review of popular, rejected, neglected, controversial, and average sociometric status. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 113, No. 1., pp. 99–128.

Niu, L. – S. Jin – L. Li – D.C. French (2016) Popularity and social preference in Chinese adolescents: Associations with social and behavioral adjustment. *Social Development*, Vol. 25, No. 4., pp. 828–845, DOI: 10.1111/sode.12172

Owens, L. – H. Feng – J. Xi (2014) Popularity among teenage girls in Adelaide and Shanghai: A pilot Q-method study. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 5., pp. 80–85, DOI: 10.4236/jss.2014.25016

Pál J. – C. Stadtfeld – A. Grow – K. Takács (2016) Status perceptions matter: Understanding disliking among adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, Vol. 26, No. 4., pp. 805–818, DOI: 10.1111/jora.12231

Parker, J. G. – K. H. Rubin – S. A. Erath – J. C. Wojslawowicz – A. A. Buskirk (2006) Peer Relationships, Child Development, and Adjustment: A Developmental Psychopathology Perspective. In: Cicchetti, D. – D. J. Cohen (eds.): *Developmental Psychopathology: Theory and Method,* Vol. 1, 2nd Ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc. pp. 419–493, DOI: 10.1002/9780470939383.ch12

Parkhurst, J. T. – A. Hopmeyer (1998) Sociometric popularity and peer-perceived popularity: Two distinct dimensions of peer status. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 18, No. 2., pp. 125–144, DOI: 10.1177/0272431698018002001

Parsons, T. (1940) An analytical approach to the theory of social stratification. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 45, No. 6., pp. 841–862.

Pellegrini, A. D. (2008) The roles of aggressive and affiliative behaviors in resource control: A behavioral ecological perspective. *Developmental Review*, Vol. 28, No. 4., pp. 461–487, DOI: 10.1016/j.dr.2008.03.001

Pellegrini, A. D. – J. D. Long (2002) A longitudinal study of bullying, dominance, and victimization during the transition from primary school through secondary school. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 20, No. 2., pp. 259–280, DOI: 10.1348/026151002166442

Pellegrini, A. D. – C. J. Roseth – M. J. V. Ryzin – D. W. Solberg (2011) Popularity as a Form of Social Dominance: An Evolutionary Perspective. In: Cillessen, A. H. N. – D. Schwartz – L. Mayeux (eds.): *Popularity in the Peer System*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 123–139.

Peters, E. – A. H. N. Cillessen – J. M. Riksen-Walraven – G. J. T. Haselager (2010) Best friends' preference and popularity: Associations with aggression and prosocial behavior. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, Vol. 34, No. 5., pp. 398–405, DOI: 10.1177/0165025409343709

Pethes, L. K. (2015) *Mitől lesz valaki népszerű egy osztályban? A diákok és osztályfőnökök véleményének összehasonlítása*. MA/MSc Thesis, Budapest, HU, BCE Társadalomtudományi Kar. http://szd.lib.uni-corvinus.hu/8601/ [Last access: 06 19 2019]

Pouwels, J. L. – T. A. M. Lansu – A. H. N. Cillessen (2016) Participant roles of bullying in adolescence: Status characteristics, social behavior, and assignment criteria. *Aggressive Behavior*, Vol. 42, No. 3., pp. 239–253, DOI: 10.1002/ab.21614

Prinstein, M. J. – A. H. N. Cillessen (2003) Forms and functions of adolescent peer aggression associated with high levels of peer status. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, Vol. 49, No. 3., pp. 310–342, DOI: 10.1353/mpq.2003.0015

Prinstein, M. J. – C. S. Meade – G. L. Cohen (2003) Adolescent oral sex, peer popularity, and perceptions of best friends' sexual behavior. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, Vol. 28, No., 4. pp. 243–249, DOI: 10.1093/jpepsy/jsg012

Prinstein, M. J. – S. C. Choukas-Bradley – S. W. Helms – W. A. Brechwald – D. Rancourt (2011) High peer popularity longitudinally predicts adolescent health risk behavior, or does it?: An examination of linear and quadratic associations. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, Vol. 36, No. 9., pp. 980–990, DOI: 10.1093/jpepsy/jsr053

Pronk J. – N. C. Lee – D. Sandhu – K. Kaur – S. Kaur – T. Olthof – F. A. Goossens (2017) Associations between Dutch and Indian adolescents' bullying role behavior and peer-group status: Cross-culturally testing an evolutionary hypothesis. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, Vol. 41, No. 6., pp. 735–742, DOI: 10.1177/0165025416679743

Puckett, M. B. – J. W. Aikins – A. H. N. Cillessen (2008) Moderators of the association between relational aggression and perceived popularity. *Aggressive Behavior*, Vol. 34, No. 6., pp. 563–576, DOI: 10.1002/ab.20280

Rambaran, A. J. – J. K. Dijkstra – T. H. Stark (2013) Status-based influence processes: The role of norm salience in contagion of adolescent risk attitudes. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, Vol. 23, No. 3., pp. 574–585, DOI: 10.1111/jora.12032

Ridgeway, C. L. (1991) The social construction of status value: Gender and other nominal characteristics. *Social Forces*, Vol. 70, No. 2., pp. 367–386, DOI: 10.2307/2580244

Ridgeway, C. L. (2014) Why status matters for inequality. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 79, No. 1., pp. 1–16, DOI: 10.1177/0003122413515997

Ridgeway, C. L. – J. W. Balkwell (1997) Group processes and the diffusion of status beliefs. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 60, No. 1., pp. 14–31, DOI: 10.2307/2787009

Ridgeway, C. L. – K. Backor – Y. E. Li – J. E. Tinkler – K. G. Erickson (2009) How easily does a social difference become a status distinction? Gender matters. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 74, No. 1., pp. 44–62, DOI: 10.1177/000312240907400103

Rock, P. F. – D. J. Cole – S. Houshyar – M. Lythcott – M. J. Prinstein (2011) Peer status in an ethnic context: Associations with African American adolescents' ethnic identity. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 32, No. 4., pp. 163–169, DOI: 10.1016/j.appdev.2011.03.002

Rodkin, P. C. – C. Berger (2008) Who bullies whom? Social status asymmetries by victim gender. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, Vol. 32, No. 6., pp. 473–485, DOI: 10.1177/0165025408093667

Rodkin, P. C. – T. W. Farmer – R. Pearl – R. Van Acker (2000) Heterogeneity of popular boys: Antisocial and prosocial configurations. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 36, No. 1., pp. 14–24, DOI: 10.1037/0012-1649.36.1.14

Rodkin, P. C. – T. W. Farmer – R. Pearl – R. Van Acker (2006) They're cool: Social status and peer group supports for aggressive boys and girls. *Social Development*, Vol. 15, No. 2., pp. 175–204, DOI: 10.1046/j.1467-9507.2006.00336.x

Romera, E. M. – A. Bravo – R. Ortega-Ruiz – R. Veenstra (2019) Differences in perceived popularity and social preference between bullying roles and class norms. *PLoS One*, Vol. 14, No. 10., e0223499, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0223499

Rose, A. J. – L. P. Swenson – E. M. Waller (2004) Overt and relational aggression and perceived popularity: Developmental differences in concurrent and prospective relations. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 40, No. 3., pp. 378–387, DOI: 10.1037/0012-1649.40.3.378

Rose, A. J. – G. C. Glick – R. L. Smith (2011) Popularity and Gender: The Two Cultures of Boys and Girls. In: Cillessen, A. H. N. – D. Schwartz – L. Mayeux (eds.): *Popularity in the Peer System*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 103–122.

Rubin, K. H. – W. M. Bukowski – J. C. Bowker (2015) Children in Peer Groups. In: Bornstein, M. H. – T. Leventhal – R. M. Lerner (eds.): *Handbook of*

Child Psychology and Developmental Science: Ecological Settings and Processes, Vol. 4, 7th Ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., pp. 175–222, DOI: 10.1002/9781118963418.childpsy405

Salmivalli, C. (2010) Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Vol. 15, No. 2., pp. 112–120, DOI: 10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007

Sandstrom, M. J. (2011) The Power of Popularity: Influence Processes in Childhood and Adolescence. In: Cillessen, A. H. N. – D. Schwartz – L. Mayeux (eds.): *Popularity in the Peer System*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 219–244.

Schwartz D. – A. Hopmeyer Gorman (2011) The High Price of High Status: Popularity as a Mechanism of Risk. In: Cillessen, A. H. N. – D. Schwartz – L. Mayeux (eds.): *Popularity in the Peer System*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 245–270.

Schwartz, D. – A. H. Gorman – J. Nakamoto – T. McKay (2006) Popularity, social acceptance, and aggression in adolescent peer groups: Links with academic performance and school attendance. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 42, No. 6., pp. 1116–1127, DOI: 10.1037/0012-1649.42.6.1116

Schwartz, D. – S. R. Tom – L. Chang – Y. Xu – M. T. Duong – B. M. Kelly (2010) Popularity and acceptance as distinct dimensions of social standing for Chinese children in Hong Kong. *Social Development*, Vol. 19, No. 4., pp. 681–697, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2009.00558.x

Shakib, S. (2003) Female basketball participation: Negotiating the conflation of peer status and gender status from childhood through puberty. *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 46, No. 10., pp. 1405–1422, DOI: 10.1177/0002764203046010008

Shakib, S. – P. Veliz – M. D. Dunbar – D. Sabo (2011) Athletics as a source for social status among youth: Examining variation by gender, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 3., pp. 303–328, DOI: 10.1123/ssj.28.3.303

Sijtsema, J. J. – R. Veenstra – S. Lindenberg – C. Salmivalli (2009) Empirical test of bullies' status goals: Assessing direct goals, aggression, and prestige. *Aggressive Behavior*, Vol. 35, No. 1., pp. 57–67, DOI: 10.1002/ab.20282

Stark, T. H – L. Leszczensky – S. Pink S (2017) Are there differences in ethnic majority and minority adolescents' friendships preferences and social influence with regard to their academic achievement? *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, Vol. 20, No. 3., pp. 475–498, DOI: 10.1007/s11618-017-0766-y

Stoltz, S. – A. H. N. Cillessen – Y. H. M. Van den Berg – R. Gommans (2016) Popularity differentially predicts reactive and proactive aggression in early adolescence. *Aggressive Behavior*, Vol. 42, No. 1., pp. 29–40, DOI: 10.1002/ab.21603

Tajfel, H. (1974) Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information*, Vol. 13, No. 2., pp. 65–93, DOI: 10.1177/053901847401300204

Tajfel, H. – J. Turner (1979) An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In: Austin, W. G. – S. Worchel (eds.): *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey, CA, Brooks/Cole, pp. 33–37.

Troop-Gordon, W. – K. J. Visconti – K. J. Kuntz (2011) Perceived popularity during early adolescence: Links to declining school adjustment among aggressive youth. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 31, No. 1., pp. 125–151, DOI: 10.1177/0272431610384488

Tseng, W.-L. – A. M. Banny – Y. Kawabata – N. R. Crick – S. S.-F. Gau (2013) A cross-lagged structural equation model of relational aggression, physical aggression, and peer status in a Chinese culture. *Aggressive Behavior*, Vol. 39, No. 4., pp. 301–315, DOI: 10.1002/ab.21480

Tyson, K. – W. Darity – D. R. Castellino (2005) It's not "a Black thing:" Understanding the burden of acting White and other dilemmas of high achievement. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 70, No. 4., pp. 582–605, DOI: 10.1177/000312240507000403

Vaillancourt, T. – S. Hymel (2006) Aggression and social status: The moderating roles of sex and peer-valued characteristics. *Aggressive Behavior*, Vol. 32, No. 4., pp. 396–408, DOI: 10.1002/ab.20138

Van Aken, M. A. G. – J. B. Asendorpf (2018) Personality and Peer Relationships. In W. M. Bukowski, B. Laursen, K. H. Rubin (Eds.) *Handbook of Peer Interactions, Relationships, and Groups*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 159–176.

Van den Berg, Y. H. M. – W. J. Burk – A. H. N. Cillessen (2015) Identifying subtypes of peer status by combining popularity and preference: A cohort-sequential approach. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 35, No. 8., pp. 1108–1137, DOI: 10.1177/0272431614554704

Van den Berg, Y. H. M. – T. A. M. Lansu – A. H. N. Cillessen (2020) Preference and popularity as distinct forms of status: A meta-analytic review of 20 years of research. *Journal of Adolescence*, Vol. 84, pp. 78–95, DOI: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2020.07.010

Van der Linden, D. – R. H. J. Scholte – A. H. N. Cillessen – J. Te Nijenhuis (2010) Classroom ratings of likeability and popularity are related to the Big Five and the General Factor of Personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 44, No. 5., pp. 669–672, DOI: 10.1016/j.jrp.2010.08.007

Vannatta, K. – M. A. Gartstein – M. Zeller – R. B. Noll (2009) Peer acceptance and social behavior during childhood and adolescence: How important are appearance, athleticism, and academic competence? *International*

Journal of Behavioral Development, Vol. 33, No. 4., pp. 303–311, DOI: 10.1177/0165025408101275

Veenstra, R. – S. Lindenberg – A. J. Oldehinkel – A. F. De Winter – F. C. Verhulst – J. Ormel (2005) Bullying and victimization in elementary schools: A comparison of bullies, victims, bully/victims, and uninvolved preadolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 41, No. 4., pp. 672–682, DOI: 10.1037/0012-1649.41.4.672

Veenstra, R. – S. Lindenberg – A. Munniksma – J. K. Dijkstra (2010) The complex relation between bullying, victimization, acceptance, and rejection: Giving special attention to status, affection, and sex differences. *Child Development*, Vol. 81, No. 2., pp. 480–486, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01411.x

Waasdorp, T. E. – C. N. Baker – B. S. Paskewich – S. S. Leff (2013) The association between forms of aggression, leadership, and social status among urban youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Vol. 42, No. 2., pp. 263–274, DOI: 10.1007/s10964-012-9837-9

Wang, M. – J. Wang – X. Deng – W. Chen (2019) Why are empathic children more liked by peers? The mediating roles of prosocial and aggressive behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 144, pp. 19–23, DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2019.02.029

Wang, S. S. – S. Houshyar – M. J. Prinstein (2006) Adolescent girls' and boys' weight-related health behaviors and cognitions: Associations with reputation- and preference-based peer status. *Health Psychology: Official Journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association*, Vol. 25, No. 5., pp. 658–663, DOI: 10.1037/0278-6133.25.5.658

Weber, M. (1978) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. (Edited by Roth, G. – C. Wittich) Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA, University of California Press

Wentzel, K. R. (2009) Peers and Academic Functioning at School. In: Rubin, K. H. – W. M. Bukowski – B. Laursen (eds.): *Handbook of Peer Interactions, Relationships, and Groups*. New York, NY, The Guilford Press, pp. 531–547.

Wildhagen, T. (2011) Testing the 'acting White' hypothesis: A popular explanation runs out of empirical steam. *The Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 80, No. 4., pp. 445–463.

Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. Farnborough, UK, Saxon House

Wilson, T. M. – R. Jamison (2019) Perceptions of same-sex and cross-sex peers: Behavioral correlates of perceived coolness during middle childhood. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, Vol. 65, No. 1., pp. 1–27, DOI: 10.13110/merrpalmquar1982.65.1.0001

Wiseman, R. (2002) *Queen Bees and Wannabes: Helping Your Daughter Survive Cliques, Gossip, Boyfriends, and Other Realities of Adolescence*. New York, NY, Three Rivers Press

Wolters, N. – H. Knoors – A. H. N. Cillessen – L. Verhoeven (2014) behavioral, personality, and communicative predictors of acceptance and popularity in early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol. 34, No. 5., pp. 585–605, DOI: 10.1177/0272431613510403

Xi, J. – L. Owens – H. Feng (2016) Friendly girls and mean girls: Social constructions of popularity among teenage girls in Shanghai. *Japanese Psychological Research*, Vol. 58, No. 1., pp. 42–53, DOI: 10.1111/jpr.12101

Xie, H. – T. W. Farmer – B. D. Cairns (2003) Different forms of aggression among inner-city African American children: Gender, configurations, and school social networks. *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 41, No. 5., pp. 355–375, DOI: 10.1016/S0022-4405(03)00086-4

Xie, H. – Y. Li – S. M. Boucher – B. C. Hutchins – B. D. Cairns (2006) What makes a girl (or a boy) popular (or unpopular)? African American children's perceptions and developmental differences. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 42, No. 4., pp. 599–612, DOI: 10.1037/0012-1649.42.4.599