1994

Undergraduate Student's Descriptions of Same-Gender and Cross-Gender Friendships

Stephen Robert Myles
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Myles, Stephen Robert, "Undergraduate Student's Descriptions of Same-Gender and Cross-Gender Friendships" (1994). *Open Access Master's Theses*. Paper 1710.
<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/1710>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

BF724.3
F64
M954
1994

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' DESCRIPTIONS OF
SAME-GENDER AND CROSS-GENDER FRIENDSHIPS

BY

STEPHEN MYLES

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
IN
PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1994
32697019

MASTER OF ARTS THESIS
OF
STEPHEN ROBERT MYLES

APPROVED:

Thesis Committee

Major Professor

Albert J. Lott

Patricia J. Morokoff

Mary Ellen Reilly

Robert M. Munn
DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1994

Abstract

In an extension of a previous study (Wright & Scanlon, 1991), this study examined gender differences in cross-gender and same gender friendships among undergraduate students at a time when such friendships are just forming. Sixty-seven female, and seventy-three male undergraduate students ($N = 140$) described themselves and a close friend (target) of each gender on a Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI). It was hypothesized that the participants would tend to form friendships with people of similar gender-role orientation. Chi-square analyses supported this hypothesis, $p < .005$. Participants also described their relationship with each of these friends on an Acquaintance Description Form (ADF-F2). The ADF-F2 measures friendship strength and satisfaction on each of 14 variables. It was hypothesized that gender differences would be significant in the college sample on measures thought to be important to this population: exclusivity, social regulation, security, and two measures of maintenance difficulty. Significant gender differences were found for 11 of the 14 ADF-F2 variables, $p < .004$. Men felt more exclusive about their friendships than women did, and found their friendships more difficult to maintain, and regulated by social forces. Women felt more secure in their friendships than men did, they found their friendships more supportive, stimulating and self-affirming than men did. Both men and women preferred female friends to male friends on six of the ADF-F2 variables, $p < .004$. Male friends were not preferred on any of the variables.

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis advisor, Dr. Albert Lott. His encouragement, support, and patient and attentive editing made this possible. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. Patricia Morokoff, Dr. Mary Ellen Reilly, and Dr. David Caruso, for their encouragement and their creative contributions. Dr. Morokoff's research group, made up of graduate students in experimental and clinical psychology, were also very helpful in exploring the implications of this study. Finally, I would like to thank Lynne Derbyshire for her endless support, inspiration and editing skills.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
List of Tables	v
List of Figures	vi
Introduction	1
Method	
Participants	5
Instruments	5
Procedure	10
Results	13
Discussion	29
Appendices	35
Bibliography	44

List of Tables

Table I - ADF-F2 Variables With Abbreviations and Examples	page 8
Table II - Chi-squared Statistics on the Degree to Which Participants Attributed Their Own Gender Role Orientation to Their Friends	page 11
Table III - Median Scores for Masculine And Feminine Scales Based on BSRI of Self and Male and Female Friend	page 12
Table IV - Frequency Distribution of Male and Female Participants Reporting Gender Role Orientation (GRO) of Self and Perceived GRO of Male and Female Friends	page 14
Table V - Chi-squared Statistics on the Degree to Which Participants Attributed Their Own Gender Role Orientation to Their Friend	page 16
Table VI - Chi-squared Likelihood Ratios and Percentage of Participants in Each GRO Category Who Attributed Their Own Gender Role Orientation to a Male or Female Friend	page 17
Table VII - Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Male and Female Participants Responding to Male and Female Friends on Fourteen ADF-F2 Variables	page 19
Table VIII - Source Table for Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Fourteen ADF-F2 Variables	page 20
Table IX - Summary Table for 2X2 Analysis of Variance for Fourteen ADF-F2 Variables	page 21

List of Figures

Figure 1 - Interactions Between Gender of Participant and Gender of Friend on Maintenance Difficulty - Situational Factor	page 24
Figure 2 - Interactions Between Gender of Participant and Gender of Friend on Exclusivity Factor	page 25
Figure 3 - Interactions Between Gender of Participant and Gender of Friend on Emotional Expression Factor	page 26
Figure 4 - Interactions Between Gender of Participant and Gender of Friend on Social Regulation Factor	page 27

Undergraduate Students' Descriptions of Same-gender and Cross-gender Friendships

Research in the social sciences on gender and friendship has focused primarily on gender differences in same-gender friendships, and a substantial body of literature has been established on these differences (see Sherrod, 1989; Winstead, 1988; Wright, 1989). However, there has been little research on friendships between the genders.

Rose (1985) examined gender differences in relationship patterns and found that both men and women reported that same-sex friendships rather than cross-sex friendships most often fulfilled functions of acceptance, help, intimacy, and companionship. She names the tendency toward same-gender friendships "the norm for homosocial interaction" (p. 63), and points to cross-gender friendships as the source of gender differences in relationship patterns, that is, men's friendships with women differ significantly from women's friendships with men. Heterosexual orientation plays a major role in gender schema theory, and Bem (1981) proposes the existence of a heterosexual sub-schema, a cultural predisposition to view all cross-gender interaction in terms of sexual attraction. These two perspectives merge to form a dichotomy of homosocial and heterosexual relationships.

O'Meara (1989) called the male-female friendship "an ignored topic in the social science literature" (p. 525), and refers to it as a "deviant relationship" that holds special problems for those involved in it and special interest to social

scientists. It is an ambiguous relationship that holds few social norms, presents few role models or opportunity structures, and lacks institutional guidelines or scripts. Cross-gender friends, lacking any kind of strategy for interacting, "must create their own interaction rules and begin to perform the role before it is culturally defined" (O'Meara, 1989, p. 530).

Despite the difficulties in forming, defining and maintaining cross-gender friendships, they appear to play an important role in many people's lives (Wright & Scanlon, 1991). Rose (1985) reports that, despite an overall preference for same-gender friendships, 53% of married women and 67% of married men in her study had cross-gender friendships with someone other than their spouses. For college age participants in her study, the rates were even higher, with 73% of single graduate women, 100% of single graduate men, and 100% of undergraduate men and women reporting close cross-gender friendships outside of their romantic relationships. Sapadin (1988) found that cross-gender friendships provide both men and women new understandings and perspectives of the other sex. Lavine and Lombardo (1984) found a relationship between gender role orientation and self disclosure to same-gender and cross-gender friends. Lower levels of disclosure were reported by undifferentiated males and females for all targets, and higher levels of disclosure were reported by androgynous males for all targets.

Wright and Scanlon (1991) examined the role of gender role orientation in the differences in men's and women's descriptions of their same- and cross-

gender friendships. Friendships were described in terms of relationship strength, interpersonal rewards, maintenance difficulty, social regulation, general favorability, and differentiation among types of relationships. Their results showed that there were not statistically significant differences between men's friendships with women, and women's friendships with men. Also, men and women differed only minimally in their friendships with men, but they differed to a much greater degree in their friendships with women. Women found their friendships with other women to be more self-affirming, interdependent, useful, secure, and generally favorable than men found their friendships with women.

Wright and Scanlon (1991) also examined the relationship between gender and gender-role orientation in the formation of friendships. They found only a modest relationship between gender role orientation and gender differences in friendships and these almost exclusively applied to men's and women's descriptions of women friends. Women were more sensitive to the perceived gender role orientation of their female friends than were men, and androgynous female friends provided the most rewarding friendships.

Wright and Scanlon's (1991) study used a sample of men and women ranging in ages from early twenties to late fifties. These participants described well-established friendships that had endured for as many as twenty years. However, cross-gender friendships among undergraduate students are more common (Rose, 1985), and there are special circumstances surrounding the formation of friendships in college. Frieze, Sales and Smith (1991) established

the centrality for young adults of making friends and moving away from psychological and economic dependence on their parents. Students who go away to college often find themselves alone for the first time in their lives. Faced with the choice of isolation in an extremely social environment, or acting quickly to develop new friendships, the exploration of new relationships becomes an important part of the college experience. Sears (1986) characterizes college students as having under-developed self concepts and social attitudes, a strong need for peer approval, and unstable peer relationships due to geographic and social mobility.

Also, friendships begun in college are often the first to be formed away from parental supervision and influence. Lavine and Lombardo (1984) posit that self-disclosure in "newly established peer relationships facilitates the process of individuation from parents" (p. 743) Friendships formed in college are often long lasting and greatly influence a person's direction and development at a crucial juncture in his or her life.

This study will extend the Wright and Scanlon (1991) study with a sample of undergraduate students to see if there are significant differences between the friendships of undergraduates as they are first forming, and the better established friendships of the older sample. The frequency of cross-gender friendships in this population, as well as the exploratory and self-defining nature of friendships in college suggest that college students will define and describe their friendships differently than the older population of Wright and Scanlon's study did.

It is hypothesized:

1. Gender Role Orientation is important to undergraduate students because they are in a process of self-definition. The undergraduate sample will be more sensitive to the perceived Gender Role Orientation of their friends tending to form friendships with people of similar Gender Role Orientation.
2. Gender differences will be significant in the college sample in measures of friendship that are of particular importance for this population: exclusivity, social regulation, security, and the two measures of maintenance difficulty.

Method

Participants

Participants were 140 undergraduate students enrolled at the University of Rhode Island. Volunteers were recruited from an introductory psychology course at the University during the spring semester of 1993. Participation in the research qualified as partial fulfillment of a class requirement. Sixty-seven women and seventy-three men participated in the study. The research took place in a large lecture hall at the university in hour long sessions on five consecutive days.

Instruments

Each participant received a packet of forms that included two copies of an informed consent form (see Appendix A), standardized instructions and a demographic survey (see Appendix B), three copies of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI, 1974) (see Appendix C), a copy of the Acquaintance Description Form- Friend volume 2 (ADF-F2, 1991) (see Appendix D), and two

answer forms for the ADF-F2 that included some questions on demographic information about the person being described on the form (see Appendix E).

The BSRI is a survey in which participants indicate on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1-7) the degree to which each of 20 masculine, 20 feminine, and 20 neutral adjectives describes themselves. The neutral adjectives are filler items used to mask the intent of the survey. A participant's responses to the masculine adjectives and to the feminine adjectives are summed and divided by twenty, providing a separate overall mean score for the masculine and feminine scales.

The BSRI was normed on undergraduate samples. Tests of reliability (Bem, 1974) showed test-retest correlations of .90 for both the masculinity scale and the femininity scale, and a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of 0.86 for the masculinity scale and between .80 and .82 for the femininity scale. The masculinity and femininity scales were also found to be independent of each other, showing correlations between -.02 and .11 for male participants and -.14 and -.07 for female participants.

Each participant's mean score for both scales is then compared to the sample median score for each scale to determine the gender role orientation (GRO) of the participant. Participants scoring above the median for both scales are categorized as androgynous. Participants scoring below the median for both scales are categorized as undifferentiated. Participants who score above the median on the scale for their own gender, and below the median on the scale for the other gender are categorized as sex-typed. Participants who score below the

median on the scale for their own gender, and above the median on the scale for the other gender are categorized as cross-sex-typed.

The participants were also be asked to complete a BSRI survey describing their same-and cross-gender friends. The perceived GRO's of the friends were calculated in the same manner as the GRO of the participants with separate masculine and feminine comparison median scores calculated for the male and female friends.

The ADF-F2 is a self-report survey with 70 items describing the characteristics of interpersonal relationships. Participants are asked to indicate on a 7-point Likert-type scale (0-6) the degree to which a statement describes their relationship with a Target Person (TP). The instrument measures 14 variables: two measures of relationship strength called Voluntary interdependence and Person-qua-Person; five measures of interpersonal values including Ego Support, Self-Affirmation, Stimulation, Utility, and Security; two measures of relationship tension or strain called Maintenance Difficulty - Personal and Maintenance Difficulty - Situational; a measure called General Favorability which measures the participant's general tendency to describe the target person in a favorable or unfavorable way; and four measures for differentiating among relationships including Exclusivity, Salience of Emotional Expression, Permanence, and Degree of Social Regulation. Tests of reliability (Wright, 1985) showed test-retest correlations consistently around 0.85 or higher on most of the fourteen measures among male and female participants (scores for the Maintenance Difficulty scale

were 0.75 for women and 0.72 for men) and a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of 0.82 for all scales. Table I lists and defines the 14 variables in the ADF-F2 and gives examples of statements for each variable.

Participants respond to five statements for each of the 14 variables. The score for each statement (0-6) is added for each variable yielding a score for each scale with a range of 0-30 points. Participants were asked to complete an ADF-F2 survey describing a same-gender friendship and a cross-gender friendship.

Table I
ADF-F2 Variables With Abbreviations and Examples

Variable	Abbreviation	Example
Voluntary Interdependence	VID	"When I plan for leisure time activities, I make a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together."
Person Qua Person	PQP	If TP were to move away or 'disappear' for some reason, I would really miss the special kind of companionship (s)he provides.
Ego Support Value	ESV	If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on TP to be happy or congratulatory about it.
Self-Affirmation Value	SAV	TP makes it easy for me to express my most important qualities in my everyday life.
Stimulation Value	SV	TP can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.
Utility Value	UV	TP seems to really enjoy helping me out and doing favors for me.
Security Value	SecV	I feel free to reveal private or personal information about myself to TP because(s)he is not the kind of person who would use such information to my disadvantage.
Maintenance Difficulty - Personal	MD-P	TP's way of dealing with people make him/her rather difficult to get along with.
Maintenance Difficulty - Situational	MD-S	Through no fault of our own, TP and I have to work hard to keep our relationship together.
General Favorability	GF	TP is a genuinely likeable person.
Exclusiveness	EXCL	Because I consider my relationship with TP to be very exclusive, I would consider it wrong to carry on the same type of relationship with anyone else.
Emotional Expression	EmEx	When TP and I get together, we spend a certain amount of time talking about the good feelings and emotions that are associated with our relationship.
Permanence	PERM	If I were asked how long my relationship with TP we'd last, I would say I consider myself committed 'till death do us part'.
Social Regulation	SoRg	The kinds of things TP and I do together are strongly influenced by definite social obligations that go along with the kind of relationship we have.

Participants were instructed that they may choose not to respond to any statements they feel do not pertain to the relationship being described. If a participant leaves one or two responses blank for any given variable, the mean of the remaining statements for that variable is substituted for the blank responses. If more than two responses are left blank for a given variable, the participant's responses for that variable are not included in the analysis.

Procedure

Standardized instructions appeared on the first sheet of the packets and the standardized instructions were also read aloud by the researcher at the beginning of each session (see Appendix B). The participants were instructed to first complete the demographic information sheet and complete a copy of the BSRI describing themselves. They were instructed to then fill out a demographic sheet, a BSRI, and an ADF-F2 describing a female friend and a male friend. The instructions left the definition of "friend" to the participant, but included the restriction that they had to be someone they had met since they began college and they could not describe someone with whom they had a sexual or romantic relationship. The packets of forms alternated the order of presentation for the surveys describing male and female friends and male and female participants received packets from separate stacks so that the order was counterbalanced for men and women receiving the packets.

Participants completed the surveys in the lecture hall and returned them to the researcher upon leaving the room. Data from each packet were transferred to

a spreadsheet file in Microsoft Excel 4.0. The data were categorized and compiled into a single file that was transferred to an SPSS- PC file for analysis.

Completed surveys were received from 67 women and 73 men.

Participants in the women's groups ranged in age from 18 to 23 years ($M = 19.2$ years) and participants in the men's group ranged in age from 18 to 28 years ($M = 19.9$ years). All participants were currently enrolled in school, 52% of the women and 37% of the men were in their freshman year, 29.9% of the women and 37% of the men were in their sophomore year, 14.9% of the women and 13.7% of the men were in their junior year and 3% of the women and 12.3% of the men were in their senior year of college.

With respect to living situations 61% of the women and 57% of the men lived in a dormitory, 6% of the women and 12.3% of the men lived in a sorority or fraternity house, 11.9% of the women and 9.6% of the men lived with their parents and 20.9% of the women and 17.8% of the men lived off campus with friends. Regarding the relationship status of the participants, a majority, 59.7% of the women and 71% of the men were single and uncommitted, one woman and two men reported being engaged, one man was pinned, three women were cohabitating with a lover, and 34% of the women and 24.7% of the men were in a committed, monogamous relationship. Nearly all participants described both themselves and their same and cross-gender friends as heterosexually oriented, but two females described themselves as bisexual, one female described herself and both her male and female friends as homosexual, one male participant was

unsure of his male friend's sexual orientation, and one female participant was unsure of her female friend's sexual orientation.

Ninety-one percent of the women and 86% of the men classified themselves as white Americans, but the sample also included one male international student, one male Asian American, one male and one female Hispanic Americans and seven male and four female African Americans.

The mean length of friendships for men and women with male and female friends is presented in Table II. The men tended to describe friendships that had existed longer ($M = 22.9$ months) than friendships described by women ($M = 13.8$ months). This difference can be attributed to the longer duration of men's friendships with other men. Men described friendships with other men that had lasted longer than the friendships they described with women, while the friendships women described with men were similar in duration to the friendships women described with other women, and longer than the friendships men described with women.

Table II

Mean Duration of Friendships For Male and Female Participants
With Male and Female Friends

Participant	Friend		
	Female	Male	Combined
Male	9.8 months	25.1 months	22.9 months
Female	14.3 months	13.3 months	13.8 months

Results

Scores for the BSRI were computed and median scores for the masculine and feminine scales were calculated for participants and the male and female friends they described. Table III presents the median scores for male and female participants and their male and female friends on the masculine and feminine scales. The scores of the male and female participants are combined to obtain median scores for the sample. The median score for the participants (male and female combined) on the masculine scale was 5.1 and the median score for the participants on the feminine scale was 4.875. These are similar to the respective median scores of 4.85 and 4.8 reported by Wright and Scanlon (1991), and 4.95 and 4.9 reported by Bem (1981, cited in Wright & Scanlon, 1991). The median score for male friends on the masculine scale was 5.15 and the median score for the male friends on the feminine scale was 4.35. The median score for female friends on the masculine scale was 4.8 and the median score for the female friends on the feminine scale was 4.875.

Table III

Median Scores for Masculine and Feminine Scales
based on BSRI of Participants and Male and Female Friends

	Male Participant		Female Participant		Combined	
	Masculine Scale	Feminine Scale	Masculine Scale	Feminine Scale	Masculine Scale	Feminine Scale
Participant	5.2	4.5	4.95	5.3	5.1	4.875
Female Friend	4.65	5.05	4.85	5.2	4.8	5.15
Male Friend	5.15	4.2	5.2	4.75	5.15	4.35

Each participant's mean scores on the masculine and feminine scales were compared to the median scores for the two scales. The mean scores describing each participant's perception of a male and female friend on the masculine and feminine scales were also compared to the median scores of the male and female friends for the two scales. The participants and the male and female friends they described were categorized into one of four gender role orientations (GRO) according to the three sets of median scores for the masculine and feminine scales.

Table IV presents the distributions of the GRO's of male and female participants and their perceptions of male and female friends. The male participants described themselves as follows: 26 sex-typed; 5 cross-sex-typed; 15 androgynous; and 27 undifferentiated. The distribution of GROs of female friends as predicted by male participants was: sex-typed, 15; cross sex-typed, 14; androgynous, 19; and undifferentiated, 25. The distribution of GROs of male

friends as predicted by male participants was: sex-typed, 14; cross sex-typed, 8; androgynous, 19; and undifferentiated, 32. The female participants described themselves as follows: 29 sex-typed; 6 cross-sex-typed; 21 androgynous; and 11 undifferentiated. The distribution of GROs of female friends as predicted by female participants was: sex-typed, 14; cross sex-typed, 15 ; androgynous, 21; and undifferentiated, 17. The distribution of GROs of male friends as predicted by female participants was: sex-typed, 11; cross sex-typed, 16; androgynous, 24; and undifferentiated, 16.

Table IV
Frequency Distribution of Male and Female Participants Reporting Gender Role Orientation (GRO)
of Self and Perceived GRO of Male and Female Friends

Male Participants				Female Participants			
GRO Category	GRO of Self	Perceived GRO of Female Friend	Perceived GRO of Male Friend	GRO of Self	Perceived GRO of Female Friend	Perceived GRO of Male Friend	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Sex-typed	26	36%	15	21%	14	19%	
Cross Sex-typed	5	7%	14	19%	8	11%	
Androgynous	15	21%	19	26%	19	26%	
Undifferentiated	27	37%	25	34%	32	44%	
					11	16%	
					15	22%	
					21	31%	
					17	25%	
					16	24%	

Wright and Scanlon (1991) found that participants in their study did not tend to regard their friends as similar to themselves in terms of GROs. Chi-squared statistics were computed for each of the four groups in the present study: females responding to female friends; females responding to male friends; males responding to female friends and males responding to male friends. As predicted, significant results were obtained for each of these groups, indicating that the participants in general tended to perceive their friends as similar to themselves in terms of GROs. Table V shows the likelihood ratios of the chi-squared tests for these four groups.

Table V

Chi-squared Statistics on the Degree to Which Participants Attributed
Their Own Gender Role Orientation to Their Friends.

Group	Likelihood Ratio		Degrees of Freedom
Females describing female friends	23.80	*	9
Females describing male friends	36.36	**	9
Males describing female friends	35.79	**	9
Males describing male friends	35.54	**	9

* $p < .005$

** $p < .001$

Follow-up Chi-squared statistics were computed comparing male or female participants in each GRO category to male or female participants in all other GRO categories to determine which categories of participants tended to perceive their friends as similar to themselves. Table VI presents the results of these sixteen follow-up analyses. The tendency to perceive one's friends as similar to one's self in terms of GRO was significant for androgynous and undifferentiated male and female participants describing both male and female friends. Sex-typed and cross sex-typed participants of either gender did not show a significant tendency to perceive their male or female friends as similar to themselves in terms of GRO.

Table VI

Chi-squared Likelihood Ratios and Percentage of Participants in Each GRO Category Who Attributed Their Own Gender Role Orientation to a Male or Female Friend

	Male Participant				Female Participant			
	Male Friend		Female Friend		Male Friend		Female Friend	
Gender Role Orientation	Percentage	Likelihood Ratio	Percentage	Likelihood Ratio	Percentage	Likelihood Ratio	Percentage	Likelihood Ratio
Sex-typed	27%	1.51	19%	0.04	21%	0.68	28%	1.37
Cross Sex-typed	40%	3.15	0%	2.21	17%	0.2	33%	0.42
Androgynous	67%	14.55 ***	67%	14.55 ***	71%	16.81 **	62%	12.9
Undifferentiated	67%	9.18 **	63%	15.73 ***	55%	5.95 *	64%	8.92

* p < 0.05

** p < 0.01

*** p < 0.001

The participants' responses to the fourteen ADF-F2 variables were then assessed for differences between men's and women's perceptions of their same- and cross- gender friendships. Mean scores and standard deviations were computed for male and female participants' perceptions of male and female friends for each variable. Table VII presents mean scores and standard deviations for each of the fourteen variables for male and female participants describing friendships with male and female friends.

Insert Table VII About Here

A Multivariate Analysis on Variance (MANOVA) was performed for the fourteen ADF-F2 variables with the gender of the participant as an independent variable and the gender of the friend as a within-subject factor. Significant results were obtained for the Gender of Participant factor, $F(14, 110) = 3.92, p < .001$, for the Gender of Friend factor, $F(14, 110) = 2.04, p < .05$, and for interaction between the Gender of Participant factor and the Gender of Friend factor, $F(14, 110) = 5.21, p < .001$. Table VIII is a source table for the multivariate analysis of variance.

Table VII

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Male and Female Participants Responding to Male and Female Friends on Fourteen ADF-F2 Variables

ADF-F2 Variable	Female Participant				Male Participant			
	Female Friend		Male Friend		Female Friend		Male Friend	
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
Stimulation Value	21.28	4.54	21.31	4.85	19.35	5.89	18.69	5.89
Utility Value	24.39	4.42	22.65	4.54	21.88	5.69	21.07	5.69
Self-Affirmation Value	24.93	4.53	23.77	4.94	22.30	5.49	20.38	5.49
Exclusivity	7.40	7.35	9.26	8.69	14.03	8.06	9.16	8.06
Maintenance Difficulty-Personal	8.01	4.92	8.50	4.75	11.59	6.09	10.99	6.09
Ego Support Value	24.91	3.71	23.70	4.60	22.05	5.36	20.56	5.36
General Favorability	25.67	3.78	25.34	4.18	23.27	5.33	21.73	5.33
Emotional Expression	16.27	5.06	16.36	4.97	16.74	4.47	13.60	4.47
Security Value	24.36	4.61	21.67	5.40	20.96	4.28	19.60	4.28
Social Regulation	8.88	5.76	10.74	6.11	15.25	6.16	13.56	6.16
Voluntary Interdependence	21.39	6.00	19.14	6.18	19.56	6.07	18.08	6.07
Person qua Person	25.01	7.43	23.53	5.36	22.48	5.45	19.89	5.45
Permanence	15.82	6.19	13.65	5.35	15.11	5.65	14.01	5.65
Maintenance Difficulty-Situational	5.10	5.19	6.97	5.43	9.97	6.96	8.30	6.96

Table VIII

Source Table for Multivariate Analysis of Variance for
Fourteen ADF-F2 Variables

Source of Variance	Wilk's Lambda	Hypothesis df	Error df	Multivariate <i>F</i>	
Gender of Participant	0.67	14	110	3.92	**
Gender of Friend	0.79	14	110	2.04	*
Interaction	0.6	14	110	5.21	**

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

The significant MANOVA was followed-up with separate 2 (gender of participant) x 2 (gender of target) analyses of variance (ANOVAs) for each of the fourteen variables. The gender of friend factor was treated as a repeated measure because each participant completed two copies of the ADF-F2. An alpha level of .004 was set for each analysis in the series in order to maintain an overall .05 significance level. Results of the 2 x 2 ANOVAs are summarized in Table IX.

Table IX
Summary Table for 2 X 2 Analyses of Variance for Fourteen ADF-F2 Variables

ADF-F2 Variable	Female and Male Friends Combined				Female and Male Participants Combined			
	Female		Male		Female		Male	
	Participant	Participant	Participant	gender of participant	Friend	Friend	Friend	gender of friend
	Means		F(A)		Means		F(B)	
Stimulation Value	21.30	19.02	8.42	*	20.28	19.96	0.67	
Utility Value	23.53	21.47	8.46	*	23.08	21.82	7.07	
Self-Affirmation Value	24.35	21.34	16.18	***	23.56	22.00	11.82	**
Exclusivity	8.35	11.63	8.38	*	10.94	9.21	4.37	
Maintenance Difficulty-Personal	8.26	11.29	15.01	***	9.88	9.79	0.02	
Ego Support Value	24.31	21.31	20.25	***	23.42	22.06	7.93	
General Favorability	25.51	22.50	20.28	***	24.42	23.46	4.19	
Emotional Expression	16.31	15.20	2.8		16.52	14.92	11.04	**
Security Value	23.02	20.28	16.34	***	22.59	20.58	16.95	***
Social Regulation	9.80	14.43	23.45	***	12.18	12.17	0.01	
Voluntary Interdependence	20.28	18.83	3.31		20.44	18.59	13.89	***
Person qua Person	24.28	21.20	14.44	***	23.69	21.64	11.13	**
Permanence	14.74	14.57	0.06		15.45	13.84	8.63	*
Maintenance Difficulty-Situational	6.03	9.14	13.53	***	7.62	7.66	0.02	

* p < .004

** p < .001

*** p < .0001

Looking first at the main effects for gender of participant, significant differences were found on eleven of the fourteen variables. Women rated their friendships with men and women significantly higher in: Stimulation Value, $F(1, 129) = 8.42, p < .004$; Utility Value, $F(1, 137) = 8.46, p < .004$; Self-Affirmation Value, $F(1, 136) = 16.18, p < .0001$; Ego Support Value, $F(1, 138) = 20.25, p < .0001$; General Favorability, $F(1, 138) = 20.28, p < .0001$; Security Value, $F(1, 137) = 16.34, p < .0001$; and Person Qua Person, $F(1, 135) = 14.44, p < .004$ than men rated their friendships with both men and women. Men rated their friendships with men and women significantly higher in: Exclusivity, $F(1, 129) = 8.38, p < .004$; Social Regulation, $F(1, 129) = 23.45, p < .0001$; Maintenance Difficulty-Personal, $F(1, 135) = 15.01, p < .0001$; and Maintenance Difficulty-Situational, $F(1, 129) = 13.53, p < .0001$, than women did.

Looking at the main effects of the gender of the friend, significant differences were found on six of the fourteen variables. Both male and female participants rated their female friend significantly higher in: Self-Affirmation Value, $F(1, 136) = 11.82, p < .001$; Emotional Expression, $F(1, 131) = 11.04, p < .001$; Security Value, $F(1, 137) = 16.95, p < .0001$; Voluntary Interdependence, $F(1, 134) = 13.89, p < .0001$; Person Qua Person, $F(1, 135) = 11.13, p < .001$; and Permanence, $F(1, 134) = 8.63, p < .004$; than they rated their male friend.

Significant interactions were also found on four of the fourteen variables. Significant interactions were followed with two Oneway ANOVAs for each ADF-F2 variable analyzing the effects of the gender of the participant on the variable for

male friends and the effects of the gender of the participant on the variable for female friends. Within-Subject ANOVAs were also performed on the ADF-F2 variables with significant interactions comparing female participants' responses for female friends to female participants' responses for male friends and male participants' responses for female friends to male participants' responses to male participants. An alpha level of .0125 was set for these Oneway ANOVAs and Within-Subject ANOVAs in order to maintain an overall .05 significance level for the follow-up analyses.

Figures 1-4 illustrate the significant results of the follow-up ANOVAs for each of these interactions. For Maintenance Difficulty-Situational women rated their friendships with men significantly higher than they rated their friendships with women, $F(1, 65) = 6.69, p < .012$; and men rated their friendships with women significantly higher than women rated their friendships with women, $F(1, 137) = 21.54, p < .0001$ (see Figure 1). For Exclusivity, men rated their friendships with women higher than they rated their friendships with men, $F(1, 68) = 24.75, p < .001$, and higher than women rated their friendships with women, $F(1, 131) = 24.27, p < .0001$ (see Figure 2). For Emotional Expression, women rated their male friends significantly higher than men rated their male friends, $F(1, 132) = 11.09, p < .001$, and men rated their female friends significantly higher than they rated their male friends, $F(1, 69) = 26.67, p < .001$ (see Figure 3). Finally, for Social Regulation, women rated their friendships with men significantly higher than they rated their friendships with women, $F(1, 63) = 6.8, p < .012$; men rated

their friendships with men significantly higher than women rated their friendships with men, $E(1, 130) = 7.72, p < .01$, and men rated their friendships with women significantly higher than women rated their friendships with women, $E(1, 135) = 38.85, p < .001$ (see Figure 4).

Figure 1 Interactions Between Gender of Participant and Gender of Friend on Maintenance Difficulty - Situational Factor.

Both male and female subjects found their cross-gender friendships more difficult to maintain than their same-gender friendships.

Figure 2 Interactions Between Gender of Participant and Gender of Friend on Exclusivity Factor.

Men felt more exclusive about their friendships with women than they did about their friendships with other men and more than women felt about their friendships with other women.

Figure 3 Interactions Between Gender of Participant and Gender of Friend on Emotional Expression Factor

Men found their friendships with other men to be less emotionally expressive than their friendships with women or women's friendships with either men or women.

Figure 4 Interactions Between Gender of Participant and Gender of Friend on Social Regulation Factor.

Women found their friendships with men to be more socially regulated than their friendships with other women. Men found their friendships with either women or men more socially regulated than women found their friendships with either women or men.

Discussion

The first hypothesis of this study stated that the undergraduate sample would be more sensitive to the perceived GRO of their friends and tend to form friendships with people of similar GROs. The results of the Chi-squared analysis supports this hypothesis. Significant results were found for each group in the study: females responding to female friends; females responding to male friends;

males responding to female friends and males responding to male friends, indicating that the participants tended to perceive their friends as similar to themselves in terms of GROs.

Upon closer examination, male and female participants who were categorized as androgynous or undifferentiated accounted for this tendency to perceive friends as similar to themselves in terms of GRO. Sex-typed and cross sex-typed participants did not display this tendency. However, 47% of the female participants, 58% of the male participants, and an even greater proportion of the friends they described were categorized as either androgynous or undifferentiated.

These results illustrate the importance of gender role orientation to the undergraduate population. At a time when the formation of friendships is of such great importance in the process of individuation and self-definition, undergraduate students tend to form both same- and cross-gender friendships with people they perceive as similar to them in gender role orientation. In a population characterized as having under-developed self concepts and social attitudes and a strong need for peer approval (Sears, 1986) the gender schema is prominent in the process of defining the self through association with others.

The second hypothesis stated the college sample would show significant gender differences in the ADF-F2 variables measuring exclusivity, social regulation, security, and the two measures of maintenance difficulty. Results of the 2 x 2 ANOVAs supported this hypothesis. Women felt significantly more

secure in their friendships than men did. Men felt more exclusive about their friendships, found them to be more regulated by social forces and more difficult to maintain.

In fact, significant differences for gender of participant were found for eleven of the fourteen variables indicating that women and men view their same- and cross- gender friendships differently on many dimensions. Women tended to have a more positive attitude about their friends as well as about the relationships they had with their friends than men did. They liked their friends and their friendships. They found them more supportive, stimulating and self-affirming. They felt more secure in their friendships and found them more helpful than men did.

When choosing a friend, both male and female participants in this sample favored a female friend over a male friend on six of the fourteen variables. They valued a female friend more as a person and were better able to express emotions with a female friend. Males and females described their friendships with women as more permanent, secure and self-affirming than their friendships with men. Male friends were not favored over female friends on any of the dimensions of friendship measured.

In a similar study using the ADF-F2 scales, Elkins and Peterson (1993) found that friendships between men were consistently less satisfying than friendships between women or friendships between men and women. They also found that people had lower expectations for male-male friendships than they did

for female-female friendships or female-male friendships. These results differ from those of the present study in that they found no significant differences between women's friendships with men and their friendships with other women. The present study clearly shows that both men and women found their friendships with women more satisfying than their friendships with men.

Factors outside the relationship, different roles, responsibilities, and life situations of the friends, presented difficulties for many of the friendships described. They affected cross-gender friendships between men and women and men's friendships with other men significantly more than women's friendships with other women. Men tended to see their friendships as more problematic than women did. They found their friendships difficult to maintain and regulated by social forces. Men also felt more exclusive about their friendships.

While men tended to think of all of their friendships as exclusive, they felt more exclusive about their friendships with women than they did about their friendships with men. Men also tended to turn to their female friends for emotional support. They received more emotional support from female friends than from male friends and less emotional support from male friends than women received from male friends.

Social obligations and expectations greatly influenced all friendships. Participants felt that there were rules of conduct regarding the amount of time friends spent together and what activities they were involved in. This was especially true for friendships with men. Women's friendships with men were

more socially regulated than their friendships with women, but less than men's friendships with men. Men's friendships with women were more socially regulated than women's friendships with women.

There are some important limitations to the present study. First, the research was designed to address issues specific to an undergraduate student population, but the sample who responded, while fairly representing the diversity of the particular university it was drawn from, was more heterogeneous than would be found in many universities or colleges in the United States today. The demographic information gathered yielded very little that might be categorized as group differences for further analysis.

Another important limitation of the study is the reliance on the ADF-F2 scales to describe friendships. Elkins and Peterson (1993), have noted that the scales are "more sensitive to nuances of friendships involving women (p. 507). Indeed, many positive aspects of the friendships measured by scales, such as Emotional Expression and Self-Affirmation Value, are characteristics traditionally associated with women's friendships. While these are important characteristics in a friendship, they may not fully describe the true nature all friendships. The ADF-F2 does not assess the characteristics of friendships that involve being spectators or participants in competitive sports, spending an afternoon under the hood of a car, or sharing jokes and humorous stories. These are characteristics, traditionally associated with men's friendships, that may be highly valued, positive aspects of both men's and women's relationships.

It is interesting to note that, while both men and women rated their friendships with women as more permanent, it was men's friendships with other men, on the average, that had endured the longest. Further, while results from this study show that men and women were more satisfied with their friendships with women than they were with their friendships with men on six of the fourteen ADF-F2 scales, we cannot assume that women were preferred as friends overall. Men might be rated higher on dimensions of friendships that were not assessed by these scales. It might have been informative to simply ask the participants which relationship they preferred. This highlights the need for more research into the nature of friendships in general and the nature of men's friendships specifically.

Erickson (1963) characterized adolescence as a struggle for identity and early adulthood as a struggle for intimacy. The time of undergraduate education provides a period of transition between these two priorities. It is marked by a process of experimentation with roles and relationships through which the student achieves identity and intimacy. Examination of the factors involved in the formation of same-and cross-gender friendships at this period helps us to better understand this process. The findings of this study clearly suggest that men and women go through this process differently. It appears to be a much more positive process for women, and men seem to approach it as a difficult and competitive process bound by rules and obligations. Men and women were similar, however, in finding their friendships with women more satisfying than their friendships with men.

Appendix A

Department of Psychology
The University of Rhode Island

Undergraduate Students' Descriptions of Same-Gender and Cross-Gender Friendships

CONSENT FORM FOR RESEARCH

The following project may not include individuals below the age of 18

I have been asked to take part in a research project described below. The researcher will explain the project to me in detail. I should feel free to ask any questions I might have regarding the research project, and if I have other questions later, Stephen Myles, 792-4291, the person responsible for this study, will discuss them with me.

I have been asked to take part in this study which will examine the nature of friendships among undergraduate students. If I choose to take part in the study, I will be asked to complete surveys that describe myself, one male friend, and one female friend I have met since I began college. I will also be asked to complete surveys that describe my relationship with these two friends. My participation will require about 40 minutes of my time.

This research will not endanger my life or my health, and I should not experience any discomfort due to my participation in this research project. Although there will be no direct benefit to me for taking part in this study, the researcher may learn more about the nature of friendships among undergraduate students due to my participation in the study.

My participation in this study will be anonymous. My name will appear on this consent form only. This consent form will be collected separately from the surveys I complete and my name will not be linked in any way to the information that I provide in the surveys that I complete.

The decision to participate in this study is up to me. I do not have to participate, and I may quit at any time. My decision to participate, to not participate, or to cease my participation after the research has begun, will not affect my class grade or school status in any way. If I choose to quit, I will simply inform Stephen Myles, 792-4291 of my decision.

If I am not satisfied with the way this study is performed, I may discuss my complaints with Stephen Myles, 792-4291, anonymously, if I choose. In addition, I may contact the office of the Vice Provost for Research, 70 Lower College Road, University of Rhode Island, Kingston Rhode Island, telephone: (401)792-2635.

I have read the Consent Form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I understand the information and I agree to participate in the study.

_____ Signature of Participant	____/____/____ Date of Birth	_____ Signature of Researcher
		Stephen Myles
_____ Printed Name		_____ Typed/printed Name
_____ Date		_____ Date

Appendix B

Instructions

The following surveys will ask you to describe yourself and one male and one female friend you have met since you began college, and your relationships to them. A friend might be defined as someone you care about and enjoy spending time with, someone who offers support and encouragement, someone who enjoys the same activities as you, or someone who challenges, stimulates or makes you feel good about yourself. These are just examples of ways that a friend might be defined and you may have a different definition of a friend. The only restrictions for the purposes of this study is that you describe a relationship with someone you have met since you began college and that you do not describe a sexual or romantic relationship.

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

What is your age? ____ years What is your sex? M F
What is your school status? Freshman____ Sophomore____ Junior____ Senior____
What college are you in?
University College____ Arts and Sciences____ Business Administration____
Engineering____ Human Science and Services____ Continuing Education____
Nursing____ Pharmacy____ Resource Development____ Oceanography____
What is your major? _____
What is your sexual orientation?
Heterosexual____ Lesbian____ Homosexual____ Bisexual____
What is your current living situation?
Dorm____ Fraternity or sorority____ With parent(s)____
Down the line____ Other (please specify) _____
What is your current relationship status?
Married____ Single, uncommitted____ Engaged____ Pinned____
In a committed, monogamous relationship____ Living with a lover____
Do you participate in any of the following sports?
Team sports____ Club sports____ Intramural sports____ Workout____
Off-campus athletic club____ Non-credit aerobic classes____
What is your ethnic background?
International student____ Asian American____ African American____
Native American____ Hispanic American____ White American____
Other (please specify) _____

On the reverse side of this sheet there is a list of personality characteristics. In the box following each characteristic please write a number from 1 to 7 to indicate the degree to which the characteristic describes **you**.

Appendix C

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never or almost never true	Usually not true	Sometimes but infrequently true	Occasionally true	Often true	Usually true	Always or almost always true

Defend my own beliefs		Adaptable		Flatterable
Affectionate		Dominant		Theatrical
Conscientious		Tender		Self-sufficient
Independent		Conceited		Loyal
Sympathetic		Willing to take a stand		Happy
Moody		Love children		Individualistic
Assertive		Tactful		Soft-spoken
Sensitive to needs of others		Aggressive		Unpredictable
Reliable		Gentle		Masculine
Strong Personality		Conventional		Gullible
Understanding		Self-reliant		Solemn
Jealous		Yielding		Competitive
Forceful		Helpful		Childlike
Compassionate		Athletic		Likable
Truthful		Cheerful		Ambitious
Have leadership abilities		Unsystematic		Do not use harsh language
Eager to soothe hurt feeling		Analytical		Sincere
Secretive		Shy		Act as a leader
Willing to take risks		Inefficient		Feminine
Warm		Make decisions easily		Friendly

Appendix D

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 makes it easy for me to express my most important qualities in my everyday life.
4. Because I think of my relationship with TP as a one and only arrangement, I would consider it wrong to form the same type of relationship with anyone else unless TP and I had already decided to call it quits.
5. TP's ways of dealing with people make him/her rather difficult to get along with.
6. If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on TP to notice it and appreciate my abilities.
7. TP is a genuinely likable person.
8. When I get together with TP, my emotional reactions are strong enough that I am definitely aware of them.
9. I can converse freely and comfortably with TP without worrying about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate, or just plain silly.
10. Because of the kind of relationship we have, not most people would think it unnatural or improper if TP and I did not spend quite a bit of time together.
11. 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.
12. If TP were to move away or "disappear" for some reason, I would really miss the special kind of companionship (s)he provides.
13. If I were asked to guess how long my relationship with TP would last, I would say I consider myself committed to the relationship "til death do us part."
14. TP and I both have life situations that make our relationship convenient and easy to keep up.
15. 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.
16. TP seems to enjoy helping me out and doing favors for me.
17. TP is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to express my true thoughts and feelings.

18. Because my relationship with TP is not the kind that people ordinarily get jealous about, I would consider it perfectly all right if TP were to have the same basic kind of relationship with another person or persons.
19. I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with TP from "falling apart".
20. 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.
21. 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.
22. When TP and I get together, we spend a certain amount of time talking about the good feelings and emotions that are associated with our relationship.
23. TP is the kind of person who likes to "put me down" or embarrass me with seemingly harmless little jokes or comments.
24. If I thought realistically about it, I would conclude that at least half the things TP and I do together are necessary because of people's expectations or other social pressures that have nothing to do with the really personal aspects of our relationship.
25. If TP and I could arrange our schedules so that we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as TP.
26. TP expresses so many personal qualities I like that I think of her/him as being "one of a kind", a truly unique person.
27. I consider my relationship with TP so permanent that if (s)he had to move to a distant city for some reason, I would move to the same city to keep the relationship going.
28. Because of circumstances that neither TP nor I can do anything about, there is quite a bit of tension and strain in our relationship.
29. TP can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it weren't for him/her.
30. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on TP to help with errands and chores to make things as convenient for me as possible.
31. TP treats me in ways that encourage me to be my true self.
32. Considering the kind of relationship we have, there are certain kinds of things that TP and I do together that I would consider inappropriate for either of us to do with anyone else.
33. I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to TP about topics that (s)he considers controversial or touchy.

34. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on TP to be happy and congratulatory about it.
35. TP has the kind of personal qualities that would make almost anyone respect and admire her/him if they got to know him/her well.
36. If I thought realistically about my relationship with TP, I would conclude that many other things are more important than its emotional aspects.
37. I felt free to reveal private or personal information about myself to TP because (s)he is not the kind of person who would use such information to my disadvantage.
38. Many of my acquaintances have such definite ideas about the responsibilities that go along with my relationship with TP that they would strongly disapprove if I did not live up to them.
39. 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 strongly consider waiting a day in order to travel with him/her.
40. "False sincerity" and "Phoniness" are the kinds of terms that occur to me when I am trying to think honestly about my relationship with TP.
41. If my relationship with TP became too dissatisfying to be worth the trouble, I could call it off or ease out of it with little difficulty.
42. Through no fault of our own, TP and I have to work hard to keep our relationship from falling apart.
43. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP introduces viewpoints that help me see things in a new light.
44. 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.
45. TP understands the personal goals and ideas that are most important to me and encourages me to pursue them.
46. Because I regard my relationship with TP to be very exclusive, I would consider it wrong to carry on the same type of relationship with anyone else.
47. When we have a disagreement or misunderstanding, I can count on TP to listen to my side of the story in a patient and understanding way.
48. TP has a way of helping me "play up" my successes and not take my failures too seriously.
49. TP is a pleasant person to be around.
50. If I thought realistically about it, I would conclude that I spend very little time thinking about the emotions I most often experience in my relationship with TP.

51. When I am with TP, I feel free to "let my guard down" completely because (s)he avoids doing and saying things that might make me look inadequate or inferior.
52. The kinds of things TP and I do together are strongly influenced by definite social obligations that go along with the kind of relationship we have.
53. 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.
54. When TP and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship that I don't get from any of my other acquaintances.
55. If something happened so that my relationship with TP was no longer satisfying, I would keep on with it anyway for legal, moral or ethical reasons.
56. Because of outside complications that neither TP nor I can change, I come close to feeling that keeping up our relationship is more trouble than it is worth.
57. 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.
58. If I were sick or hurt, I could count on TP to do things that would make it easier to take.
59. Doing things with TP seems to bring out my more important traits and characteristics.
60. Because I regard my relationship with TP to be a "one and only " arrangement, I would be very disappointed if I found out that TP had developed the same basic kind of relationship with anyone else.
61. I can count on communication with TP to break down when we try to discuss things that are touchy or controversial.
62. TP has a way of making me feel like a really worthwhile person, even when I do not seem to be very competent or skillful at my more important activities.
63. It is easy to think of favorable things to say about TP.
64. If I were to list the most important aspects of my relationship with TP, Positive emotional experiences are among the things I would include.
65. TP is quick to point out anything that (s)he sees as a flaw in my character.
66. If I thought about it really objectively, I would conclude that society has quite a few rules and regulations about the kind of relationship I have with TP.
67. I do things with TP that I may not be particularly interested in simply because I enjoy spending time with her/him.
68. TP is the kind of person I would miss very much if something happened to interfere with our acquaintance.

69. If I thought realistically about it, I would conclude that my relationship with TP could easily be dissolved if necessary.

70. Because our different roles and responsibilities create competition and conflict between us, TP and I experience quite a bit of strain in our relationship.

Appendix E

Please complete this sheet by describing your relationship to a **male friend** that you have met since you began college.

Friend's first name _____ What is your friend's age? ____ years
 What is your friend's school status? Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____
 Senior _____ Not currently enrolled in school _____
 How long have you known this friend? _____

Where did you meet this friend?

Dorm _____ Work _____ Party _____ Academic program _____ Sports _____
 Fraternity or Sorority function _____ Other (please specify) _____

What is your friend's sexual orientation?

Heterosexual _____ Lesbian _____ Homosexual _____ Bisexual _____ Not sure _____

The accompanying form lists 70 statements about your reactions to an acquaintance called the Target Person (TP). Each statement is followed by a scale ranging from 6 down to 0. Please decide which of the scale numbers best describes your reaction to that statement, record your answer next to the statement number on this sheet

You will notice that some of the statements are best answered in terms of "how often" and some are best answered in terms of "how likely". This will not be confusing. Simply read the following codes carefully and use them as guides in circling your choices. Remember, you are describing a **male friend**.

6 = ALWAYS. WITHOUT EXCEPTION	-or-	6 = DEFINITELY. NO DOUBT ABOUT IT
5 = ALMOST ALWAYS		5 = EXTREMELY LIKELY. ALMOST NO DOUBT
4 = USUALLY		4 = PROBABLY
3 = ABOUT HALF THE TIME		3 = PERHAPS
2 = SELDOM		2 = PROBABLY NOT
1 = ALMOST NEVER		1 = EXTREMELY UNLIKELY
0 = NEVER		0 = DEFINITELY NOT

Please try to answer all items. However, if you feel a statement does not apply to your relationship with your TP, put an X next to the statement number and go on to the next statement.

1 _____	15 _____	29 _____	43 _____	57 _____
2 _____	16 _____	30 _____	44 _____	58 _____
3 _____	17 _____	31 _____	45 _____	59 _____
4 _____	18 _____	32 _____	46 _____	60 _____
5 _____	19 _____	33 _____	47 _____	61 _____
6 _____	20 _____	34 _____	48 _____	62 _____
7 _____	21 _____	35 _____	49 _____	63 _____
8 _____	22 _____	36 _____	50 _____	64 _____
9 _____	23 _____	37 _____	51 _____	65 _____
10 _____	24 _____	38 _____	52 _____	66 _____
11 _____	25 _____	39 _____	53 _____	67 _____
12 _____	26 _____	40 _____	54 _____	68 _____
13 _____	27 _____	41 _____	55 _____	69 _____
14 _____	28 _____	42 _____	56 _____	70 _____

On the reverse side of this sheet there is a list of personality characteristics. In the box following each characteristic please write a number from 1 to 7 to indicate the degree to which the characteristic describes your **male friend**.

Bibliography

- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex-typing. Psychological Review, 88, 354-364.
- Elkins, L. E., & Peterson, C. (1993). Gender differences in best friendships. Sex Roles, 29, (7,8), 497-507.
- Erickson, E. H., (1963). Childhood and society (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.
- Frieze, I. H., Sales, E., & Smith, C. (1991). Considering the social context in gender research. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15, 371-392.
- Lavine, L. O., & Lambardo, J. P. (1984). Self-disclosure: Intimate and nonintimate disclosures to parents and best friends as a function of Bem sex-role category. Sex Roles, 11, 735-744.
- O'Meara, J. D. (1989). Cross-sex friendship: Four basic challenges of an ignored relationship. Sex Roles, 21, 525- 543.
- Rose, S. B. (1985). Same- and cross-sex friendships and the psychology of homosociality. Sex Roles, 12, 63-74.
- Sapadin, L. A. (1988). Friendship and gender: Perspectives of professional men and women. Journal of Social and Personal Relations, 5, 387-403.
- Sears, D. O. (1986). College sophomores in the Laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 515-530.
- Sherrod, D. (1989). The influence of gender on same-sex friendships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), Close relationships. Newberry Park, CA: Sage.

- Winstead, B. A. (1988). Sex differences in same-sex friendships. In V. J. Derlega & B. A. Winstead (Eds.), *Friendship and social interaction*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Wright, P. H. (1985). the Acquaintance Description Form. In S. Duck & D. Perlman (Eds.) *Understanding Personal Relationships: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Sage: London. Pp. 39-62.
- Wright, P. H. (1989). Gender differences in adults' same- and cross- gender friendship. In R. G. Adams & R. Blieszner (Eds.), *Older adult friendship: Structure and process*. Newberry Park, CA: Sage.
- Wright, P. H. & Scanlon, M. B. (1991). Gender role orientations and friendship: Some attenuation, but gender differences abound. *Sex Roles*, 24, 551-566.