# Supplementary Material

### Social Cognitive Map (SCM)

Peer group composition.The information assessed via peer-reports were analysed using the SCM 4.0 computer program (Leung, 1998). Based on the similarity of children’s co-nominations, the program uses a complex sequence of arithmetic steps to assign participants to non-overlapping peer groups (Cairns et al., 1997). In a first step, SCM 4.0 created a co-nomination matrix, reflecting how often a child was nominated to the same group as any other child. The co-nomination profile of each child was then correlated with the profile of every other child, resulting in a correlation matrix that represents the similarity between the co-nomination profiles of the children. Based on a pre-defined cut-off value (r ≥ .40) children were then assigned to social groups. This approach typically produces low to non-overlapping group solutions (Cairns et al., 1997). However, in the event that a child was initially assigned to more than one group, the group in which it had a correlation of ≥ .50 with 50% of the group members, or, if this applied to several groups, the group with the highest correlations with other group members was selected.

Social Centrality Status.To estimate group centrality, each group in a social network was assigned a group centrality score (*GCS*), which was composed of the average number of nominations of the two most frequently nominated members of each group. The group with the highest centrality score in a social network (*GCSmax*) was then used as a reference to obtain classification into three levels of group centrality. Groups with “*high*” centrality had a centrality score greater than or equal to the multiplication of *0.7 x GCSmax*. The centrality scores of groups with “medium” centrality ranged between 0.3 x GCSmax and *0.7 x GCSmax*. “Low” centrality groups had centrality scores $\leq $ *0.3 x GCSmax*.Member-within-group centrality was calculated in a similar way, using the individual with the highest number of nominations in a group (*ICSmax*) as the reference. Variable levels were assigned values from “1” (low) to “3” (high). Both centrality measures (i.e., group centrality and within-group centrality) can be combined to define the centrality status of an individual within the social network. Individuals can be classified as “nuclear,” “secondary,” or “peripheral” in centrality in the social network. Nuclear centrality in the social network is only assigned to children with “high” within-group centrality from “high” centrality groups. Secondary centrality in the social network is assigned if “medium” (but not “low”) centrality is present on one or both centrality measures. “Low” centrality on either of the centrality measures generally leads to classification as peripheral in the social network. Hence, the individual centrality status within the social network is a three-level ordinal variable with a range from “1” (peripheral) to “3” (nuclear).
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