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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The following literature review provides a summary of friendship and related research. In the first section, the concept of friendship is defined. Subsequent sections deal with the areas of attraction research, as it relates to friendship; various friendship theories; and research specifically related to the process of friendship dissolution.

Definitions of Friendship

The concept of friendship has been defined as a degree of attraction, a variation on a continuum of interpersonal relations and a relationship more involved than an acquaintance yet different from a romantic relationship (Kurth, 1970; Peters & Kennedy, 1970; Suttles, 1970; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959; Wright, 1978; Wright, Note 1).

Kurth (1970) defined friendship as an interpersonal relationship that involves each individual personally. Friendships are said to require a high degree of psychological intimacy and involve a great deal of the self. Friendship is defined as a different relationship from a friendly relation in that a friendly relation lacks the uniqueness of a friendship. A friendly relation can develop into a friendship when it is found to be rewarding and there is a desire to secure the rewards enough to prearrange commitments. Friendships are
generally more involved and more intimate than friendly relations in that they imply unlimited obligations, necessitate future planning, and require stronger affective ties than friendly relations. Friendly relations are mostly role involvements which are less intimate, have set obligations, have little or no involvement in future plans, may not involve any affective ties, and may even involve feelings of dislike. It is generally advisable and convenient to maintain friendly relations with co-workers and neighbors to make life pleasant (Kurth, 1970).

Peters and Kennedy (1970) defined friendship as a primary relationship in which the people involved are predisposed to participate in a wide range of activities. The predisposition is associated with a predominance of positive affect. They conceptualize friendships as relationships that fall along a continuum of intimacy from casual acquaintances to high primary relationships. Friendships are said to be differentiated from other interpersonal relationships by voluntary and spontaneous participation in activities and the experience of the relationship for its own sake.

Albert and Brigante (1962) suggested that friendship must be viewed as a special type of role relationship which integrates the multiple roles of each participant. They hypothesized that the more important the friendship roles for each party, the closer the relationship will be, and interactions will be experienced as more satisfying.

Suttles (1970) described friendship as a social institution. As such, it serves to allow people to go beyond traditional institutional affiliations. It is a generalized relationship that can occur between or within social strata and which creates a note of equality as friends
are defined as treating each other as equals. Friends may privately and without ceremony break their relationship or change it without outside influence. The most important consideration in defining a friendship is that a person who is considered a friend must be appreciated for their unique self rather than for incidental advantages, characteristics, or possessions that belong to them.

Thibaut and Kelley (1959) viewed friendship as a process in which the possibilities of rewards and costs are repeatedly sampled to determine if the relationship's outcomes are superior to those of other possible friendships. The process of exploration is especially important. Frequently, in the early stages in a relationship the necessity for exploration lessens as the relationship becomes more routine and many of the rewards and costs have been sampled.

Wright (Note 1) described the concept of friendship as an extremely broad and ambiguous relationship. There are no normative definitions nor are there formal ceremonies or symbols external to the relationship. Thus, it is difficult to identify a relationship as a friendship when one is not involved. Wright proposes that most friendships develop insidiously and deteriorate insidiously, and finds it more appropriate to speak in terms of degree of "friendness" rather than friendship versus non-friendship. According to Wright, friendship is a kind of love relationship, different from a romantic relationship but not necessarily less involved or important. He illustrates the qualitative differences among different kinds of love relationships along three dimensions: (a) the degree of interdependence required; (b) the permanence of the relationship; and (c) the exclusiveness of
the relationship. He sees friendship as a relationship involving an unspecified level of interdependence. The level of interdependence may fluctuate over time, but is not exclusive and is not necessarily permanent. The demands and restraints of the relationship are internal and a matter of the individual's commitment to the relationship. Friendship is a rewarding relationship, in which friends do things for one another, are encouraging and supportive to each other and help each other maintain an impression of themselves as competent, worthwhile persons. Each of these characteristics can and do vary between friends and friendships. Not all friends provide the same quality or quantity of these characteristics. People have different friendships which may provide a different pattern of rewards. A friendship is conceptualized by Wright (Note 1) to represent an investment of self on the part of the individual to the degree that the well-being and worth of the other person has implications for the well-being and worth of the other's self. Conceptualizing the relationship as an investment implies a return of dividend, which is not clearly delineated nor always immediate in a friendship. It is anticipated that the return will be continuing or periodic and will take the form of a global, self-referent reward such as enhanced sense of individuality, self-affirmation or self growth.

For a relationship to be considered a friendship according to Wright's (1978) definition it must involve voluntary interdependence and the parties involved must feel they are reacting to one another as whole, unique persons. Friendships depend on the perception of both parties toward the other for their existence. The strength of a
relationship can be evaluated in terms of how much in evidence the
previously mentioned aspects of the relationship are present.

**Attraction and Friendship**

Attraction research antedated friendship theories and research. In view of the relevance of attraction to friendship, it is important to discuss attraction theories and research for a better understanding of friendship.

It is generally agreed that attraction is one of the earliest interactions between two people. An interaction resulting in attraction, especially mutual attraction, may evolve into a friendship. Understanding the determinants of attraction can aid in understanding the development of interpersonal relationships. Huston (1974) viewed attraction as a constellation of sentiments which comprise the evaluative orientation of one person toward another. Huston describes attraction as including an evaluative component which refers to the quality and strength of one's sentiments toward another, a cognitive component or the belief one has about another, and a behavioral component which includes one's tendency to avoid or approach another person and the manner in which these tendencies are manifested. These evaluative components influence each other, and therefore, attraction may influence one's perception of another. If components are positive one may perceive an individual as more positive which may increase attraction.

Newcomb (1956) suggested that attraction is a function of the extent to which reciprocal rewards are present in an interaction.
Similarly, dislike, or non-attraction, is a function of reciprocal punishment. Reciprocal rewards are available when one person offers validation by indicating that his percepts and concepts agree with another's, whereas punishment results when one person indicates dissimilarity or disagreement among percepts or concepts. Byrne (1971) hypothesized that the relative number and intensity of rewards and punishments associated with an individual are at least one important determinant of attraction toward that person. Most theorists agree that attraction will follow if one individual either directly provides another with rewards or need satisfaction or is perceived as potentially able to do so (Lott & Lott, 1965). Clore and Byrne (1974) explained that attraction is based on positive affect that accompanies reinforcement. Reinforcement and punishment influence the development of attraction through a process that is similar to classical conditioning. Clore and Byrne (1974) described reinforcement as less central to their conditioning model than the affective response it produces. The core of their model is the idea that attraction toward a person depends on the positive affect associated with the person, reinforcement is the source of that affect.

Lott and Lott (1965) found that a number of variables affected attraction. They found that propinquity (amount of contact), belief that one is liked, or presence during reinforcing experiences, all resulted in attraction. In addition, subjects were attracted to those who were rated as warm, helpful, equalitarian, having good adjustment or being sensitive. Similarity of religion, background attitude and values were also found to be significant variables. The literature
suggests that attraction increases when there is shared success or failure perceived as arbitrarily imposed by an external source and when one member of the pair is directly responsible for producing satisfying rewards or consequences (Lott & Lott, 1965).

Attraction and Similarity

In looking more closely at similarity and its relationship to attraction there are contradictory and ambiguous findings. In an attempt to determine the factors influencing the formation of mutual attraction, Bonney (1946) compared groups of mutual friends in elementary school, high school, and college on academic achievement, intelligence, interests, socio-economic home background, and personality traits. Approximately 100 elementary school students on each grade level (two through six) were studied and tested over a 5 year period. Mutual and non mutual pairs were obtained on the basis of repeated pupil choices. A child's general social acceptance was measured in terms of degree of mutual attraction or unreciprocation. Two groups were formed using only subjects whose degree of mutual attraction was very high and those whose degree of mutual attraction was unreciprocated. The unreciprocated pairs were used as control pairs to the mutual pairs. For the high school students, pairs of mutual friends were obtained from teachers and then confirmed with the students. College students were obtained through tests taken in the Personnel Office and through students completing the tests as part of course work. Elementary subjects were measured on the variable of academic achievement by standard achievement tests and/or reading tests. Both
groups, mutual pairs and unreciprocated pairs, were very similar in academic achievement. For the high school and college subjects, similarity in academic achievement was measured using grade averages. The results indicated a low relationship for academic achievement between mutual pairs. Bonney concluded from these data comparisons that academic achievement did not play a significant role in friendship formation.

Elementary subjects were measured for similarity on the intelligence variable using various standard group intelligence tests. Tests used for obtaining a measure of intelligence for high school and college subjects were not described. Results of these measures indicated a high degree of similarity for mutual pairs on the intelligence variable and a greater degree of differences for unreciprocated pairs for all subjects. Bonney concluded that the intelligence variable was more closely related to the process of friendship formation than the academic achievement variable.

Sixth grade elementary subjects were measured for similarity on the interest variable using an interest inventory which required subjects to respond to items involving recreation, material objects, school, people and occupations. They rated them on a scale indicating degree of liking. Interests were measured for high school and college subjects regarding occupational preference using the Kuder Preference Record. Results were largely undifferentiated for all groups of mutual and unreciprocated pairs. College mutual pairs showed a high level of similarity in areas measuring scientific and social service attitudes. Bonney concluded that most high school and college friendships are
formed without reference to occupational interest, however science and clerical occupational interest areas exert more influence on friendship formation than other occupational interests.

Information on similarity of home background was gathered for fifth grade elementary students using an instrument designed to rate such areas as cultural, occupational, and economic status of the family. Results indicated that groups of mutual friends were more alike in home background than were groups of unreciprocated pairs. However, scores in general were in a narrow range, suggesting that the groups were homogeneous, thus accounting for much of the similarity. Bonney proposed that with more heterogeneous groups, he would expect lower correlations. He stated that similarity of socio-economic level played a greater than chance role in friendship formation.

The similarity of mutual pairs and unreciprocated pairs of elementary and college students were measured using the California Personality Inventory (CPI). High school subjects and a different group of college subjects were also compared using an instrument developed by Bonney to measure traits specifically related to capacity to win friends. The results from the CPI were insignificant. However, the results of Bonney's instrument indicated a strong relationship between personality similarity and mutual pairs as compared to unreciprocated pairs. Bonney concluded that general personality inventories did not measure the traits important to friendship formation because they were not constructed for that task.

In general, Bonney concluded that a number of the variables studied had a slight relationship to friendship formation, although
most were found to be insignificant or almost insignificant. He attributed this to inadequate instruments and demand characteristics involved in his selection of subjects. Much of Bonney's information was obtained through observation or teacher evaluations. These data may have been biased because of potential inaccuracies in these subjective measures. Bonney interpreted the lack of significant findings as indicating the need for developing a scale or technique designed to measure factors involved in interpersonal attractions.

Banikotes, Russel, and Linden (1972) attempted to determine if laboratory studies produced comparable results to real life attraction situations. Subjects were 44 undergraduate male students aged 18-22 who were all part of the same cooperative living group. The Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) was administered to the subjects. Each subject was then required to rank the other subjects in order of best to least liked. Subjects were then grouped into best and least liked pairs. A subject and his chosen best liked peer were a best liked pair; and a subject and least liked choice were a least liked pair. Several weeks later, subjects were presented with four attitude survey response protocols and told they were protocols of individuals from another university. In actuality, two of the protocols represented responses from the subject's best and least liked choices. The other two protocols were contrived similar and contrived dissimilar protocols. After each protocol the subject was administered an Interpersonal Judgment Scale (IJS) protocol. The subject was asked to rank the individuals represented by the attitude survey response protocols in terms of how much he thought he would like the individual. During
another session subjects were presented with EPI protocols, and the same procedure was followed. Results showed a significant preference for contrived similar over contrived dissimilar protocols. Best liked over least liked protocols; and least liked over contrived dissimilar protocols. Because the criteria used to evaluate subjects' reactions to test response protocols and ranking data yielded the same results, Banikiotes et al. concluded that individuals were significantly more attracted to protocols of others whose attitude survey responses were similar to their own than to those whose responses were dissimilar. They further found that the attitude survey analysis revealed that only one item concerning political philosophy discriminated between liking and disliking pairs. This indicated that in real life the nature of the attitude is important, while in a laboratory setting the proportion of attitudes agreed upon is more important as a determinant of attraction. However, attitude similarity in both cases, real life situations and laboratory settings, was found to be important. The authors concluded that individuals responded to the attitude survey protocols and to the person in a similar manner. EPI similarity was not found to be a significant factor in the formation of liking and disliking others in real life situations. Subjects indicated attraction toward people represented by the test response protocols which were similar to their own. However, they did not appear to like the real individuals whose test response protocols were similar to their own any better than the real individuals whose protocols were dissimilar to their own. Banikiotes et al. concluded from these results that individuals responded differently to EPI test response
protocols than they did to the individuals represented by the protocols. This indicated that similarity of test data may be of significance only when there is very limited information available to the subject. In summary, Banikiotes et al. found that similarity on test data is of significance in attraction only when limited information is available. In real life situations other factors are operating to determine attraction. While Banikiotes et al. attempted to provide a comparison of real life attraction situations to laboratory attraction situations they did not use similar methods of measuring attraction to compare the two situations. In the real life measure, subjects ranked other subjects from their living group on a scale of least liked to best liked. In the laboratory setting, subjects indicated attraction by completing an IJS for the test protocol. The real life measure of attraction took into account many more factors than the laboratory measure. Subjects may have rated real life individuals differently had they completed an IJS for each best liked and least liked person. Also, had subjects been shown all test protocols from their living group they may have ranked the individuals differently.

Wright and Bidon (1966) explored variables of intimacy and formality in relation to interpersonal attraction. They used 37 females whose median age was 50 years and who were all members of the same Catholic Altar Society for at least four years. Subjects were given a list of names of all subjects with a 100 millimeter graphic rating scale following each name. Subjects were asked to mark on each scale how much she enjoyed being with the named subject. The line was marked at the 0, 50, and 100 millimeter points with "mildly,"
"moderately," and "very much." Each subject then rated three randomly selected subjects on a person perception questionnaire consisting of intimacy and formality items. The results of the study indicated that attraction ratings were not significantly related to educational level. However, attraction was significantly related to high and median ratings of intimacy. They found no relationship to ratings on formality. The authors concluded that personality similarity was not an important consideration in interpersonal attraction, rather an individual's social interests as expressed in interpersonal relationships had an important bearing on attractiveness to others. While Wright and Bidon were interested in measuring attraction in terms of the stated variables, they used a population in which all members had been acquainted with each other for four years and had probably already established some form of a relationship. Having established a relationship, they had experiences in common and knowledge with each other not usually available during initial attraction situations. These experiences may account for the finding that intimacy rather than personality similarity was related to attraction. As Banikiotes et al. (1972) stated, similarity might be important only when information is limited. In the study by Wright and Bidon, information was not limited. The information included past instances of positive and negative interactions as well as influences such as group social pressure. Hence, they may have been measuring more than attraction as it is traditionally defined.

In summary, it seems that similarity on such dimensions as personality traits, background traits, and attitudes is of primary importance
initially during an interaction. Similarity appears to spark attraction. Newcomb (1958) proposed that as relationships developed, more data becomes available. Individuals experienced rewards as a result of their interaction and initial perceptions of similarity or actual similarity were modified and the individual became more or less attractive.

Theories of Friendship

The process of refining initial perceptions and experiencing rewards and/or punishment through interaction is the process of becoming friends. There are numerous theories of friendship formation, each proposing their view of the process and factors involved in two people becoming friends. A large amount of research and speculation has been generated surrounding the personality characteristics possessed by either or both parties. The majority of the theoretical discussions concern similarity and complementarity of ideas, concepts, needs and personality characteristics.

Similarity

It has been hypothesized that attraction and therefore friendship, results when two individuals either assume or perceive similarity of ideas, needs or personality characteristics in each other.

It was postulated by Newcomb (1961), that perceived similarity facilitated empathy and sharing in adult friendships. Hess (1972) further postulated that this empathy and caring facilitated communication and reciprocity. The cognitive-developmental theory of friendship states that the desire for a relationship involving shared
activity, communication and especially reciprocity was the motive for attraction and eventually the basis of a friendship (Lickona, 1974). The cognitive-developmental approach to friendship views social responses as cognitively based. Changes in the cognitive base are said to come about as a result of developmental process or stages (Hess, 1974). Emotions such as liking and loving would then be the result of the organization of thought. Therefore, developmentally determined needs would interact with the kind and intensity of attraction felt. Similarity is said to operate as a developmental constant on attraction, but the attributes on which similarity judgments were based were said to be subject to developmental shifts (Hess, 1974). During different stages of development, friends might vary with respect to similarity of attributes on which attraction was based (Levinger & Snoek, 1972).

Flemming (1932) attempted to determine if similar opposite characteristics resulted in friendship. His subjects were 200 undergraduate psychology students. The subjects were asked to indicate the name of their best same sex friend in college. They were also asked to rate their friend on a scale of 1 to 10 (low to high) on pleasantness, steadiness, expressiveness, and adjustment, to name a few characteristics. All subjects were also administered an introversion-extroversion test, the Army Alpha test, the Thorndike examination, and a social intelligence test. Only subjects who named as their best friend other participating subjects were used in the comparisons. Male and female subjects were treated separately. The ratings and scores of a subject were compared with the ratings and scores of the best friend.
The correlations indicated a greater tendency for those with similar characteristics to be friends than those with opposite characteristics. However, Flemming notes the correlations were not high enough to be considered predictive of the similarity of friends. Although Flemming used some standardized objective tests to measure the variables, many of the traits were measured using nonstandardized subjective instruments. Hence, characteristics of the subject and their perceptual biases may have affected the measurement of the traits.

Fiedler, Warrington, and Blaisdell (1952) investigated the effect of similar unconscious attitudes on social relations and perceived similarity as related to best and least liked relationships. Twenty-six members of a college fraternity who had known each other for at least three months served as subjects. They were administered a test consisting of 76 descriptive statements of personality traits selected from Murray's list of personality descriptions. Subjects were administered the statements on separate index cards, and asked to sort the statements into eight categories. They placed the statement most characteristic of themselves or the person they were describing at one end of the distribution, and the statement least characteristic at the other end. Results indicated that subjects perceive persons whom they liked best as more similar to themselves than those who were less liked. However, the results did not support the hypothesis that persons tend to prefer others who actually are more similar than those who are less similar to themselves. Since Fiedler et al. used subjects from a single fraternity, characteristics particular to those who would join that fraternity as opposed to another fraternity as well as
characteristics particular to those who would join any fraternity may be confounding the results. Fiedler et al. pointed out, fraternity groups tend to select their members on the basis of liking, making it probable that all members are more alike than nonmembers, and most members probably liked each other at least somewhat. Therefore, were the same procedure to be used on other groups in which membership is not based on liking and similarity to group norms, the results might be expected to differ.

Izard (1960a) attempted to study interpersonal attraction by studying personality variables in relation to friendship. The author hypothesized that mutual friends would have similar personality profiles. Izard further hypothesized that there would also be significant positive correlations for some of the separate personality characteristics that make up a personality profile. Two hundred high school and private college students were asked to list their closest friends in rank order. They were then administered the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). From these subjects 30 pairs who had chosen each other as best friends, were selected to participate. A control group of 60 subjects from an entering college class were selected and paired at random. The results supported the hypothesis that mutual friends have similar personality profiles. There were also significant correlations on the personality characteristics of exhibition, deference and endurance for mutual friends. Izard concluded that there was evidence for the similarity hypothesis. In this study, Izard provided evidence showing friends to be more similar than strangers. However, Izard failed to provide evidence that friends were more similar than people
who did not consider themselves friends; i.e., people who knew each other but did not pick each other as friends. Strangers might choose each other as friends and therefore not be significantly different from mutual friends. Strangers may, if they become acquainted with each other, develop a friendship. Similarity may also be the result of friendship. Therefore strangers would be significantly different than friends. Finding that friends are more alike than people who know each other but are not friends would provide more conclusive evidence that to be friends, two people must have similar characteristics.

Izard (1960b) attempted to prove that subjects and their unilateral sociometric choices had more similar personality profiles prior to acquaintance than they did with their sociometric rejections. Izard administered the EPPS to an entering freshman class. Six months later 47 females from the group were asked to list the three most likeable and least likeable girls in their class. Twenty-five of the subjects made mutually exclusive sociometric choices. Of these 12 were randomly selected for pairing with classmates they listed as most likeable and the remaining were paired with the classmates they listed as least likeable. The results of the study indicated that prior to acquaintance personality profiles were significantly similar for subjects and their choices of most likeable, but not for subjects and their choices of least likeable. Izard concluded that actual personality similarity was an antecedent of liking but not rejection. Izard further concluded that these results added support to the assumption that personality similarity facilitates friendship. This second study provides evidence that strangers are not likely to be as similar as
friends and that dissimilar strangers might develop a friendship and become more similar. It does not, however, demonstrate that people who are similar and considered likeable by each other will be able to maintain a friendship, only that similar others are considered likeable.

Izard (1963) performed a follow-up study that attempted to add emphasis to the previous study's hypotheses by demonstrating repeatability, and by testing the generalizability of the earlier study (Izard, 1960b). Three hundred twenty-three fraternity pledges were asked to list their three closest friends, and three people whom they felt were least likely to become their close personal friends. Nineteen pairs of subjects who had mutually chosen each other as friends, and 17 pairs of subjects who had placed each other in the least likely category were chosen to participate. In addition, a control group of 30 pairs was drawn randomly. Personality profiles were obtained by using the EPPS administered at the time the students entered college and administered again approximately four months prior to obtaining the friendship data. In another part of the study, a friendship rating form and the EPPS were administered during class periods to graduating seniors. Twenty pairs of friends were chosen as well as a control group of randomly paired subjects who had not named each other on a friendship rating form. The results from the first part of the present study confirmed and supported the similarity hypothesis. However, results from the second part failed to support the similarity hypothesis. Izard concluded that the results were contradictory because of the difference in populations from which subjects were selected. In the first part of the study subjects were entering
freshmen, while in the second part of the study subjects were graduating seniors. Izard concluded that the two populations differed in terms of social and emotional maturity. Therefore, with the older subjects personality similarity was less important as a determinant of interpersonal attraction or friendship. As in the earlier study (Izard, 1960b), Izard (1963) failed to take into account the length of the friendships or acquaintanceships studied. Hence, the results not only indicated that the individual subjects matured, they may also have indicated that the friendships themselves matured. Perhaps, initially, both people were similar and this helped to determine the original friendship. As both individuals matured and changed, so did the relationship. It would then be necessary to consider the length of friendships when studying friendship variables.

Beier, Rossi and Garfield (1961) hypothesized that friendships are formed between people who are basically similar to each other and yet whose dissimilarities are also a source of attraction. They proposed that the dissimilarities would embody characteristics which are highly valued. Disliked persons, however, would be seen as possessing dissimilar characteristics which are unacceptable. Twenty-six college students were administered the MMPI three times. The three conditions of administration varied the instructional set as follows: (a) answer the items as they themselves would; (b) answer the items as their most liked friend would; (c) answer the items as their least liked acquaintance would. The results of the study indicated that subjects perceived themselves as having more characteristics in common with their friends than with disliked persons. Subjects also projected
characteristics on the friend, which they apparently lacked and admired. They projected onto the disliked person characteristics of a maladjusted person. Beier et al. concluded that their hypotheses as to the formation of friendship had been supported. A problem with the design of the Beier et al. study was the failure to administer the MMPI in a random order. Subjects may have remembered how they marked answers for themselves and marked answers similarly for their friends and dissimilarly for disliked people. The MMPI also may have been an inappropriate instrument in that it was designed to measure psychopathology. The items measure thoughts and feelings not usually shared with others, or able to be perceived by others. Hence, answering for another may have been extremely difficult and have more accurately reflected their own feelings than the personality characteristics of others.

Mehlman (1962) did a study involving friends and enemies. The author hypothesized that relationships experienced as good ones or friendships, would be found to be homogeneous as measured by the EPPS. Relationships experienced as poor ones, or enemies, would be found to be either not related or heterogeneous. The author further hypothesized that friends would perceive themselves and their friends in essentially similar ways. They would agree as to who was considered to be more dominant and aggressive, or would agree on other such characteristics. In addition, enemies would tend to perceive each other in a dissimilar fashion. They would disagree on the above mentioned characteristics. Sophomore students were administered the EPPS in class. Two weeks later they were administered a friendship rating.
scale. They were required to designate their best friend of either sex and to rate themselves on specified scales in comparison with this individual. Later, they were administered a best enemy scale with the same structure as the friend scale. Contact was then made with the persons designated by the subjects. These persons were asked to come by for additional testing. Statistical comparisons of the friendship and enemy groups revealed correlations that tended to be positive, moderate or low and mostly insignificant. Mehlman concluded that although there was some evidence that friends are alike in some objectively measured characteristics, and that friends tend to agree in perceptions of the relationship, the correlations were not high enough nor was the enemy group different enough to provide definitive evidence. He stated that tendency toward similarity or dissimilarity was an irrelevant consideration. Mehlman noted that perhaps there was no general rule for the formation of friendship, but that an individual would form a friendship dependency based on wants, needs, and personal characteristics. Hence, no two friendships would be alike. A major problem with Mehlman's procedure which may account for his lack of consistent or significant findings was his allowing subjects to describe different sex friends or enemies. There has been little agreement on the characteristics shared by romantic attachments and same sex friendships. Hence, different sex friendships may be somewhat varied from both of these relationships. This may have influenced variance causing inconclusive results for Mehlman.

Secord and Backman (1964) investigated the processes contributing to the maintenance and stability of a dyad. They examined two
conditions in dyadic relations that seemed to contribute to attraction. These conditions were perceived similarity and interpersonal congruency. One hundred fifty-two subjects were asked to characterize themselves and their best friend of the same sex in terms of a list of needs (represented in the EPPS) on ranking scales developed for this purpose by the authors. A large number of the need comparisons performed were significant. Secord and Backman concluded from the results that the principle of similarity was the most prominent explanation of the significant findings. They further concluded that congruency may still have been operating with similarity but was less important. The authors reported a subject's tendency to rank or measure another person's characteristics using his own characteristics as a frame of reference as a major problem with the study. Therefore introducing similarity between himself and the other person on the traits being ranked.

A number of investigations have involved similarity of personal constructs. Personal constructs are described as the hypotheses and interpretations formed by an individual about the world and are said to be fundamental elements of the personality (Duck, 1972). Initially, Duck hypothesized that the personal construct theory would provide a link between theories of attitude-similarity and personality-similarity as factors in attraction and friendship. Duck used the Role Construct Repertory Test (Reptest) to measure the structuring of constructs. The Reptest requires subjects to complete a grid with constructs, and/or names of people as instructed. The researcher hypothesized that members of a friendship group would be more similar in the structural
arrangement of descriptions of their fellow members than a nominal group of randomly selected people. Subjects were 40 students in their first or second year of college, 10 of whom were of a known friendship group. Each subject was given a sociometric test to discover personal preferences among the other subjects. A nominal group of 10 members was constructed to counterbalance the friendship group. This group was composed of students who had not reciprocated each other as choices. Subjects in each group were administered a Reptest. The results supported the hypothesis of greater perceived similarity by the friendship group, and Duck therefore concluded that similarity in the structuring of constructs was also supported.

Duck and Spencer (1972) assessed the degree of similarity between individuals who later became friends. They compared the constructs of friends against nominal pairs within the same population prior to acquaintance as well as after a period of continued acquaintance. Sixteen female students and residents of the same hall were used as subjects. During their first week at the university, while subjects were minimally acquainted with each other a Reptest was administered. Subjects were asked to provide as elements of the test a list of personal acquaintances who fit a list of roles provided to the subjects. Six months later subjects completed a second Reptest with somewhat different roles provided. After completing the test a sociometric technique was used to obtain a list of friends. Results indicated that pairs who later became friends had more similar constructs on the initial Reptest than nominal pairs. After six months of acquaintance, however, similarity between friends was no longer
significantly greater than between nominal pairs, unless only psychological constructs were considered. In which case friendship pairs were more significantly alike than nominal pairs had been. Duck and Spencer concluded that similarity of constructs was shown to be a precursor of friendship. They also concluded that progressive strengthening of friendships occurred as a result of increasing disclosure and perception by the friends of similarity in regards to their psychological constructs. They explained the findings of differences in levels of significance on similarity of constructs as an indication that friendship is a multilevel, multidimensional relationship, with the early levels of interaction consisting of discovering information about the manner and physical attractiveness of the new acquaintance. Later levels involve information about the other's personality and less obvious constructs.

Duck (1973a) hypothesized that liking is the result of similarity of the construct system, and this type of similarity is perceivable by the persons concerned. Thirty-eight teacher trainees who were residents of the same dormitory, and who had all lived in the same hall for one year were the subjects. Subjects were administered a form of the Reptest and upon completion of this, a sociometric technique was used to elicit a list of friends that was not limited to residents of their hall. Subjects were then asked to consider each of their elicited constructs and to list any of their acquaintances who in their opinion used the same construct. The results showed that pairs of friends had more similar constructs than nominal pairs. Females showed greater similarity with same sexed friends. Duck concluded the results
provided support for the hypothesis that, in general, actual similarity of the content of construct systems distinguished friendship pairs from nominal pairs. Duck also concluded that his finding illustrated the necessity for conceptualizing friendship in degrees, and also in terms of distinguishing qualities depending on the situation and sex of those involved.

Duck (1973b) hypothesized that similarity of general personality characteristics as measured by the California Personality Inventory (CPI) would differentiate acquaintances who were attracted to each other from those who were not attracted to each other. He further hypothesized that the CPI would not differentiate friendship pairs from other nominal pairs. Forty-two female students were recruited; 21 were previously unacquainted with one another, while the remaining 21 had lived in the same dormitory for at least one year. A sociometric technique was used to ensure that the acquainted 21 were established friendship pairs. Subjects completed the CPI using the standard instructions. They were then asked to complete a Reptest. Subjects in the acquainted group were asked to generate a list of local friends. The other subjects were divided into two groups. Each group was given a discussion topic and told they needed unanimous agreement on the topic. They were told they would have 20 minutes to discuss it and reach a decision. These subjects were then asked to list the names of those persons in their group to whom they felt attracted. All subjects were classified into one of two categories. Subjects who had been chosen or had chosen other subjects on the sociometric test were in one category. Subjects who had not been chosen by other subjects were in
the other category. Similarity of personality as measured by the CPI was found to strongly differentiate friendship and nominal pairs in the unacquainted population, but not in the acquainted population. Personality similarity as measured by the Reptest was found to strongly differentiate friendship pairs from nominal pairs in the acquainted population. This was not true for the unacquainted population. Duck concluded that these findings helped to explain the equivocal results of previous studies concerning the relationship between personality similarity and acquaintance. Since for the most part, previous studies failed to distinguish different stages of friendship development.

Duck and Craig (1978) further studied personality similarity in terms of stages of friendship development. They hypothesized that newly acquainted friends were more likely to be similar in terms of relatively accessible superficial personality information. In addition, they hypothesized that long term friends were more likely to be similar in terms of less accessible, more fundamental personality information. Forty previously unacquainted students of both sexes, from the same residence were the subjects of this longitudinal study. One month after entering the University they were given three personality tests, the CPI, the Allport-Vernon Study of Values (AVSV) and a Reptest. In addition, they were administered a sociometric test three months and again after eight months they were re-administered the sociometric test. The results after the first administration were all non-significant indicating that none of the measures were predictors of sociometric choices at that stage. The results after the second administration, three months after the first, indicated that the AVSV
was a predictor of sociometric choice at early stages of a relationship. The results at the third administration indicated that the Reptest was able to predict friendship choices made after eight months of acquaintance. Friendship pairs were also found to be more similar than nominal pairs on all categories of constructs. There were no significant effects on any measures derived from the CPI or the AVSV after eight months of acquaintance. Duck and Craig concluded that distinguishing between types of personality similarity and also different lengths of relationship allowed more accurate predictors of friendship choices.

Duck and associates (Duck, 1972; 1973a; 1973b; Duck & Craig, 1978; Duck & Spencer, 1972) reported studies which were systematic and essentially well controlled. However, they failed to consider that the college student population might have characteristics which would prevent results from generalizing to other populations. Past research has indicated that results of entering college students are not generalizable even to graduating college students. Hence for these results to be generalizable subjects would need to be drawn from a wider range of age and other variables represented.

Morton (1959) described friendship formation and maintenance in terms of structure of the group to which the individuals belong. He proposed that similarity, in terms of the traits considered important by the group would be the determining friendship variable. Morton used members of two fraternities who had been members for at least one year. The friendship structure of the fraternities was measured by a sociometric technique. The traits were obtained by having all subjects fill
out questionnaires in which variables such as athletic ability, grades, manners, professional intentions, extra curricular activities and other variables were assessed. Friendship structure was measured twice to provide an indication of friendship stability. Friendships were found to be fairly stable. Morton's main hypothesis was supported. Similarity of interests and norms most important to fraternity members were most influential in building a friendship. In Alpha fraternity, friendship was found to be related to degree of similarity in college class, athletic ability, manners and appearance. In Beta fraternity, friendship was found to be related to the traits of college class, professional intentions and amount of work done for the fraternity. As Morton stated, these results may only apply to groups which have developed group norms and have been in existence long enough for members to agree on the traits, norms and interest patterns important to the group. A group in which membership is large and widespread might not have as much impact on friendship formation. This would be attributed to not being as closely involved in the group process.

Complementarity

Complementarity theory states that two parties will be attracted to each other because they perceive the other as possessing complementary needs, characteristics or attributes to their own. Rielly, Commins, and Stefic (1960) attempted to determine if need patterns of friends were complementary and mutually satisfying. They were also interested in determining if perception of complementarity was more important than actual complementarity, and if friends would have
similar values. Subjects were 50 pairs of junior and sophomore female college students who were mutual friends. A control group was constructed by randomly pairing a junior subject with a sophomore subject and forming a pair of non-friends. Subjects were first administered an EPPS which provided a measure of self-perceived personality needs. They were then given an AVSV to provide a relative measure of subject values. Two days after this administration, subjects were again given the EPPS and told to take it as they thought their friend would answer. This provided a friend predicted need score. The results did not support the hypothesis that there was a complementary relationship between friends in respect to personality needs. However the results did indicate similarity between friends in regard to values. Rielly et al. concluded that although complementarity had been demonstrated to be essential in different sex relationships, it was not essential for a same sex friendship. In addition, similarity was not felt to be an essential feature of friendships. This is because the correlations between friends were not significantly different from those of non-friends. Rielly et al. may have failed to find conclusive results for either similarity or complementarity due to a lack of a standard method of measuring complementarity. Rielly et al. could not be sure the needs they were considering complementary were those considered by others to be complementary. Rielly et al. failed to define mutual friendship or degree of friendship. They also used subjects who volunteered, so that some pairs may have been recently acquainted friends who were not close while others may have been long term friends who had an almost exclusive best friendship. It seems logical to
propose that if complementarity was the main basis for friendship formation, then long term friendships would be more complementary than recent friendships. Long term friendships have been maintained and proven while a short term friendship may yet dissolve for various reasons, one of which being a lack of sufficient complementarity.

- Banta and Heatherington (1963) investigated complementarity and similarity of needs in mate and friend selection. They attempted to differentiate between selective processes involved in like sex and different sex pairs. One hundred seventy-four subjects grouped in 29 clusters of six people, an engaged couple and a male and female friend of each fiancee were administered the EPPS. Results indicated a general preference for similar needs rather than complementary needs among engaged couples. The results further indicated that similarity was preferred for same-sex friendships, with females choosing friends who were more similar to themselves than males chose. Banta and Heatherington concluded that there was no evidence for complementarity of needs. Although Banta and Heatherington have provided more information on friendship by studying both a same-sex and other-sex friend for each subject, the lack of evidence for the complementarity theory may still be a result of a lack of instrument developed for this particular use, and a lack of agreement as to which needs are complementary.

- Pierce (1970) attempted to prove a relationship between need similarity or complementarity and friendship choice and to differentiate the needs that were most relevant to friendship choice. Pierce administered the Jackson Personality Research Form A (JPR) to an
entering freshman class. Near the end of the academic year the subjects' roommates were given a questionnaire. The questionnaire concerned satisfaction with school; in addition, the roommate was asked to list two freshmen the subject particularly liked. The JPR of the subjects and the two freshmen chosen by the roommates were compared for similarity of personality characteristics and complementarity of personality needs. Pierce found that similarity was a more accurate predictor of friendship. He also found that the two general personality areas of order versus impulsivity and "turning toward people versus turning away from or against people" were the needs significantly related to friendship choice. Pierce intended to study friendship choice but in asking for two people the subject particularly liked he assumed liking and friendship were equivalent. Liking and friendship are not generally considered to be the same thing. The roommates choices may have been persons for whom the subject had expressed admiration, interest and desire for friendship, not a person who was a friend. There may actually have been no relationship, so that Pierce's study in actuality may pertain more to attraction than friendship. As with other studies of complementarity, no standardized, accepted instrument for measuring complementarity was used. Therefore, comparisons may not have been adequately made on that dimension.

In conclusion, there have been no decisive studies done in support of the complementarity theory. In fact, most studies have failed to find any support of the theory or have found evidence in support of the theory of similarity as a basis of friendship formation.
A similar line of research investigated the ideals and personality characteristics possessed by the friends. Thompson and Nishimura (1952) hypothesized that friendship is based on mutual satisfaction of needs, thus, an individual would look for a person whose needs complemented his own. In addition, it was hypothesized that friendships would be determined by a compatibility of ideals between the persons involved. Each person would regard the other as possessing those personality characteristics which he himself idealized. Eight pairs of best friends were chosen from a Japanese-American community group. The basis for selection of a pair was said to be observation and inquiry. Subjects were given a list of personality traits. They were asked to rate the traits on a nine point scale in order of their significance for his own personality, his ideal personality, his friend's personality and the personality of an acquaintance who was not a close friend. They found that subjects regarded their friends as conforming to their ideal. They further found that the strength of the attraction was indicated by the extent of agreement between the ideals of the two parties and the extent to which the subjects considered the other as achieving their ideal. They further concluded that friendship was a relationship of degrees; in other words, a relationship existed on a continuum from acquaintance to enemy. Thompson and Nishimura's results can not be considered conclusive because of the small number of subjects involved and the exclusive population to which they belonged. The Japanese-American community may have some particular cultural influences on friendship that effected the results of the study. In addition friendship pairs were chosen on the basis of observation,
which may have resulted in varying levels and degrees of friendship
pairs thus confounding the results and introducing experimenter bias.

Social Penetration Theory

The social penetration theory refers to the behavioral processes
involved in the development of interpersonal relationships. It pro-
poses that interpersonal interaction progresses over time in both the
degree of intimacy involved or depth of penetration and the amount of
interaction or breadth of penetration (Taylor, 1965). This theory
allows for measurement of the qualitative aspects of a relationship or
friendship. It is hypothesized that persons in a deep relationship
should exhibit a greater number of intimate interactions than those in
less deep relationships. These less deep relationships were hypothe-
sized to have a greater number of superficial interactions than deeper
relationships. Taylor further proposed, in agreement with Thibaut and
Kelley (1959), that people would choose to continue moving along the
intimacy continuum if they expected to receive gains or payoffs from
future interactions. When cost was seen to outweigh reward, he
hypothesized that the relationship would either cease to develop
further or dissolve. Taylor attempted to test the hypotheses of the
social penetration theory using male freshman students at a University
orientation. During orientation subjects were administered question-
naires to obtain information regarding the subject's age, IQ, social-
emotional adjustment, birth order, and to identify the subject as a
high revealer or a low revealer. Subjects who were previously
unacquainted and the same level of revealer were paired as roommates.
These roommate pairs and two groups of randomly selected pairs to serve as controls. Subjects were administered five questionnaires over a 13 week interval. The questionnaires measured the amount of activity with the roommate over a three week period, the cumulative amount of personal information revealed to the roommate over time, the cumulative accuracy of acquisition of objectively verifiable information between roommates, and the cumulative accuracy of acquisition of information on the values and attitudes between roommates. Taylor found that the amount of mutual disclosure, activities engaged in and the accuracy of interpersonal knowledge increased significantly over time. His results also indicated that high revelation dyads exhibited greater breadth of social penetration than low revelation dyads at all levels of intimacy. Further, Taylor found that accuracy of information one roommate had about the other was greater at more intimate levels than superficial levels of intimacy. Indicating that previous research done on perception of attributes of a friend might be somewhat invalid since, unless the level of intimacy was controlled for the accuracy of information might vary greatly. Taylor concluded that the major hypothesis of the social penetration theory, interpersonal interaction progresses over time, was supported.

Attachment Theory

Attachment theory is a way of conceptualizing the tendency of people to participate in attachment behavior. Attachment behavior is any form of behavior that results in a person attaining or retaining proximity to another, differentiated and preferred individual (Bowlby,
Attachment theory proposed that the patterns of attachment behavior shown, or the people one develops a relationship with are the result partly of age, sex and circumstances. In addition, patterns of attachment are also partly a result of the experiences one had with attachment figures early in life, specifically with one's parents. Attachment theory also proposed that rewards and punishment play a very small part in the development of attachment. The most important process related to this theory is learning to distinguish familiar from strange. The main variables which affect a child's later development of attachment patterns is thought to be the extent to which parents provide a secure base and encourage exploration of self and environment (Bowlby, 1977).

**Economic Transaction Theories**

A number of individuals have proposed theories of friendship similar to the extent that they consider friendship a kind of economic transaction. The filter theory was proposed to account for changes in the determinants of attraction in pairs who progressively increased their closeness (Kerckhoff & Davis, 1962). The theory states that the level of a relationship depended on the reinforcement received from the relationship (Levinger, 1974). Levinger hypothesized that the initial determinant of attraction would decrease in importance as the relationship developed. As two people got to know each other they would perceive a wider range of attributes. These then, would enter into the evaluation of the other and the earlier perceived attributes would have decreased in importance. Levinger stated that there have
been no data supporting the theory, but concludes it is a promising approach to the problem of the effects of the level of the relationship on reinforcement.

The resource exchange theory of interpersonal reinforcement proposed a classification scheme for resources with six broad categories of interpersonal resources: money; goods; information; services; status and love. These cover the major qualities that one person appears to offer to or receive from another (Foa, 1971). Each resource is made up of two characteristics: (a) the extent to which the value of a resource is influenced by the person who delivers it, such as love; and (b) the expression of the resource in a range from concrete to symbolic. Status and information are the most symbolic, and goods and services are the most concrete. The studies generated by the theory suggest a linkage between general classes of reinforcers and the emphasis on levels of pair relatedness. A resource such as love has the greatest value in a strongly personal relationship and would be appreciated in an impersonal relationship (Foa, 1971).

Turner, Foa, and Foa (1971) in a series of studies using college students attempted to provide evidence in support of the hypotheses of the resource exchange theory. Their initial study was concerned with the perceptual and cognitive differentiation of the six classes of resources. Subjects received a series of messages each dealing with one of the classes of resources from an unseen confederate. Subjects were then asked to return to the confederate the most similar and the most dissimilar message for each message they received. The subjects had a prearranged supply of return messages from which to choose. The
authors found that subjects were classifying the messages in the same manner as proposed by the theory. In another study, the authors tested the hypothesis that the frequency with which various resources are exchanged, in a given situation, will be higher if the resource is similar as opposed to dissimilar to the one for which it is being exchanged. To test the hypothesis they devised and administered an instrument called the "Social Interaction Inventory." One hundred sixty college freshmen were administered the inventory. In it they were presented with six situations and were required to give a certain resource to another person for each situation. The subject was instructed to choose in each situation the item which he preferred in exchange for what had been given. The frequency of resources preferred for each of the stimulus situations was calculated. The results supported the hypothesis that the frequency of the resources depended on the similarity of the choices to be exchanged. Turner et al. concluded that in the situation of friendship, as in any social situation, some resources were more appropriate than others. Turner et al. further concluded that preference for an interpersonal resource varies across situations. Although this series of studies supported the hypotheses they were done only in laboratory situations and the results may not generalize to real-life settings. The laboratory situations may have been too simplified and may not have accounted for the multitude of real life variables.

Hatfield, Utne, and Traupmann (1979) described the Equity Theory of friendship. They stated it as a general theory of social behavior
applied to intimate relationships. It is composed of four propositions:

1. Individuals will try to maximize outcomes. Outcomes = Rewards - punishments.

2. Groups can maximize collective rewards by evolving accepted systems for equitably apportioning resources among members. Groups will generally reward members who treat others equitably and punish members who do not.

3. Individuals participating in inequitable relationships will be distressed.

4. Distressed people will try to eliminate their distress by restoring equity.

The authors presented two reasons for distress: being overbenefitted which resulted in feelings of guilt, empathy and dissonance, and being underbenefitted which resulted in feelings of anger and resentment. Friends reduced distress by restoring actual equity. They may alter their own gains or their partner's relative gains. They may also restore psychological equity by changing their perceptions of the situation or by trying to convince themselves it was equitable.

Lott and Lott (1974) described the basis of friendship formation as liking. Liking was said to result under those conditions in which an individual experienced rewards in the presence of another person, regardless of the relationship between the person and the rewarding event. They considered the determinants of liking to be the analysis of the reward. The reward was considered an effective reinforcement if it was relevant to the motivational stand, and the preceding
experiences of the person being reinforced. The nature of reinforcement consisted of an incentive if a hoped for or feared anticipation of events either happened or were averted relative to the condition under which the person is operating. Positive outcomes were said to be governed by both long-term and momentary factors. Interpersonal positive outcomes were said to be success, approval and attention. Rewards which came directly from another person influenced the evaluations made of that person. Interpersonal attitudes might also be influenced by the nature of the characteristics and the evaluation of the characteristics. Hence, all of these factors were said to be involved in liking someone and becoming friends with them.

Levinger (1979) described the Social Exchange Theory of friendship. He stated that interpersonal relations seemed initially to develop on the basis of universalistic exchanges. At first less valued goods, services or information would be exchanged. Later the most valued rewards, that signified unique meaning to those involved would be exchanged. He proposed that increasing intimacy could be manifested by an increase in the number and variety of unique or particularistic exchanges. These exchanges would be ones in which one party did good for the other at little cost and much pleasure to himself. The exchanges would be mutually beneficial with the parties involved performing complimentary roles. Levinger included in the theory the assumption that as interpersonal involvement deepened, the partner's satisfactions and dissatisfactions would become more and more identified with his own. Time span would have a significant effect on the relationship. Early interactions were seen as taking place in a
limited time frame, and as the relationship deepened and stabilized its time frame would expand. Current outcomes would be evaluated with regard to a longer past and more foreseeable future. The formative stage would be marked by superficial interactions, exploration and testing. The next stage or plateau stage would be a stage in which members would have established an enduring relationship, valued by both members. The members would have de-emphasized exchange properties because of an economy of surplus. Common interest would allow both members to have engaged in joint actions that enhanced mutual pleasure at low cost and promoted a continuing high credit balance in their relationship. The declining stage would be marked by members again paying close attention to the benefits and costs as well as to lost benefits that resulted from not exploring alternative possibilities. Levinger proposed that theoretically it should be possible to assess an ongoing relationship by examining both member's expressions of reward and sacrifice regarding each of the relationship's central activities. A preoccupation with the reward cost balance would indicate a declining relationship. Levinger reported no research supporting the social exchange theory.

Scanzoni (1979) proposed that there were stages of behavioral interdependence between exchange partners. Interdependence was defined as a reliance upon others within the social system for valued rewards, benefits or gratifications. Scanzoni described three stages of interdependence. These were exploration, expansion and commitment. All three were said to vary in interdependence from low to high. Individuals moved through the stages by making a series of decisions in
which they continually chose to decrease or increase their involvement. Scanzoni felt that a relationship seldom existed in only one stage. Relationships were seen as ongoing and moving freely back and forth between stages. The larger social system in which the relationship occurred was said to be both a cause and consequence of the processes within the relationship. During the exploration stage, Scanzoni proposed that termination was relatively easy because of the minimal investment and interdependence. The objective of the individuals was to discover whether or not the relationship was worthwhile, profitable to maintain, or develop. If they discovered it was not it would be terminated. To move to the expansion stage, interest was required along with maximum joint profit. During expansion, attraction, obligations, and negotiations caused a continually widening network of intermeshed interests. Commitment was said to result in a situation where the members were no longer attending to alternative relationships. Scanzoni did not describe any investigations using his theories.

Burgess and Huston (1979) proposed a theory consisting of a composite of descriptions suggesting how partners grow increasingly closer. They suggested that the process of growing closer would be illustrated by the individuals involved interacting more often and longer in a widening array of settings. The partners would attempt to restore proximity when separated. They would disclose things to each other that they would not disclose to others. In addition, they would become less inhibited and develop their own communication system which would increase their ability to map and anticipate each other's views.
of social reality. All of these factors would result in increased liking, trust and love for each other and in their seeing the relationship as unique and irreplaceable. Burgess and Huston proposed that in the early stages of a relationship attraction would be based on the probability of the partners finding rewards in shared behavior. As the relationship evolved other reward cost considerations would take on increasing importance. Partners may be attracted to each other and maintain a relationship because of previous interactions being profitable and because profits have been steadily increasing. The surrounding physical and social world might also provide some of the benefits of a relationship, that is, material goods and status may be achieved by virtue of their union. Burgess and Huston note that little reasearch has been done using the theory.

McCarthy and Duck (1976) used Byrne's paradigmatic approach to study friendships at several stages of development. They hypothesized that Byrne's findings of the reinforcement of attitudinal similarity to a laboratory stranger might be modified by other motivational processes at more advanced stages of a relationship. Dissimilarity is proposed as becoming reinforcing and producing increased attraction as similarity becomes less reinforcing due to satiation effects. Mild disagreement with a new acquaintance might indicate that the person is stimulating and potentially rewarding. McCarthy and Duck propose that stimulation value as described by Wright (1969) requires some amount of opinion discrepancy superimposed on a general similarity of orientations. They believe individuals seek a basic similarity of orientation first and then look for dissimilarities to maintain the relationship.
and reach further levels of development. Searching for dissimilarity and finding it in relative minor areas would also tend to confirm similarity. In established friendships, dissimilarity might be unattractive, since any new discovery of dissimilarity might indicate a radical change or long standing misperception.

McCarthy and Duck (1976) measured attraction of subjects toward a same sex fictitious stranger, a tentative same sex friend (i.e., duration of less than six months), or an established friend. Attraction was measured after exposing subjects to similar or dissimilar responses attributed to the previously named people. Subjects studied the attitudinal material and then completed the Interpersonal Judgment Scale (IJS) devised by Byrne (1971). They found that subjects preferred tentative friends to be mildly dissimilar rather than similar. The authors conducted a replication with the condition of tentative friends divided into early (1–3 months) and late (4–6 months). They found that early tentative friends were preferred to be mildly dissimilar, late tentative friends were preferred to be greatly dissimilar and established friends were preferred to be totally similar. They explain this in terms of friendship not being a smooth continuity but rather a process involving plateaus and steps.

Wright's Model

Wright's (1969; Note 2) model of friendship proposed that friendship had a behavioral and experiential component. The behavioral component involves voluntary interdependence, the tendency of the parties involved to interact when both are free of external pressures or
constraints toward interaction. The experiential component involves the degree to which two people respond to each other as individuals and accept the other for what he is. Wright proposed that the existence or nonexistence of a friendship seemed to depend on the way each party perceived the other. Different sets of friends were said to vary with respect to the specific things they do for one another that was found to be reinforcing. One person may have different friendships with several kinds of people each providing a different pattern of direct rewards. Wright has delineated several classes of direct rewards in friendship; utility value, ego support value, stimulation value and self affirmation value. Friendships vary as follows: in the extent each of the rewards are present; the degree to which the behavioral and experiential components are involved; and how difficult a relationship is to maintain. Wright developed the Acquaintance Description Form (ADF), an instrument to measure each of the above mentioned variables (see Appendix B). Wright (1969), in developing and testing the ADF, performed six studies. Each of the studies utilized 50 to 100 subjects from introductory and educational psychology courses. In the first study subjects were asked to complete the forms using someone they had known for at least a year and a half and with whom they considered themselves well acquainted. The target person was required to be either one of the subject's best friends, a friend but not one of his best friends or an acquaintance but not really a friend. In the second study, subjects were asked to use the forms to describe someone considered to be either a helpful, cooperative person or someone with whom it was often difficult to get along. The third and
fourth studies required subjects to describe two same sex acquaintances of 18 months or more and then answer a series of questions concerning the two people. These questions involved who is the better friend, who is more generous, thoughtful, and helpful, who is the most stimulating and with which of the two it is harder to get along. There were also questions involving how the subject felt he was perceived by the two acquaintances and which of the two had more respect for the subject as a person. Wright reports these studies provided material for item analysis and revealed the need for another scale, the General Favorability Scale, which was developed and tested in the fifth study. The fifth study required subjects to bring two same sex acquaintances that had known each other for more than 18 months, to the experiment. These triads were required to describe each other using the ADF and then answer the same questions as studies three and four. These studies were used to gather reliability and validity data, to test the ADF for ability to discriminate between lesser and better friends and to test the general favorability scale. No major hypotheses were tested by these studies. In a sixth study, the subjects were asked to report in same sex pairs, who had been acquainted for at least 18 months and who knew each other quite well. Each member of the pair was required to give his or her partner the name of another person of the same sex. Subjects then received additional requirements for the named person, designed to measure the instruments' validity for high and low conditions as measured by each of the scales. Subjects were also asked to return in two weeks to describe the same person they had described previously, thus giving a measure of test-retest
reliability. In this study Wright tested the ADF scales for their validity by specifically appointing conditions for the target person in order to determine if the scale was sensitive to the various levels it was supposed to measure. For example, for the high Stimulation Value (SV) condition the partner was instructed to chose for the other target person who their partner considered to be interesting and stimulating. For the low SV condition the partner was instructed to chose a target person who their partner considered to be dull and not stimulating. In this way Wright insured the scales were valid, that is they measured what he had designated them to measure. Wright found large significant differences on the Difficult to Maintain (DM) scale for those friendships that were designated to be difficult to maintain. Other results were significant in the hypothesized direction, except for the Utility Value (UV) scales. However, in a later study which amplified the directions for this condition, a significant difference was found. Wright (1969) concluded that the ADF is a serviceable instrument for measuring the components of friendship. Wright (Note 2) attempted to determine if three of the individual scales of the ADF actually differentiated among known levels of friendship. The three individual scales were Total Friendship (TF), Voluntary Interdependence (VID), and Person-Qua-Person (PQP). In doing so Wright identified five levels of friendship. The levels ranged from very best friend to definitely not a friend. Subjects were volunteers from introductory psychology classes. One hundred and five males and 123 females were asked to name a person on one of the levels of friendship who was of their own sex and whom they had known well for more than a
year. Each subject was later contacted and asked to complete an ADF and describe the person they had named. Wright then compared the mean scores on each scale for the subjects and the five levels of friendship. Results indicated that the ADF scores differentiated clearly among four of the five friendship levels on the TF scale. The VID and PQP scales differentiated between three and two groupings of friendship levels, respectively. None of the three scales were found to differentiate between the levels of "good friends" and "moderate friends." Wright concluded that the three scales provided a workable estimate of friendship strength. However, he found that subjects did not make fine discriminations among friends at intermediate levels.

Walker and Wright (1976) did a study investigating friendship as a function of intimate and nonintimate self-disclosure in the process of social exchange. They observed the differences in friendship levels produced by varying levels of self-disclosure. They predicted that the level of friendship would increase when an individual had the opportunity to exchange and receive highly intimate information from another person. Subjects were 65 pairs of undergraduates who knew very little about one another and had no contact with each other outside of class. Subjects were asked to describe their assigned partner using the ADF. Subjects were then asked to return a week later and participate in a conversation with their partner. One partner from each pair was enlisted as a confederate. Pairs were assigned to one of three conditions. The conditions were intimate, nonintimate, and control. The confederate was given a list of topics according to the condition the pair was assigned. Confederates were instructed to begin the
conversations and do most of the talking for the first 10 minutes. Subjects in the intimate condition scored their partners higher on the ADF scale of VID indicating increased liking. Walker and Wright concluded that communication is important in the formation of friendship and acts as a social reward in conversations. As they note, this research is based on a paper and pencil test and therefore limited in its scope and accuracy. In addition, the subjects in the study were not friends and had little contact with each other, therefore they may not have been able to accurately or appropriately fill out the questionnaire which was developed for friends.

Friendship Differences in Subgroups

Along with studies in the general area of friendship there have been studies investigating the difference in friendships of various subgroups and the process and characteristics important for subgroups in the selection and rejection of friends. Peretti (1976) investigated friendships of black college students. One hundred ninety-seven black undergraduates were asked to complete a modified sociogram. This procedure diagrammed their closest friends so as to obtain information on the influence of structural characteristics on close friendship formation. Subjects were asked to fill out a questionnaire which permitted a determination of group stability. A week later, subjects were also asked to complete a questionnaire which measured the degree of social intimacy perceived in the subject's friendship unit. Peretti found that there were more closest friend groups with members of the other sex than of the same sex. He also found that a number of black
closest friendship groups were composed of the same sex and tended to be very intimate. Peretti further found that other sex dyads scored higher on indications of intimacy. He concluded that the possibility of physical sexual contact or sexual favors might be a factor in the higher intimacy scores.

Peters and Kennedy (1970) investigated the friendships of college students in general. They reported data from a longitudinal study in which 76 students were asked to provide a list of persons they considered to be very close friends. Subjects were also asked to provide extensive information about themselves, their perceptions and their friends and friendships. In addition, subjects were asked to indicate the friends on the list they considered their very closest friends. Measures which they found discriminated between levels of intimacy were shared confidences, money having been lent or borrowed, feeling free to behave without constraints and exchanged home visits. Peters and Kennedy determined that the university was an important context for friendship formation. Between one half and two thirds of friends were on campus. They also found that friends were thought of as people who shared things. The average number of on campus friends was found to be four, in addition to three close off campus friends. They found indications that this was the maximum number of close friendships an individual could handle in terms of psychological energy and available time.

Austin and Thompson (1948) studied the rationale behind a child's choice of three best friends and for changes in choice over a two week period. Sixth grade children were asked to list the names of their
first, second and third best friends. They were also asked to explain why these children were chosen. Two weeks later the procedure was repeated. The original lists were then distributed to the children with instructions to explain any changes in choice of friends. The responses were then grouped into categories, and the frequency analyzed. The results indicated that the children probably chose their friends on the basis of personality characteristics. Children seemed to prefer others who could be described as moral and socially conventional. Frequent association and propinquity also contributed to friendship choice. Decrease in frequency of association was the major reason given for a change in friend choice. Another major reason was change in similarity of interests and needs.

Blau and Rafferty (1970) investigated changes in preschool children's friendship status as a result of manipulating reinforcement. They hypothesized that by reinforcing children jointly while learning a task, each member of a pair would become a cue for reinforcement. This then would effect friendship status such that more reinforcement would lead to a more intense friendship. Blau and Rafferty identified friend pairs through a picture sociometric technique. The 48 preschool children were tested individually. Each was asked to identify the children with whom they liked to play and those with whom they did not like to play. Subjects who were neutral in the friendship rankings were matched pairs. Reinforcement schedules of continuous reinforcement (CF), fixed ratio 20 (FR20), and fixed ratio 40 (FR40) were used while the pairs learned a button pressing task. The results indicated that
friendship status increased for all subjects regardless of reinforcement schedule.

Wood and Robertson (1978) had 257 grandparents, whose average age was 65, participate in their investigation. They were interested in determining which variables were important in accounting for differences in life satisfaction. The variables studied were amount of involvement with grandchildren, amount of involvement with friends and amount of involvement with organizations. The authors obtained information on the number and frequency of activities engaged in with grandchildren and friends as measures of involvement. Involvement in organizations was determined by the number of different types of groups participated in and length of membership. Life satisfaction was measured by the Life Satisfaction Index-Z. Involvement with both grandchildren and friends was significant in accounting for variations among grandparents in life satisfaction. Friends were found to be significantly greater contributors to satisfaction than was involvement with grandchildren.

Powers and Bultena (1976) investigated the important social contacts of late life. All of the 235 subjects were over 70. Interaction scores were based on the number of days per year the subject had face-to-face contact with a spouse, children and their families. Intimate friendships were determined by responses to specific questions. Males were found to have significantly higher interaction scores than females, except as related to contact with intimate friends. The social network of males was basically limited to three types of persons. The three types were friends, children and spouses. The social
network of females was distributed over a wider range of interactants, they have greater social contacts and more intimate friends than males.

Shulman (1975) investigated the salience of relatives and other categories of relationships for adults at various stages of life. Interviews were conducted on 347 adults. They found that relatives accounted for 40% of all persons named to the networks of close friends. Young people were less likely to name relatives to the network. Shulman concluded that networks tend to be geared to the needs and concerns of the stage of life of the individual.

Wright (Note 3) reviewed same sex friendships and the differences between men and women. He proposed that there were central tendencies within each group that were in line with traditional sex roles and socialization practices. But, despite these differences, men and women's friendships are similar in more ways than they are different. In a review of the findings using the ADF, Wright found that men preferred agreement on day-to-day activities finding this more interesting and stimulating, while women preferred agreement on their deeper personal values, finding this interesting and stimulating (Wright and Crawford, 1971). It was also reported that men had initial difficulty disclosing themselves with potential friends, but if they overcame this difficulty they became better friends. Women were not reluctant disclosers (Walker and Wright, 1976). Wright also found that women tend to differentiate more clearly among different categories of friends than men, and that women tend to be friends in a holistic and multifaceted way while men may regard a person a friend with respect to one or a limited number of facets. In general, Wright
(Note 3) found that women's friendships are more person-oriented while men's are more activity-oriented. For long standing friendships both men and women end up with the same kind of friendships, although the course of development may be different.

**Changes in Friendships**

Some of the studies and theories regarding the development of friendship have been described earlier. Much less research has been done regarding friendship's subsequent lapse, and the variables that are involved in maintaining a friendship or dissolving a friendship.

**Maintenance of Friendships**

Lickona (1974) hypothesized that the moral development of a person or his predominant level of moral development influences his choice of friends. The moral stages are said to provide a cognitive context for affectional relations and also to have an impact on attraction on both early and later stages of a relationship. People tend to choose friends who are functioning at the same or higher moral level as themselves. If, as the relationship progresses, the stages of moral development are revealed and are found to be significantly different the course of a friendship may be altered. At higher levels of moral development, Lickona (1974) anticipates more acts of altruism and consideration for the other's needs which would increase affection, thus increasing the level of involvement and strengthening the friendship.

Fiebert and Fiebert (1969) hypothesized that friendship formation is somewhat of a combination of many of the earlier discussed theories.
of friendship. Friendship is seen as multidimensional. Friendship involves commitment, loyalty, mutual willingness and desire to risk self disclosure and accept the negative aspects of the other. Also, friendship attempts to mutually fulfill needs and a mutual modification of constructs, attitudes and values. Fiebert and Fiebert proposed that friendship formation was a sort of combination of four models of friendship. These are as follows: (a) the incremental model, which states that the greater the frequency of interaction the greater the frequency of liking, as a result of increased opportunities for mutual positive reinforcement; (b) the shared stress model, which proposed that externally produced involuntary stressors are powerful initiators of friendship; (c) the perceived similarity model, in which perceived similarity is higher than actual similarity as a result of individuals seeking anchoring points of similarity; and (d) the perceived need complimentarity model in which complimentarities refers to particular patterns of dissimilarity in needs. In its simplest form this model involves the presence of a need in one person and the presence in the other of a need which can reciprocally fulfill the need of the first. Both parties must perceive the potential for fulfillment.

Kurth (1970) proposed that the process of friendship formation and development begins when two people come into contact with each other through some formal role. They each perceive that the other is interested in forming a relationship and must make a decision on the type of relationship they want. This part of the process is called a friendly relation and is typified by office relationships in which two people are friends and see each other only at work. While deciding
whether to take the relationship further each explores possible outcomes and tries to predict future outcomes. If they do not get enough information, or it is negative, they will lose interest in the relationship and it will cease to develop. Ambivalence is said to exist in forming the friendship and throughout the lifetime of a friendship because of the changes and uncertainty about a relationship's possible outcomes. Relationships can change without the full awareness of the individuals involved. Friendships are said to be easy to start, but difficult to control or destroy (Wright, Note 1). Many times friendships are maintained even though one or both parties feel they would like to dissolve it. Events are continually occurring which effect the relationship; these may be external, such as a new individual forming a friendly relation with one of the parties. A new relationship could strain the members' capacity for relationships by the possibility of bringing a new, more rewarding friendship into being. Kurth (1970) further hypothesized that friendships require substantial bases so that if the initial formal role dissolves the relationship can persist. Many cultural norms are said to aid relationships in developing. Reciprocity, gratitude and faithfulness encourage further interaction. The norms of propriety can make friendships more difficult to dissolve because when a relation begins to deepen individuals tend to violate the norms of civil interaction by revealing their "true selves" to each other. The threat of exposure and the reward of acceptance in spite of the violation of norms helps hold the relationship together. Kurth stated that once the relationship is formed the members are concerned with the stability of the rewards and costs, so they
periodically test to see if the other is living up to the bargain, and if their views of the relationship are still similar. If one member should discover that they are not receiving the expected support for one of their role identities, this will be less reinforcing and they will seek to change the relationship or become involved in another.

**Dissolution of Friendship**

Albert and Brigant (1962) viewed friendship as a role relationship determined mostly by the social structure of the participants. They describe the social structure as defining for the individual the number and meaningful characteristics of those with whom the individual could choose to become involved.

The social structure of an individual places restrictions on the various kinds of behavior that may be undertaken in order to satisfy his motives. It defines the boundaries through the communicative processes and contents. Social structure was seen as limiting the potential range of choices that each member made. Hence an individual's personality determined interactions and attractions only within a restricted, predetermined range of choices. The authors proposed that past a certain point of cultural restrictions, the final determinant of participants' choices in a friendship was the personalities of each. Relationships could be solely determined by social role such as an office friendship or by free choice. They proposed that when less social responsibility or free choice is invested by each participant the relationship can be dissolved easier. This is because each participant would view the break as a result of external cues and
circumstances. In other words, the more involved the social role is in the relationship, the easier it will dissolve because the participants will be less personally involved with each other. This hypothesis would seem to be related to Wright's (Note 2) scale of Person-Qua-Person, in which the extent of the personal involvement is assessed by the ADF.

Many of the theories whose main focus was on friendship formation and the determinants of friendship also postulated on the dissolution of friendship. Fiebert and Fiebert (1969) cited reasons for discontinuation of friendships as: weakening of shared stress situations, major time interruptions, an increasing perception of dissimilarity or an increasing perception of non-fulfillment of needs.

Burgess and Huston (1979) explained the deterioration of relationships from an exchange theory perspective. A relationship is viewed in terms of the transactions that occur between partners or in terms of the relationships each partner maintains with others. Some of these relationships or ties will not be consolidated because the people involved find the interaction insufficiently rewarding, or a one-sided dependency develops. The authors proposed that a relationship would deepen as each member learns to anticipate increasing rewards. Some of these rewards may be mediated through others in the surrounding physical and social world. If anticipated rewards do not occur, or if the surrounding environment inhibits rewards from reaching the friends, the relationship would be expected to deteriorate.

Levinger (1979) proposed that during the decline of a relationship both past pleasures and prospective gratifications would be discounted.
The relationship and its' gains would be viewed in terms of a shorter time span and the participants would be more aware of the reward cost continuum. Levinger considered dissolution of marital relationships. He proposed that most relationships terminate before stability has been established. The frequency of contacts was seen as a major factor in dissolution. Interactional determinants were seen as a response to the satisfactoriness of the participants actual joint outcomes in the light of their earlier expectations. The higher the payoff correspondence to their outcome expectations the more gratifying the interaction, and the more it will promote their exchange balance. A relationship will terminate if the participants persist in giving each other unsatisfactory payoffs.

Braiker and Kelley (1979) studied conflict in close, other sex relationships and conflict's role in the development of the relationship. They proposed that close relationships were made up of behavioral exchanges and were interdependent on the normative level as well as level of personal characteristics and attitudes. Two people involved in a close relationship were seen as mutually dependent. The existence of conflict was described as evidence of the mutual dependency. The authors proposed that a person who is not dependent has no special interests in the other person, and no conflicts with the other person. They proposed that the interdependence between two persons existed on different levels. Each person gains rewards and incurs costs on each level of exchange. They further asserted that relationship growth did not necessarily involve cycles of crisis and disruption. Conflict was not seen as an essential part of the developmental
process. However, they did assert that conflict could play a positive role in relationship development. Relationships that moved successfully through conflict episodes were likely to evolve to new bases of interdependence. Conflict was described as producing an aversive experience, and as being arousing and motivating. If the conflict level is high it was proposed that the emotional level would also be high. It was further proposed that the resolution would be short term such as escape or an exaggerated action. Lower levels of conflict were proposed to be resolved by more complex reactions. The persons involved would be intrapersonally motivated to think about the relationship and to assess it in relation to alternatives. This process was predicted to be highly informative and positive for the relationship. The process would be positive if those involved recognized the benefits of the relationship. Conflict was seen to engender changes in feelings and attitudes. As the person resolves conflicts in favor of the partner's interests a basis for self-attribution develops with "really caring" for the partner. If a relationship is continually in a state of conflict, or resolution of a conflict is not possible, a negative evaluation of the relationship would result in dissolution of the relationship.

Duck and Allison (1978) in one of the relatively few studies dealing directly with lapsed friendships compared lapsed and successful relationships of college students. They hypothesized that students who had chosen to live off campus with each other after 12 months of acquaintance as dormmates would be more similar in personal constructs as measured by the Reptest, than those who had not chosen to live with
each other. They further hypothesized that of the friends who chose to live together, those who continued to live together after eight months would be different in respect to the type of similarity than those who quit living together before eight months. Subjects were administered a Reptest towards the end of their year living off campus. After completing the test subjects identified the people with whom they had chosen to live off campus and indicated whether the relationship was still in existence. The results confirmed their hypotheses. Duck and Allison found that subjects were more similar to people they chose to live with than to those they rejected. Relationships which failed after being chosen showed characteristically different patterns of the types of similarity. The authors failed to account for the reasons behind choices to live with a group and the reasons for failure to stay. There might have been other personal reasons for subjects' decisions to terminate or live off campus which were not related to friendship.

In a preliminary study of lapsed and current friendships, Rodgers and Blau (Note 4) used Wright's (Note 2) ADF. They hypothesized that current friendships were more reinforcing than lapsed friendships. They further hypothesized that the ongoing relationship was stronger and easier to maintain than the lapsed relationship had been. They inferred support for current friendships being more reinforcing and easier to maintain. Although none of the analyses of variance were significant for the scales measuring reinforcement value, all were approaching significance at the .05 level. Since the study had a small sample, six males and six females, it was anticipated that the
differences would be significant with a larger sample. They also found significant differences between the strength of current friendships and lapsed friendships.

The hypothesized reasons for dissolution of a friendship can be summarized as belonging to three categories. One category of reasons for friendship lapse was the social structure and forces in which the relationship was that situated preventing the full benefits of the relationship and the failure of the relationships to form a stable structure. Another category of reasons was perception of dissimilarity or nonfulfillment of needs. The third category of reasons for lapse was the reinforcement value of the relationships. That is, those relationships in which anticipated rewards failed to occur or payoffs were seen as unsatisfactory were hypothesized as more likely to dissolve.

In light of the lack of research investigating the reasons for and characteristics particular to dissolved friendships, the present study is offered as a step towards filling the gap of knowledge between characteristics of ongoing friendships and those of lapsed friendships. The present study evaluated current close friendships and lapsed close friendships of 1 to 1½ years prior and 3 to 4 years prior to present. The aim was to determine distinguishing and predictive qualitative differences between ongoing friendships and those that had dissolved. Characteristics of the friendships were obtained using the Acquaintance Description Form (ADF) developed and revised by Wright (1969, Note 2). The hypotheses of the study were as follows:
1. Current friendships of males and females will be higher on all scales, except the DM Scale than either of the measures of lapsed friendship.

2. There will be no significant differences between lapsed friendships of 1 to 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) years or 3 to 4 years, indicating that subjects were able to evaluate past relationships as they had perceived them when the relationship was ongoing.

3. Lapsed friendships will be rated higher on the DM Scale than current friendships indicating they were more difficult to maintain than current friendships.

4. Females will rate their current friendships higher on the PQP Scale than males rate their current friendships indicating that females relate more personally in their friendships than do males.

5. Lapsed friendships of females will be rated lower on the PQP Scale than current friendships indicating that successful or ongoing friendships are ones in which females relate personally to each other. When this scale is low the friendship lapses.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

One hundred ninety-seven students (71 males, 126 females) from introductory Social Science courses volunteered to be subjects. Forty-six percent of these students, 27 males (38%) and 63 females (50%), returned completed, scoreable research packets. Subjects range in age from 17 to 57 with a mean of 21.9. Subjects represented all undergraduate year levels. A form included in the packet required subjects to provide the demographic information of their initials, age, sex, the initials of the friends described, and the length of the three friendships. All of the females provided the information requested, nine of the males omitted all or part of the information. Subjects were asked to describe one current same sex friend and two former same sex friends using the ADF. (See detailed instructions, Appendices D, E, F.)

Measure

The Acquaintance Description (ADF) is comprised of eight scales with 10 items each. The scales are defined as follows:

The Utility Value Scale (UV): The degree to which an individual regards the friend as helpful and cooperative, the friend's willingness to use their own time and resources to assist the individual in meeting his needs and goals (Wright, Note 2).
The Ego Support (ESV): The degree to which an individual regards the friend as encouraging, supportive, and non-threatening; the degree to which a friend is perceived as capable of helping the individual maintain an impression of himself as a competent worthwhile person (Wright, Note 2).

The Stimulation Value Scale (SV): The degree to which an individual regards another person as interesting, stimulating, capable of introducing new ideas or activities, and capable of fostering an expansion or elaboration of the individual's knowledge and perspectives (Wright, Note 2).

The Self Affirmation Value Scale (SAV): The degree to which the partner is valued as a friend because of acting, reacting, and treating the individual in ways that facilitate the recognition and expression of highly valued and important self attributes (Wright, Note 2).

The Voluntary Interdependence Scale (VID): The degree to which the plans and activities of one of the partners are contingent upon those of the other in the absence of outside pressures or constraints toward interaction (Wright, Note 3).

The Person Qua Person Scale (PQP): The degree to which partners react to one another as unique, genuine and irreplaceable in the relationship (Wright, Note 3).

The General Favorability Scale (GF): The individual's tendency to respond to the friend in a generally favorable or unfavorable manner via globally complimentary or noncomplimentary statements (Wright, Note 3).
The Maintenance Difficulty Scale (DM): The degree to which the friendship is difficult to maintain. A difficult relationship is one in which one or both partners spend a great deal of time and energy clarifying actions or comments, making up after an argument or exercising patience and restraint to keep the relationship intact. The factors making a relationship difficult to maintain may be different from those making the relationship worth forming and maintaining (Wright, Note 3).

The Total Friendship Measure (TF): Summation of the VID and PQP scales. These are different aspects of friendship strength and are combined to form the TF (Wright, Note 2).

Subjects respond to each item on a seven point scale (0-6) indicating the extent to which the item applies to the friend. Six (6) is high with definitions of always or definitely. Zero (0) is low with definitions of never or definitely not.

The maximum raw score for each scale is 60. The raw scores on each scale are adjusted to the mean of the appropriate reference sample (male or female) in order to provide a convenient and stable reference point for interpreting the scores on the scales (Wright, Note 3).

Procedure

Students were contacted during class time. They were informed of the need for securing their participation and told they would be required to answer questionnaires for three different friends as specified in the instructions provided. Further this process would require 1 to 1 1/2 hours of their time. No additional information
concerning the nature of the study was provided. Interested students were asked to sign a list along with a telephone number where they could be reached. This latter was done separate from the data collection in order to allow for follow-up to those students who took a packet but failed to return it as required. Questionnaire packets were subsequently distributed. The students were informed their answers would be confidential and there was no interest in determining how any single individual had completed a questionnaire.

The contents of the packet included: a cover letter (Appendix A); one ADF (Appendix B); three sets of instructions (Appendices D, E, F); each attached to a separate answer sheet (Appendix C); and a Reply Request Form (Appendix G). This last form served a dual purpose. Students were asked to complete the form in full (name, address and phone number) if they wanted subsequent information concerning the results of the study. They were asked only to provide their name if they did not want results. The returned Reply Request forms provided the names of those who had returned the packets and did not require follow-up. The students were asked to return these forms separate from the packet to insure the anonymity of their answers. The three sets of instructions were presented in randomized order and numbered according to their randomized position. This was done to provide counter balancing of instructional set and practice effects. Subjects were instructed to complete the answer sheets in the order provided. No other precautions were taken to insure completion of the forms in the prescribed order. They were given a return date of five working days and were informed that they would probably be contacted if they had not
returned the packets by that time. They were told that returns could be made to the class or a designated location in the Psychology Department. Since the original goal was 100 subjects, 50 males and 50 females and since the goal for females was reached before the goal of 50 males, only male volunteers were contacted with a follow-up phone call. Of the 29 males contacted at least once by phone, 10 complied with the request to return completed questionnaires as quickly as possible. Data collection terminated before the original goal was reached because the term was ending and comparable resources were unavailable.

The questionnaire packet was arranged in the order of the letter, the reply request form, the ADF and the three instructional sheets and answer sheets. The latter were prearranged in randomized order to control for order effects for the three friendship status conditions. The three sets of instructions consisted of descriptions of three different same sex friendship statuses; current close friend, past close friend of 1 to 1 1/2 years, and past close friend of 3 to 4 years ago. The specific instructions for each friendship status condition appear in Appendices D, E, and F.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS

The data were analyzed to determine if current and lapsed friendships of males differed significantly from current and lapsed friendships of females and also to determine if friendship status, current, short or long lapsed, were reflected by the ADF in the predicted manner. A 2 X 3 analysis of variance between gender and friendship status conditions was performed for each of the scales of the ADF. There were significant differences between current friendships and lapsed friendships for all of the eight scales (see Tables 1 through 8). The strength of the relationships as measured by Total Friendship (TF) was not significant (Table 9). There were significant differences between males and females on the Difficulty of Maintenance scale (DM) (Table 8) and the General Favorability scale (GF) (Table 1). No significant differences between males and females existed on the other six scales. There were no significant interactions between gender and friendship status. An Eta squared ($\eta^2$) computed on the significant F values showed strength of relationship between the variance in the dependent variable, scores on the scales and the independent variables sex or friendship status, at less than 5% for most scales. For the PQP scale, status accounted for 11% of the variance. For the SAV and ESV
Table 1
Analysis of Variance Summary Table for the General Favorability Scale (GF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11314.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>684.46</td>
<td>684.46</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>&lt; .019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10630.28</td>
<td>120.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>17768.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012.25</td>
<td>1006.12</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93.28</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>&gt; .593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>15662.49</td>
<td>88.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>29082.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Analysis of Variance Summary Table for the Self-affirmation Value Scale (SAV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12050.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.12</td>
<td>79.12</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>&gt; .443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11971.55</td>
<td>136.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>12848.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1911.35</td>
<td>955.68</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10934.61</td>
<td>60.64</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>&gt; .379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>10934.61</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>24899.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Analysis of Variance Summary Table for the Ego Support Value Scale (ESV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9148.01</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9147.55</td>
<td>103.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>10308.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>834.77</td>
<td>417.39</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>124.25</td>
<td>62.13</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>&gt;.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>9349.25</td>
<td>53.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>10184.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Analysis of Variance Summary Table for the Utility Value Scale (UV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13073.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>&gt;.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.67</td>
<td>49.67</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>&gt;.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13023.52</td>
<td>147.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>13786.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1100.83</td>
<td>550.41</td>
<td>7.672</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58.79</td>
<td>29.40</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>&gt;.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>12626.82</td>
<td>71.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>26859.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

Analysis of Variance Summary Table for the Stimulation Value Scale (SV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15369.02</td>
<td>173.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76.63</td>
<td>76.63</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>15292.39</td>
<td>173.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>12308.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1229.05</td>
<td>614.53</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82.69</td>
<td>41.35</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>10996.82</td>
<td>62.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>27677.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6

Analysis of Variance Summary Table for the Person-Qua-Person Scale (PQP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10066.76</td>
<td>227.22</td>
<td>2.032</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>227.22</td>
<td>227.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9839.54</td>
<td>111.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>11199.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2309.18</td>
<td>1154.59</td>
<td>22.957</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.19</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>8851.82</td>
<td>50.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>21265.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Analysis of Variance Summary Table for the Voluntary Interdependence Scale (VID)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16597.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78.41</td>
<td>78.41</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>&gt; .520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16519.17</td>
<td>187.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>12349.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1616.42</td>
<td>808.21</td>
<td>13.373</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96.04</td>
<td>48.02</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>&gt; .453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>10637.04</td>
<td>60.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>28947.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
Analysis of Variance Summary Table for the Difficulty Maintenance Scale (DM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22788.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.331</td>
<td>&lt; .023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1301.71</td>
<td>1301.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21486.45</td>
<td>244.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>17275.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1628.67</td>
<td>814.34</td>
<td>9.240</td>
<td>&lt; .003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136.61</td>
<td>68.30</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>&gt; .462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>15510.70</td>
<td>88.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>40064.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Analysis of Variance Summary Table for the Total Friendship Measure (TF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>110361.47</td>
<td>12703.41</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>&gt; .288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12703.41</td>
<td>12703.41</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>&gt; .288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>978658.60</td>
<td>11121.12</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>&gt; .288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>394297.66</td>
<td>21342.63</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>&gt; .110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9493.63</td>
<td>4746.82</td>
<td>2.443</td>
<td>&gt; .090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10394.36</td>
<td>5197.36</td>
<td>2.443</td>
<td>&gt; .090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>374410.30</td>
<td>21342.63</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>&gt; .110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>5045559.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scales 8% of the variance was accounted for. Linton and Gallo (1975) indicate that a relationship is strong when at least 10% of the variance is accounted for.

The mean scores and standard deviations for each scale are presented in Table 10 by sex. These mean scores illustrate the differences between current friendship and lapsed friendships. The ordering of the means are in the expected direction for all but one scale for males and one scale for females.

To determine significant differences between these mean friendship status scores the Tukey(a) procedure for multiple comparisons was performed. The results indicated that all but one comparison between the current and the two lapsed statuses were significantly different. The nonsignificant comparison was for the Utility Value scale (UV) between current and lapsed 1-1½ years.
Table 10

Mean ADF Scale Scores and Standard Deviations for Males and Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADF Scale</th>
<th>Current M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lapsed 1-1½ Yrs. M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lapsed 3-4 Yrs. M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females (n = 63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Favorability</td>
<td>50.29</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>46.83</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>44.57</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Affirmation Value</td>
<td>44.09</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>40.09</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>38.86</td>
<td>8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Support Value</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>44.06</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Value</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>39.71</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>38.27</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation Value</td>
<td>43.03</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>39.41</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>38.26</td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Qua-Person</td>
<td>45.86</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>40.13</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Interdependence</td>
<td>39.91</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Difficulty</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>11.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Friendship</td>
<td>85.60</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>75.33</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>83.19</td>
<td>72.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (n = 27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Favorability</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>43.44</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>39.48</td>
<td>11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Affirmation Value</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>40.16</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>39.08</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Support Value</td>
<td>49.16</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>43.15</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>44.08</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Value</td>
<td>41.94</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>39.98</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>36.05</td>
<td>12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation Value</td>
<td>41.82</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>35.65</td>
<td>10.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Qua-Person</td>
<td>44.21</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>38.91</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>36.51</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Interdependence</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>34.74</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>32.37</td>
<td>12.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Difficulty</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Friendship</td>
<td>114.37</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>94.90</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>79.76</td>
<td>22.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate there are significant qualitative differences between current friendships and friendships that have lapsed. The first and third hypotheses stated that current friendships of males and females would be rated higher on all scales, except the Maintenance Difficulty (DM) Scale (which would be lower) than either of the measures of lapsed friendship. The data suggest support of these hypotheses. Thus, Tables 1 through 8 reveal significant main effects for friendship status for all scales (all p's < .003). Post hoc analyses using the Tukey(a) procedure demonstrated that for all scales, except the DM Scale, current friendship ratings were significantly higher than ratings for either of the lapsed friendship categories (all p's < .05). On the DM Scale, post hoc comparisons revealed that mean ratings on both lapsed friendship categories were significantly higher (p < .05) than for the current friendship category. That is, lapsed close friendships, as predicted, were seen as less rewarding and more difficult to maintain than current friendships. Current friendships of males and females are perceived as more rewarding, supportive, stimulating, unique and useful than friendships which had been ongoing years ago, but have subsequently lapsed. A nonsignificant
difference among the three statuses of friendship on the measure of the strength of the relationship (TF) was found and indicates that the subjects chose to describe friendships that were of relatively equal types. The description provided in the instructions of a close friendship controlled for individuals choosing different levels of friendship for each condition. Therefore, all friendships chosen would have been of the same type, close friendships, and relationship strength or intimacy would necessarily have been the same. Males rated all the friendship conditions higher on the DM Scale than did females. Apparently male friendships withstand or produce higher levels of stress than female friendships, or that conflict and stress are more inherently a part of male friendships than they are a part of female friendships. Females either dissolve a friendship that is difficult to maintain or female friendships produce less stress and conflict. This is an area which needs further clarification through continued research. On the other hand, the small sample of males (n = 27) who returned completed questionnaires may have been biased in favor of males who tend to be involved in friendships requiring high maintenance. It is conceivable that males in less stressful friendships chose not to return the questionnaires. Thus, this uncontrolled variable may have influenced the outcome. Also, the population (social science undergraduates) may have been biased in favor of this characteristic. Further research including larger male samples from diverse populations is indicated.

The second hypothesis that there would be no significant differences between lapsed friendships of 1 to 1½ years or 3 to 4 years,
indicating that subjects were able to evaluate past relationships as they had perceived them when the relationship was ongoing, was also supported. There were no significant differences between either lapsed friendship status. Therefore, subjects were able to evaluate past friendships as though time had been turned back and the relationship was ongoing. That is, as though the relationship had not yet been dissolved. A significant difference might have indicated a bias on the subjects' part in remembering a friendship as worse or better than it was or have difficulty in remembering how a relationship had been. Alternatively, the lack of substantial control of the order in which the ADF's were completed and the inherent complications of retroactive, post hoc measurement of the lapsed friendship statuses may have introduced favoritism for the current friendship status condition. Subjects may also have anticipated the hypotheses and completed the ADF's to comply with what was expected, thus introducing experimental bias. Longitudinal studies in which lapses are predicted in ongoing friendships are indicated to explore the interpretation of these results.

The fourth hypothesis stated that females will rate their current friendships higher on the PQP Scale than males rate their current friendships suggesting that females relate more personally in their friendships than do males. This hypothesis was not supported \((p > .685, \text{ see Table 6})\). Wright (Note 3) found women more likely to emphasize personalism, to react to each of their friends in a holistic and undifferentiated manner, while men were task oriented, more likely to emphasize external interests and activities and to perceive friends as serving delineated and differentiated functions. Thus, females
would rate current friendships higher on the PQP Scale reflecting the amount of personalism involved in a friendship. The results failed to support this hypothesis. It may be that while friendships, in general, for males are less personally oriented than for females, that close friendships for males are equivalent in personalism as are same sex friendships for women. Wright (Note 3) found that the differences between male and female friendships diminished as the strength and duration of the friendship increased.

The fifth hypothesis predicted that the lapsed friendships of females would be rated lower on the PQP Scale than current friendships suggesting that successful or ongoing friendships were ones in which females relate personally to each other. This hypothesis was supported by the results suggesting that successful or ongoing female friendships are characterized by high levels of personalism. Thus, Table 6 reveals significant main effects for friendship status ($p < .001$). Post hoc analysis using the Tukey(a) procedure demonstrated current friendships were significantly higher than ratings for either of the lapsed friendship categories ($p < .05$). A friendship between females in which the level of personalism is low as measured by the PQP Scale may be predictive of a dissolving or weak friendship.

Males and females were found to differ significantly for the GF and DM scales. These findings suggest that females exert less effort in maintaining a relationship but perceived their friends more favorably than males.

The Tukey(a) comparisons between the current friendship category and each of the lapsed friendship categories indicated that for all
scales except UV the status conditions were significantly different as predicted; suggesting that current friends were attributed more positive characteristics as measured by the ADF scales than friends in either lapsed status. The UV comparison of current and lapsed 1-1½ years was not significant indicating that current friends as compared to friends in the recently lapsed status are not perceived as more useful. However, current friends are perceived as more useful than were friends in the long lapsed status.

As reported in the results the $n^2$, strength of association measure, resulted in a weak although significant relationship between the ratings on the ADF and the independent variables of sex of the individual and friendship status for most of the scales. This suggests that although the effects of the differences found between current and lapsed friendships are real and significant there are other important mediating variables. Duck and Craig (1978) found that the stage of development of a friendship effected the type of information the friends had about each other and also effected their perception of personality similarity. Fiebert and Fiebert (1969) proposed an incremental model of friendship in which the longer two people know each other the greater their chances of liking each other. Taylor (1965) proposed that as interactions progress over time, there are corresponding increases the number of intimate exchanges which results in a deeper relationship. Therefore, Taylor is suggesting that there is a relationship between the length of time a friendship has been in existence and the rewards experienced as a result of closeness in the relationship. These studies suggest that the length of time two people
have been friends affects their relationship strength, and the rewards of the relationship. Perhaps controlling for this variable would account for some of the variance of the dependent measures in populations from which subjects are selected. Izard (1963) obtained different results from samples of freshmen and seniors and proposed the results were due to the difference in the two populations in terms of social and emotional maturity. Conceivably the age differences of the subjects in the present study might also account for some of the variance of the scores not accounted for by status.

The interpretations made from the results have assumed that subjects were able to disregard any negative associations that accompanied the dissolution of friendships. The interpretations further assumed subjects were able to place themselves back in time and able to evaluate the friendships as ongoing. As previously mentioned, this may not have been possible. Subjects may have considered friendships with negative associations or memones and therefore rated them less positive than current friendships. Subjects may also have been unable to recall the relationship as it had been and may have rated both lapsed friendships in the same manner. The discussion of the results also assumed the current friendships were relationships which were not failing or would not dissolve. This may not be true. Friendship has in previous research (Taylor, 1965) been described as a process with many stages. The current friendships in this study may eventually dissolve, in which case it is hypothesized that they would become more similar to the lapsed friendships described in this study. Future research involving
studies in which friendships are followed and periodically measured on the ADF would provide more information in this regard.

In summary, current close friendships were found to be of significantly greater strength, more rewarding and less difficult to maintain than lapsed friendships were at the time they were active. Current friendships were found to involve more personalism than lapsed friendships for women. All levels of male friendships were found to involve greater difficulty to maintain than female friendships. These findings suggest the existence of predictive differences between friendships that will be successful and longstanding and those that are likely to dissolve. Future studies, in which the length of the relationships and ages of those involved are controlled, are potential areas for further exploration of dissolved friendships and their characteristics.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The major purpose of this research was to identify some of the variables which distinguished current from lapsed close friendships. Current and lapsed friendships of 63 female and 27 male undergraduates were compared using the Acquaintance Description Form. It was found that current friendships of males and females are perceived as more rewarding, supportive, stimulating and unique than were lapsed friendships. Lapsed friendships are rated as more difficult to maintain than current friendships, suggesting that relationships in which individuals must invest more time and energy in maintaining the relationships are more likely to dissolve. Suggestions are offered for improving the methodology of future studies on friendship.
APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION
Dear Student:

This is a study of friendship. When you choose to participate, any information you provide will be kept in strictest confidence and none of it will be repeated in reference to you. However, in order to provide a reference for the researchers, and not to confuse your responses with someone else, you must put your initials, sex, age and class year on the answer sheets. Your participation is purely voluntary and you may choose to withdraw your participation at anytime. But, please return the materials so others may have the opportunity to serve.

This packet contains the Acquaintance Description Form (ADF), three (3) sets of instructions, and answer sheets for each instructional set. Please complete the answer sheets, using the appropriate instructions, in the numbered order you find them (i.e. 1, 2, 3). Be sure the number of the instructions corresponds to that on the answer sheet. The three sets of instructions and answer sheets use the same ADF questionnaire.

It will take approximately 1 1/2 to 2 hours to conscientiously respond to the 3 answer sheets. We realize that this is a long process and greatly appreciate your time and effort.

Upon completion, please return the packet to your next class. You may also deposit the packet at the Psychology Department (GCB 317), in the box labelled "Friendship Research." We need the materials no later than five (5) working days from today.

If you wish more information on this study, or would like an abstract of the results, please include the Reply Request Form with your name and address. You will be contacted as soon as feasible.

Thank you for your generous cooperation.

Sincerely,

Teresa Rodgers, B.A.
Research Associate and
Graduate Student

Burton Blau, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and
Graduate Programs' Coordinator
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APPENDIX B

ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM
ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM

Statements

This form lists some statements about your reactions to an acquaintance called the Target Person (TP). Please indicate your reaction to each statement on the special answer sheet you have been given. Perhaps some of the situations described have never come up in your relationship with TP. If this happens, try your best to imagine what things would be like if the situation did come up.

1. TP can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.

2. If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on TP to be willing to loan it to me.

3. TP's ways of dealing with people make him/her rather difficult to get along with.

4. TP has a lot of respect for my ideas and opinions.

5. TP is a genuinely likeable person.

6. TP is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to behave according to my most important beliefs and values.

7. If I hadn't heard from TP for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact him/her just for the sake of keeping in touch.

8. TP keeps me pretty well informed about his/her true feelings and attitudes about different things that come up.

9. When we get together to work on a task or project, TP can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems.

10. If I were looking for a job, I would count on TP to try his/her best to help me find one.

11. I can count on TP's being very easy to get along with, even when we disagree about something.

12. If I have an argument or disagreement with someone, I can count on TP to stand behind me and give me support when (s)he thinks I am in the right.

13. If I were asked to list a few people that I thought represented the very best in "human nature," TP is one of the persons I would name.
14. TP makes it easy for me to express my most important personal qualities in my everyday life.

15. If I had a choice of two good part-time jobs, I would seriously consider taking the somewhat less attractive job if it meant that TP and I could work at the same place.

16. If TP were to move away or "disappear" for some reason, I would really miss the special kind of companionship (s)he provides.

17. TP is the kind of conversationalist who can make me clarify and expand my own ideas and beliefs.

18. TP is willing to use his/her skills and abilities to help me reach my own personal goals.

19. I can count on having to be extra patient with TP to keep from giving up on him/her as a friend.

20. I can converse freely and comfortably with TP without worrying too much about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate, or just plain silly.

21. Although I do not always know exactly why, TP has a way of getting on my nerves.

22. If I am ever confused or doubtful about what I am really like, TP is the kind of person who can help me get things clear for myself.

23. If TP and I could arrange our weekly schedules so we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as TP.

24. TP thinks and acts in ways that "set him/her apart" and make him/her distinct from other people I know.

25. TP can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it weren't for him/her.

26. TP is the kind of person who seems to really enjoy doing favors for me.

27. I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with TP from "falling apart."

28. If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on TP to notice it and appreciate my ability.
29. It would be hard to think of anything bad to say about TP, even if I were trying to describe him/her in a way that gave a true and well-rounded impression of what (s)he is like.

30. TP is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to express my true thoughts and feelings.

31. If I had decided to leave town on a certain day for a leisurely trip or vacation and discovered that TP was leaving for the same place a day later, I would seriously consider waiting a day in order to travel with him/her.

32. When I am with TP, I get the impression that (s)he is "playing a role" or trying to create a certain kind of "image."

33. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP introduces viewpoints that help me see things in a new light.

34. I can count on TP to be a good contact person in helping me to meet worthwhile people and make social connections.

35. I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to TP about topics (s)he considers controversial or touchy.

36. TP has confidence in my advice and opinions about practical matters and personal problems.

37. TP has the kind of personal qualities that would make almost anyone respect and admire him/her if they got to know him/her well.

38. I can tell from the way TP reacts to me that I really am the kind of person I most often think I am.

39. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together.

40. I can count on TP to do and say the things that express what (s)he truly feels and believes, even if they are not the things (s)he thinks are expected of him/her.

41. I can count on TP to be ready with really good suggestions when we are looking for some activity or project to engage in.

42. If I have some more or less serious difference with a friend or acquaintance, TP is a good person for acting as a go-between in helping me to smooth out the difficulty.

43. I have a hard time really understanding some of TP's actions and comments.
44. If I am in an embarrassing situation, I can count on TP to do things that will make me feel as much at ease as possible.

45. TP is the kind of person for whom the expression "a real loser" is both meaningful and accurate.

46. TP knows the kinds of activities that are most important to me personally and encourages me to get involved in them.

47. If I had no plans for a free evening and TP contacted me suggesting some activity that I am not particularly interested in, I would seriously consider doing it with him/her.

48. Some of the most rewarding ideas, interests and activities I share with TP are the kinds of things I find it difficult, if not impossible, to share with any of my other acquaintances.

49. TP has a way of making ideas of topics that I usually consider useless and boring seem worthwhile and interesting.

50. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on TP to help with errands or chores to make things as convenient for me as possible.

51. I can count on TP's acting tense or upset with me without my knowing what I've done to bother him/her.

52. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on TP to be happy and congratulatory about it.

53. TP is a pleasant person to be around.

54. TP does things with me in a way that helps me know and understand myself better.

55. TP is one of the persons I would go out of my way to help if (s)he were in some sort of difficulty.

56. When I am with TP, (s)he seems to relax and be him/herself and not think about the kind of impression (s)he is creating.

57. TP can come up with good, challenging questions and ideas.

58. TP is willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects, even if (s)he is not directly involved.

59. I can count on TP's being willing to listen to my explanations in a patient and understanding way when I've done something to rub him/her the wrong way.
60. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP listens and reacts as if my thoughts and ideas make a lot of sense.

61. It is easy to think of favorable things to say about TP.

62. TP treats me in ways that encourage me to be my "true self."

63. If I had just gotten off work or out of class and had some free time, I would wait around and leave with TP if (s)he were leaving the same place an hour or so later.

64. If I were trying to describe TP to someone who didn't know him/her, it would be easy to fit him/her into a general class or type of persons.

65. TP is the kind of person from whom I can learn a lot just by listening to him/her talk or watching him/her work on problems.

66. I can count on TP to be willing to loan me personal belongings (for example, his/her books, car, typewriter, tennis racket) if I need them to go somewhere or get something done.

67. I can count on communication with TP to break down when we try to discuss things that are touchy or controversial.

68. TP has a way of making me feel like a really worthwhile person, even when I do not seem to be very competent or successful at my more important activities.

69. TP seems to have a knack for annoying me or "turning me off."

70. TP is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to do the kinds of things I really want to do.

71. I try to get interested in activities that TP enjoys, even if they do not seem especially appealing to me at first.

72. When TP and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship I don't get from any of my other acquaintances.

73. TP is the kind of person who is on the lookout for new, interesting and challenging things to do.

74. If I were sick or hurt, I could count on TP to do things that would make it easier to take.

75. I can count on TP to misunderstand me and take my actions and comments the wrong way.

76. TP is a good, sympathetic listener when I have some personal problem I want to talk over with someone.
77. TP is one of those individuals for whom the expression "a really nice person" is both meaningful and accurate.

78. Doing things with TP seems to bring out my most important personal traits and characteristics.

79. If TP and I were planning vacations to the same place and at about the same time and (s)he had to postpone his/her trip for a month, I would seriously consider postponing my own trip for a month also.

80. TP is the kind of person I would miss very much if something happened to interfere with our acquaintanceship.
ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM

Answer Sheet

Sex: M or F  Your Initials: ___  Initials of Target Person: ___

Age: ___  Class Year: ___  Length of Friendship: ___

Please record below your response to each of the statements about your Target Person (TP). Decide which of the scale numbers or letters best describes your reaction and record your choice by circling that number or letter. Please read the following codes carefully and use them as guides in circling your choices:

6 Always. Invariable; without exception.
5 Almost always.
4 Usually.
3 About half the time.
2 Seldom.
1 Almost never.
0 Never.

g Definitely. Absolutely no doubt about it.
f Extremely likely. Almost no doubt about it.
e Probably.
d Perhaps.
c Probably not.
b Extremely unlikely.
a Definitely not.
### Statement #: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 g f e d c b a</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 g f e d c b a</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 g f e d c b a</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5 g f e d c b a</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 g f e d c b a</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5 g f e d c b a</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5 g f e d c b a</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5 g f e d c b a</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5 g f e d c b a</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>5 g f e d c b a</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTION FOR CURRENT STATUS
Instructions: Current

Think of someone of your same sex, with whom you spend some of your free time, or for whom you would undertake special arrangements or for whom you would undergo inconvenience. Your relationship with this person is a rewarding relationship for you and you would describe it as a close friendship.

Fill in the ADF questionnaire with this person as the target person (TP).
APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTIONS FOR LAPSED 1 TO 1½ YEARS STATUS
Instructions: 1 - $1\frac{1}{2}$ Years Ago

Think of someone, of your same sex, with whom you spent some of your free time or for whom you would have undertaken special arrangements or for whom you would have undergone inconvenience. Your relationship with this person was a rewarding relationship for you and you would have described it as a close friendship not more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ years ago. However, you would not now describe it as a close relationship, for reasons other than death, relocation, marriage or divorce. In other words about $1\frac{1}{2}$ years ago you were close friends but for reasons other than the preceding you are not currently close friends.

Please fill in the following ADF questionnaire as though it was 1 or $1\frac{1}{2}$ years ago and the two of you are still close friends. Your friend is the target person (TP).
APPENDIX F

INSTRUCTIONS FOR LAPSED 3 TO 4 YEARS STATUS
Instructions: 3 - 4 Years Ago

Think of someone, of your same sex, with whom you spent some of your free time or for whom you would have undertaken special arrangements or for whom you would have undergone inconvenience. Your relationship with this person was a rewarding relationship for you and you would have described it as a close friendship not more than 4 years ago. However, you would not now describe it as a close relationship, for reasons other than death, relocation, marriage or divorce. In other words about 4 years ago you were close friends but for reasons other than the preceding you are not currently close friends.

Please fill in the following ADF questionnaire as though it was 3 or 4 years ago and two of you are still close friends. Your friend is the target person (TP).
APPENDIX G

REPLY REQUEST FORM
REPLY REQUEST FORM

I would like:

_____ more information about this study.

_____ an abstract of the results (available in the Fall, 1981).

Please Print:

Name: __________________________________________

Address: ________________________________________

City: ____________________________________________

Other comments:


3. Wright, P. H. *Men's friendships, women's friendships and the alleged inferiority of the latter.* Manuscript submitted for publication, 1981.
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