

University of Windsor

## Scholarship at UWindor

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

---

1-1-1971

### The development of childhood friendship expectations.

Brian J. Bigelow  
*University of Windsor*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Bigelow, Brian J., "The development of childhood friendship expectations." (1971). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 6665.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/6665>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email ([scholarship@uwindsor.ca](mailto:scholarship@uwindsor.ca)) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDHOOD FRIENDSHIP EXPECTATIONS

by

BRIAN J. BIGELOW

B. A., University of Windsor, 1970

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies through the  
Department of Psychology in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts at the  
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada  
1971

UMI Number: EC53053

### INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

**UMI**®

---

UMI Microform EC53053

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC  
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway  
PO Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

AP: W6317

APPROVED BY:

John J. La Garza  
Lambert  
Patrol Flood  
Alvin Kalariguan

369196

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his gratitude to the following persons who contributed to the thesis. I thank Dr. John La Gaipa, the director, for his continuous support and scrutiny without which the thesis would have been deficient. In addition, I wish to convey my thanks to Drs. Kobasagawa, and Schneider for their patient readings of material and their most helpful comments. Dr. Flood is also deserving of thanks for his useful queries and suggestions throughout the year. In addition, Dr. A. Smith was of valuable assistance for his statistical advice.

Of special consideration, I thank Miss Brenda Manasse for her tolerant help in the coding of endless essays. Brenda was an additional source of motivation during the times where it was needed most.

Finally, I wish to thank the master's thesis committee as a whole for their generous and patient contributions during the year. They have my deepest gratitude and appreciation.

## ABSTRACT

An exploratory investigation of the development of children's friendship expectations was conducted using 480 male and female subjects selected from grade schools. Friendship essays were content analyzed by means of 21 friendship expectancy categories. Separate chi squares were computed by sex and for total subjects for each dimension for a total of 63 chi squares. The following dimensions revealed an increase in importance with age level: Intimacy Potential (Females), Genuineness, Acceptance, Admiration, Loyalty and Commitment, Generous Helping (Males), Selfish Helping (Males), Incremental Prior Interaction, Propinquity, Organized Play (Males), Common Activities, Stimulation Value, Common Interests, Similarity of Attitudes and Values (Females), Similarity: Demographic, and Evaluative Dimension. General Play was negatively related to age. The following dimensions were important but failed to change in importance over age level: Ego Reinforcement, Selfish Sharing, and Reciprocity-of-Liking. Generous Sharing was unimportant for any age level. It was also found that the number of different friendship dimensions used by subjects was a positive function of age. Agreement between the two coders was 76%, six of the categories falling below the 70 percent criterion. The correlation ( $r$ ) between coders was .82 which was significant.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. METHOD .....	17
Subjects .....	17
Procedure .....	17
III. RESULTS .....	26
Statistical Analysis .....	26
Reliability .....	27
Tables 1-27 .....	29-57
IV. DISCUSSION .....	58
APPENDIX A. Percentage Distributions by Grade Level and Sex ...	69
APPENDIX B. Summary Table .....	74
APPENDIX C. The Five Most Frequently Used Friendship Expectations, Presented in Rank Order for Each Grade .....	75
APPENDIX D. Coding Dimensions .....	79
REFERENCES .....	81-87
VITA AUCTORIS .....	88

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Considerable research has been done on the antecedent conditions of interpersonal attraction and friendship formation. College students have been the most frequently used subjects. Less attention has been given to the development of friendship in children. A fairly large number of variables have been identified by such research but few of them have been applied to an understanding of the growth of friendship in children.

The general area dealt with in this study is the relative importance to children of different kinds of others' friendship behaviours. What is the incentive or reinforcement value of various individual acts of friendship and how do they change in importance over time? The experimental approach has often been used to deal with such a question, particularly in regard to similarity of attitudes and values, and altruism. Little substantive research has been done on children's conceptions of friendship.

The specific approach used in the present investigation is in terms of friendship expectations. Friendship expectations are defined as those attitudes, values and behaviours that a subject expresses as being important characteristics of a friend. Friendship expectations are viewed as socially defined and as a product of socialization. The present study examines changes in friendship expectations in children as a function of age.



## Review of the Literature

The following review of the literature serves to identify the major variables isolated in research on friendship employing adults and children as subjects. There is less emphasis given to the many issues raised as to the relationship among the variables. Rather, the interest is on the isolation of categories that can be used to examine changes in children's conceptions of friendship. The following sections review studies dealing with propinquity; mutual activities; similarity; physical attractiveness; reciprocity-of-liking; altruism; multidimensional approaches to friendship; moral judgment; and changes in friendship with age.

### Propinquity

Extensive research has been conducted on the relationship of propinquity to interpersonal attraction (Festinger, Schacter & Back, 1950; Gullahort, 1952; Maisonneuve, Palmade & Fourment, 1952; Willerman & Swanson, 1952). The notion that propinquity per se does not lead to attraction was proposed by Newcomb (1956). Propinquity only leads to interpersonal attraction to the extent that physical distance fosters an increase in interaction.

Kipnis (1957), in a study of bomber crews, revealed that interpersonal attraction, in terms of interpersonal preferences, increased according to the degree of contact that crew members had with each other. Functional distance has also been found to lead to interpersonal attraction in elementary school children (Byrne, 1961a). Byrne disclosed that proximity significantly determines sociometric liking in the

classroom, functional distance of seating arrangement being a more potent variable than actual distance.

Sweetser (1941) found that the number of neighbourhood acquaintances for adolescents was less than for younger children, indicating that social environment broadens as age increases. The broadening of social environment points to the possibility that proximity becomes less important for friendship formation as age increases. Austin and Thompson (1948) determined that the most important reason for sixth grade children to change friends was that there was a lack of recent contact.

Although research indicates that propinquity is a factor in friendship formation, there is little indication as to the value placed by children on physical or functional distance in their choice of friends. A more pertinent question is whether children attempt to explain or account for their choice of friends in terms of proximity and whether propinquity is valued more or less with age.

### Mutual Activities

Mutual activities are reasoned to be key sources of friendship conceptions. Festinger (1951) theorizes that many goals and satisfactions are more easily obtainable within the group.

Parten (1932) studied social participation among preschool children and found that play activities range from least to most social as age increases. Children become more aware of others in play as age increases. Burch (1965) differentiates between expressive and structured play. Expressive play is understood as the tendency to

disturb the existing order. Structured play is similar in conception to Parten's cooperative play where activities are socially defined and structured according to sanctions, common goals, and roles.

Dimock (1937) revealed that early adolescent boys share similar numbers of play interests. Thus, play seems to have saliency to affiliation in adolescent as well as childhood years.

Perhaps the major type of activity engaged in by mutual friends is play, game, or fun behaviour. The above studies imply that play acquires different meanings according to age. Older children use more social types of play, being more aware of others' presence than are younger children, particularly after five years of age. The extent to which play and other forms of similar activities become salient to friendship has not been established. The relative value placed on such activities in comparison to other forms of affiliative behaviour has yet to be determined as a function of age.

### Similarity

Early studies on similarity and its relationship to friendship focussed on similar background as a factor related to friendship choice. Smith (1944) examined the effects of similarity of sex, religious status, and occupational status of parents on friendship formations of high school students. Smith concluded that subjects select from among those who resemble themselves in one or more characteristics. Bonney (1946) examined the role of similarity in academic achievement and home background on mutual friendship choices of elementary, high school, and college students. The relationship between these variables to mutual friendship choices was highly significant.

Miller & Stone (1951) studied different aged children at the elementary school level according to the similarity of the child's usage of psychosexual modes of relating to playmates. Miller & Stone concluded that the more the child uses pregenital modes in relating to others, the more the child is rejected by his peers.

Various theorists have attempted to account for the relationship between attitude similarity and attraction (Newcomb, 1956; Byrne & Blaydock, 1963; Levinger & Breedlove, 1966). Heider (1958) theorizes that harmonious unit relationships tend to be perceived as one. Thus, if two people perceive themselves as similar on relevant dimensions, they perceive themselves as a unit. Byrne (1961) theorizes that similar attitudes and values have a reinforcement value. Using a bogus questionnaire technique, Byrne and Griffitt (1966) have extended the similarity-attraction relationship to children, discovering that the similarity-attraction relationship does not change as a function of age.

There is evidence to support the fact that assumed similarity is more important than actual similarity in determining attraction. Friends may exaggerate the actual degree of similarity that exists (Newcomb, 1956). Byrne and Blaydock (1963) found that assumed similarity of attitudes is more characteristic of marital happiness than actual similarity of attitudes. Davitz (1955) studies perceived similarity of activities and friendship choice among children from six to 12 years of age. Davitz concluded that perceived similarity serves to close the psychological distance between subjects and valued friends for all age levels.

Though attitude similarity has been found to be an important antecedent condition of attraction, the strength of the relationship between similarity and attraction does not appear to change as a function of age. Whether the relative importance attached to similarity varies with age is yet an empirical question. Furthermore, though assumed similarity has been found to be more descriptive of children's friendships than actual similarity, there is little evidence to indicate that the value of assumed similarity changes with age. More specifically, it is not clear what kinds of assumed similarity vary as a function of age.

#### Physical Attractiveness

Physical attractiveness has been examined primarily in relation to dating and romance. Byrne, Ervin and Lambeth (1970) found that subjects' estimation of the physical attractiveness of his (or her) date correlated significantly with attraction, dating and marriage. Walster, Aronson, Abrahams and Rottman (1966) discovered that rated physical attractiveness is the most important determiner of liking on a computer dating experiment.

Since this investigation is limited essentially to same sex friendships and to age-groups not yet dating, the dimension of physical attractiveness is not expected to be important.

#### Reciprocity-of-Liking

The reciprocity-of-liking rule was first proposed by Newcomb (1956; 1961). The reciprocity-of-liking rule states that people tend to like others who have expressed a liking for them. The reciprocity-

of-liking rule views the expression of liking as a reinforcement of the interpersonal bond.

As a test of the reciprocity-of-liking rule, Secord and Backman (1959) formed dyads of adult strangers after the strangers had been informed as to whom they would like on the basis of personality tests. The subjects formed interpersonal bonds with people who they had been informed liked them.

Ausubel (1953) revealed that assumed reciprocity-of-liking is more effective than actual reciprocity-of-liking in determining interpersonal attraction. High school students were asked to rank in order the names of their three best friends in terms of preference. Sociometric measures were taken for preference of each classmate as a friend, popularity of classmates, and self estimates of others' feelings about oneself. There was no observed reciprocity of acceptance between the individual and the group. The tendency however was for subjects to assume, through the mechanism of projection, that reciprocal liking is in fact the case.

The above studies indicate that people tend to like others who express a liking for them. In addition, subjects manifest the tendency to overestimate the extent to which others reciprocate the liking. These experiments imply that the expectation of reciprocity-of-liking is one which is less frequently confirmed in actual fact. The prevalence of the expectation of reciprocity-of-liking in children's friendship expectations as a function of age has not been established.

## Altruism

The role of altruism in the initiation of interpersonal attraction was interpreted by Leeds (1963). Leeds reasoned that giving is more effective than reciprocity in the early stages of social relations since, presumably the cost incurred by the child results in the reward of the recipient.

Many studies have probed the relationship between reinforcement and interpersonal attraction. Lott and Lott (1961) discovered that children who are in another's presence at the time of reward increase their attraction to that child. Hartup and Glazer (1967) examined the relationship between peer reinforcement and social status. Social acceptance is positively related to frequency of giving positive reinforcements but not to the giving of negative reinforcements. Preschool children were observed to like peers who manifested attention and approval, affection and personal acceptance, submission, and who gave tokens.

None of the studies on altruism in relation to age has found significant decreases in altruism as a function of age. Five studies failed to find significant increases in altruistic behaviour with increases in age. Grusec and Skubinski (in press) found that 10-year-olds do not donate more marbles to orphans than do eight-year-olds. Rosenhan and White (1967) failed to detect a difference in the level of donation of gift certificates to orphans with nine and 10 year old subjects. Staub (1968) used the giving of candies to peers as a dependent measure of altruism and also failed to observe significant differences in altruistic behaviour.

Studies finding significant increases in altruism with age are characterized by the use of a wider range of ages in subject samples. Bryan and Walbeck (1969) found that the donation of gift certificates by subjects ranging from eight to 10 years of age is a positive function of age. Handlon and Gross (1958) revealed that 12-year-olds give more jointly earned pennies or seals to a partner than do four-year-olds. Harris (1970) perceived an increase in the giving of poker chips to peers by 10-year-olds than by nine-year-olds. Midlarsky and Bryan (1967) disclosed that 10-year-old children give more candies to needy children than do six-year-old children. With regard to helping, Staub and Feagen (1969) and Staub (1970) found that children help peers in distress more so as age increases.

There is evidence to indicate that there is a developmental pattern in sharing with children, but that sharing may not show similar patterns for friendship. Ugurel-Semin (1952) had subjects from six to 12 years of age share an odd number of nuts with a strange child. Ugurel-Semin found that selfish sharing diminished with age; generous sharing increased with age after the fifth year; and equalitarian sharing increased over age, reaching a plateau during early adolescence. Wright (1942b) revealed that eight-year-old boys share toys more frequently with strange children than with friends.

The above inconsistencies with regard to the relationship of altruism to age were reasoned by Bond (1968) to be the result of the use of various operational definitions of altruism, i.e., altruism as giving, helping, or sharing. Another likely source of discrepancy is the use of different ages ranges of subject samples. Studies reporting



insignificant findings generally employed narrower ranges than did other reports. An implication from the above experiments is that altruism is a multidimensional variable. Any assessment of changes in the importance of altruism in friendship expectations with increases in age requires the use of more than one dimension of altruism.

### Multidimensional Approaches to Friendship

Much of the research of friendship has followed a unidimensional approach. Several investigators have developed scales to tap the various facets of a friendship relationship. Wright (1969) has developed a model of friendship and has constructed scales to measure utility value, ego support, and stimulation value.

Fiebert and Fiebert (1969) developed a conceptual guide to friendship formation. These authors view friendship as a multidimensional dependent variable. Two models of friendship formation were developed which are pertinent to the present investigation. The incremental model states that the longer one interacts with a person, the greater the chances are of knowing that person, and thereby liking that person. The perceived similarity model is based on the fact that friends perceive similarities and are in fact more similar than are strangers on certain dimensions. Fiebert and Fiebert also identify commitment and loyalty as important to the study of friendship. Fiebert and Fiebert define commitment and loyalty as a continuum of resistance to the dissolution of the friendship.

Canfield and La Gaipa (1970) did a factor analysis of college friendship expectations and identified the following factors: intimacy potential, genuiness, acceptance, ego reinforcement, similarity, and ritualistic social exchange. These authors found that the same factors are not perceived as equally important at each level of friendship. Subsequently items were selected on the basis of factor loadings to construct the Friendship Expectancy Inventory.

Lischeron and La Gaipa (1970) obtained validity data for the Canfield and La Gaipa inventory by means of a longitudinal study of friendship formation among college male roommates. Expectancy confirmation along these dimensions was found to be related to the growth of friendship, though the relative magnitude of the predictions obtained varied somewhat with the measure of affiliation used.

The friendship expectations identified by these investigators have not been examined with respect to children and, as a consequence, little is known about the growth of these factors over time.

### Moral Development

A basic assumption underlying the present investigation is that friendship expectations are a product of socialization. Children's conceptions of affiliative behaviours in others are thought to reflect moral development in general. Piaget (1932) theorizes that cognitive and social growth are inseparable. Kohlberg (1964) refers to moral development as rising as a consequence of cognitive development. In the following text, the essential literature on moral development is reviewed in the context of providing a comprehensive grid with which to view the development of childhood friendship expectations.

Piaget (1932) was the first to investigate the development of moral judgment in the child. Piaget used the game of marbles as a measure of moral judgment. Piaget reasoned that the game of marbles is an index of social and intellectual processes in general for children from three to seven years of age. The first period in which the child was observed to develop some concept of moral rule was between the ages of 11 and 12, during which time the codification of rules is the theme. Earlier periods were observed to be void of stable moral rules and are described by Piaget as being egocentric. Piaget conceptualized the development of moral rules as following essentially three stages: egocentrism, incipient cooperation, and cooperation.

Kohlberg (1964) elaborates on Piaget's stages of moral development. Kohlberg proposes three primary stages in the development of moral judgement in the child as follows: early judgements are based primarily on the rewards and punishments from an external source; later judgments are controlled by social approval-disapproval; and older children develop moral principles which are founded on internal standards independent of external control.

More recent investigations have examined the internalization of moral standards in terms of the effects of the child's behaviour upon others. Hoffman and Saltstein (1967) found that indexes of morality development of the seventh grade child are characterized by the induction of painful consequences by the child's behaviour for the parent or others. Costanzo (1970) disclosed that self-blame peaks at 13 years of age.

According to the studies reviewed, children do not effectively internalize moral rules until approximately 12 to 13 years of age. One

implication of these studies to the present investigation is that friendship expectations which embody the consideration of others' needs should surface approximately at 13 years of age. Prior to adolescence, friendship expectations ought to embody references to more hedonistic principles.

#### Changes in Friendship with Age

Early friendship research was primarily concerned with the stability of friendship over time. During infancy and early childhood, friendships were observed to be relatively unstable (Challman, 1932; Hagman, 1933; Jersild & Fite, 1937). Green (1933) found that the number of friendship contacts for subjects two to three years of age is based upon the actual number of friends, whereas the number of contacts for five-year-olds is based upon repeated experiences with the same friends.

Hetzer (1926) observed that early adolescent friendships had singular characteristics. Hetzer suggested that girls between the ages of 11 and 13 experience a negative stage during which interpersonal relationships are somewhat avoided. Vecerka (1926) concluded that friendship choices are more consolidated and person-specific after 13 years of age. Additional evidence of unique friendship behaviours during early adolescence was discovered by Danziger (1931). Engagements in similar activities index the early adolescent period of growth. In accord with the above findings, Jenkins (1931) perceived a restriction in the range of friendships and a parallel increase in intimacy in adolescent subjects.

Dymond, Hughes, and Raabe (1952) found that sixth graders shift emphasis from external friendship qualities to internal personality characteristics such as friendliness and cheerfulness, indicating a growth of empathy. Horrocks and Buker (1951) and Horrocks and Thompson (1946) perceived that 18-year-olds when asked to write the names of their two best friends both before and after a two week interval. Thompson and Horrocks (1947) disclosed that the stability of friendship choice increases as a function of age.

The above findings indicate a rather consistent trend in the growth of friendship stability over time. Older children change friendships less frequently than do younger children. This increase in stability has been related to concomitant increases in intimacy and valuing of personality dimensions. Early adolescence seems to be the age period during which children begin to shift emphasis from external to intrapersonal factors in the choice of friends. It has not been ascertained if friendship expectations display similar developmental properties.

#### Statement of the Problem

Previous research has neglected to examine the changes in childhood friendship expectations according to age. The present investigation is an attempt to detect and inspect systematically the changes in friendship expectations across childhood ages.

#### Predictions

There is sufficient evidence to support the general contention that children's friendship expectations change as a function of age.

Friendship expectations are reasoned to be an outgrowth of socialization. Research on altruism, moral judgement, and mutual activities disclosed systematic changes over time. Correspondingly, children's conceptions of friendship are expected to manifest on orderly growth pattern.

Friendship expectations are thought to share a close correspondence with contributing variables in interpersonal attraction research. Early research on interpersonal attraction revealed that friendships were of a more internal nature beginning at the 11 to 13 year period. Internal friendship values are those which include the more dispositional and less superficial qualities. It is therefore predicted that internal friendship expectations surface during early adolescence. Specifically, the internal friendship expectations are: acceptance, ego reinforcement, genuineness, intimacy potential, and loyalty and commitment.

The literature on propinquity led to the general anticipation that physical distance would play a decreasing role in friendship expectations as age increased. A scrutiny of the changes in propinquity as a friendship expectation over time is ventured.

According to the literature on similarity, it is expected that the friendship expectations of similarity of attitudes and values, and similarity of background are stable across age.

With reference to the literature on altruism, it is predicted that sharing as a friendship expectation follows the trend of selfish, generous, and equalitarian as a function of age.

Multidimensional research has focussed exclusively on adult subjects. Thus, it is generally expected that ego reinforcement, genuineness, intimacy potential, ritualistic social exchange, similarity, and

utility potential (i.e., altruism) are more frequently used dimensions in adolescence rather than in young children.

Due to the general findings in cognitive and moral development, particularly with reference to increased levels of abstraction, and the internalization of internal standards, it is expected that children use an increasingly larger number of friendship conceptions as age progresses.

The remaining dimensions reviewed were examined without reference to hypotheses since little information was available upon which to base predictions concerning the development of these variables over time and as friendship expectations. The remaining dimensions were: mutual activities, physical attractiveness, reciprocity-of-liking, altruism (Helping), stimulation value, and evaluative dimension. The present investigation explored the prevalence of these friendship expectations according to age.

## CHAPTER II

### METHOD

#### Subjects

The sample consisted of 480 children attending local elementary schools. Sixty subjects, 30 males and 30 females, were randomly selected from each of grades one through eight.

#### Procedure

Teachers were told to ask their students to think about their best friends of the same sex and to then write down the expectations they had of these friends that differentiated them from other acquaintances. The teachers were permitted to elaborate on these instructions to make sure that the students understood what they were supposed to do. Precautions were given the teachers, however, that they should not suggest or imply any specific traits that a friend might have. Standardized instructions were not used because of differences in grade level. What seems clear to a 12-year-old is likely to be confusing to a six-year-old.

The teachers were also requested to indicate on a cover sheet attached to the essays, information about the specific class including the average socio-economic status of the class and any other important characteristic, i.e., the class contained many slow learners. Since sufficient classes were available for most of the grades, it was possible to delete from the sample investigated any socially and academically deprived groups.



### Derivation of Dependent Measures

The essays were content analyzed according to friendship expectation categories. Content analysis is an attempt to score, categorize, and derive useful objective data from written material (Starkweather, 1969). In determining the types of categories that apply to the material, the analyst uses value analysis (Budd, Thorp & Donohew, 1967). Budd et al. describes values as belief systems or goals. Thus, each friendship expectation was a documentation of the child's friendship beliefs.

### Coding Procedure

Coders. Two graduate psychology students, one male and one female, were recruited to do the coding of the essays. Prior to actual coding, a training period was conducted which consisted of familiarization and practice in the application of friendship expectation categories. During training, coders separately rated identical samples of material and compared results. Discussions were then held at periodic intervals between the coders and the research supervisor. Difficulties in coding particular responses were resolved by either clarification of category definitions or by a further inspection of essay content.

Instructions to Coders. Each bit of essay material was contextually analyzed. As a general rule, the intensity of responses was coded in relation to the overall essay. The most frequently referred to dimension was assigned a value of "4", the next "3", and the least "2". Dimensions not used were given a value of "1". Where responses were used with equal strength, a value was assigned on the basis of the essay's

sequencing of material, coders avoiding full intensity values. In cases where two or more overall themes were used, full intensity values were avoided. The value "4" was used exclusively in cases where the dimension was mentioned more frequently than any other dimension, thereby constituting the theme of the essay. Vague statements were ignored unless the subject elaborated with more clarity elsewhere in the essay. Where discrimination among dimensions was difficult for certain responses, the responses were not coded.

Categories of Friendship Expectations. The following 25 categories were developed with reference to substantive research. The categories were developed prior to the coding of the essays.

1. Propinquity (Festinger, et al., 1950; Gullahorn, 1952)

Friends who live in close physical proximity to the child are friends scoring high on the proximity dimension. The child may mention that his (or her) friend is in the same class at school or has a house not far away.

Example: "We are in the same class at school."

2. Mutual Activities (Davitz, 1955)

General: Indications that the child and friend engage in the same passtimes are coded here. In this category, statements were coded when the child was not explicit as to the type of acitivity engaged in.

Example: "We do things together."

3. Mutual Activities (Davitz, 1955)

Organized: Engagements in mutual activities that require some group organization are scored here. It was necessary for the child to be explicit as to the type of activity engaged in.

Example: "We go to the Scouts together."

4. Play (Parten, 1932; Burch, 1965)

General: Involvement in play, game, or fun behaviour is coded here. General play refers to play activities which are not in group context. Play activities need not be spelled out in this category.

Example: "He plays with me every day."

5. Play (Parten, 1932; Burch, 1965)

Organized: In this category are coded indications that the friend plays with the child on an organized, group oriented basis. Specific reference to the particular play activity is required.

Example: "They play baseball with me."

6. Similarity of Attitudes and Values (Byrne & Griffitt, 1966)

Responses indicating that the friend shares similar social and/or political beliefs and/or general orientations to the world are coded in this category.

Example: "We believe in God."

7. Similarity: Demographic (Smith, 1944)

Responses mentioning similarity of social background are included here. References to language, socioeconomic status, religious denomination, or ethnic background are examples of this dimension.

8. Similarity: Personal Characteristics (Bonney, 1946)

Citations of unique personality traits of the friend are coded here. Examples of such traits are: intelligence, special abilities, overall "personality", and shyness.

9. Common Interests (Dimock, 1937)

Responses expressing the fact that friends share common interests are coded here. Common interests may involve a concern for the same

kinds of activities, academic involvements, or the particular hobbies that the child and friend are interested in.

Example: "We like science."

10. Physical Attractiveness (Walster et al., 1966)

References to the friend's physical attractiveness are coded here. Responses mentioning physical features or clothing are salient to this dimension.

Example: "She has nice blue eyes."

11. Reciprocity-of-Liking (Newcomb, 1956; 1961)

When the child indicates that the friend likes him (or her) then the reciprocity-of-liking dimension is in use.

Example: "She likes me and I like her."

12. Altruism (Helping): Friend as Receiver (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1964)

In this category, the friend is interpreted as receiving non-material aid from others.

Example: "I help my friends to do things."

13. Altruism (Helping): Friend as Giver (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1964)

In this category, the friend is perceived as helping the respondent. This dimension is essentially non-material and involves some effort on the part of the friend.

Example: "They help me with my homework."

14. Altruism (Sharing): Friend as Receiver (Ugurel-Semin, 1952)

In this dimension, subjects are judged as sharing material rewards with their friends.

Example: "I give him candy sometimes."

15. Altruism (Sharing): Friend as Giver (Ugurel-Semin, 1952)

This category refers to friends who give material rewards to the respondent.

Example: "She shares her toys with me."

16. Ego Reinforcement (Wright, 1969)

Ego Reinforcement deals with the expectation that a friend is one who expresses positive feelings about you. The friend bolsters the self-concept. Such a friend considers the respondent as a worthwhile, competent, important person, deserving of praise and appreciation.

Example: "He makes me feel good inside."

17. Stimulation Value (Wright, 1969)

Stimulation value refers to the extent that the subject perceives another as interesting and imaginative, capable of presenting the subject with novel and interesting activities, and capable of allowing the subject to learn and extend present knowledge.

Example: "He has ideas about what to do."

18. Intimacy Potential (Canfield & La Gaipa, 1970)

Messages are scored in this category when the expectation is that the friend possesses the ability to communicate his own inner feelings and private thoughts. Here, the friend has the capacity to deal with personal problems.

Example: "We can tell each other our secrets."

19. Genuineness (Canfield & La Gaipa, 1970)

This factor taps the genuineness-reality dimension. Other terms might be transparency, authenticity, and spontaneity. The expectation is that a friend is open, honest, and straightforward. There is no need to keep up a front.

Example: "She doesn't think she is something special."

20. Acceptance (Canfield & La Gaipa, 1970)

Acceptance deals with the acknowledgement of one's integrity, identity, and individuality. Acceptance is like Roger's concept of unconditional positive regard. A friend is expected to acknowledge your right to your right to your convictions even if he disagrees with you. This expectation is that the friend does not reject others because of their beliefs or opinions. The acceptance of what people are, in spite of the fact that they may have differences or shortcomings, is the important feature here.

Example: "My friends are considerate of my feelings."

21. Admiration (Canfield & La Gaipa, 1970)

Admiration describes a friend who is admired, not because of his intrinsic value, but because of what he accepts and achieves. The items deal with a friend's character, achievement, and social responsibility. This person shows conformity to dominant values and norms.

Example: "He doesn't get into trouble."

22. Ritualistic Social Exchange (Canfield & La Gaipa, 1970)

This category describes the expectation that friends express social amenities such as a warm greeting or a friendly hello.

Example: "He says thanks for small favours."

23. Loyalty and Commitment (Fiebert & Fiebert, 1969)

Messages are scored in this category when the friendship expectation describes the friend as remaining as a friend, regardless of the cost of doing so. It may be very taxing to the friendship in circumstances that strain the relationship. Examples of such strains are:

moving away, betraying a trust, getting into trouble, etc. In spite of these setbacks, the child is expected to continue as a friend.

24. Incremental Prior Interaction (Fiebert & Fiebert, 1969)

The response is entered in this category if the subject mentions that the friend has been a person of longstanding acquaintance. The notion here is that friends are people with whom one has had a history of contact.

Example: "We grew up together."

25. Evaluative Dimension (Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum, 1967)

The evaluative dimension describes the subject's global opinion of the friend. The expectation here is that friends are nice, pleasant, sweet, beautiful, etc.

Example: "My friend is a nice person."

Reliability

In order to eliminate inapplicable or unreliable categories, a preliminary investigation of 95 essays was conducted over all grade levels. Categories which were coded less than 5% of the time were discarded, unless that category had an essential interpretive relationship to remaining categories. As a result, the following categories were eliminated: mutual activities, similarity: personal characteristics, physical attractiveness, and ritualistic social exchange. Thus, 21 categories remained with which to code the essays (see Appendix).

The coefficient of reliability (inter-coder agreement) and the product-moment correlation were both calculated because they provide different information about the extent to which the coders agree.

The coefficient of reliability is calculated by the below formula:

$$C. R. = 2M / N1 + N2$$

In the above formula, M is the number representing the actual "match" or agreement in coding a particular dimension for the specific subjects. For each category or dimension, the number of times that the coders agreed was summed. N1 is the total number of times the Coder I used a given dimension and N2 is the total number of times that Coder II used the same dimension.

The product-moment correlation is calculated by treating the coders as variables. The frequency with which both coders used a given dimension was used as the basis for computing the correlation.

Janda (1969) describes the coefficient of reliability as a "microscopic" measure of reliability, since it is sensitive only to the joint occurrences of the same dimension in the same protocol, and because it ignores frequencies for the same dimensions across subjects. The product-moment correlation is considered a "macroscopic" measure since it measures agreement in the use of dimensions for the total number of protocols without being sensitive to agreement on the same protocols.



## CHAPTER III

## RESULTS

Statistical Analysis

The objective of the study was to determine for each of the 21 categories whether or not there was a significant difference in the importance assigned to the dimension with increasing grade level. For this purpose, a three by eight design was used for each of the 21 dimensions by means of the chi square statistic. Separate chi squares were computed by sex and for total subjects for each dimension for a total of 63 chi squares. In addition, since two coders were used for each subject, it was necessary to combine the two scores into one score for each subject. That is, rather than analyzing each subject's response on the basis of both coders separately, subjects were assigned to different class intervals on the basis of their combined scores. Combined scores were placed into one of three categories for each chi square: Low Importance; Moderate Importance; and High Importance according to the intervals 2-3; 4-5; and 6-8 respectively.

A two by eight analysis of variance design was also used, relating sex and grade level in the number of categories used. The number of categories used was on the basis of the combined scores. Categories with combined scores of 4 through 8 for a given protocol were entered. Therefore, the score for each subject could range from 0 to 21, according to the number of different dimensions used.

Percentage distributions are presented for each of the total 21 dimensions in tables 1 to 21. In each table, the percentages are

presented by grade level, based on an n of 60\*. The total N for the eight grades is 480. Chi squares (three by eight design) are presented for the total samples. Separate chi squares were computed for each sex and are presented only when one of the sexes fails to be significant. Table 22 presents the rank order of incidence of the friendship dimensions for the total and for sex. Table 23 cites those dimensions most frequently used for each grade level. To determine if a significant difference exists by sex, F tests (Table 24) were computed using the ratio of the two chi squares. An analysis of variance was computed (Table 25) which compared the effects of grade level and sex on the number of dimensions used by the total sample. Also, the rank order correlation of dimensions for each sex was computed (Table 26).

### Reliability

Table 27 presents data on inter-coder agreement on each of the 21 dimensions. An inter-coder agreement of 70% was established as minimum level of reliability that was considered acceptable. It may be observed in Table 27 that inter-coder reliability was below the minimum level on only six of the 21 dimensions: Similarity: Attitudes and Values (64.8%), Acceptance (61.5%), Common Interests (60.4%), Intimacy Potential (54.0%), Reciprocity-of-Liking (50.3%), and Genuineness (44.0%).

The low reliabilities for the above six dimensions may have been due in part to the low incidence of these categories. It may be observed

---

\* For instance, in Table 1 it may be observed that Intimacy Potential becomes Moderately Important only at grades seven eight.

in Table 22 that these six categories were generally less frequently coded than the other 15 categories. Overall "microscopic" inter-coder agreement was 76%.

The "macroscopic" measure of reliability based on the frequency distribution of the incidence by the two coders was also computed. A product moment correlation of .82 was obtained, indicating an overall satisfactory agreement between the two coders.

In addition, a rank order correlation of .74 was obtained in comparison of the incidence for total sample by sex (Table 26). The variance unaccounted for by the correlation coefficient was largely attributable to Play: Organized and Evaluative Dimension.

TABLE 1

## Intimacy Potential

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mod	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	20
	Low	100	100	100	100	100	100	91	80
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Table 1 suggests that the importance assigned to Intimacy Potential increases with grade level ( $X^2 = 64.82$ ,  $df = 7$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .34$ ). An examination of these data by sex (see Appendix 1) reveals that this change can be accounted for almost completely by females ( $X^2 = 67.29$ ,  $df = 7$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .46$ ). The chi square for males was insignificant ( $X^2 = .0$ ). The ratio of these two chi squares could not be computed with an F test -- the F is indeterminate. It is apparent, however, that a sex difference exists. Examination of the percentage distribution for females suggests that the change in the importance assigned to Intimacy Potential occurs between the sixth (0%) and seventh (8%) grade ( $t = 2.25$ ,  $df = 59$ ,  $p < .05$ ) with a pronounced effect for the eighth grade.

TABLE 2

## Genuineness

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7
	Mod	0	3	0	2	5	12	8	25
	Low	100	97	100	98	95	88	90	68
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Table 2 reveals that Genuineness is significantly more important as grade level increases ( $\chi^2 = 70.12$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .35$ ). Genuineness shows sporadic growth until grade eight where a sharp rise is noticed. No sex differences were found for Genuineness. In this case, inter-coder agreement was only 44%, an average of 12% of the protocols containing Genuineness.

TABLE 3

## Acceptance

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	0	2	2	8	0	3
	Mod	3	0	5	7	7	10	18	35
	Low	97	100	95	92	92	82	82	62
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Table 3 shows that Acceptance varies as a function of grade level ( $X^2 = 75.73$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .36$ ). The change over time is fairly continuous except for a rise between the seventh and eighth grades. Significant chi squares were found for both males and females. Comparison by sex revealed that the differences are of borderline significance ( $F = 2.40$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p < .10$ ). The change was somewhat greater for females than for males. Inter-coder agreement in this instance was only 62% with an average of 16% of the protocols showing Acceptance.

TABLE 4

## Ego Reinforcement

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	3	2	2	8	7	10	3	3
	Mod	20	18	13	23	27	27	27	30
	Low	77	80	85	68	67	63	70	67
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Ego Reinforcement was not found to change as a function of grade level ( $X^2 = 17.55$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > .05$ ;  $C = .18$ ). Similarly, no sex differences were found. To assess if Ego Reinforcement plays a role in friendship, the data were collapsed across grade levels as well as sex. It was found that an average of 28% of the protocols had been coded as moderate or high importance on Ego Reinforcement which is above a chance level of occurrence ( $t = 13.66$ ,  $df = 479$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Thus, Ego Reinforcement appears to be an important friendship expectation, but it shows little or no change over time.

TABLE 5

## Admiration

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	2	3	2	7	17	18
	Mod	0	0	3	20	15	17	15	23
	Low	100	100	95	77	83	77	68	58
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Table 5 indicates that Admiration is significantly more important as grade level increases ( $X^2 = 80.43$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .37$ ). Admiration first emerges at the fourth grade ( $t = 4.22$ ,  $df = 59$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and shows continuous growth across grades. There were no detectible sex differences.



TABLE 6

## Loyalty and Commitment

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	0	2	5	7	10	12
	Mod	0	0	2	3	5	13	30	22
	Low	100	100	98	95	90	80	60	67
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Table 6 shows that Loyalty and Commitment displays an above chance increase in importance as grade level increases ( $\chi^2 = 89.8$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .39$ ). The development of Loyalty and Commitment is continuous, beginning at the fifth grade ( $t = 2.58$ ,  $df = 59$ ,  $p < .05$ ). There were no sex differences for the Loyalty and Commitment dimension.

TABLE 7

## Helping: Friend as Receiver (HelpR)

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5
	Mod	2	5	3	5	2	10	13	20
	Low	98	95	97	95	98	88	87	75
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Helping: Friend as Receiver (HelpR) displays a significant increase in importance with grade level ( $X^2 = 42.50$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .28$ ). An examination of data by sex indicates, however, that this growth is primarily a function of changes by males ( $X^2 = 49.92$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .41$ ). A nonsignificant finding was obtained for females ( $X^2 = 12.52$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > .05$ ;  $C = .22$ ). Significant differences were obtained between males and females ( $F = 3.98$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p < .001$ ). An examination of male data (see Appendix A) suggests that importance is assigned to HelpR beginning with the seventh grade ( $t = 3.48$ ,  $df = 59$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

TABLE 8

## Helping: Friend as Giver (HelpG)

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	2	2	2	2	2	5	10	15
	Mod	3	10	12	5	12	20	23	20
	Low	95	88	87	93	87	75	67	65
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Helping: Friend as Giver (HelpG) displays a significant increase in importance with grade level ( $X^2 = 46.66$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .29$ ). Examination of data by sex revealed, however, a significant chi square for males ( $X^2 = 33.32$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .01$ ;  $C = .34$ ) but not for females ( $X^2 = 20.65$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > .05$ ;  $C = .28$ ). The F test was not significant ( $F = 1.61$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Though no changes over grade were found for females, 20% of the protocols were coded in terms of HelpG ( $t = 10.98$ ,  $df = 479$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that HelpG is an important friendship dimension across most of the grade levels for females (see Appendix A).

TABLE 9

## Sharing: Friend as Receiver (SharR)

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Mod	3	8	5	2	2	5	8	
	Low	97	92	95	98	98	95	98	92
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

The dimension of Sharing: Friend as Receiver (SharR) shows no significant change over grade level ( $X^2 = 7.91$ ,  $df = 7$ ,  $p < .05$ ;  $C = .12$ ). No sex differences were found. It also appears that SharR is of minimal value in childrens' friendship expectations. Only 4.4% of the protocols across all grades were coded on the HelpR dimension ( $t = .46$ ,  $df = 479$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

TABLE 10

## Sharing: Friend as Giver (SharG)

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	5	3	5	0	3	5	0	5
	Mod	18	17	27	18	15	18	8	5
	Low	77	80	68	82	82	77	92	90
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Table 10 indicates that Sharing: Friend as Giver (SharG) does not significantly differ as a function of grade level ( $\chi^2 = 20.71$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > .05$ ;  $C = .20$ ). There were no sex differences. When all grades were combined for the total sample, it was found that 19% of the protocols had been coded on this dimension ( $t = 10.55$ ,  $df = 479$ ,  $p < .001$ ) which is statistically significant.

TABLE 11

## Incremental Prior Interaction (Increm)

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	2	2	2	3	3	5	10	7
	Mod	0	5	2	7	7	12	22	38
	Low	98	93	97	90	90	83	68	55
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

It may be observed in Table 11 that Incremental Prior Interaction (Increm) demonstrates a significant and continuous increase in importance with grade level ( $\chi^2 = 80.01$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .37$ ). No significant differences were obtained by sex ( $F = 1.88$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The major change in emphasis placed on Increm appears to occur between the sixth and seventh grade ( $t = 12.93$ ,  $df = 118$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

TABLE 12

## Propinquity

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	2	0	2	2	2	0	10	5
	Mod	5	5	7	10	10	20	28	27
	Low	93	95	92	88	88	80	62	68
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Table 12 shows that Propinquity significantly and steadily increases in importance over grade level ( $\chi^2 = 52.71$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .31$ ). No sex differences were uncovered ( $F = 1.52$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p > .05$ ) with respect to changes in Propinquity over grade level.

TABLE 13

Play: General (PlayG)

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	7	15	8	8	5	2	0
	Mod	37	57	30	43	33	18	17	12
	Low	63	37	55	48	58	77	82	88
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

According to Table 13, Play: General (PlayG) manifests a significant decrease in importance with respect to increases in grade level ( $X^2 = 70.91$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .35$ ). Although the decrease in importance of PlayG is evident for males ( $X^2 = 53.26$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .42$ ) and for females ( $X^2 = 41.73$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .38$ ) there was no significant sex difference ( $F = 1.27$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p > .05$ ). PlayG displays an elevated importance at all grade levels with fluctuations in importance from the first through to the fourth grade and a progressive decrease in importance from the fifth through to the eighth grade.



TABLE 14

Play: Organized (Play0)

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	2	0	7	3	2	0	7	0	
	Mod	0	0	8	23	7	10	10	20	
	Low	98	100	85	73	92	90	83	80	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
				Grade						

Play: Organized (Play0) increases significantly over grade level ( $X^2 = 47.38$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .29$ ). An examination by sex, however, revealed that much of this change can be attributed to the male sample. The chi square for males was as follows:  $X^2 = 45.67$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .39$ , as compared to  $X^2 = 13.38$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > .05$ ;  $C = .22$  for females. The F test for sex differences was significant ( $F = 3.41$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p < .025$ ). Examination of the male sample (see Appendix 4) suggests that Play0 becomes important in the third grade.

TABLE 15

## Common Activities

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	2	7	15	12	17	23	20
	Mod	3	5	25	37	12	23	37	40
	Low	97	93	68	48	77	60	40	40
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Table 15 shows that Common Activities is significantly more important as grade level increases ( $\chi^2 = 97.29$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .41$ ). No sex differences were noticed with respect to increases in Common Activities over time ( $F = 1.18$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The trend of growth in Common Activities is sporadic.

TABLE 16

## Stimulation Value

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	0	3	3	8	20	18
	Mod	2	3	12	20	27	43	32	43
	Low	98	97	88	77	70	48	48	38
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Table 16 shows that Stimulation Value significantly and continuously increases in importance with increases in grade level ( $X^2 = 125.10$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .45$ ). There were no significant differences between sexes ( $F = 2.29$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $.05 > p < .10$ ) on the Stimulation dimension, although the trend was for greater change among females than males.

TABLE 17

## Common Interests

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	5
	Mod	0	0	5	5	0	5	27	13
	Low	100	100	95	93	100	95	70	82
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Table 17 disclosed a significant increase in the importance of Common Interests according to grade level ( $\chi^2 = 69.02$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .35$ ). There were no observable sex differences ( $F = 1.21$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Common Interests surfaces above chance occurrence at the seventh grade ( $t = 5.07$ ,  $df = 59$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Inter-coder agreement was only 60% for Common Interests and was found an average of only 10% of the time for the total.

TABLE 18

## Similarity: Attitudes and Values (SimAV)

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

High	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
Mod	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	8
Low	100	100	100	100	98	97	90	92
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Grade							

Similarity: Attitudes and Values (SimAV) displays a significant growth over time for the total sample ( $X^2 = 30.71$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .01$ ;  $C = .24$ ). The significant growth of SimAV in Table 18 can be mainly accounted for by the females ( $X^2 = 29.39$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .01$ ;  $C = .33$ ). The male data was not significant ( $X^2 = 16.58$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > .05$ ;  $C = .25$ ; see Appendix 5). No significant sex differences were found ( $F = 1.77$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p > .05$ ) for increases in SimAV over grade level. Elevation in importance is not seen until the seventh grade ( $t = 2.58$ ,  $df = 59$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Inter-coder agreement was only 65%, an average of only 4% of the protocols showing SimAV.

TABLE 19

## Similarity: Demographic

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	0	5	2	0	2	3
	Mod	0	3	7	30	13	15	8	20
	Low	100	97	93	65	85	85	90	77
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Number							

Table 19 shows that Similarity: Demographic displays a significant increase in importance according to grade level ( $X^2 = 49.20$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .30$ ). There were no significant differences in the effect of sex on the escalation of Similarity: Demographic over grade level ( $F = 1.13$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The first significant increase in the importance of Similarity: Demographic occurs at the third grade ( $t = 2.18$ ,  $df = 59$ ,  $p < .05$ ) with marked elevations at the fourth and eighth grade. SimAV is important from the third to the eighth grades.

TABLE 20

## Reciprocity-of-Liking

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	5	3	5	0	2	0
	Mod	7	5	12	8	2	5	3	7
	Low	93	95	83	88	93	95	95	93
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

According to Table 20, Reciprocity-of-Liking displays no significant development in importance over grade level ( $X^2 = 18.81$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > .05$ ;  $C = .19$ ). No differences between sexes were found ( $F = 2.04$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p > .05$ ) on the Reciprocity-of-Liking dimension. An average of 8% importance was discovered for each grade level for Reciprocity-of-Liking which was significant ( $t = 6.40$ ,  $df = 470$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Inter-coder agreement was low (50%), only an average of 10% of the total subjects mentioning Reciprocity-of-Liking.

TABLE 21

## Evaluative Dimension

Percentage Distribution by Importance and Grade for Total Sample

(N = 480)

Importance	High	0	0	0	3	2	5	3	3
	Mod	2	5	13	10	15	28	18	27
	Low	98	95	87	87	83	67	78	70
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Grade							

Table 21 shows that the evaluative dimension manifests a continuous and significant increase with grade level ( $\chi^2 = 39.30$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $C = .27$ ). There was no difference between sexes that could not be attributable to chance ( $F = 1.10$ ,  $df = 14/14$ ,  $p > .05$ ) on the Evaluative measure.



TABLE 22

Rank Order for Incidence for Total and for Sex.\*

<u>Dimension</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>T</u>
1. Play: General	83	92	175
2. Common Activities	87	79	166
3. Stimulation Value	63	78	141
4. Ego Reinforcement	55	79	134
5. Helping: Friend as Giver	82	95	102
6. Admiration	45	40	95
7. Sharing: Friend as Giver	48	44	92
8. Evaluative Dimension	24	57	81
9. Propinquity	39	41	80
10. Incremental Prior Interaction	39	36	75
11. Similarity: Demographic	32	33	67
12. Loyalty and Commitment	28	38	66
13. Acceptance	23	37	60
14. Play: Organized	49	2	51
15. Helping: Friend as Receiver	16	24	40
16. Common Interests	16	23	39
17. Reciprocity-of-Liking	14	24	38
18. Genuineness	12	26	38
19. Sharing: Friend as Receiver	12	7	19
20. Intimacy Potential	00	17	17
21. Similarity: Attitudes and Values	6	8	14

\*Note: Incidence scores are computed using the matched scores of both coders which exceeded the value of "1".

TABLE 23

The Five Most Frequently Used Friendship Expectation Categories, Presented in Rank Order for Each Grade.\*

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Categories</u>
I	1. Play: General (37%)
	2. Ego Reinforcement (23%)
	3. Sharing: Friend as Giver (23%)
	4. Propinquity (7%)
	5. Reciprocity-of-Liking (7%)
II	1. Play: General (63%)
	2. Ego Reinforcement (20%)
	3. Sharing: Friend as Giver (20%)
	4. Helping: Friend as Giver (12%)
	5. Incremental Prior Interaction (7%)
III	1. Play: General (45%)
	2. Sharing: Friend as Giver (32%)
	3. Common Activities (32%)
	4. Reciprocity-of-Liking (17%)
	5. Play: Organized (15%)
IV	1. Play: General (52%)
	2. Common Activities (52%)
	3. Similarity: Demographic (35%)
	4. Ego Reinforcement (32%)
	5. Play: Organized (27%)

TABLE 23 (Continued)

V	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Play: General (42%)</li> <li>2. Ego Reinforcement (33%)</li> <li>3. Stimulation Value (30%)</li> <li>4. Common Activities (23%)</li> <li>5. Reciprocity-of-Liking (22%)</li> </ol>
VI	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stimulation Value (52%)</li> <li>2. Common Activities (40%)</li> <li>3. Ego Reinforcement (37%)</li> <li>4. Evaluative Dimension (33%)</li> <li>5. Helping: Friend as Giver (25%)</li> </ol>
VII	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Common Activities (60%)</li> <li>2. Stimulation Value (52%)</li> <li>3. Loyalty and Commitment (40%)</li> <li>4. Propinquity (38%)</li> <li>5. Helping: Friend as Giver (33%)</li> </ol>
VIII	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Common Activities (60%)</li> <li>2. Stimulation Value (62%)</li> <li>3. Incremental Prior Interaction (45%)</li> <li>4. Admiration (42%)</li> <li>5. Acceptance (38%)</li> </ol>

Table 23 illustrates the differences in the types of friendship expectations for each grade level. It may be noted that grades one through five are characterized by a predominance of Play: General, and Ego Reinforcement, whereas the sixth through the eighth grades are earmarked by Common Activities and Stimulation Value.

---

\*See Appendix for sex differences.

TABLE 24

## F Scores of Sex Differences Based on Chi Squares

<u>Dimension</u>	<u>Chi Square</u>		<u>F Score</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Probability</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>			
Intimacy Potential	00.00	67.29	----	7/0	Indeterminate
Genuineness	23.96	49.89	2.08	14/14	
Acceptance	26.33	63.16	2.39	14/14	
Ego Reinforcement	17.08	11.11	1.53	14/14	
Admiration	67.33	55.86	1.20	14/14	
Loyalty and Commitment	45.40	59.58	1.31	14/14	
Helping: Friend as Receiver	49.92	12.52	3.98	14/14	$p < .01$
Helping: Friend as Giver	33.32	20.65	1.61	14/14	
Sharing: Friend as Receiver	8.42	11.89	1.41	7/7	
Sharing: Friend as Giver	17.07	20.85	1.22	14/14	
Incremental Prior Interaction	60.12	31.32	1.91	14/14	
Propinquity	23.80	36.17	1.51	14/14	
Play: General	53.26	41.73	1.27	14/14	
Play: Organized	45.67	13.38	3.41	14/14	$p < .05$
Common Activities	62.23	52.78	1.17	14/14	
Stimulation Value	41.73	96.33	2.30	14/14	
Common Interests	40.99	49.58	1.20	14/14	
Similarity: Attitudes and Values	16.58	29.39	1.77	14/14	

TABLE 24 (Continued)

<u>Dimension</u>	<u>Chi Square</u>		<u>F Score</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Probability</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>			
Similarity: Demographic	31.73	27.99	1.13	14/14	
Reciprocity- of-Liking	7.94	16.22	2.04	14/14	
Evaluative Dimension	27.82	25.23	1.10	14/14	

TABLE 25

Analysis of Variance Summary Table Indicating the Effects of Sex and Grade Level on the Number of Different Friendship Dimensions Used for the Total Sample.

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Grade	7	40.92	3.27***
Sex	1	1.83	.15
Sex X Grade	7	1.28	.10
Error	464	12.51	

\*\*\*  $P < .001$

Table 25 indicates that grade level has a significant main effect ( $F = 3.27$ ,  $df = 7/464$ ,  $p < .001$ ) upon the number of friendship dimensions used by total subjects. No significant effect was found for sex. There was no interaction effect between sex and grade level.

TABLE 26  
Rank Order Correlation ( $\rho$ ) of Incidence by Sex  
for Total Sample

<u>Dimension</u>	<u>Rank Order</u>	
	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>
1. Common Activities	1	2
2. Play: General	2	1
3. Stimulation Value	3	4
4. Ego Reinforcement	4	4
5. Play: Organized	5	21
6. Sharing: Friend as Giver	6	7
7. Admiration	7	9
8. Helping: Friend as Giver	8	6
9. Incremental Prior Interaction	9	12
10. Propinquity	10	8
11. Similarity: Demographic	11	13
12. Loyalty and Commitment	12	10
13. Evaluative Dimension	13	5
14. Acceptance	14	11
15. Helping: Friend as Receiver	15	15
16. Common Interests	16	17
17. Reciprocity-of-Liking	17	16
18. Sharing: Friend as Receiver	18	20
19. Genuineness	19	14
20. Similarity: Attitudes and Values	20	19
21. Intimacy Potential	21	18

\*Note:  $\rho = .74$ ,  $n = 21$ ,  $p < .001$

TABLE 27  
 Rank Order of Percentage Agreement for Categories  
 for Total Subjects.\*

<u>Category</u>	<u>Percentage Agreement</u>
1. Common Activities	86.4
2. Loyalty and Commitment	84.3
3. Helping: Friend as Giver	83.2
4. Playing: Friend as Giver	83.2
5. Stimulation Value	83.2
6. Similarity: Demographic	81.8
7. Sharing: Friend as Giver	81.7
8. Incremental Prior Interaction	80.7
9. Propinquity	80.6
10. Helping: Friend as Receiver	78.7
11. Sharing: Friend as Receiver	76.0
12. Evaluative Dimension	72.2
13. Admiration	71.8
14. Ego Reinforcement	70.2
15. Play: Organized	69.8
16. Similarity of Attitudes and Values	64.8
17. Acceptance	61.5
18. Common Interests	60.4
19. Intimacy Potential	54.0
20. Reciprocity-of-Liking	50.3
21. Genuineness	44.0

\* Note: all percentage agreement scores below 70% do not meet the established criterion of inter-coder reliability.



## CHAPTER IV

## DISCUSSION

In review, 17 of the 21 dimensions examined in this study showed changes as a function of age. There was an increase in incidence in all but one of these 17 dimensions (Play: General). Three of the dimensions did not change as a function of age, but were found at most of the grade levels. Only Sharing: Friend as Receiver was not identified as a significant friendship variable. The overall results, then, support the general hypothesis of the developmental nature of friendship conceptions.

Equally important to the findings on change is the time of onset of these friendship expectations. The rationale underlying the present study was that the development of friendship expectations parallels cognitive and moral development, particularly in regard to increased levels of abstraction and the acquisition of internal standards. It was predicted that the more abstract and internal dimensions would become salient in early adolescence. As contrasted to the more superficial and concrete dimensions, it was suggested that the following variables would emerge around the 12th year of age: Intimacy Potential, Genuineness, Acceptance, Ego Reinforcement, and Loyalty and Commitment.

The general findings indicated that these abstract, internal dimensions emerged at a later age than the more concrete superficial variables. Genuineness, Acceptance, and Loyalty and Commitment emerged as important friendship expectations about the seventh grade for both males and females.

Significant increases in Intimacy Potential, however, were found only for females during the seventh and eighth grades. An extended age range may be necessary to show the manifestation of this variable for males. One possibility for such a lag for males may be the earlier maturation of females. Another possibility is that males in this age group may consider such behaviour as unmasculine and perhaps are reluctant to disclose their valuing of Intimacy Potential due to the inhibiting effects of the classroom situation, where they are in close contact with peers.

The growth in importance of Intimacy Potential, Genuineness, Acceptance, and Loyalty and Commitment is supportive of Flavell (1969) and Piaget (1932) with respect to a decrease in egocentrism with age. These variables imply an ability to take others' points of view into account. Previous research has also found that the ability of children to maintain stable friendship is a function of age (Jenkins, 1931; Green, 1933 ; Thompson & Horrocks, 1947). It should be noted that the emergence of these abstract, internal dimensions occurs about the same time that friendships become more stable. Whether the emergence of these variables is a consequent or antecedent condition of friendship stability is an empirical question.

The major exception found was in regard to Ego Reinforcement which did not change in importance over time. The finding that Ego Reinforcement was important over all grade levels suggests that it is a measure of the reinforcement value of an interpersonal bond.

Friendship expectations in regard to altruism appear to vary with the operational definition used and the sex of the respondent. The distinction made between Helping and Sharing proved to be useful. Helping was defined in terms of non-material whereas Sharing was defined in terms of material rewards. The distinction between the friend as receiver or giver of the reward also proved useful.

Helping: Friend as Receiver (generous helping) was found to increase in importance with age for the male sample. The change, however, appears to occur primarily at grade seven. Prior to this grade level there were few instances where males described a best friend as one who was helped in some activity. In the female sample, no change was found by grade level in regard to the importance assigned to helping a friend. It should be noted, however, that across all grades females reported as much or more helping as did the males, though the total overall incidence for both sexes places this dimension as one of the less important ones.

Helping: Friend as Giver (selfish helping) was also found to increase in importance with age for the male sample but not for the female sample. Whereas the definition of a friend as one who receives help appeared in the male sample in grade seven, the definition of a friend who gives help appeared in the second grade, showing a changing conception of altruism with maturation. It should not be assumed that females are less concerned with receiving help from a friend. The friend as a "giver" was fairly constant at all grade level in females.

The results for the male sample on Helping are consistent with experimental studies indicating an increase in Helping as a function of age (Staub & Feagen, 1969; Staub, 1970). Interpretation of the sex differences found in the present study are limited due to the lack of experimental studies dealing with this matter. Perhaps, the differences found are related to differences in the sex role. Females may learn to be more dependent on others than males.

The findings on Sharing: Friend as Receiver (generous sharing) failed to support research by Ugurel-Semin (1952) on increases in providing material rewards to another as a function of age. Very few of the protocols of children of either sex described a friend as one who is given things. There are some differences between these two studies that may account for the discrepancy. Ugurel-Semin examined behavioural changes rather than verbal reports. Furthermore, the study did not deal with friendship as such but altruistic behaviour among strangers. It should also be noted that Wright (1942b) found that eight year old boys share toys more frequently with strange children than with friends.

Sharing: Friend as Giver (selfish sharing) also failed to show any significant developmental trends. There was a difference, however, between this dimension and Friend as Receiver in terms of the frequency with which protocols described a friend in terms of sharing material objects. At all ages, children of both sexes described a friend as one who gives me things. The greater incidence for Friend as Giver than Friend as Receiver can be interpreted with reference to theorizing

by Leeds (1963). To be the recipient of material rewards by a friend may be more rewarding or have a greater reinforcement effect on affiliation than to be the giver of rewards, particularly in the early stages of social development. The relatively high importance assigned to the Friend as Giver dimension is also consistent with research on the effects of material rewards on interpersonal attraction (Lott & Lott, 1961; Hartup & Glazer, 1967).

The results obtained in the present study in regard to altruism suggest that developmental trends involving altruism are dependent on the problem investigated, the measure of altruism employed (Bond, 1968), and the sex of the child. The lack of developmental trends in sharing is inconsistent with a number of studies (Ugurel-Semin, 1952; Handlon & Gross, 1958; Harris, 1967; Midlarsky & Bryan, 1967; Bryan & Walbeck, 1969). The finding underscores the methodological and contextual differences between these studies and the present investigation. It appears that an examination of altruism in the context of friendship expectations may manifest a different development from the study of altruism apart from established affiliative relationships.

The fact that Loyalty and Commitment emerged at the fifth grade indicated that friendship expectations of a need for stability become important during early adolescence. Fiebert and Fiebert (1969) theorize that commitment and loyalty are crucial components of friendship. It may be said, in addition to Fiebert and Fiebert's theory, that the rise in Loyalty and Commitment earmarks the development of moral principles which are founded on internal standard (Kohlberg, 1964).

The surfacing of Admiration at the fourth grade was reasoned to be attributable to the need in children for some external standard by which they might judge others as worthy of their friendship. The internalization of the expectation of Admiration was also reflective of Kohlberg's (1964) theory.

The prediction that Similarity of Attitudes and Values would not show developmental changes was supported for males and not for females. It should be noted that in the female sample no significant changes were observed until the seventh grade. Perhaps, the emergence of this variable in females reflects earlier social development or greater sensitivity to moral and spiritual values in adolescence. The findings for females do not support research by Byrne and Griffitt (1966). These authors found a constant relationship between similarity of attitudes and attraction toward a stranger across grades four to twelve. The difference between these two studies may be due to the use of strangers versus the use of friends. Another possibility is that similarity of attitudes and values does determine attraction at earlier ages than was indicated in the present study, but may be relatively unimportant in a friendship hierarchy of values.

An additional prediction not supported is in regard to Similarity: Demographic which was found to be positively related to grade level. Smith (1944) found that mutual friends in elementary grades were similar on demographic characteristics. Studies on high school students have also obtained positive results (Smith, 1944; Bonney, 1946). In the present study the importance of this variable appeared in the third grade, in contrast to Similarity of Attitudes and values which appeared

in the seventh grade. Similarity of Attitudes and Values could be considered as being at a higher level of abstraction than similarity of demographic characteristics. The earlier emergence of demographic characteristics may reflect the more concrete orientation of younger children. This would suggest that the cognitive development of development of children may play a role in the kinds of similarity considered to be important in a friendship.

The findings that changes occurred over time in regard to Incremental Prior Interaction is fairly self-evident. One would expect older children to mention Incremental Prior Interaction more frequently than younger children by virtue of the possibly longer history of interactions with the same friends.

The prediction that Propinquity as a friendship expectation decreases in importance with age was rejected. On the contrary, Propinquity displayed an increase in importance over time. In order to account for the discrepancy, an alternative interpretation of the literature is warranted. Sweetser (1941) found that social environment broadens for adolescents. It appears, from the present study, that Propinquity does not decrease in importance over time, but is redefined according to the extended social environment. The findings of the present study with respect to Propinquity suggest that peer group interaction occurs physically more remote from the home as children become older and more mobile.

The decrease in importance attributed to Play: General was informative with reference to the development of cognitive differentiation, particularly in view of the fact that Play: Organized displayed growth

over time for males. The absence of growth in organized play for females may have been due to the fact that females are less likely than males to engage in more specialized forms of group activity such as are found in sports.

The examination of the chi square data suggests that the more abstract friendship dimensions emerge at a later age than the more concrete dimensions. The analysis of variance findings (Table 25) indicate that the number of friendship dimensions employed by children varies directly as function of grade level. These findings corroborate results obtained by Scarlett and Crockett (1971). These authors found that the number of constructs used by children to describe their peers increased monotonically with age, the use of egocentric and concrete constructs shifting to the use of nonegocentric and abstract constructs. Both studies support Piaget's (1932) observation that children are more likely with age to use intentional modes in relating to others than relating in a simply concrete and superficial fashion.

The present study differs from that by Scarlett and Crockett in that a comparison was not made in regard to the description of acquainted versus unfamiliar peers. Scarlett and Crockett found greater differentiation in both number of constructs and level of abstractness of constructs in the description of acquainted as compared to unfamiliar peers. This finding suggests the need for further research on changes in expectations that children have of others that are social acquaintances rather than best friends.



The increase in Stimulation Value over time mirrored an accelerated growth of cognitive development with age. The dramatic rise in the importance of Stimulation Value seemed to be a logical outgrowth of the fact that children are increasingly more able to absorb and therefore need stimulation as age increases, particularly in view of the position (Festinger, 1951) that many important goals and satisfactions such as the learning of social and intellectual skills are more easily obtainable from the group.

Reciprocity-of-Liking failed to change in importance over age, although it had stable value across grades. The fact that Reciprocity-of-Liking was important over all grades studied was supportive of Newcomb's (1961) theory that Reciprocity-of-Liking is a reinforcement of the interpersonal bond. Thus, Reciprocity-of-Liking may possess reinforcement properties across all ages examined in the present study. In contrast, the Evaluative Dimension was mentioned more frequently by children with increases in age. These changes may reflect an increased tendency to focus on personal qualities or generalized personality traits with age.

In summary, the following dimensions were found to be of greatest importance to children's friendship expectations (Table 22): Play: General, Common Activities, Stimulation Value, Ego Reinforcement, Admiration, Sharing: Friend as Giver, and Helping: Friend as Giver. For each grade level (Table 23), the five most frequently mentioned dimensions are identified. It may be observed in this table that Play: General was mentioned most often in the first five grades, whereas

Stimulation Value and Common Activities are most important for the remaining grades.

#### Implications for Further Research

Several additional problems were suggested by the present undertaking. Of central consideration is the issue of whether the friendship expectations observed in the present study occur independent of cultural context, or whether these friendship dimensions are limited to the culture studied. Since the more abstract, internal dimensions were observed to increase in value during early adolescence, one could question the origin of the change. In cultures where adolescents are treated differently from the present culture, one might anticipate a corresponding difference in the time during which these dimensions arise as important friendship variables.

The present investigation may be criticized on the manner in which the data was collected. It may be maintained that children's friendship essays were limited to the ability of children to express themselves on paper. Certain friendship variables may have been operative, yet communication skills may have been deficient, therefore precluding the detection of these dimensions. If the saliency of friendship dimensions corresponds to the ability of children to communicate their valuing of these dimensions then this issue is not so vital. This issue can only be answered by further examination.

The methodology of the present study was deficient from the standpoint that the data was collected from only one source, i.e., written material. A multimethod approach using written, verbal, and behavioural data would have been more helpful in ascertaining the validity of the present study's findings.

Also, the issue was raised as to the correspondence between friendship expectations to the actual affiliative behaviours of children. Are the dimensions that are ascribed as important by children actually implemented in their interactions with friends? Additional data are warranted if one is to ascertain if children actually act on the basis of what they deem is important in friendship.

The present understanding can be criticized on the grounds that since the data were collected from several different elementary schools, the results may have been confounded by social class differences. In order to assure that social class differences do not effect the results, further research on the development of friendship expectations in children would be facilitated by attempts to control for social class influence.

Finally, it was questioned if the dimensions identified in the present study were peculiar to friendship or whether they are characteristic of affiliative as well as non-affiliative interactions. Research exploring the differences between these two contexts is needed in order to help resolve this problem

## APPENDIX A

## PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS BY GRADE LEVEL AND SEX

## Intimacy Potential (Males)

## Percentage Distribution by Grade Level (N = 240)

High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mod	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Grade							

Note:  $\chi^2 = 0.00$ ,  $df = 0$ ,  $p > .05$

## Intimacy Potential (Females)

## Percentage Distribution by Grade Level (N = 240)

High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mod	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	40
Low	100	100	100	100	100	100	83	60
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Grade							

Note:  $\chi^2 = 67.29$ ,  $df = 7$ ,  $p < .001$

## Helping: Friend as Receiver (Males)

Percentage Distribution by Grade Level (N = 240)

High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Mod	0	0	0	3	0	3	13	27
Low	100	100	100	97	100	97	87	67
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Grade

Note:  $\chi^2 = 49.92$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$

## Helping: Friend as Receiver (Females)

Percentage Distribution by Grade Level (N = 240)

High	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Mod	3	10	7	7	3	17	13	13
Low	97	90	93	93	97	80	87	83
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Grade

Note:  $\chi^2 = 12.52$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > .05$

## Helping: Friend as Giver (Males)

Percentage Distribution by Grade Level (N = 240)

High	0	3	3	0	3	3	10	20
Mod	3	10	10	0	7	20	23	13
Low	97	87	87	100	90	77	67	67
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Grade							

Note:  $X^2 = 33.32$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .01$

## Helping: Friend as Giver (Females)

Percentage Distribution by Grade Level (N = 240)

High	3	0	0	3	0	7	10	10
Mod	3	10	13	10	17	20	23	27
Low	93	90	87	87	83	73	67	63
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Grade							

Note:  $X^2 = 20.65$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > .05$

## Play: Organized (Males)

## Percentage Distribution by Grade Level (N = 240)

High	3	0	10	7	3	0	13	0
Mod	0	0	13	40	10	20	20	31
Low	97	100	77	53	87	80	67	63
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Grade							

Note:  $\chi^2 = 45.67$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .001$

## Play: Organized (Females)

## Percentage Distribution by Grade Level (N = 240)

High	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Mod	0	0	3	7	3	0	0	3
Low	100	100	93	93	97	100	100	97
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Grade							

Note:  $\chi^2 = 13.38$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > .05$

Similarity: Attitudes and Values (Males)

Percentage Distribution by Grade Level (N = 240)

High	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Mod	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	3
Low	100	100	100	100	97	93	93	97
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Grade

Note:  $\chi^2 = 16.58$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p > .05$

Similarity: Attitudes and Values (Females)

Percentage Distribution by Grade Level (N = 240)

High	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Mod	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	13
Low	100	100	100	100	100	100	87	87
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Grade

Note:  $\chi^2 = 29.39$ ,  $df = 14$ ,  $p < .01$



## APPENDIX B

## SUMMARY TABLE

Dimension	Incidence			Percent Agreement	Chi Square			Contingency Coefficient		
	M	F	T		M	F	T	M	F	T
Inti	00	17	17	54.0	00.00	67.29***	64.82***	0.0	0.46	0.34
Genu	12	26	38	44.0	23.96*	49.89***	70.13***	0.30	0.41	0.35
Accept	23	37	60	61.5	26.33*	63.16***	75.73***	0.31	0.45	0.36
EgoRei	55	79	134	70.2	17.08	11.11	17.55	0.25	0.21	0.18
Admir	45	40	95	71.8	67.33***	55.86***	80.43***	0.46	0.43	0.37
Loyalt	28	38	66	84.3	45.40***	59.58***	89.80***	0.39	0.44	0.39
HelpR	16	24	40	78.7	49.92***	12.52	42.50***	0.41	0.22	0.28
HelpG	39	47	86	83.2	33.32**	20.65	46.66***	0.34	0.28	0.29
SharR	12	97	19	76.0	8.42	11.89	7.91	0.18	0.21	0.12
SharG	48	44	92	81.7	17.07	20.85	20.71	0.25	0.28	0.20
Increm	39	36	75	80.7	60.12***	31.32**	80.01***	0.44	0.33	0.37
Prop	39	41	80	80.6	23.80*	36.17***	52.71***	0.30	0.36	0.31
PlayG	83	92	175	83.2	53.26***	41.73***	70.91***	0.42	0.38	0.35
PlayO	49	2	51	69.8	45.67***	13.38	47.38***	0.39	0.22	0.29
ComAct	87	79	166	86.4	62.23***	52.78***	97.29***	0.45	0.42	0.41
Stim	63	78	141	83.2	41.73***	96.33***	125.10	0.38	0.53	0.45
ComInt	16	23	39	60.4	40.99***	49.58***	59.02***	0.38	0.41	0.35
SimAV	6	8	14	64.8	16.58	29.39**	30.71**	0.25	0.33	0.24
SimDem	32	33	67	81.8	31.73**	27.99*	49.20***	0.34	0.32	0.30
RecLik	14	24	38	50.3	7.94	16.22	18.81	0.17	0.25	0.19
Eval	24	57	81	72.2	27.82*	25.23*	39.39***	0.32	0.30	0.27

\* =  $p < .05$ \*\* =  $p < .01$ \*\*\* =  $p < .001$

## APPENDIX C

THE FIVE MOST FREQUENTLY USED FRIENDSHIP EXPECTATION CATEGORIES,  
PRESENTED IN RANK ORDER FOR EACH GRADE (MALES).

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Categories</u>
I	1. Play: General (37%)
	2. Sharing: Friend as Giver (33%)
	3. Ego Reinforcement (13%)
	4. Acceptance (3%)
	5. Sharing: Friend as Receiver (3%)
II	1. Play: General (80%)
	2. Sharing: Friend as Giver (13%)
	3. Ego Reinforcement (10%)
	4. Helping: Friend as Giver (10%)
	5. Common Activities (7%)
III	1. Play: General (33%)
	2. Sharing: Friend as Giver (30%)
	3. Common Activities (30%)
	4. Play: Organized (23%)
	5. Reciprocity-of-Liking (10%)
IV	1. Common Activities (57%)
	2. Play: Organized (47%)
	3. Play: General (40%)
	4. Similarity: Demographic (37%)
	5. Stimulation Value (27%)

- V
1. Ego Reinforcement (40%)
  2. Play: General (37%)
  3. Stimulation Value (30%)
  4. Common Activities (23%)
  5. Admiration (13%)
- VI
1. Stimulation Value (47%)
  2. Common Activities (40%)
  3. Sharing: Friend as Giver (27%)
  4. Play: General (23%)
  5. Evaluative Dimension (23%)
- VII
1. Common Activities (53%)
  2. Admiration (40%)
  3. Stimulation Value (37%)
  4. Helping: Friend as Giver (33%)
  5. Propinquity (33%)
- VII
1. Stimulation Value (77%)
  2. Common Activities (73%)
  3. Admiration (57%)
  4. Incremental Prior Interaction (54%)
  5. Play: Organized (37%)

## (Females)

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Categories</u>
I	1. Play: General (37%)
	2. Ego Reinforcement (33%)
	3. Sharing: Friend as Giver (13%)
	4. Propinquity (10%)
	5. Reciprocity-of-Liking (10%)
II	1. Play: General (47%)
	2. Ego Reinforcement (30%)
	3. Sharing: Friend as Giver (27%)
	4. Sharing: Friend as Receiver (13%)
	5. Incremental Prior Interaction (13%)
III	1. Play: General (57%)
	2. Sharing: Friend as Giver (33%)
	3. Common Activities (33%)
	4. Reciprocity-of-Liking (23%)
	5. Evaluative Dimension (23%)
IV	1. Play: General (63%)
	2. Common Activities (47%)
	3. Ego Reinforcement (40%)
	4. Similarity: Demographic (33%)
	5. Admiration (27%)

- V
1. Play: General (47%)
  2. Stimulation Value (30%)
  3. Ego Reinforcement (27%)
  4. Sharing: Friend as Giver (23%)
  5. Evaluative Dimension (23%)
- VI
1. Stimulation Value (57%)
  2. Evaluative Dimension (43%)
  3. Ego Reinforcement (43%)
  4. Admiration (40%)
  5. Common Activities (40%)
- VII
1. Common Activities (67%)
  2. Stimulation Value (67%)
  3. Loyalty and Commitment (47%)
  4. Propinquity (43%)
  5. Ego Reinforcement (37%)
- VIII
1. Stimulation Value (77%)
  2. Common Activities (47%)
  3. Acceptance (47%)
  4. Loyalty and Commitment (46%)
  5. Genuineness (43%)

APPENDIX D

CODING DIMENSIONS

Subject #: ..... Grade: ..... Sex: Male ( ) Female ( )

Listed below are the 21 friendship expectancy categories. For each category, indicate the intensity with which that category describes the friendship essay. There are four possible values for each category: (1) least descriptive, (2) somewhat descriptive, (3) moderately descriptive, and (4) very descriptive.

Answer by placing a check mark between the appropriate parentheses.

	1	2	3	4
1. Intimacy Potential .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Genuineness .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. Acceptance .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Ego Reinforcement .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. Admiration .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. Loyalty and Commitment .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. Altruism (Helping) - Friend as Receiver .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. Altruism (Helping) - Friend as Giver .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. Altruism (Sharing) - Friend as Receiver .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. Altruism (Sharing) - Friend as Giver .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. Incremental Prior Interaction .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. Propinquity .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. Play - General .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. Play - Organized .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. Common Activities .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. Stimulation Value .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
17. Common Interests .....	( )	( )	( )	( )

APPENDIX D (Continued)

	1	2	3	4
18. Similarity - Attitudes and Values .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
19. Similarity - Demographic .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
20. Reciprocity-of-Liking .....	( )	( )	( )	( )
21. Evaluative Dimension .....	( )	( )	( )	( )

## REFERENCES

- Austin, M. C. & Thompson, G. G. Children's friendships: A study of the bases on which children select and reject their best friends. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1948, 39, 101-116.
- Ausubel, D. P. Reciprocity and assumed reciprocity of acceptance among adolescence: A sociometric study. Sociometry, 1953, 16, 339-348.
- Bond, N. D. Correlates of altruism in elementary school children. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1968.
- Bonney, M. E. A sociometric study of the relationship of some factors to mutual friendships on the elementary, secondary, and college levels. Sociometry, 1946, 9, 21-47.
- Bryan, J. H., & Walbeck, N. Preaching and practicing generosity: children's actions and reactions. Child Development, 1970, 41, 329-353.
- Budd, R., Thorp, R. K., & Donohew, L. Content Analysis of Communications, Macmillan (Ed.), 1967.
- Burch, W. R., Jr. The play world of camping: research into the social meaning of outdoor recreation. American Journal of Sociology, 1965, 70(5), 604-612.
- Byrne, D. The influence of propinquity and opportunities for interaction on classroom relationships. Human Relations, 1961a, 14, 63-70.
- Byrne, D. Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 713-715.



- Byrne, D., & Blaydock, B. Similarity and assumed similarity of attitudes between husbands and wives. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 636-640.
- Byrne, D., Ervin, C. R., & Lambeth, J. Continuity between the experimental study of attraction and real-life computer dating. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 151-165.
- Byrne, D., & Griffitt, W. A developmental investigation of the law of attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 699-703.
- Canfield, F. E., & La Gaipa, J. J. Friendship expectations at different stages in the development of friendship. Paper read at the meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Louisville, Kentucky, April, 1970.
- Challman, R. C. Factors influencing friendship among preschool children. Child Development, 1932, 3, 146-158.
- Costanzo, P. R. Conformity development as a function of self-blame. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14, 366-374.
- Danziger, L. Freundschaften bei proletiermadchen. Zsch. f. pad. Psychologische, 1931, 32, 309-325.
- Davitz, J. R. Social perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 173-176.
- Dimock, H. S. Rediscovering the Adolescent. Association Press, 1937.
- Festinger, L., Schacter, L. S., & Back, K. Social Pressures in Informal Groups: A Study of Human Factors in Housing. New York: Harper, 1950.

- Dymond, R. F., Hughes, A. S., & Raabe, V. L. Measurable changes in empathy with age. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1952, 16, 202-206.
- Festinger, L. Architecture and group membership. Journal of Social Issues, 1951, 1, 152-163.
- Fiebert, M. S., & Fiebert, P. B. A conceptual guide to friendship formation. Perceptual & Motor Skills, 1969, 28, 383-390.
- Flavell, J. H. The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget. 1963, Van Nostrand.
- Green, E. H. Friendships and quarrels among preschool children. Child Development, 1933, 4, 327-353 (a).
- Green, E. H. Group play and quarreling among preschool children. Child Development, 1933, 4, 302-307 (b).
- Grusec, J. E., & Skubiski, S. L. Model nurturance, demand characteristics of the modeling experiment, and altruism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, (in press).
- Hagman, E. P. The companionships of preschool children. University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare, 1933, 7, (Whole No. 4)
- Handlon, B. J., & Gross, P. The development of sharing behaviour. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 425-428.
- Harris, M. Some determinants of sharing in children. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1968. Reported in D. L. Krebs, Altruism- an examination of the concept and a review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 258-302.
- Hartup, W. W., Glazer, J., & Charlesworth, R. Peer reinforcement and sociometric status. Child Development, 1967, 38, 1017-1024.

- Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958.
- Hetzer, H. Der einfluss der negativen phase auf soziales verhalten und literarische produktion pubertierender madchen. Quell. u. stud. z. Jugendk., no. 4. Jena: Fischer, 1926, 1-40.
- Hoffman, M. L., & Saltstein, H. D. Parent discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 45-57.
- Horrocks, J. E., & Buker, M. E. A study of the friendship fluctuations of adolescents. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1951, 78, 131-144.
- Horrocks, J. E., & Thompson, G. G. A study of the friendship fluctuations of rural boys and girls. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1946, 69, 189-198.
- Janda, K. A microfilm and computer system for analyzing comparative politics literature. In G. Gerbner (Ed.), The Analysis of Communication Content. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1969, Pp. 407-436.
- Jenkins, G. G. Factors involved in children's friendships. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1931, 22, 440-448.
- Jersild, A. T., & Fite, M. D. Children's social adjustments in nursery school. Journal of Experimental Education, 1937, 6, 161-179.
- Kipnis, D. M. Interaction between members of bomber crews as a determinant of sociometric choice. Human Relations, 1957, 10, 263-270.
- Kohlberg, L. Development of moral character and moral ideology. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of Child Development Research (Vol. 1), New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964, Pp. 383-431.

- Leeds, R. Altruism and the norm of giving. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 229-240.
- Levinger, G., & Breedlove, J. Interpersonal attraction and agreement: A study of marriage partners. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 367-372.
- Lischeron, J., & La Gaipa, J. J. Expectancy confirmation and friendship. Paper presented at the meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba, May, 1970.
- Lott, A. J., & Lott, B. E. Group cohesiveness, communication level, and conformity. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1961, 62, 408-412.
- Maisonneuve, J., Palmade, G., & Fourment, C. Selective choices and propinquity. Sociometry, 1952, 15, 135-140.
- Midlarsky, E., & Bryan, J. H. Training charity in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 408-415.
- Miller, D. R., & Stone, M. E. The prediction of social acceptance by means of psychoanalytic concepts. Journal of Personality, 1951, 20, 162-174.
- Newcomb, T. M. The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Newcomb, T. M. The prediction of interpersonal attraction. American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The Measurement of Meaning. University of Illinois Press, 1967.
- Parten, M. B. Social play among preschool children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1933, 28, 136-147.

- Piaget, J. The Moral Judgment of the Child. New York Free Press, 1932, translated 1965.
- Rosenhan, D., & White, G. M. Observation and rehearsal as determinants of prosocial behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 424-431.
- Scarlett, H. H., Press, A. N., & Crockett, W. H. Children's descriptions of peers: a Wernerian developmental analysis. Child Development, 1971, 42, 439-453.
- Secord, P. F., & Backman, C. W. Interpersonal congruency, perceived similarity, and friendship. Sociometry, 1964, 27, 115-127.
- Smith, M. Some factors in friendship selection. Sociometry, 1944, 7, 303-310.
- Starkweather, J. A. Overview: computer-aided approaches to content recognition. In Gerbner, G., Holsti, O. R., Krippendorff, K., Paisley, W. J., & Stone, P. J. (Eds.), The Analysis of Communication Content, 1969.
- Staub, E. A child in distress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14, 130-140.
- Staub, E. The effects of success and failure on children's sharing behaviour. Paper presented at the 39th annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Washington, D. C., April, 1968. Reported in D. L. Krebs, Altruism - an examination of the concept and a review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 258-302.

- Staub, E., & Feagen, L. Effects of age and number of witnesses in children's attempts to help another child in distress. Papers presented at the 40th annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April, 1969. Reported in K. L. Krebs, Altruism- an examination of the concept and a review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 258-302.
- Sweetser, F. L. Neighbourhood acquaintances: a study of personal neighbourhoods. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in political science, Columbia University, 1941.
- Thompson, G. G., & Horrocks, J. E. A study of the friendship fluctuations of urban boys and girls. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1947, 70, 53-63.
- Ugurel-Semin, R. Moral Behaviour and moral judgement of children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 463-474.
- Vecerka, L. Das soziale verhalten von madchen wahrend der reinfezeit. Quell. u. stud. z. Jugendk., 4, Jena: Fischer, 1925, 41-121.
- Walster, E., Aronson, V., Abrahams, D., & Rottman, L. Importance of physical attractiveness in dating behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 5, 508-516.
- Willerman, B., & Swanson, L. An ecological determinant of differential amounts of sociometric choices within college sororities. Sociometry, 1952, 15, 326-329.
- Wright, B. A. The development of the ideology of altruism and fairness in children. Psychological Bulletin, 1942, 39, 485-486.
- Wright, P. H. A model and a technique for studies of friendship. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1969, 5, 295-309.

## VITA AUCTORIS

Mr. Brian John Bigelow was born in Windsor, Ontario on the first of December, 1947. He attended Walkerville Collegiate Institute from 1961 to 1967, obtaining the Honours Graduation Diploma. Mr. Bigelow studied at the University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, during the years 1967 to 1970 and received the Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in psychology. The bachelor's degree was awarded with high honours. During the summer months of 1970, he attended an internship training programme for psychometrists at the Ontario Hospital School at Cedar Springs, Ontario. Mr. Bigelow was enrolled as a graduate student in social psychology at the University of Windsor in the fall of 1970. On completion of the master's thesis, Brian was admitted to the University of Dundee, Scotland, as a doctoral research student in social psychology, commencing in October of 1971.

Mr. Bigelow has been the recipient of the Ontario Graduate Fellowship, 1969-70, and the Canada Council Doctoral Fellowship, 1970. Mr. Bigelow was awarded the Canada Council Fellowship on the basis of his master's thesis proposal and is presently receiving support from the Canada Council.