

Children's Perceived Control about Friendship and Action Regulation
in Friendship Relationships in the Context of Peer Status

Brigitte Wanner

Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophie
am Fachbereich Erziehungswissenschaften,
Psychologie und Sportwissenschaften
der Freien Universität Berlin

Berlin

2002

Gutacher: Prof. Dr. P. B. Baltes
Prof. Dr. L. Krappmann

Disputation: 20. Januar 2003

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xii
ABSTRACT	xiii
GERMAN SUMMARY	xv
1. INTRODUCTION	xxv
2. THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS	1
2.1 Goal Striving in Middle Childhood and Preadolescence	1
2.1.1 Goal Content Theories of Goal Striving	3
2.1.1.1 Developmental Tasks as Sources of Thematic Issues of Goals	3
2.1.1.2 Structural Issues of Goals	6
2.1.2 Self-regulation Theories of Goal Striving	8
2.1.2.1 Expectancy-value Theories	10
2.1.2.2 Process Models of Action Regulation	12
2.1.3 Summary	15
2.2 Perceived Control and Objective Control Conditions	17
2.2.1 An Action-Theory Model of Psychological Control as a Theoretical Framework	18
2.2.1.1 Constituents of Objective Control Conditions: Contingency and Competence	18
2.2.1.2 Perceived Control: Interpretations of Contingency and Competence	20
2.2.1.3 Reciprocal Relationships among Perceived Control, Action, and Action Outcomes	21
2.2.1.4 Domain-specificity of Perceived Control: Evidence in the Domain of Peer Relationships	23
2.2.1.5 Adapting the Model for the Domain of Friendship: Identifying Relevant Action Means and Ends	24
2.2.1.6 Comparing the Control Expectancy and Perceptions of Goal Difficulty	27
2.2.1.7 Development of Perceived Goal Difficulty, Agency and Means-ends Beliefs	30
2.2.1.8 Developmental Differences in the Functioning of Goal Difficulty, Agency and Means-ends Beliefs	36
2.2.1.9 Some Speculations about the Sources of Influence for Belief Formation in the Domain of Friendship	39
2.2.3 Summary	41
2.3 Perceived Control and Action Regulation under Varying Conditions of Objective Control	43
2.3.1 Coping with Low Objective Control Conditions	43
2.3.1.1 Assimilative and Accommodative Processes Targeted at Regulating Goal Pursuit and Development when Objective Control is Low	44
2.3.1.1.1 Adjustment of goal importance as an accommodative strategy	46
2.3.1.2 Development of Assimilative and Accommodative Processes in Middle Childhood	47

	<u>Page</u>
2.3.2 Congruency between Perceived Control and High versus Low Conditions of Objective Control.....	48
2.3.2.1 Is High Perceived Control Maladaptive When Objective Control Conditions are Low?	49
2.3.3 Identifying Relevant Action Strategies for the Domain of Friendship Based on the Literature of Children's Coping.....	56
2.3.3.1 A Multi-dimensional Model of Domain-specific Assimilative Coping in Middle Childhood	56
2.3.3.2 Empirical Evidence of Relationships among Domain-unspecific Measures of the Selected Action Strategies and Perceived Control.....	60
2.3.4 Summary.....	61
2.3.5 Excursion: Seeking out Adults' Help as a Strategy to Cope with Problems in Peer Relationships -- An Appropriate and Useful Action Means at all Ages?	63
2.4 Friendships and Peer Group Acceptance -- Two Different Types of Peer Relationships	68
2.4.1 Peer Group Acceptance and Sociometric Status	69
2.4.2 Friendship	70
2.4.2.1 Friendship Participation and Quantity.....	71
2.4.2.2 Friendship Quality.....	71
2.4.2.2.1 Intimacy	71
2.4.2.2.2 Conflict	72
2.4.2.2.3 Reciprocity.....	73
2.4.2.3 Children's Conceptions of Friendship	74
2.4.2.4 Friendless Children differ in their Views of Friendship Quality, Conceptions of Friendship, and Perceived Control from Friendened Children....	75
2.4.2.5 Children Often Become Friends at School or Neighborhood	76
2.4.2.6 Children's Preference of Same-Sex Friendships	76
2.4.2.7 Gender Differences in Friendship Quality and Quantity	77
2.4.3 Friendship and Peer Group Acceptance are Different Types of Peer Relationships -- but they are Not Independent.....	77
2.4.3.1 Sociometric Status as a Marker of Contingencies Provided by the Peers as Social Context	81
2.4.3.2 Sociometric Status as a Marker of Individual Differences in Children's Competencies	82
2.4.3.3 Sociometric Status as a Marker of the Veridicality of Children's Outcome Perceptions of Both Peer Acceptance and Friendship Relationships	85
2.4.4 Empirical Evidence of Perceived Control in the Domains of Peer Group Acceptance and Friendship	88
2.4.4.1 Children's Competence Perceptions and Popularity: Perceived Social Competence and Self-efficacy.....	88
2.4.4.2 Children's Contingency Perceptions and Popularity: Attributions and Locus of Control	91

	<u>Page</u>
2.4.4.3 Multi-dimensional Assessments of Perceived Control and their Relationships with Popularity and Peer Interaction	93
2.4.4.4 Relationships of Perceived Control and Friendship	94
2.4.5 Summary.....	96
2.5 Central Questions Examined in the Present Study	97
3. METHOD.....	113
3.1 General Assessment Procedures	113
3.2 Participants.....	114
3.2.1 Testing the Effects of the Different School Contexts.....	115
3.2.2 Assessment Procedures.....	116
3.2.2.1 Testing the Effects of the Ordering of Administering the Questionnaires	117
3.2.2.2 Administration Procedures.....	117
3.3 Measures	118
3.3.1 Children's Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, Goal Difficulty, Action Strategies, and Goal Importance	118
3.3.1.1 Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, Goal Difficulty, and Goal Importance	120
3.3.1.2 Action strategies in Difficult Friendship Situations.....	120
3.3.1.3 Response Format.....	121
3.3.2 Quality Characteristics of Children's Friendships	121
3.3.2.1 Assessing Friendship Reciprocity	122
3.3.2.2 Response Format.....	123
3.3.3 Response scales	124
3.3.4 Children's Sociometric Status.....	124
3.3.5 Control Variables.....	125
3.4 Treatment of the Data	125
3.4.1. Identification of Sociometric Groups	125
3.4.1.1 Does the Participation Rate of the Children Affect the Reliability of the Sociometric Classifications?	127
3.4.2 Identification of Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children across the Sociometric Status Groups (i.e., Popular, Average, and Rejected Children).....	127
3.4.2.1 Does Participation Rate of the Children's Friends Affect the Reliability of the Classification of Friendled and Friendless Children?.....	131
3.4.2.2 Do Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children Differ in Age and Gender?.....	131
3.4.2.3 Do Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children Differ in Aggression?.....	132
3.4.3 General Remarks to the Analyses Employing Sociometric Status and Friendship Status (Friendless vs. Friendled Children) as Potential Moderator Variables.....	133
3.4.4 Preparation of the Raw Data for Analyses.....	134
3.4.4.1 Parceling.....	134

	<u>Page</u>
3.4.4.2 Treatment of the Missing Data	135
3.4.4.3 Outlier Treatment	137
3.4.4.4 Aggregating Items Assessing Friendship Quality into Indicators of the Children's Typical Views of Friendship and their Own Views of Mutual Friendships and their Friends' Views of the Friendship	137
3.4.4.5 Reduction of Statistical Dependencies when Analyzing the Friends' Mutual Views of their Relationships across Sociometric Groups	138
3.5 General Statistical Procedures	140
3.5.1 Structural Equation Modelling as a Statistical Approach.....	140
3.5.1.1 Controlling for Gender and Grade Effects	140
3.5.1.2 Evaluation of the Overall Model Fit	141
3.5.1.2.1 χ^2 - Value.....	141
3.5.1.2.2 χ^2 / df Ratio	142
3.5.1.2.3 Root-Mean-Square-Error-of-Approximation	142
3.5.1.2.4 Relative Goodness-of-Fit Indices.....	142
3.5.1.2.5 Local Model Fit	143
3.5.1.3 Testing for Factorial Invariance in Multi-Sample Analyses	143
3.5.1.3.1 Factorial invariance.....	144
3.5.1.3.2 Two Rationales for Testing Factorial Invariance.....	145
3.5.1.3.3 Significance levels	147
4. RESULTS.....	149
4.1 Preparatory Analyses : Development of Means-ends and Agency Beliefs	149
4.1.1 Summary of Cross-sectional Age Comparisons: Development of Agency and Means-ends, Goal Difficulty, Action Strategies, and Friendship Outcomes (i.e., Self- and Friend-rated Friendship Quality and Number of Mutual Friendships)..	149
4.1.1.1 Higher-order Structures of Agency and Means-ends beliefs across Grade Levels	150
4.1.1.2 Low Degree of Differentiation between Agency and Means-ends beliefs across Grade Levels.....	150
4.1.2 Representation of the Higher-order Constructs of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, and Action Strategies by Domain Representative Parcels.....	158
4.1.3 Internal Validity and Measurement Invariance of the Investigated Constructs across Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children.....	159
4.1.3.1 Testing Measurement Invariance of the Sets of Constructs across Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children	160
4.1.3.2 Measurement Invariance of Models Combining Two or Three Sets of the Constructs across Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children .	165
4.1.4 Homogeneity of Latent Variances of the Constructs across Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children.....	167
4.1.5 Effects of Gender on the Constructs across Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children	168

	<u>Page</u>
4.1.6 Linear and Quadratic Effects of Grade on the Constructs across Sociometric Groups of Friendened and Friendless Children	169
4.1.7 Summary of the Results of the Preparatory Analyses	172
4.2 Does Children’s Sociometric Status Moderate the Relationships among Perceived Control, Action Strategies, and Friendship Outcomes (i.e., Friend-rated Friendship Quality and Number of Mutual Friendships)?	175
4.2.1 Do Rejected Children who have Mutual Friends Overestimate their Control whereas Friendless Children have Low Perceptions of Control?	175
4.2.1.1 Mean-level Differences in Perceived Control (i.e., Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, Goal Difficulty), and Action Strategies across Sociometric Groups of Friendened and Friendless Children	176
4.2.1.1.1 Agency beliefs	176
4.2.1.1.2 Means-ends beliefs.....	176
4.2.1.1.3 Goal Difficulty.....	177
4.2.1.1.4 Action Strategies.....	179
4.2.1.2 Additional Analyses: Mean-level Differences in Friendship Outcomes (i.e., Children's Typical Views of Friendship Quality, Self ratings and Friend ratings of Mutual Friendships, and Number of Mutual Friendships) ..	179
4.2.1.2.1 Children's typical views of friendship quality	179
4.2.1.2.2 Self ratings and friend ratings of mutual friendships.....	180
4.2.1.2.3 Number of mutual friendships.....	182
4.2.1.3 Invariance of the Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs across Sociometric Groups of Friendened and Friendless Children	183
4.2.1.3.1 Invariance of the correlational structures within belief systems.....	183
4.2.1.3.2 Invariance of the correlational structure across belief systems	184
4.2.1.4 Summary of Additional Analyses: Invariance of the Correlational Structures of Action Strategies, Self-rated Friendship Quality Across Sociometric Groups of Friendened and Friendless Children and Invariance of the Correlations of Self-rated and Friend-rated Quality of Mutual Friendships ...	186
4.2.1.4.1 Action strategies	186
4.2.1.4.2 Self-rated Intimacy and Conflict.....	186
4.2.1.4.3 Self-rated and friend-rated Intimacy and Conflict of mutual friendships.....	186
4.2.1.5 Invariance of the Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs with Goal Difficulty across Sociometric Groups of Friendened and Friendless Children...	187
4.2.1.6 Invariance of the Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs with Action Strategies across Sociometric Groups of Friendened and Friendless Children	190
4.2.1.7 Invariance of the Correlations of Action Strategies and Goal Difficulty across Sociometric Groups of Friendened and Friendless Children	194
4.2.1.8 Invariance of the Correlations of Perceived Control (i.e., Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, and Goal Difficulty), and Action Strategies with Self-rated Friendship Quality across Sociometric Groups of Friendened and Friendless Children.....	196

	<u>Page</u>
4.2.1.8.1 Agency and means-ends beliefs	196
4.2.1.8.2 Goal Difficulty	199
4.2.1.8.3 Action strategies	200
4.2.1.9 Additional Analyses: Investigating the Interplay of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs in the Prediction of Action Strategies and Self-rated Friendship Quality across Sociometric Groups of Friended and Friendless Children	202
4.2.2 Correlations of Perceived Control, Action Strategies and Number of Mutual Friendships	204
4.2.2.1 Additional Analyses: Does Sociometric Status, as a Third Variable, Explain the Relationships of External Means-ends Beliefs and Goal Difficulty with the Number of Mutual Friendships which were Invariantly Found Across Grade Levels?	206
4.2.3 Correlations of Perceived Control, Action Strategies and Friend-rated Friendship Quality	207
4.2.3.1 Agency Beliefs and Friend-rated Friendships Quality	207
4.2.3.2 Means-ends Beliefs and Friend-rated Friendships Quality	210
4.2.3.3 Goal Difficulty and Friend-rated Friendships Quality	211
4.2.3.4 Action Strategies and Friend-rated Friendship Quality	211
4.2.3.5 Additional Analyses: Investigating the Interplay of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs in the Prediction of Friend-rated Friendship Quality across Sociometric Groups of Friended Children	214
4.2.3.6 Additional Analyses: Do Action Strategies Mediate the Link between Action-Control Beliefs and Friend-rated Friendship Quality?	216
4.2.3.7 Additional Analyses: Controlling for the Effects of RAVEN Intelligence, School Grades, Aggression, and Social Desirability on the Relationships of Perceived Control, Action Strategies and Friend-rated Friendship Quality	223
4.3 Exploratory Analyses of a Possible Mechanism Underlying the Relationship between Perceived Control and Friendship: Do Friendless Children Differ in their Ascribed Importance of Friendships from Friended Children?	226
4.4 Summary of the Results of the Main Analyses	228
5. DISCUSSION	235
5.1 The Main Findings of the Present Study	235
5.1.1 Results of Preparatory Analyses: Developmental Differences and their Implications for the Main Study	240
5.1.1.1 Higher-Order Structures of Agency and Means-ends beliefs and Action Strategies	240
5.1.1.2 Increases in Differentiation between External and Self-related Means Dimensions of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs During Middle Childhood ..	240
5.1.1.3 Low Degree of Differentiation between Agency and Means-ends Beliefs Throughout Middle Childhood	241
5.1.1.4 Evidence for Some Degree of Differentiation between Agency and Means-ends Beliefs Throughout Middle Childhood	241

	<u>Page</u>
5.1.1.5 Goal Difficulty and Means-ends Beliefs Represent Beliefs about Contingencies	242
5.1.1.6 Patterns of Salient and Nonsalient Relationships among Perceived Control, Action Strategies, and Self-rated Friendship Quality	243
5.1.1.7 With Age Children Increasingly Recognized the Efficiency of Self-related Means and Direct Action and the Inefficiency of External Means, Action Omission, and Seeking Help for Friendships	245
5.1.1.8 The Importance of Friendships Increases at the End of Middle Childhood....	245
5.1.1.9 Implications of the Results of the Preparatory Cross-sectional Analyses for the Main Analyses	246
5.1.2 Does Children’s Sociometric Status Moderate the Relationships among Perceived Control, Action Strategies, and Friendship Outcomes (i.e., Self-rated and Friend-rated Friendship Quality and Number of Mutual Friendships)?	246
5.1.2.1 Do Friendless-Children Overestimate their Control whereas Friendless Children have Low Perceptions of Control?.....	247
5.1.2.1.1 Mean levels of children's own views of friendship quality	248
5.1.2.1.2 Mean levels of the friends' views of friendship quality	249
5.1.2.1.3 Mean levels of perceived control and action strategies.....	251
5.1.2.2 Perceived Control and Action Strategies are uncorrelated with the Number of Mutual Friendships	253
5.1.2.3 Correlations of Agency Beliefs, Direct Action, and Children's Own Views of Friendship Quality are Invariant Across Sociometric Groups of Friendless and Friendless Children.....	255
5.1.2.4 Correlations of Contingency Beliefs, Action Omission, Seeking Help, and Children's Own Views of Friendship Quality are Moderated by Sociometric Status and Friendship Participation.....	256
5.1.2.4.1 Moderating effects: friendless-rejected children.....	258
5.1.2.4.2 Moderating effects: friendless-average children	260
5.1.2.4.3 Moderating effects: friendless-rejected children	261
5.1.2.5 Correlations of Perceived Control, Action Strategies, and Friend-rated Friendship Quality are Moderated by Sociometric Status.....	263
5.1.2.5.1 Moderating effects: Popular and average children.....	264
5.1.2.5.2 Moderating effects: Rejected children	266
5.1.2.6 Suggestions for Future Research.....	268
5.1.3 Exploratory Analyses of a Possible Mechanism Underlying the Relationship between Perceived Control and Friendship: Do Friendless Children Differ in their Ascribed Importance of Friendships from Friendless Children?	270
5.2 Strengths and Limitations of the Present Study.....	271
5.3 Summary and Conclusions	276
REFERENCES.....	281

APPENDICES

	<u>Page</u>
A Sample Sizes.....	1
B Effects of the Various School Settings on the Central Constructs -- A Comparison among the Three Assessed Schools.....	2
C Effects of the Ordering of Assessments of Measures in the Study.....	6
D Measurement Instruments.....	11
E Descriptive Statistics of the Indicators of the Central Constructs	21
F Details of the Structural Equation Modeling Procedures	29
G Development of Means-ends and Agency Beliefs: Structural Relationships, Mean Levels, and Functioning in the Domain of Friendship During Middle Childhood	33
H Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, Action Strategies, Self-rated Friendship Quality, Goal Difficulty, and Goal Importance: Estimated Parameters of the Measurement-Invariant 5-Group Models	113
I Testing Measurement Invariance of Models Combining Two or Three Sets of the Constructs across Sociometric Groups of Friended and Friendless Children	118
J Equality of Latent Variances of the Constructs and Gender, Linear, and Quadratic Effects of Grade on the Constructs across Sociometric Groups of Friended and Friendless Children.....	121
K Mean-level Differences in Friendship Outcomes (i.e., Children's Typical Views of Friendship Quality, Self ratings and Friend ratings of Mutual Friendships, and Number of Mutual Friendships).....	131
L Invariance of the Correlational Structure of Action Strategies, Self-rated Friendship Quality Across Sociometric Groups of Friended and Friendless Children and Invariance of the Correlations of Self-rated and Friend-rated Quality of Mutual Friendships.....	134
M Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses	140
N Relationships of Perceived Control (i.e., Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, and Goal Difficulty) and Action Strategies with the Number of Mutual Friendships	143
O Effects of RAVEN Intelligence, School Grades, Peer-nominations of Aggression, and Social Desirability on the Relationships of Perceived Control, Action Strategies and Friend-rated Friendship Quality	144

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Theory</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Relevant Causal Dimensions in the Domains of Academic Achievement and Friendship.....	26
2	Degree of Fit between Objective and Perceived Control: The Realistic Nature of Perceived Control.....	49
3	Overview of the Hypotheses	111
<u>Method</u>		
4	Age, Gender, Number of Nominated Friends, Number of Nominated Friends who Participated of Friendled and Friendless Children across the Groups of Popular, Average, and Rejected Children	129
<u>Results</u>		
5	Latent Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs and Action Strategies Across Grade Levels.....	153
6	Overview of the Latent Correlations of Perceived Control (i.e., Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, and Goal Difficulty), and Action Strategies with Friendship Outcomes -- Are they in Hypothesized Directions across Grade Levels?	157
7	Testing Measurement Invariance of the Constructs across Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children	162
8	Testing Measurement Invariance of Mutual Friendship Perceptions across both Sociometric-status Groups (i.e., Average, Popular, and Rejected Children) and Sources of Ratings (i.e. Self vs. Friends' Ratings)	164
9	Testing Invariance of the Latent Mean Levels of of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, Action-Strategies, Goal Difficulty, and Self-rated Friendship Quality across Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children	178
10	Testing Invariance of Latent Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs ...	184
11	Correlations between Agency and Means-ends Beliefs across Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children	185
12	Testing Invariance of Latent Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs and Goal Difficulty across Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children.....	188
13	Testing Invariance of Latent Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs and Action-Strategies across Sociometric Groups of Friendled and Friendless Children.....	191

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
14 Testing Invariance of Latent Correlations of Action Strategies and Goal Difficulty across Sociometric Groups of Friended and Friendless Children	195
15 Testing Invariance of Latent Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, Action-Strategies, Goal Difficulty and Self-rated Friendship Quality across Sociometric Groups of Friended and Friendless Children	202
16 Testing Invariance of the Latent Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, Action-Strategies, Goal Difficulty and the Number of Mutual Friendships across Sociometric Groups	205
17 Testing Invariance of the Latent Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, Action-Strategies, and Goal Difficulty with Friend-rated Friendship Quality (i.e., Intimacy and Conflict) across Groups of Friended Average, Popular, and Rejected Children	212
18 Simple and Partial Relationships of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs and Friend-rated Friendship Quality across Groups of Accepted (i.e., popular and average) and Rejected Children.....	215
19 Testing Invariance of Latent Correlations of Goal Importance and Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, Action-Strategies, Goal Difficult, and Friendship Quality across Sociometric Groups of Friended and Friendless Children	226
20 Overview of Relationships of Goal Importance with Perceived Control, Action Strategies, and Friendship Outcomes across Sociometric Groups of Friended and Friendless Children	227
21 Overview of Significant Differences in the Latent Correlations among Perceived Control, Action Strategies, and Self-rated Friendship Quality Across Sociometric Groups of Friended and Friendless Children	231
22 Moderating Effects of Sociometric Status: Overview of Latent Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs, Action Strategies, and Friend-rated Friendship Quality and Results of Testing their Invariance.....	234
<u>Discussion</u>	
23 Summary of the Hypotheses and Main Results	237

List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Introduction</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Working Model: Reciprocal Relationships among Perceived Control, Action Strategies, and Friendship Outcomes.....	29
	<u>Theory</u>	
2	A Schematic Representation of the Three Sets of Beliefs Posited by the Action Theory of Psychological Control.....	21
3	Reciprocal Relationships among Perceived Control, Action, and Action Outcomes	23
4	Friendship and Sociometric Status: Horizontal Coherence and Shared Action Means	80
5	Conceptual Model: Reciprocal Relationships among Perceived Control, Action, and Perceived Action Outcomes	99
6	Expected Relationships of Perceived Control and Action Strategies with Friend-rated Friendship Quality (i.e., Intimacy and Conflict).....	107
7	Expected Relationships of Perceived Control and Action Strategies with the Number of Mutual Friendships	108
	<u>Results</u>	
8	Mean Levels of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs	177
9	Mean-levels of Mutual Views of Friendship Quality.....	180
10	Relationships of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs with Goal Difficulty	189
11	Relationships of Agency and Means-Ends Beliefs with Action Strategies across Target Groups.....	193
12	Relationships of Action Strategies and Goal Difficulty.....	196
13	Relationships of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs with Self-rated Friendship Quality.....	198
14	Relationships of Action Strategies and Self-rated Friendship Quality	200
15	Correlations of Agency and Means-ends Beliefs and Friend-rated Friendship Quality.....	208
16	Latent Correlations of Action Strategies and Friend-rated Friendship Quality ...	214
17	Partial Relationships of Agency and Means-ends beliefs, Action Strategies, and Friend-rated Friendship Quality	221