



8-1973

## An Investigation of the Components of Platonic and Romantic Heterosexual Relationships

Philip F. Guinsburg

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Guinsburg, Philip F., "An Investigation of the Components of Platonic and Romantic Heterosexual Relationships" (1973). *Theses and Dissertations*. 981.

<https://commons.und.edu/theses/981>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE COMPONENTS OF PLATONIC AND  
ROMANTIC HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS

by  
Philip F. Guinsburg

Bachelor of Arts, Columbia University 1968

Master of Arts, University of North Dakota 1970

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Grand Forks, North Dakota

August  
1973

T1973  
G948

This dissertation submitted by Philip F. Guinsburg in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Paul H. Wright  
(Chairman)

Hilda Wing

John O. Nee

Ray Collins

Richard S. Smith

William Johnson  
Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

Title AN INVESTIGATION OF THE COMPONENTS OF PLATONIC AND  
ROMANTIC HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS

Department PSYCHOLOGY

Degree DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature Philip Fried Linsburg

Date February 5, 1973

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Paul Wright for his encouragement and helpful assistance throughout my entire graduate career. Also, I wish to thank Dr. Hilda Wing for her time and effort in working with my writing style, which allowed me the opportunity to write this dissertation. Appreciation is also extended to the other members of the committee, Dr. Noll, Dr. Childers, and Dr. Ludtke.

The technical assistance of Al Lindem, John Ducksavage and Gloria Kerns at the University of North Dakota Computer Center is deeply appreciated.

Finally, a very special expression of gratitude is extended to my wife Debbie, whose sacrifices and support have sustained my graduate studies, and to my mother and father who faithfully stood by me during my twenty-two years of going to school.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
ABSTRACT . . . . .	vii
 Chapter	
I. STUDIES OF "PLATONIC" AND "ROMANTIC" HETEROSEXUAL ATTRACTION . . . . .	1
Research on Need Similarity	
Research on Complementary Needs	
Research on Attitude and Value Similarity	
Heterosexual Interpersonal Attraction	
II. PLATONIC HETEROSEXUAL FRIENDSHIPS: PRELIMINARY STUDIES AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	17
III. METHOD . . . . .	28
Subjects	
Procedure	
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	32
Treatment of the Data	
Comparison of the "Platonic" Heterosexual Relationship with the "Romantic" Heterosexual Relationship for Males	
Comparison of the "Platonic" Heterosexual Relationship with the "Romantic" Heterosexual Relationship for Females	
Comparison of the "Platonic" Heterosexual Relationship for Males and Females	
Comparison of the "Romantic" Heterosexual Relationship for Males and Females	
V. DISCUSSION . . . . .	47
Findings	
Implications	
Conclusions and Future Studies	
APPENDICES . . . . .	60
REFERENCES . . . . .	128

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Basic Factors of the Male and Female Platonic Relationship . . . . .	21
2. Basic Factors of the Platonic and Romantic Heterosexual Relationships for Males . . . . .	35
3. Basic Factors of the Platonic and Romantic Heterosexual Relationships for Females . . . . .	39
4. Basic Factors of the Platonic Heterosexual Relationship for Males and Females . . . . .	42
5. Basic Factors of the Romantic Heterosexual Relationship for Males and Females . . . . .	45

## ABSTRACT

During the past twenty years, heterosexual relationships have been studied extensively by researchers in the field of interpersonal attraction without the attainment of consistent results (Wright, 1968). Wright (1968) stated that there were two methodological problems with this past research which are the treatment of variables used to explain attraction as both the independent and dependent variables in the same study and the use of dyadic indices. Also, Wright (1969) noted that past research has generally not examined heterosexual relationships separately for each sex. Finally, Guinsburg (1970a) found that most research dealing with heterosexual relationships has only examined the "romantic" relationship. However, over 1400 undergraduates at one university had "platonic" heterosexual relationships (Guinsburg, 1970a, b, c).

The present study was concerned with the specification and operationalization of variables connected with the "platonic" and "romantic" heterosexual relationship for each sex. This would allow for the determination of variables important to the different forms of "platonic" and "romantic" relationships (close to distant relationships). An attempt was made to avoid the mistakes made in previous research.

The following methodology was used: (1) Each subject was asked to describe a particular type of heterosexual relationship



ranging from "close platonic" and "close romantic" to "distant platonic" and "distant romantic" relationships. Eight different types of heterosexual relationships were used and it was arranged so that there would be an equal number of subjects for each sex describing each type of heterosexual relationship. (2) A "Validation Index Questionnaire" was created and used to gain outside validation criteria about each of the relationships being described. (3) Wright's (1971) "Acquaintance Description Form" was used to allow subjects to describe further their heterosexual relationship in terms of items found to be relevant characteristics of same sex friends. (4) Subjects filled out the "Opposite Sex Friendship Questionnaire Form M or F" so as to allow for the scaling of items dealing with "platonic" heterosexual relationships by a population describing eight types of heterosexual relationships.

The results indicated that there was a continuous distribution of responses to all except one of the items from the three questionnaires. Then, for each sex, subjects were divided into two groups. The first group consisted of subjects who were describing a "platonic" or "semi-platonic" relationship and the second group consisted of subjects describing "romantic" and "semi-romantic" relationships. A factor analysis was run separately for each sex on each of the two groups of subject descriptions dealing with either "romantic" or "platonic" relationships. The factors were interpreted for both the "platonic" and the "romantic" groups, and comparisons were made between the factors of the "romantic" and "platonic" group for males and females. Also, comparisons were made between males and females concerning the "platonic" and the "romantic" groups.

From this study the following conclusions may be drawn about heterosexual relationships.

1. Males and females describe the "platonic" relationship as differing from the "romantic" relationship because the "platonic" relationship lacks the emotional closeness and comfort of the "romantic" relationship.

2. Females saw the "platonic" relationship as important for communication about personal problems, while males saw it as important for casual dating activities.

3. Only females saw the "romantic" relationship as more important to them than the "platonic" relationship.

4. The male focuses on the various qualities and characteristics of the "romantic" girl friend while the female stresses her emotional involvement in the relationship and its importance to her.

5. Females generally express more emotional and intellectual involvement in the "romantic" relationship than males.

## CHAPTER I

### STUDIES OF PLATONIC AND ROMANTIC ATTRACTION

Serious reflection on the question of heterosexual interaction seems to reveal that "platonic" as well as "romantic" attraction has a prominent place as a stable and functional dyadic relationship. On the surface, these two forms of heterosexual attraction differ primarily on the dimension of sexual or sensual involvement; the "platonic" relationship lacks the overt and usually directly expressed interest in erotic physical intimacy that is generally recognized as one of the most important components of the "romantic" relationship.

Guinsburg (1970a) found that researchers of attraction have virtually ignored the "platonic" relationship. However, over 1400 undergraduate students at one university reported having such a relationship (Guinsburg, 1970a, b, c). Unlike the "platonic" relationship, the "romantic" has been studied extensively from several different theoretical perspectives. However, Wright (1968) reports that findings in this research area, along with those in other areas of attraction, have been inconsistent and contradictory. He discusses two basic methodological problems in previous research dealing with interpersonal attraction. The first problem concerns the studying of a variable proposed to explain interpersonal attraction by treating this variable conceptually as if it were an independent variable but

analytically as if it were the dependent variable. Therefore, the experimenter would find subjects who are attracted to one another and then try to demonstrate his hypothesized variable as causing the effect of attraction. The second methodological problem involves the use of dyadic indices in analyzing experimental results. According to Wright, this procedure prevents the analysis of individual characteristics of subjects in the experimental results.

It was the intent of this study to discover some of the basic components involved in heterosexual attraction by examining both the "platonic" and "romantic" relationships. Due to the lack of research on "platonic" heterosexual attraction, the present study was largely exploratory in nature and was designed to minimize some of the problems encountered in previous attraction research. A review of the major theoretical approaches to interpersonal attraction reveals that the relevant research since the mid-fifties has emphasized three approaches; the theory of need similarity, the theory of need complementarity, and the theory of attitude and value similarity.

#### Research on Need Similarity

The theory of need similarity states that persons with similar affective characteristics tend to find the same interpersonal situations satisfying and realize more accurate interpersonal perception and communication. Izard (1960a, b), a proponent of the theory, postulated that affective characteristics were stated as experiences of favorable feelings, self-involving interest, and acceptance or esteem in relation to another person. Thus, similarity of affective needs

and of ways of expressing and receiving affect are a significant factor in interpersonal attraction. Personality similarity facilitates positive affect and thus interpersonal attraction, because whatever produces positive affect in one member of the pair would evoke positive affect in the other. Also, this personality similarity would increase the accuracy of interpersonal perception and communication.

Izard (1960a) looked at the relationship of same sex friendship in high school students. He hypothesized that mutual friends have similar personality profiles. High school students were given the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (1954) to measure their personality profiles in terms of the fifteen basic personality needs identified by the EPPS. The inventory consists of 225 items to appraise the motivational dispositions or needs of the person taking the inventory. The fifteen basic needs appraised are: achievement, deference, order, exhilaration, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, succorance, dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, heterosexuality, and aggression (Edwards, 1954). These students also listed their closest friends in rank order. The results showed that actual pairs of friends were significantly more similar in terms of needs than pairs established by random selection. Also, only actual pairs of friends showed significant intraclass correlations on certain personality needs. Thus, personality similarity or similarity of personality needs seemed to be a significant factor in interpersonal attraction.

Freshman girls entering college were given the EPPS and questioned about friends made at school six months later. Izard (1960b)

indicated from this that personality similarity was an antecedent of sociometric choice.

Izard (1963) replicated his study (1960b) with a different set of freshman girls. However, when the same EPPS was given to college seniors never before tested, and they were told to list their friends, the data failed to confirm the earlier findings; college seniors were not especially attracted to similar others. Izard (1963) attributed this finding to increased social and emotional maturity and suggested that the mature person has less need to see his personality characteristics reflected in his friends.

Wright (1968) found both conceptual and methodological problems in Izard's work on need similarity. The conceptual problems involved a failure by Izard to specify the conditions under which need similarity should promote attraction and a failure to consider the possibility of any specific personality variables being involved. Because of these conceptual difficulties, Wright (1968) felt that any research findings from this theory would be difficult to interpret meaningfully.

There were two methodological problems in the work of Izard which Wright (1968) deemed as responsible for the inconsistencies in his research findings. The first problem concerned the studying of need similarity by treating it conceptually as if it were the independent variable but analytically as if it were the dependent variable. That is, the experimenter finds subjects who are attracted to one another and then tries to demonstrate some effect such as need similarity at work. There is no independent definition of need similarity,

nor is there specification of the conditions under which it should promote the attraction which brings the subjects to the study.

The second methodological problem is the use by Izard of dyadic indices in analyzing his experimental results. When dyadic indices are used, the scores from a pair of subjects are combined by correlational methods into a single score. This procedure results in a situation where only the subjects as a pair can be further analyzed rather than each subject individually. Thus, any data concerning individual characteristics will probably be lost from the analysis of experimental results.

Wright (1968) also pointed out that Izard never attempted to obtain a differentiated conceptualization of friendship or attraction. None of Izard's research findings ever specified the components of same sex or opposite sex friendship. Thus, there was no way that Izard could demonstrate what components of friendship the various EPPS variables were related to. Because of the nature of the EPPS, Izard could use this inventory to compare two people on their similarities and differences concerning basic needs, but not make specific predictions from it concerning interpersonal attraction. Wright (1969) believes that in order to evaluate precisely a specific institution such as friendship, the use of a scale constructed from descriptions of the relationship would be valid. With this procedure, one would be able to obtain the specific components involved in the relationship. Wright's "Acquaintance Description Form" was developed to provide such a scale.

Research on Complementary Needs

The theory of need complementarity is a different theory of interpersonal attraction in which the same conceptual and methodological mistakes have been made as in the theory of need similarity. The theory of complementary needs conceives of interpersonal attraction between two people in terms of the pair's emotional needs, and thus in terms of the need patterns of both members of the pair. Winch (1955) states that if there is to be a strong interpersonal attraction, the need patterns of the pair should be complementary. Thus, a person high on one need would be attracted to someone low in that need (complementarity of needs). Also, a person high in one need would be attracted to someone high in the opposite need (need satisfaction).

The need complementarity theory was examined in regard to married couples. According to Winch (1955a), a person high in one need would be attracted to someone high in the opposite need. The personality need patterns of twenty-five married couples were examined, principally through interviews with these couples. To minimize the effect of living together on the personalities of the spouses, all couples studied had been married less than two years and were childless. The correlations of married couples on certain personality characteristics (needs) were lower than randomly paired couples on these same characteristics.

Winch (1955b), using a different group of young married couples, determined their personality need patterns with three different methods: an interview structured to elicit evidence on a person's



needs; a case history interview; and an eight card thematic apperception test. Only the personality needs brought out by the interview technique supported the hypothesis that spouses tend to select each other on the basis of complementary rather than similar need patterns. The TAT and the case history measures did not support the hypothesis of either need complementarity or similarity of needs.

Reilly, Commins, and Steffic (1960) looked at the idea of the complementarity of personality needs in friends of the same sex. They tested whether need patterns of friends are complementary, whether personality needs of friends are mutually satisfying, and whether it is the perception of an individual's characteristics, or the actual presence of them which is crucial in determining behavior. One hundred pairs of college juniors and sophomores, half of whom were friends and half of whom were randomly matched, were given the EPPS to obtain self perceived personality need scores and the Allport Vernon Study of Values to get measures of six basic interests or values. No consistent complementary relationships were found in regard to self-perceived personality needs of friends nor was there any evidence of mutual need satisfaction between friends. Friends did not tend to see themselves and their friends as more consistently complementary rather than more consistently similar. There was no significant statistical evidence for a correlation of personality needs between friends, as friends tended to be only slightly similar in personality needs.

The problem of whether opposites attract, or whether people tend to choose mates with personality patterns similar to their own, was studied by Murstein (1961). The subjects consisted of two groups:

newlyweds and a group of people married ten years or more. The newlyweds were similar to Winch's (1955a, b) group of subjects, and the nonnewlyweds were used to study the effect of marriage on the development of complementary needs. A number of personality measures, including the EPPS, were administered to obtain personality need patterns from the subjects. The examination of the personality-need patterns tended to favor a need similarity theory of need-pattern choice for the couples who had been married for ten years or more. The evidence obtained from the newlyweds was entirely inconclusive in that neither the need similarity nor the needs complementarity theory of marital choice was supported.

According to Wright (1968), the same problems that existed for need similarity studies exist for need complementarity studies. First of all, there are conceptual problems resulting in a lack of specification of the conditions under which need complementarity should promote attraction. This promotes difficulties in interpreting any research findings using this theory. Secondly, the same methodological problems found in the research of need similarity are found in the research of need complementarity resulting in inconsistent findings between the work of Winch (1955a, b) and the work of Reilly, Commins, and Steffic (1960) and Murstein (1961). The variable of need complementarity is treated in research conceptually as an independent variable and yet analytically as a dependent variable, resulting in a lack of a valid operational specification of need complementarity in terms of its effect on attraction. Also, Winch (1955a, b) and others used dyadic indices in analyzing their experimental results resulting in

the loss from experimental analysis of individual characteristics of the subjects. Wright (1968) implied that these procedures should not be used without also trying to study the relationship directly.

#### Research on Attitude and Value Similarity

Newcomb (1956) proposes the theory of propinquity: people are most likely to be attracted toward those in closest contact with them. He combines the theory of propinquity with the theory of attitude and value similarity in which physical and psychological distance (attitude similarity) influence interaction and thus interpersonal attraction. Given an adequate opportunity for individuals to become familiar with each other's attitudes, attraction is predictable from the perceived similarity of attitudes of two people on important and relevant issues. Newcomb found that people have notions about their environment and the proper rules of social conduct. Those who are not in agreement with one's own notions are considered uninformed, immoral, and of low intelligence. If another person's notions about his environment and the proper rules of social conduct are in agreement with one's own, rewarding interaction is facilitated which helps to form a positive relationship. Also, the more important the similar attitudes are to the individuals involved, the greater the attraction.

Newcomb (1956) explored the theory of attitudes and value similarity with regard to male transfer students at the University of Michigan, all of whom were initially strangers before sharing rooms in a dormitory. They were given questionnaires to determine how each of them felt about other members in the dormitory and how they felt about

important and relevant issues is not necessarily liked more than a stranger who is known to have similar attitudes on less relevant issues. Also, a stranger with attitudes similar to those of the subject is judged to be more intelligent and moral.

Byrne and Nelson (1965) tested whether attraction toward a stranger is a positive function of the proportion of positive reinforcements received from that stranger or the effect of the number of similar attitudes expressed by a stranger. Each subject was asked to read an attitude scale supposedly filled out by an anonymous stranger, after which he was requested to evaluate the stranger along a number of dimensions, including that of attraction. The attitude scales read by the subjects were experimentally varied so that the number of attitudes similar to those of the judges were varied parametrically. Attraction for the stranger who had supposedly filled out the attitude scale was significantly and directly affected only by the proportion of similar as opposed to dissimilar attitudes, not the number of similar attitudes expressed.

Berscheid and Walster (1969) pointed out some limitations of the theory of attitude and value similarity with regard to a secondary assumption concerning the relationship of attitude similarity to the amount of interpersonal attraction. Byrne (1961) and Newcomb (1956) felt that the relevance of the content of the attitude to the person holding the attitude will help determine how much perceived similarity of attitudes affects liking. This hypothesis was not researched experimentally by Newcomb (1956) and failed to be experimentally validated by Byrne (1961). Also, Newcomb (1956) and Byrne (1961)

interpreted their findings as indicating that it was the number of similar attitudes between two individuals that promoted liking. Byrne and Nelson (1965) found this was not the case.

Levinger and Breedlove (1966) also followed Newcomb's formulation and tested a hypothesis similar to that of Byrne (1961). They felt that in a marital situation where the amount of agreement on an attitude facilitated or was important to the goals of the relationship, the amount of agreement on that attitude would be important for marital satisfaction. Marital satisfaction in their study, then, served as an indirect index of attraction between marital partners. To test their hypothesis, they obtained from married couples a great deal of information concerning their own marriage and their attitudes toward marriage in general. Their data did not support the hypothesis that actual agreement and attraction are more highly correlated on attitudinal dimensions of greater importance as compared to those of lesser importance. They concluded that their hypothesis was not supported because of the lack of a valid operational definition for attitude similarity and agreement.

Thus, from the findings of Newcomb (1956), Byrne (1961), Byrne and Nelson (1965), and Levinger and Breedlove (1966), one can find inconsistencies in results and problems with conceptualizations. One explanation could be the failure to study the dimensions of attitude similarity directly such as from scales constructed from descriptive statements by individuals about a particular interpersonal relationship. Also, there is a lack of a valid operational definition of attitude similarity which has led to the failure of Levinger and

Breedlove (1966) to successfully relate similarity to some interpersonal relationships (marriage).

From the research problems of need similarity, need complementarity, and attitude and value similarity theorists, one might consider the following in terms of future research concerning heterosexual relationships:

1. It does not seem scientifically fruitful or valid to hypothesize the important independent variables affecting a particular kind of heterosexual relationship without a thorough description of the important dimensions of the relationship in question. The researcher needs to know the various components of a heterosexual relationship so that he has something to try to relate the independent variable to. Before one hypothesizes the independent variable, a better course of action might be to obtain the important variables involved in a certain relationship through descriptive statements made by various individuals involved in this kind of relationship.

2. For purposes of clarity, in determining variables involved in various heterosexual relationships, the relationships should be examined separately for each sex. There is no reason for one to assume that there are no sex differences in interpersonal relationships. It is possible, if not likely, that men and women differ markedly with respect to those factors that are most important in both "romantic" and "platonic" heterosexual attachments.

3. The use of dyadic indices in analyzing experimental results loses too much information concerning the individual characteristics of subjects.

4. Personality inventories should never be used as the only measuring instrument for interpersonal attraction since they were not designed for this purpose.

#### Heterosexual Interpretation Attraction

In the search for the determinants of heterosexual interpersonal attraction, some progress has been made in recent years toward operationalizing and specifying the variables involved. Also, attempts have been made to study the heterosexual relationship by building a scale to measure it out of the statements made by subjects describing it.

Swenson (1961, Swenson and Gilner, 1964) was interested in describing the "behavior of love" and asked 300 college students to list all the actions, utterances, and feelings which they thought differentiated their relationships with loved ones from their relationships with mere acquaintances. From these responses, he derived a 383 item questionnaire. One hundred students answered each item, either never true, sometimes true, or always true, with respect to five target persons: father, mother, closest sibling, closest same sex friend, and closest opposite sex friend (or spouse). He discarded forty-seven items answered "never true" for all of the five target persons in the study and extracted ten factors from the remaining 336 items. Six factors dealt with the "loving behaviors" of the opposite sex friendships: the verbal expression of feelings, self-disclosure, non-material evidence of love (concern and encouragement), nonexpressed feelings, material evidence of love, and tolerance of the less desirable aspects of the loved person.

Rubin (1969) criticized Swenson (1961) for his lack of specification of the "thoughts, feelings, and behavioral predispositions" which are involved in romantic love. Rubin saw the specification of these aspects as necessary for the investigation of antecedents and consequences of varying degrees of love in particular relationships.

Rubin (1969) discussed his own efforts to investigate the antecedents and consequences of "romantic love" and arrive at a "meaningful conceptual definition" of it. He developed a "romantic love" scale out of a large pool of questionnaire items generated by the responding of different subjects about their thoughts, feelings and behavioral predispositions toward some particular other person (target person). Half of the items were intended to reflect "liking" and involved the desire to affiliate, feelings of responsibility and equity, of trust and respect, and the perception of supposed similarity to the target person. The other half of the items were intended to reflect "love" and referred to physical attraction, idealization, a predisposition to serve, the desire to share emotions and experiences, feelings of exclusiveness and absorption, affiliative and dependent needs, and the holding of contradictory feelings. Once this "love scale" was developed, a factor analysis yielded three basic "romantic love" components: a basic desire to be with the person as much as possible and a dependency on the relationship continuing, a basic desire to do anything possible for the loved person, and feelings of possessiveness toward the loved person along with feelings of freedom to say anything to the person.



Rubin (1969) used statements made by "platonic" opposite sex friends in calculating his "love scale" but failed to pay much attention to the relationship itself. No interpretation of the data dealing with the opposite sex "platonic" friendship was given. He felt the subjects would have closer relationships with a same sex friend than with a "platonic friend" and that attitudes toward same sex friends would therefore provide a more suitable comparison with attitudes toward dating partners. However, he never justified this portion of his methodology in his research findings.

Thus, while there has been some progress towards correcting conceptual and methodological problems in the research of heterosexual interpersonal attraction, the research orientation has been mostly oriented to the "romantic" relationship. One has to question the progress of research dealing with heterosexual relationships with the continued ignoring of the "platonic" opposite sex relationship. It is this research gap in dealing with heterosexual relationships that seems to justify the research by this author.

## CHAPTER II

### PLATONIC HETEROSEXUAL FRIENDSHIPS: PRELIMINARY

#### STUDIES AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The first extensive research in the area of "platonic" heterosexual relationships started with the work of Guinsburg. Guinsburg (1970a) conducted an exploratory study attempting to determine whether the opposite sex "platonic" relationship actually exists as a socially and personally significant relationship. In addition some of the important determinants in its creation and maintenance were explored.

The first part of the study concerned the creation of an opposite sex "platonic" friendship scale. Two hundred male and 200 female students were given an open-ended questionnaire in order to produce a variety of statements about the opposite sex "platonic" relationship. A content analysis was used to reduce these statements to the most common ones. These common statements were scaled and factor analyzed. For each sex, an arbitrarily determined total of six factors were derived by means of the principal components method and rotated orthogonally to the varimax solution.

From the six factors derived, Guinsburg (1970a) found four important characteristics of opposite sex friendships:

1. The friend was important as a confidant.
2. The friend had many suitable characteristics desired in a marriage partner.

3. The friend was frequently a co-participant in leisurely activities.

4. The friend was trusted and respected.

The second part of the study investigated ways in which opposite sex "platonic" friendships differed from "romantic" opposite sex friendships. A "Platonic Opposite Sex Friendship Scale: Form M or F" was constructed from basic factors yielded by the factor analysis, and was administered to a "platonic" oriented friendship group (200 males and 200 females) and to a "romantic" oriented friendship group (200 males and 200 females). The same person could take part in both groups, but this was not often the case. It was expected that this procedure would reveal differences in the patterning of factors related to "platonic" versus "romantic" opposite sex relationships for both sexes.

A significant difference was found between the platonically oriented and romantically oriented groups in relation to their mean scores over all the factors. For males, there was a significant difference between the "platonic" and "romantic" groups on all the individual factors except frequency of contact and being trustful and relaxed toward friends. For females, there was a significant difference between the "platonic" and "romantic" groups on all the individual factors except confiding and trust and respect. Also, there was a greater variability of response for females than for males and for the "platonic" than the "romantic" group. These results led to four tentative conclusions:

1. For males, the "platonic" opposite sex friend seemed to be considered a good "friend" and a casual dating partner.
2. For females, the male "platonic" friend tended to be important as a confidant rather than a dating partner.
3. Females previously have been shown to be more variable in the way they respond toward friends. In this study they tended not to differentiate as much between a "platonic" versus a "romantic" friendship because of a possible confusion as to why the friend was a "platonic" one.
4. There seemed to be more uncertainty concerning the "platonic" opposite sex relationship compared to the "romantic" one.

This first study by Guinsburg (1970a) did not seem to identify clearly the basic characteristics of the opposite sex "platonic" friendship. This problem led to a second study attempting the construction of a second opposite sex "platonic" friendship scale using some modification in methodology. Guinsburg (1970b) utilized approximately 200 introductory and educational psychology students (100 males and 100 females) at the University of North Dakota. These students were given an open-ended questionnaire (see Appendix A) in which they described their closest friend of the opposite sex with whom they had a "platonic" relationship. The students who participated in the study were required to be single and to have a close opposite sex "platonic" friend whom they had seen recently. The directions for the questionnaire were:

Please think of the closest opposite sex friend with whom you have a non-romantic, non-sexual or "platonic" relationship. Then, describe this friend by writing twenty statements explaining your

relationship with the person and what this friendship means to you. As you are writing these statements please keep in mind these following questions:

- a. Why is this person a "platonic" friend?
- b. What makes this person different from a romantic friend?
- c. Do you ever foresee this relationship changing from a platonic to a romantic one?
- d. What benefits do you obtain from taking part in this relationship?
- e. How important is this relationship to you and why?
- f. How important is this relationship compared to your most important same sex friendship?

A total of seventy-five items for males and seventy-five items for females were generated. A content analysis was used to eliminate similar and repetitious items and also to discard those items occurring infrequently (fewer than seven times). The content analysis produced fifty different items for males and fifty different items for females.

Guinsburg (1970c) put the items generated from the above study into another questionnaire with a different form for each sex. The "Opposite Sex Friendship Questionnaire: Form M or F" (see Appendix B) was designed to have the subjects scale each item by answering with agree (1), no opinion (2), or disagree (3). This questionnaire was given to 200 introductory and educational psychology students (100 males and 100 females). The requirements for answering this questionnaire were the same as those for the previous questionnaire. The directions for this questionnaire were:

Please think of your closest opposite sex friend with whom you have a non-romantic, non-sexual or "platonic" friendship. Then, answer the following items on your questionnaire in terms of this particular individual. Please fill out the form completely. Do not mention your name or the name of your friend.

A factor analysis was run on the ratings of the subjects on the items. Separately for each sex, factors were extracted by means of the principal components method and rotated orthogonally to the varimax solution (Lindem, 1970). Items which correlated less than .30 with each particular factor were discarded (see Appendix C). However, only those items which correlated .50 or more with a particular factor were used for interpreting the factor.

TABLE 1  
BASIC FACTORS OF THE MALE AND FEMALE  
PLATONIC RELATIONSHIP

Factor	<u>Males</u>
1	My relationship with my platonic friend could change to a romantic relationship.
2	Much of our conversation concerns romantic dating situations we have with others.
3	The platonic relationship is at least as important to me as any romantic relationship or same sex friendship.
4	It is not my doing that is keeping the relationship a platonic one.
5	The friendship is important as it is because there is the freedom to talk about almost anything.
6	I give more to the relationship than my friend does.
7	My platonic friend is a confidant in whom I trust.
8	The relationship is easier to maintain than a romantic one because I have no fears of being honest with my friend and no fears of the constraint of the romantic relationship.
9	My friend is physically and socially attractive to me.
10	While our conversations are good because they are free and open, maintaining the relationship does not boost my ego concerning my feelings of masculinity.

TABLE 1--Continued

Factor	<u>Females</u>
1	My relationship with my platonic friend could change to a romantic relationship.
2	The platonic relationship is at least as important to me as any romantic relationship or same sex friendship.
3	The friendship is as important as it is because of the freedom to talk about almost anything.
4	The trust and openness in our communication with each other is an important part of the relationship, and I would seek this with a future marriage partner.
5	The respect that we have in our relationship causes us to want to spend time together.
6	Much of our conversation concerns the matter of sex and other personal situations of mine where he is not involved.
7	He is attractive to me as a person but not as a potential sex partner.
8	I give more to the relationship than my friend does.
9	The openness of our conversations is not the only aspect of our relationship. The relationship is also important because we care about each other.
10	While my platonic friend is an important friend, he does not replace the importance of having either a good romantic relationship or same sex friendships or both.

As shown in Table 1, the following six factors obtained were the same for both sexes:

1. There is a potential for a change in the relationship from a "platonic" to a "romantic" one.
2. Much of the conversation involved in a "platonic" opposite sex friendship concerns dating, sex and other personal matters.

3. The relationship is at least as important as any romantic relationship or same sex friendship.

4. There is freedom in the relationship to talk about almost anything.

5. The "platonic" opposite sex friend is a trusted confidant.

6. Both males and females feel they are giving more to the relationship than their friend is.

The following factors were found for males but not females:

1. It is not the males who are keeping the relationship "platonic".

2. For males, the relationship is easier to maintain than a "romantic" one.

3. The male finds the friend physically and socially attractive.

4. The male does not receive a boosting of his ego concerning his feelings of masculinity from the relationship.

The following factors were found for females but not males:

1. The female stresses mutual trust and respect as an important aspect of the relationship.

2. The females find the friend socially but not physically attractive.

3. The females see the relationship as important because of mutual concern and caring.

4. The females do not see the friend replacing a good same sex or romantic relationship.

In describing the friendship, the males seem to focus on the "platonic" friend as an object while the females focus on the overall



relationship. The correlation for items with their respective factors was from .30 to .84.

To summarize briefly, one thousand undergraduate students at the University of North Dakota participated in the study by Guinsburg (1970a), 200 in Guinsburg (1970b), and 200 in Guinsburg (1970c) who described their close "platonic" opposite sex friendship. Thus, this relationship seems to be an important one for young adults. A "platonic" opposite sex friendship scale was generated for each sex, but this scale lacked validation because of the use of only subjects describing "close platonic" and "close romantic" opposite sex relationships. There is a need for a variety of subjects describing a variety of heterosexual relationships of varying intensities of closeness. Also, there was a lack of an outside criterion for demonstrating validity of the scale items. Thus, there were no separate questions or items for characterizing the kind of relationship the opposite sex friendship scale items were being answered about.

#### Statement of the Problem

This study was concerned with the specification and operationalization of variables connected with the "platonic" and "romantic" heterosexual relationships separately for each sex. It was hoped that the study would allow for the determination of variables important to the different forms of "platonic" and "romantic" relationships, ranging from "close" relationships to "distant" relationships. Also, an attempt was made to avoid the mistakes that were made in previous studies of interpersonal attraction. There was no use of personality

measures to determine the relevant variables of heterosexual relationships, and the validation procedure utilized both external validation criteria and a subject population encompassing different sorts of heterosexual relationships. With the above in mind, the following methodology was followed: (1) Each subject was asked to describe a particular type of heterosexual relationship. In order to gain variability in the description of heterosexual relationships, eight different types of heterosexual relationships were asked for, including "close platonic," "close romantic," "somewhat close platonic," "somewhat close romantic," "somewhat distant platonic," "somewhat distant romantic," "distant platonic" and "distant romantic." It was arranged so that there would be an equal number of subjects for each sex describing each type of heterosexual relationship. (2) In order to obtain outside validation criteria about each of the relationships being described, a "Validation Index Questionnaire" was created (see Appendix D). Each subject indicated on this questionnaire, using Likert type scaling responses, descriptive information about the relationship he was asked to describe. This information concerned the type of relationship, the intensity of the relationship, the amount of satisfaction gained from it, the frequency of contact among the two members, and the kinds of activities involved in the relationship and their frequency of occurrence. (3) Also, as part of our outside validation criteria, Wright's (1971) "Acquaintance Description Form" (see Appendix E) was used. This would allow the subjects to describe further their heterosexual relationship in terms of items found to be relevant to same sex friendships. (4) The subjects were asked to fill

out the "Opposite Sex Friendship Questionnaire: Form M or F" created for the study of Guinsburg (1970c) in terms of the heterosexual relationship they were asked to describe. This allowed for the scaling of the items of the opposite sex friendship scale by a population describing eight types of heterosexual relationships. Thus, there was greater variability in responding to the questionnaire, which is necessary for true validation. The absence of sufficient variability in subjects was one of the possible shortcomings that Wright (1968) found in the research of Izard (1960a, b) and others. (5) In order to ascertain whether there were continuous distributions of responses to the items of the "Validation Index", "Acquaintance Description Form" and the "Opposite Sex Friendship Questionnaire", a frequency distribution of those responses was run separately for each sex. This procedure was necessary because of the later use of factor analysis requiring continuous variables. (6) Then, for each sex, subjects were divided into two groups. The first group consisted of subjects who indicated that they were describing a "platonic" or "semi-platonic" relationship, and the second group consisted of subjects who were describing "romantic" or "semi-romantic" relationships. Separately for each sex a factor analysis was run on each of the two groups of subject descriptions dealing with either "romantic" or "platonic" relationships. (7) For each sex, factors were interpreted for both the "platonic" and the "romantic" groups. Then comparisons were made between the factors of the "romantic" and the "platonic" group for males and for females. Also, comparisons were made between males and females concerning the "platonic" and the "romantic" groups.

With the use of this procedure, the following results were expected:

1. There would be a production of interpretable factors that would allow for the differentiation of the "platonic" heterosexual relationship from the "romantic" heterosexual relationship separately for each sex.
2. There would be a production of factors that would allow for the differentiation of the male versus the female viewpoint concerning the "platonic" and "romantic" relationship.
3. The various components of "platonic" and "romantic" relationships that would be revealed in this research could be useful in evaluating findings from past research in this area.

With the knowledge of the basic factors for "platonic" and "romantic" relationships, one could investigate these relationships in subsequent studies by individually examining the various factors. From studying the factors dealing with the emotional components in "romantic" relationships, one could determine why certain persons become romantically involved and others do not. Also, in examining the factors that are similar for both "platonic" and "romantic" relationships, one could assess whether success in establishing better "romantic" relationships is predicated on experiencing "platonic" relationships first. Finally, factors which differentiate the male and the female viewpoint toward the "romantic" relationship might be studied in terms of their effect on marital difficulties. Thus, there should be a sizeable amount of research possibilities generated from this study because of the important grasp given to the various parameters of these relationships.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD

#### Subjects

Three hundred and twenty subjects (160 males and 160 females) were asked to participate in a study concerning heterosexual relationships. These subjects were volunteers from undergraduate psychology courses at the University of North Dakota. Subjects were asked to report for the study in same sex pairs who would be acquainted for more than eighteen months and who knew each other quite well.

#### Procedure

When the subjects reported to the experimental room, they were told to sit together with their partner so that the different subject pairs could easily be identified. Each subject was given a copy of the "Validation Index" questionnaire and a separate set of written instructions. The written instructions with phrases omitted where instructions varied were as follows:

Please give your partner the name of a person other than yourself to describe using the "Validation Index." This should be a person of the opposite sex, and someone with whom your partner has a . . . . .

Do not tell your partner what kind of person this individual is supposed to be; simply give him (her) the name of someone you feel fits the instructions. Do this by writing the name of the individual on the top of the "Validation Index" questionnaire, then hand the questionnaire to your partner. Your partner has been asked to give you the name of an individual to describe. In all probability, his (her) instructions are different from yours.

It will be best if you do not try to figure out the instructions; just fill out the "Validation Index" questionnaire about the individual you are describing as well as you can.

Each subject was asked to give the name of an individual that his friend had a heterosexual relationship with in accord with one of eight possible heterosexual relationships. Thus, there were eight different sets of instructions so that descriptions would be obtained for the following types of heterosexual relationships: (A) a close "platonic" heterosexual relationship (a close relationship with no overt sexual or romantic involvement), (B) a close "romantic" heterosexual relationship (a close relationship with sexual and romantic aspects), (C) a somewhat close "platonic" heterosexual relationship (a somewhat close relationship with no overt sexual or romantic involvement), (D) a somewhat close "romantic" heterosexual relationship (a somewhat close relationship with sexual and romantic aspects), (E) a somewhat distant "platonic" heterosexual relationship (a somewhat distant relationship with no overt sexual or romantic involvement), (F) a somewhat distant "romantic" heterosexual relationship (a somewhat distant relationship with sexual and romantic aspects), (G) a distant "platonic" heterosexual relationship (a distant platonic relationship with no overt sexual or romantic involvement), and (H) a distant "romantic" heterosexual relationship (a distant relationship with sexual and romantic aspects). Each set of instructions was paired with every other set of instructions, but no situation was allowed where both members of a pair received the same set of instructions.

For subjects filling out the "Validation Index," the following instructions were given:

Please think about the individual you have been asked to describe. Then answer the items on the questionnaire in terms of this individual. Please fill out the form completely and respond with only one answer to each item. Only mention your social security number, not your name.

Then these same subjects were asked to fill out the "Opposite Sex Friendship Questionnaire: Form M or F" concerning the same individual. This is the same questionnaire utilized in a previous study by Guinsburg (1970c) although the title of it was omitted for obvious reasons. The following directions were given:

Please think of the same individual about whom you answered the previous questionnaire. Then, answer the following items on your questionnaire (either agree, disagree, or no opinion) in terms of that particular individual. Please fill out the form completely. Only mention your social security number, not your name.

Finally, these same subjects were asked to fill out the "Acquaintance Description Form" concerning the individual they had already described twice before. The "Acquaintance Description Form" is an instrument devised by Wright (1971). It was designed to measure the following dimensions of same sex friendships: (1) Voluntary Interdependence as a criterion of friendship ("the degree to which the plans, activities, and decisions of one of the acquaintances are contingent upon those of the other when both members of the pair are free to exercise a certain amount of choice"); (2) a Difficult-to-Maintain dimension ("the degree of difficulty two friends have in maintaining the relationship"); (3) a Stimulation Value dimension ("the degree to which one person sees another as interesting and imaginative"); (4) a Utility Value

dimension ("the degree to which the subject sees another person as cooperative, helpful"); (5) an Ego Support Value dimension ("the degree to which the subject sees another person as encouraging, supportive, non-threatening, and, in general capable of helping the subject feel more comfortable"); and (6) the Person-qua-Person Variable (seeing an individual as "unique, genuine, and irreplaceable in the relationship"). A seventh dimension called General Favorability ("a correction factor" necessitated by "a global tendency to make favorable responses to one's better friends") is also measured. The following instructions were given:

Please think of the same individual about whom you answered the previous questionnaires. Then, answer the following items on your questionnaire in terms of that individual. Please fill out the form completely. Only mention your social security number, not your name.



## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Treatment of the Data

Responses were obtained from 160 males and 160 females for the twenty-two "Validation Index" items, the fifty "Opposite Sex Friendship Questionnaire" items, and the seventy "Acquaintance Description Form" (ADF) items. Males and females responded separately about one of eight possible heterosexual relationships. After the data were collected, the seventy items of the "Acquaintance Description Form" were reduced to seven scaled scores using the method devised by Wright (1969). Thus, the responses to seventy-nine variables--seventy-two questionnaire items and seven ADF scores--were used for further analyses.

In order to ascertain whether there were monotonic and continuous distributions for these items, a frequency distribution of responses to each item was compiled separately for each sex. Each of the seventy-nine frequency distributions was examined for continuous trends. A visual examination indicated that seventy-eight variables showed the continuous distributions necessary for the use of factor analyses. The variable which did not show a simple distribution referred to the duration of time of the relationship. The distribution was positively skewed for the "platonic" relationship for females. Hence, separately for each sex, a Median Test was run

combining this item with the first item of the "Validation Index" dealing with the type of relationship ("platonic," "semi-platonic," "neutral," "semi-romantic," and "romantic"). The results for females indicated that there was a significant monotonic relationship ( $p < .02$ ) between the type of relationship and the duration of time it had been going on. That is, "platonic" and "semi-platonic" relationships seem to have been running proportionately longer intervals of time for females than were "romantic" and "semi-romantic" relationships. No significant monotonic relationship was found for males. This item was retained in the factor analyses.

Then, for each sex, subjects were divided into two groups. The first group consisted of twenty-five male and forty-five female subjects who indicated that they were describing a "platonic" and "semi-platonic" relationship, and the second group consisted of eighty-eight male and sixty-six female subjects who were describing "romantic" and "semi-romantic" relationships. The subject descriptions of neutral relationships were discarded. Although the methodology was designed to yield an equal number of "romantic" and "platonic" subject descriptions, this was not the result. Thus for males, there were eighty-eight descriptions of "romantic" type relationships and twenty-five descriptions of "platonic" relationships. For females, there were sixty-five descriptions of "romantic" type relationships and forty-five descriptions of "platonic" relationships.

A factor analysis was run separately for each sex on each of the two groups of subject descriptions dealing with either "romantic" or "platonic" relationships. Factors were extracted by means of the

principal components method and rotated orthogonally to the varimax solution (Lindem, 1970). Items which correlated less than .30 with each particular factor were discarded (see Appendix F). However, only those items that correlated .50 or more with a particular factor were used in interpreting that factor.

Comparison of the "Platonic" Heterosexual Relationship with  
the "Romantic" Heterosexual Relationship for Males

The factors concerning "platonic" and "romantic" relationships for males are listed in Table 2. The factor analyses actually produced twenty factors for "platonic" relationships which accounted for ninety-seven percent of the variance and twenty-three factors for "romantic" relationships which accounted for ninety-seven percent of the variance. Any factor accounting for less than three percent of the variance was not interpreted for comparison purposes but can be found in Appendix F. As shown in Table 2, the following aspects of male heterosexual relationships were found for both the "romantic" and "platonic" groups.

1. An important aspect of both relationships involved "dating activities" although it is more important for the "platonic" group.
2. The girl friend is seen as being physically attractive.
3. The girl friend is seen as being genuine and unique.
4. The girl friend is taken into consideration when plans, activities, or decisions are made.

The following components were found for "romantic" but not for "platonic" relationships:

TABLE 2

BASIC FACTORS OF THE PLATONIC AND ROMANTIC  
HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS FOR MALES

Factor	Percent of Variance Accounted For	
<u>Platonic Relationships</u>		
1	20%	Dating activities. Some of the important activities for serious and casual dating include going to parties together, exchanging letters, studying together, watching sports, and going for walks.
2	9%	Not emotionally comforting. The platonic girl friend does not give much emotional support.
3	8%	Trust. The relationship is easy to maintain because there is trust and relaxation involved.
4	7%	Physical attraction. The platonic girl friend is found to be physically attractive.
5	6%	Imaginative and genuine. The platonic girl friend is found to be interesting, imaginative, genuine and unique.
6	6%	Cooperative. The platonic girl friend is found to be cooperative and helpful.
7	6%	Importance of best male friend. The platonic girl friend is not easier to talk to than the best male friend.
8	5%	Role playing. Games which are often found in romantic relationships are also found in platonic relationships.
9	5%	Common interests. They share common interests.
10	4%	Talk about sexual matters. Platonic couples talk about sex and have a brother-sister type relationship.
11	3%	Importance of current romantic relationship. The current romantic relationship is more important than the current platonic relationship.
12	3%	Voluntary interdependence and encouragement. Platonic couples take each other into

TABLE 2--Continued

Factor	Percent of Variance Accounted For	
<u>Platonic Relationships</u>		
		consideration for plans and activities, and encourage and support one another.
13	3%	Giving of sympathy and confidence. The platonic girl friend gives sympathy and instills confidence in the male.
14	3%	Difficulty of maintenance. There is some difficulty in maintaining the platonic heterosexual relationship.
<u>Romantic Relationships</u>		
1	18%	Emotional comfort. The romantic girl friend provides emotional comfort.
2	7%	Dating activities. Some of the important activities for serious and casual dating include watching movies, going to parties, going for automobile drives, going for walks, and talking on the telephone.
3	5%	Physical attraction. The romantic girl friend is found to be physically attractive.
4	4%	Openness of communication. Romantic couples can talk about things openly and freely.
5	4%	Importance of platonic relationship. The current romantic relationship is not more important than the current platonic relationship.
6	4%	Honesty. There is no phoniness in the relationship.
7	3%	Lack of imagination and cooperation. The romantic girl friend is not seen as imaginative or cooperative.
8	3%	Good listener. The romantic girl friend is seen as open minded and good at listening.
9	3%	Voluntary interdependence and genuine. Romantic couples take each other into consideration for plans and activities, and the friend is seen as being genuine and unique.
10	3%	Play in sports. They play in sports together.

1. The most important aspect for "romantic" relationships is the emotional comfort received from the girl friend.
2. "Romantic" couples can talk about things openly and freely.
3. The "romantic" heterosexual relationship is seen as no more important than the "platonic" relationship.
4. There is no phoniness in the "romantic" relationship.
5. The "romantic" girl friend is not seen as imaginative or cooperative.
6. The "romantic" girl friend is a good listener.
7. "Romantic" couples play in sports together.

The following components were found in "platonic" but not in "romantic" relationships:

1. Dating activities are the most important aspect of the relationship.
2. The girl friend does not give emotional comfort.
3. The relationship involves trust.
4. The girl friend is seen as imaginative.
5. The girl friend is seen as cooperative.
6. There are games (artificial role playing) involved in the relationship.
7. The best male friend is seen as more important than the "platonic" girl friend.
8. "Platonic" couples share common interests.
9. "Platonic" couples talk about sex a great deal.
10. The "platonic" relationship is seen as less important than the current "romantic" relationship.

11. The "platonic" girl friend is seen as supportive.
12. The "platonic" girl friend is sympathetic and instills confidence.
13. The "platonic" relationship is more difficult to maintain.

Thus, males saw both "platonic" and "romantic" relationships as important for dating activities because the girl is physically attractive and genuine as a person. However, males view the "platonic" relationship more in terms of its utility value than they do the "romantic" relationship where emotions are involved.

Comparison of the "Platonic" Heterosexual Relationship  
with "Romantic" Heterosexual Relationship for Females

The factors concerning "platonic" and "romantic" relationships for females are listed in Table 3. The factor analyses for females produced fourteen factors for "platonic" relationships accounting for eighty-six percent of the variance and twenty factors for "romantic" relationships accounting for eighty-one percent of the variance. Any factor accounting for less than three percent of the variance was not interpreted but can be found in Appendix F. The following aspects of female heterosexual relationships were found for both the "romantic" and "platonic" groups.

1. Communication plays an important part in both relationships but is stressed more in "platonic" relationships.
2. The boy friend is seen as imaginative and interesting.
3. Watching sports events together is an important activity for both groups.

TABLE 3

BASIC FACTORS OF THE PLATONIC AND ROMANTIC  
HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS FOR FEMALES

Factor	Percent of Variance Accounted For	
<u>Platonic Relationships</u>		
1	45%	Openness of communication. For platonic couples, there is ease, openness, and frequency of communication.
2	10%	Emotional support. The platonic boy friend is important for emotional support.
3	6%	Relationship no longer exists. Many of the platonic relationships described do not exist at this time.
4	4%	Studying together. Platonic couples study together often, as against going to parties together or going for walks.
5	3%	Lack of sexual attraction. For platonic couples there are no sexual feelings or attraction for each other.
6	3%	Imaginative and interesting. The platonic boy friend is seen as interesting and imaginative.
7	3%	Watching sports together. For platonic couples, an important dating activity is watching sporting events together.
<u>Romantic Relationships</u>		
1	29%	Voluntary interdependence and genuine. Romantic couples take each other into consideration for plans and activities, and the boy friend is seen as genuine and unique.
2	7%	Most important romantic relationship. The relationship being described is the most important romantic relationship for the female.
3	5%	Importance of communication. For romantic couples, most of the important dating activities involve some sort of interpersonal communication.



TABLE 3--Continued

Factor	Percent of Variance Accounted For	
<u>Romantic Relationships</u>		
4	4%	Non-communicative joint activities. Non-communicative activities for romantic couples include studying and eating together, watching movies and watching sports events.
5	4%	Useful, encouraging and imaginative. The romantic boy friend is seen as useful, encouraging and imaginative.
6	3%	Talking on the telephone. Romantic couples do a lot of talking on the telephone rather than going to dances.
7	3%	Age of subject and length of relationship. For romantic couples there is a positive relationship between the age of the subject and the length of time the relationship was going on.
8	3%	Female in control. The female sees herself in control of the romantic relationship by being responsible for the relationship being "romantic".

The following components were found in "romantic" but not in "platonic" relationships:

1. The most important aspects of "romantic" relationships are the taking of each other into consideration for activities and plans, and the seeing of the boy friend as unique and genuine.
2. The boy friend is seen as cooperative and supportive.
3. "Romantic" couples talk a good deal on the telephone.
4. For "romantic" couples, the older the female partner is, the longer the relationship seems to have been going on.

5. The female is in control of the relationship being a "romantic" one.

The following components were found in the "platonic" relationship but not the "romantic" relationship:

1. The ease, openness, and frequency of communication is the most important aspect of the relationship and accounts for more variance than all the other factors for the relationship combined.
2. The boy friend gives emotional support.
3. Many of the "platonic" relationships described no longer exist.
4. "Platonic" couples study together a great deal.
5. There is no sexual attraction involved.

Thus, females saw both the "platonic" and "romantic" relationships as important for communication. However, females experience an intense emotional involvement in the "romantic" relationship that separates it from the "platonic" relationship which is important for the verbal discussion of personal problems and feelings.

#### Comparison of the "Platonic" Heterosexual Relationships for Males and Females

As shown in Table 4, the following aspects of "platonic" heterosexual relationships were found for both the males and the females.

1. The friend is seen as interesting and imaginative.
2. The friend is seen as supportive and encouraging, although this is stressed more by females.

The following components were found for males but not females:

TABLE 4

BASIC FACTORS OF THE PLATONIC HETEROSEXUAL  
RELATIONSHIPS FOR MALES AND FEMALES

Factor	Percent of Variance Accounted For	
<u>Males</u>		
1	20%	Dating activities
2	9%	Not emotionally comforting
3	8%	Trust
4	7%	Physical attraction
5	6%	Imaginative and genuine
6	6%	Cooperation
7	6%	Importance of best male friend
8	5%	Role playing
9	5%	Common interests
10	4%	Talk about sexual matters
11	4%	Importance of current romantic relationship
12	3%	Voluntary interdependence and encouragement
13	3%	Giving of sympathy and confidence
14	3%	Difficulty of maintenance
<u>Females</u>		
1	45%	Openness of communication
2	10%	Emotional support
3	6%	Relationship no longer existing
4	4%	Studying together
5	3%	Lack of sexual attraction
6	3%	Imaginative and interesting
7	3%	Watch sports together

1. The most important aspect of the "platonic" relationship is the dating activities.

2. The girl friend does not give emotional comfort.
3. There is trust involved in the relationship.
4. The girl friend is seen as physically attractive.
5. The girl friend is seen as genuine and unique.
6. The girl friend is seen as cooperative and helpful.
7. The best male friend is seen as more important than the girl friend.
8. There are games involved in the platonic relationship.
9. There are common interests with the girl friend.
10. Males talk about sexual matters with the girl friend.
11. Their current "romantic" relationship is more important.
12. They take each other into consideration for plans and activities.
13. The girl friend is sympathetic and gives confidence.
14. The relationship is difficult to maintain.

The following components were found for females but not for males:

1. The ease, openness, and frequency of communication is the most important aspect of the relationship and accounts for more variance than all the other factors of the relationship combined.
2. Many of the platonic relationships described no longer exist.
3. They study together a great deal.
4. There is no sexual attraction or feelings for each other in the relationship.
5. They watch sporting events together.

Thus, males and females saw the "platonic" relationship as satisfying and beneficial. However, males saw the "platonic" girl

friend as a good date while females saw the "platonic" boy friend as a good listener and adviser for personal problems.

Comparison of the "Romantic" Heterosexual  
Relationship for Males and Females

Table 5 shows that the following aspects of "romantic" heterosexual relationships were found for both the males and the females.

1. The friend is taken into consideration when making plans and decisions and is seen as genuine and unique. This aspect is seen as more important by females.
2. The "romantic" relationship is important for dating activities.
3. Communication is an important part of the relationship.

The following components were found for males and not for females:

1. The girl friend gives emotional comfort.
2. The girl friend is seen as physically attractive.
3. The current "platonic" relationship is seen to be as important as the current "romantic" relationship.
4. There is honesty in the relationship.
5. The girl friend lacks imagination and usefulness.
6. The girl friend is a good listener.
7. They play in sports together.

The following components were found for females and not males:

1. This "romantic" relationship is more important than all other heterosexual relationships.
2. The boy friend is seen as cooperative, imaginative and supportive.

TABLE 5

BASIC FACTORS OF THE ROMANTIC HETEROSEXUAL  
RELATIONSHIP FOR MALES AND FEMALES

Factor	Percent of Variance Accounted For	
<u>Males</u>		
1	18%	Emotional comfort
2	7%	Dating activities
3	5%	Physical attraction
4	4%	Openness of communication
5	4%	Importance of platonic relationship
6	4%	Honesty
7	3%	Lack of imagination and cooperation
8	3%	Good listener
9	3%	Voluntary interdependence and genuineness
10	3%	Play in sports
<u>Females</u>		
1	29%	Voluntary interdependence and genuineness
2	7%	Most important romantic relationship
3	5%	Importance of communication
4	4%	Non-communicative joint activities
5	4%	Useful, encouraging and imaginative
6	3%	Talking on the telephone
7	3%	Age of subject and length of relationship
8	3%	Female in control

3. They talk on the telephone.

4. The older the participants in the relationship, the longer it has been going on.

5. The female controls the relationship in such a way that it is a "romantic" one.

Thus, the "romantic" friend was seen by males and females as an important dating partner for many activities and with whom communication is often and frequent. However, males focused on the girl friend rather than the relationship itself, unlike females. Also, males did not see themselves as being as intellectually and emotionally involved as females in the relationship.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

#### Findings

##### The Continuity of Variables in Platonic and Romantic Relationships

In examining the data for males and females, all but one of the dimensions (intervals of time the relationships had been going on) used in the describing of "platonic" and "romantic" relationships were shown to be monotonically continuous. With the knowledge that the data were continuously distributed, four separate factor analyses were run so that the following could be compared: First, the male viewpoint of "platonic" heterosexual relationships versus their viewpoint of "romantic" heterosexual relationships; second, the female viewpoint of "platonic" heterosexual relationships versus their viewpoint of "romantic" heterosexual relationships; third, the male viewpoint versus the female viewpoint of "platonic" heterosexual relationships; and finally, the male viewpoint versus the female viewpoint of "romantic" heterosexual relationships. It is interesting to note that an attempt was made to get an equal number of descriptions for a variety of heterosexual relationships, including the "platonic," the "semi-platonic," the "semi-romantic," and the "romantic." Yet the number of "romantic" and "semi-romantic" subject descriptions was greater than the "platonic" and "semi-platonic" ones. What appears to be the case



is that the close same sex friend does not always know the exact nature of his close friend's heterosexual relationship. This was especially true for males. It is also possible that although the term "platonic" was defined for all subjects, it was still confusing for some.

Comparison of the "Platonic" Heterosexual Relationship with the "Romantic" Heterosexual Relationship for Males

Males generally see both the "platonic" and "romantic" relationships as important vehicles for companionship in various dating activities and plans where male companionship would be inappropriate. Also, in both these relationships, the girl friend is described as being special compared to other girls they know, because she is physically attractive and genuine as a person.

The emotional comfort received by the male from the "romantic" girl friend seems to distinguish the "romantic" relationship the most from the "platonic" one. By being a good listener and allowing for open and honest conversation, the "romantic" girl friend seems to promote this comfort. Males do not necessarily see the "romantic" relationship as more important, but they do like the honesty and lack of phoniness which exists because they are able to express natural sexual feelings more freely.

The "platonic" relationship seems to have a more utilitarian character than the "romantic" relationship. This impression is indicated by males describing the "platonic" girl friend as a "good"

casual date who is intellectually stimulating, cooperative, supportive, sympathetic, and trustworthy. Although common interests are also shared with the "platonic" girl friend, the non-sexual nature of the "platonic" relationship is seen as a type of game playing. This aspect of "artificiality" in the relationship is said to make it difficult to maintain and not a good replacement for a close same sex or "romantic" heterosexual relationship.

Comparison of the "Platonic" Heterosexual  
Relationship with the "Romantic"  
Heterosexual Relationship  
for Females

Females generally see the "platonic" and "romantic" heterosexual relationships as important because of the frequency and openness of communication with the boy friend. This vehicle of communication allows for an emotional closeness between the friends, which the female enjoys. Also, the boy friend is seen as someone who is intellectually stimulating and with whom she can enjoy casual dating activities.

There seems to be considerable more emotional involvement on the part of the female with the boy friend in "romantic" heterosexual relationships. The female takes the boy friend into consideration when making any plans or decisions, and spends a good deal of time with him. Even when the boy friend is not physically available, the female spends a good deal of time talking to him on the phone. Also, the "romantic" boy friend is admired for his cooperative, supportive, and genuine qualities. Finally, it should be noted that the female

sees herself as responsible for this relationship being a "romantic" one. Males do not disagree with this idea.

The ease, openness, and frequency of communication with the boy friend is the most important aspect of "platonic" heterosexual relationships for the female. The lack of sexual attraction or feelings for the boy friend allows the female to share verbally certain feelings and problems concerning sexual and personal matters with him. Thus, the "platonic" relationship allows the female a special kind of interpersonal communication which gives her emotional support and advice when she needs it. Quite often, for females, the "platonic" relationship will evolve out of an academic or work situation where the friends study and work together. Females see the "platonic" relationship as less important than the "romantic" one, possibly because in many cases the "platonic" relationship is stated to be no longer existing. In the various relationships described by females, there was a higher proportion of "platonic" rather than "romantic" relationships that were stated to have ended previous to this study. This finding may have been due to the subject population that was sampled.

#### Comparison of the "Platonic" Heterosexual Relationship for Males and Females

Both males and females see the "platonic" heterosexual relationship as a beneficial and satisfying relationship. For males, the girl friend is a "good" casual date, and for females, the boy friend is a "good" listener and adviser for personal problems. Also, the

"platonic" friend is seen by males and females as intellectually stimulating and supportive.

Males differ from females in seeing the "platonic" girl friend as important for casual dating. They see the girl friend as a useful companion for dating activities where a same sex friend would not be appropriate. However, they attach no emotional importance to the relationship even though they are ambivalent as to whether the "romantic" or "platonic" girl friend is more important to them. Males see the "platonic" relationship as emotionally artificial possibly because they describe a lack of sexual expression and emotional involvement in the relationship.

Females like the opportunity that the "platonic" heterosexual relationship provides for a special variety of communication with the friend which deals with dating, personal, and sexual matters. They feel more at ease in talking with the "platonic" boy friend about personal matters because the emotional involvement is less than for a "romantic" boy friend and is non-sexual. This relationship is not as important for females as the "romantic" one is.

#### Comparison of the "Romantic" Heterosexual Relationship for Males and Females

Males and females see the "romantic" heterosexual friend as the important dating partner who is often taken into consideration when plans and activities are accomplished. Also, they both stress the aspect of open and frequent communication in the relationship as being important.

However, males differ from females in their overall view of the relationship. The male views the "romantic" heterosexual relationship more in terms of the objective aspects. The girl friend is viewed as an emotionally comforting, physically attractive, imaginative and helpful object. Males do not mention much about their emotional involvement in the relationship. They care about and respect the "romantic" girl friend, but they do not talk about a total emotional involvement or commitment in the relationship.

Females focus on their total emotional involvement in the "romantic" heterosexual relationship. The boy friend is taken into consideration for most activities, plans, and decisions by the female. Her stress is on the emotional closeness and interaction involved in the relationship rather than just the boy friend as an object. Also, females see themselves as responsible for the "romantic" nature of this relationship, which males do not dispute.

#### Implications

The basic findings from this research have some interesting implications for future research concerning heterosexual relationships in the area of interpersonal attraction.

Although the present study was not designed to specifically examine the importance of personality needs to interpersonal attraction, the major tenets of need similarity and need complementarity were not given any support from the results of this study. Izard (1960a) stated that in order for two people to be attracted to one another, they would have to have similar personality needs. In

opposition to Izard, Winch (1955a) stated that a person high in one need would be attracted to someone high in the opposite need. Yet, the results of this study did not even hint that either need similarity or need complementarity was an important factor for "platonic" or "romantic" heterosexual relationships.

Newcomb (1956) proposed that attraction between individuals would be predictable from the similarity of their attitudes and values toward relevant and important objects. To the extent that attitudes and values are correlated with common interests, the results of this study somewhat supported the presence of similar attitudes and values for "platonic" and "romantic" relationships. This study did show that males felt that they held common interests with their "platonic" girl friends, and that females often found that their relationships with their "platonic" boy friends revolved around the common activity of studying for college courses. Thus, the present study supports indirectly the presence of similar attitudes and values in heterosexual relationships, because it found that males saw common interests and females saw common activities as important to the "platonic" heterosexual relationship. Although this study did not specifically test for similar attitudes and values, it was felt that if their presence in heterosexual relationships was as important as Newcomb stressed, the results of this study should have more strongly supported their importance.

The fact that the results of the present study show no support for the work of Izard (1960a) and Winch (1955a) and only slight support for Newcomb's (1956) research points to a major procedural

problem with most of the past research in the area of interpersonal attraction. The theorists and researchers of the need similarity, need complementarity, and attitude and value similarity approaches have never tried to investigate their hypotheses in terms of sex differences and have always treated the "romantic" relationship as the only heterosexual relationship. The treatment of "romantic" relationships as the sole heterosexual relationship for research is obviously a mistake since this study and Guinsburg (1970a, b, c) have shown the "platonic" heterosexual relationship to be a common and researchable relationship, which may have a definite influence on the forming of later "romantic" relationships. The present study has indicated that males and females are quite different in their approaches to the "platonic" and "romantic" heterosexual relationships. Males saw the "platonic" girl friend as useful for dating activities, and females saw the "platonic" boy friend as useful for communicating with about personal problems. Also, the males stress the qualities and characteristics of their "romantic" girl friends while the females stress their emotional involvement in the "romantic" relationship. Thus, male-female differences in interpersonal attraction are a viable research topic that past research has overlooked. This fact might account in part for the problems and inconsistencies of past research in this area.

Rubin (1969) did account for sex differences in developing a "love scale" for "romantic love" using the factor analysis approach of this study. He found for both sexes three basic "romantic love" components: a basic desire to be with the person as much as possible and

a dependency on the relationship continuing, a basic desire to do anything possible for the loved person, and feelings of possessiveness toward the loved person along with feelings of freedom to say anything to the person. The results of this study agree with some of Rubin's findings. Males and females did see the openness of communication as an important part of the "romantic" relationship. Also, females did indicate a need to be with the "romantic" boy friend as much as possible as well as an emotional dependency on the relationship. However, females did not state any predisposition to help the boy friend whenever possible, nor did they indicate possessiveness towards him. The males in this study did not agree with any of Rubin's findings beyond the factor of freedom of communication.

Possible reasons for the discrepancy between this research and that of Rubin's might be Rubin's desire to find the same basic "love" components for both sexes and his discarding of data dealing with "platonic" heterosexual relationships. Rubin researched his "love scale" separately for each sex, but in the final analysis of his results, seemed to "force" statistically his conclusions as applicable to both sexes. Also, Rubin did not bother to interpret data dealing with "platonic" relationships because he felt that attitudes toward same sex friends were more related to "romantic" relationships than were attitudes toward "platonic" opposite sex friends. In the present research, the opportunity to compare "romantic" relationships with "platonic" relationships was useful in getting a clearer interpretation of each one.



Finally, Lewis (1960), a scholar of English literature, stated some differences between "platonic" and "romantic" friendships which are somewhat similar to the results of this study. He stated that "platonic" friendship usually exists around some common activity without any emotional absorption of the friends in each other. However, "romantic" friends are absorbed emotionally in each other and their main focus of interest is the absorption itself. The findings of this study indicated that both males and females saw the "platonic" relationship as revolving around a common activity such as dating or talking without much emotional involvement occurring in the relationship. However, only females stated that they were completely emotionally absorbed in the "romantic" relationship with the boy friend. Males stated that the girl friend was emotionally comforting, but did not see themselves as totally involved emotionally in the relationship. Possibly, what might be occurring for males is a desire on their part to keep the freedom allowed by the emotional distance of "platonic" relationships and yet enjoy the emotional and sexual benefits of "romantic" relationships.

#### Conclusion and Future Studies

In summarizing the findings of this research, the following general conclusions may be drawn about heterosexual relationships.

1. Males and females recognize a "platonic" heterosexual relationship that is somewhat different from "romantic" heterosexual relationships. The basic difference seems to be the lack of emotional closeness and comfort in the "platonic" relationship which is usually

found in "romantic" relationships. This can probably be attributed to the stated lack of existence and expression of sexual and emotional feelings in the relationship. Males especially feel that the absence of sex in the "platonic" relationship makes it somewhat artificial.

2. Males and females recognize the importance of the "platonic" relationship for different reasons. Females enjoy the special kind of communication dealing with personal matters that the relationship allows. However, males enjoy most having the "platonic" girl friend as a casual dating companion who is readily available and also physically attractive, cooperative, and imaginative.

3. Females are definite about the "romantic" relationship being more important to them than the "platonic" one, while males are ambivalent on this issue.

4. Males and females focus on the "romantic" relationship from different viewpoints. The male focuses on the various qualities and characteristics of the "romantic" girl friend that he likes. Females stress the emotional involvement in the relationship and its importance to them.

5. There seems to be a different degree of emotional involvement in the "romantic" relationship for females and males. Males have strong positive feelings toward their "romantic" girl friend but do not admit to being emotionally "wrapped up" or completely emotionally dependent on the girl friend. However, females seem to be constantly involved emotionally with the boy friend. The boy friend is taken into consideration for almost all decisions, plans, and activities, and the relationship is put above almost everything in importance.

Interestingly enough, the female sees herself as controlling the "romantic" nature of the relationship, which might account for some of her willingness to be so committed to it.

Future research in this area might, first of all, look at the relationship of the "platonic" friendship to the "romantic" one. With the casual dating activities that the male describes and the active communication that the female talks about, there may be an active learning process about the opposite sex in the "platonic" relationship. If both males and females learn about members of the opposite sex and perhaps how to relate to them from "platonic" heterosexual relationships, then, it would be interesting to see how useful this relationship would be for establishing "successful" "romantic" relationships. This learning process might even affect the later success of the more permanent kind of "romantic" relationship known as marriage. Also, it might be wise to examine more closely the male-female differences in involvement and viewpoint toward the "romantic" relationship in terms of their effect on the marital relationship and marital difficulties. Although the subject population of this study consisted of unmarried college students, the results did show basic differences in the approach that males and females have toward the "romantic" relationship. If these differences could be shown to exist for older and married males and females, an understanding of them might provide an answer to this problem. Or perhaps, if males and females could be shown how each one differs in involvement and viewpoint toward the "romantic" relationship, this knowledge might alleviate tension in the marital situation.

The important key to future research in the area of interpersonal attraction is the attainment of operational definitions of the particular relationships that are to be studied and the avoidance of using personality measures to determine the relevant variables of the relationship. This is what this study attempted to do.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

## OPPOSITE SEX FRIENDSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

Think about your closest opposite sex platonic (nonsexual) friend. You should have known this platonic friend for at least six months. Please list 20 or more descriptive characteristics about your relationship with this person. For example, "My friend is important to me for talking about dating matters."

Please keep in mind the following:

- a. Why is this person a platonic friend?
- b. What makes this person different from your romantic partner?
- c. Do you ever foresee this relationship changing from a platonic to a romantic one?
- d. What benefits do you obtain from taking part in this relationship?
- e. How important is this relationship to you and why?
- f. How important is this relationship compared to your most important same sex friendship?

Remember: All this information will be kept confidential.

Just write down your age\_\_\_\_\_

sex\_\_\_\_\_

Married or Single\_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX B**



OPPOSITE SEX FRIENDSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE: FORM M

1. She is easy to talk to concerning my problems.
2. She provides emotional comfort when I need it.
3. She gives me advice on my dating problems.
4. We sometimes go out on casual dates.
5. We share common interests.
6. I find it easier to talk to her than girls with whom I have a romantic interest in.
7. I find her physically attractive.
8. I can confide in her about most things without worrying about her telling others.
9. I trust her.
10. I am relaxed when I am with her.
11. I feel happy when I am with her.
12. I can talk to her about the girls I date.
13. I can talk to her about sex.
14. She is open minded.
15. We can talk about things freely and openly.
16. She brightens my spirits.
17. She is fun to talk to and be with.
18. She helps me with my problems.

19. When she has a personal or dating problem, she will discuss it with me.
20. She is easy to be with because nothing sexual is expected or anticipated.
21. The relationship is easy to maintain because there is no reason to be phony with her.
22. She seems to understand me quite well.
23. She is almost always sympathetic concerning my problems and emotions.
24. She offers advice on matters concerning girls.
25. I do not believe our friendship can become romantic.
26. She is as important to me as friends of my own sex.
27. We respect each other.
28. When I am in a bad mood or tense, she can cheer me up.
29. I do not believe we could enjoy the relationship as much if it were romantic.
30. I can tell her things I could not tell my best male friend.
31. The relationship could change to a romantic relationship.
32. She is a good listener.
33. We can talk to each other about almost anything.
34. I like the relationship because we need and care about each other.
35. On some subjects, she is the only person I can talk to.
36. This platonic relationship is currently more important to me than my current romantic relationship.
37. She gives me confidence in myself.

38. I am more at ease with my platonic friend than with my romantic friend.
39. It is hard to discuss personal problems with a romantic friend.
40. I do not find her physically attractive.
41. The platonic relationship is more important to me than my closest same sex relationship.
42. My current romantic relationship is more important to me than my platonic relationship.
43. The relationship could not change because we know each other too well.
44. The relationship could not change to a romantic one because she has a romantic friend.
45. The relationship could not change because I have a romantic friend.
46. The relationship is easy to maintain because there are no games involved as in the case of many romantic relationships.
47. I am really responsible for the relationship being platonic.
48. She is really responsible for the relationship being platonic.
49. She has many of the qualities that I would want in a future marriage partner.
50. I have the same feelings for her as I would have for a sister.

OPPOSITE SEX FRIENDSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE: FORM F

1. We discuss highly personal matters.
2. He is very understanding toward my problems.
3. When I am depressed, I go to him for encouragement or consolation.
4. We can talk together on almost all matters.
5. He seems to be interested in what I have to say.
6. We can tell each other exactly how we feel without being embarrassed.
7. He keeps confidential, those things I tell him in private.
8. He usually gives me good advice to my problems.
9. I don't see us becoming romantic friends because we know each other too well.
10. If I am depressed, he can cheer me up.
11. We respect each other.
12. I can call him anytime of the day and I know he will be there to talk.
13. I can discuss things with him that I couldn't discuss with my best girl friend.
14. We have no sexual attraction for each other.
15. I feel that our relationship is as important as my relationship with my best girl friend.
16. If either of us wanted to do something important, but not alone, we could do it together and have a good time.

17. He might become a romantic partner because we can talk so easily together and we respect each other.
18. This platonic relationship is as important to me as my romantic relationship.
19. We are not wary of each other. We can talk about almost anything from dating problems to family problems.
20. We have common interests.
21. We have a mutual trust for each other.
22. We discuss sexual matters.
23. We sometimes go on casual dates together.
24. I often give him advice on his problems.
25. He is a good listener.
26. He is easy to talk to.
27. I can talk to him as easily as I can with my best girl friend.
28. We can discuss problems concerning our romantic dating partners.
29. He is fun to be with.
30. We discuss all subjects openly and freely.
31. I feel very relaxed with him.
32. We are completely honest with each other.
33. He has most of the qualities I want in a future marriage partner.
34. I don't see this relationship becoming romantic because we are too much alike.
35. Our relationship is important to us because we care about and need each other.
36. This relationship could not change because I have a romantic interest in someone else.

37. This relationship could not change because he has a romantic interest in someone else.
38. This relationship is easier to maintain than a romantic or same sex friendship because we do not play games, and emotions such as jealousy and envy are not involved.
39. I can talk more frankly and openly with him than I can with my romantic partner.
40. He is more important to me than my best girl friend.
41. We confide in each other.
42. He gives me confidence in myself.
43. It is me who is keeping this relationship a platonic one.
44. It is he who is keeping this relationship a platonic one.
45. He is concerned about me.
46. Our relationship will never become romantic because it would somehow ruin a perfect relationship.
47. I find him physically unattractive.
48. I have the same feelings for him as I would have for a brother.
49. I find him physically attractive.
50. He is less important to me than my best girl friend.

APPENDIX C

BASIC FACTORS OF PLATONIC HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS: 1970 DATA

Factor 1

Males

- |         |     |  |
|---------|-----|--|
| -.84379 | 25) | I do not believe our friendship can become romantic.                                   |
| .79644  | 31) | The relationship could change to a romantic relationship.                              |
| -.72045 | 43) | The relationship could not change because we know each other too well.                 |
| -.63981 | 44) | The relationship could not change to a romantic one because she has a romantic friend. |
| .43969  | 5)  | We share common interests.   |
| -.41299 | 50) | I have the same feelings for her as I would have for a sister.                         |
| -.40421 | 45) | The relationship could not change because I have a romantic friend.                    |
| .34585  | 34) | I like the relationship because we need and care about each other.                     |
| -.31275 | 40) | I do not find her physically attractive.   |

Factor 2

Males

- |         |     |   |
|---------|-----|---|
| .74262  | 24) | She offers advice on matters concerning girls.                          |
| .68180  | 3)  | She gives me advice on my dating problems.                              |
| .54221  | 12) | I can talk to her about the girls I date.                               |
| .50207  | 19) | When she has a personal or dating problem, she will discuss it with me. |
| -.39403 | 11) | I feel happy when I am with her.  |



Factor 3Males

- .75230 38) I am more at ease with my platonic friend than with my romantic friend.
- .65377 42) My current romantic relationship is more important to me than my platonic relationship.
- .58366 36) This platonic relationship is currently more important to me than my current romantic relationship.
- .57895 39) It is hard to discuss personal problems with a romantic friend.
- .53722 6) I find it easier to talk to her than girls with whom I have a romantic interest in.
- .51828 45) The relationship could not change because I have a romantic friend.
- .48215 41) The platonic relationship is more important to me than my closest same sex relationship.
- .36966 4) We sometimes go out on casual dates.
- .30717 49) She has many of the qualities that I would want in a future marriage partner.

Factor 4Males

- .68686 47) I am really responsible for the relationship being platonic.
- .59959 48) She is really responsible for the relationship being platonic.
- .54298 7) I find her physically attractive.
- .53484 17) She is fun to talk to and be with.
- .40790 35) On some subjects, she is the only person I can talk to.
- .39136 40) I do not find her physically attractive.
- .38436 11) I feel happy when I am with her.

Factor 5Males

- .62123 33) We can talk to each other about almost anything.
- .56376 26) She is as important to me as friends of my own sex.
- .49887 30) I can tell her things I could not tell my best friend.
- .46623 34) I like the relationship because we need and care about each other.
- .44938 16) She brightens my spirits.
- .41375 19) When she has a personal or dating problem, she will discuss it with me.
- .36420 28) When I am in a bad mood or tense, she can cheer me up.
- .34479 11) I feel happy when I am with her.
- .33471 35) On some subjects, she is the only person I can talk to.
- .31861 50) I have the same feelings for her as I would have for a sister.

Factor 6Males

- .59057 1) She is easy to talk to concerning my problems.
- .58215 2) She provides emotional comfort when I need it.
- .56114 32) She is a good listener.
- .52987 5) We share common interests.
- .51886 27) We respect each other.
- .43738 18) She helps me with my problems.
- .42284 23) She is almost always sympathetic concerning my problems and emotions.
- .41677 22) She seems to understand me quite well.

Factor 7Males

- .68761 8) I can confide in her about most things without worrying about her telling others.
- .67044 9) I trust her.
- .53166 15) We can talk about things freely and openly.
- .48205 14) She is open minded.
- .38758 18) She helps me with my problems.
- .34476 6) I find it easier to talk to her than girls with whom I have a romantic interest in.
- .33970 22) She seems to understand me quite well.
- .32295 19) When she has a personal or dating problem, she will discuss it with me.

Factor 8Males

- .74023 46) The relationship is easy to maintain because there are no games involved as in the case of many romantic relationships.
- .62855 20) She is easy to be with because nothing sexual is expected or anticipated.
- .54001 21) The relationship is easy to maintain because there is no reason to be phony with her.
- .50292 29) I do not believe we could enjoy the relationship as much if it were romantic.
- .35551 12) I can talk to her about the girls I date.

Factor 9Males

- .66323 40) I do not find her physically attractive.
- .60163 10) I am relaxed when I am with her.
- .56034 7) I find her physically attractive.
- .44903 16) She brightens my spirits.
- .32484 5) We share common interests.

Factor 10Males

- .58453 37) She gives me confidence in myself.
- .56478 13) I can talk to her about sex.
- .56306 49) She has many of the qualities that I would want in a future marriage partner.
- .39611 21) The relationship is easy to maintain because there is no reason to be phony with her.
- .37087 32) She is a good listener.
- .35539 35) On some subjects, she is the only person I can talk to.

Factor 1Females

- .83046 46) Our relationship will never become romantic because it would somehow ruin a perfect relationship.
- .75101 9) I don't see us becoming romantic friends because we know each other too well.
- .66565 36) This relationship could not change because I have a romantic interest in someone else.
- .65794 17) He might become a romantic partner because we can talk so easily together and we respect each other.
- .64950 14) We have no sexual attraction for each other.

Females

- .56580 37) This relationship could not change because he has a romantic interest in someone else.
- .55828 34) I don't see this relationship becoming romantic because we are too much alike.
- .55317 38) This relationship is easier to maintain than a romantic or same sex relationship because we do not play games, and emotions such as jealousy and envy are not involved.
- .44655 48) I have the same feelings that I would have for a brother.
- .40832 28) We can discuss problems concerning our romantic dating partners.
- .36746 23) We sometimes go on casual dates together.
- .35416 35) Our relationship is important to us because we care about and need each other.
- .30718 20) We have common interests.

Factor 2Females

- .67674 50) He is less important to me than my best girl friend.
- .64232 18) This platonic relationship is as important to me as my romantic relationship.
- .63084 13) I can discuss things with him that I couldn't discuss with my best girl friend.
- .59776 40) He is more important to me than my best girl friend.
- .47333 27) I can talk to him as easily as I can with my best girl friend.
- .45686 3) When I am depressed, I go to him for encouragement or consolation.
- .41503 33) He has most of the qualities I want in a future marriage partner.
- .38822 15) I feel that our relationship is as important as my relationship with my best girl friend.

Females

- .34319 39) I can talk more frankly and openly with him than I can with my romantic partner.
- .32134 30) We discuss all subjects openly and freely.
- .30708 1) We discuss highly personal matters.

Factor 3Females

- .69457 41) We confide in each other.
- .67441 24) I often give him advice on his problems.
- .52744 19) We are not wary of each other. We can talk about almost anything from dating problems to family problems.
- .44052 6) We can tell each other exactly how we feel without being embarrassed.
- .41550 31) I feel very relaxed with him.
- .39400 28) We can discuss problems concerning our romantic dating partners.
- .38940 43) It is me who is keeping this relationship a platonic one.
- .37764 30) We discuss all subjects openly and freely.
- .37209 27) I can talk to him as easily as I can with my best girl friend.

Factor 4Females

- .59604 8) He usually gives me good advice to my problems.
- .51593 33) He has most of the qualities I want in a future marriage partner.
- .48022 21) We have a mutual trust for each other.
- .47773 32) We are completely honest with each other.
- .42453 23) We sometimes go out on casual dates together.

Females

- .41834 26) He is easy to talk to.  
 .34260 20) We have common interests.

Factor 5Females

- .72039 11) We respect each other.  
 .69646 42) He gives me confidence in myself.  
 .50419 32) We are completely honest with each other.  
 .41852 16) If either of us wanted to do something important, but not alone, we could do it together and have a good time.  
 .36751 39) I can talk more frankly and openly with him than I can with my romantic partner.  
 .30981 25) He is a good listener.

Factor 6Females

- .77358 22) We discuss sexual matters.  
 .61790 4) We can talk together on almost all matters.  
 .57262 1) We discuss highly personal matters.  
 .41915 43) It is me who is keeping this relationship a platonic one.  
 .33076 30) We discuss all subjects openly and freely.  
 -.31258 44) It is he who is keeping this relationship a platonic one.

Factor 7Females

- .75096 49) I find him physically attractive.  
 .70822 47) I find him physically unattractive.

Females

- .34748 26) He is easy to talk to.
- .34141 48) I have the same feelings for him as I would have for a brother.
- .33748 14) We have no sexual attraction for each other.
- .31339 16) If either of us wanted to do something important, but not alone, we could do it together and have a good time.

Factor 8Females

- .74589 25) He is a good listener.
- .58794 31) I feel very relaxed with him.
- .55629 10) If I am depressed, he can cheer me up.
- .39030 21) We have a mutual trust for each other.

Factor 9Females

- .78529 45) He is concerned about me.
- .44112 35) Our relationship is important to us because we care about and need each other.
- .34827 44) It is he who is keeping this relationship a platonic one.
- .33474 13) I can discuss things with him that I couldn't discuss with my best girl friend.
- .30576 43) It is me who is keeping this relationship a platonic one.



Factor 10Females

- .62000 15) I feel that our relationship is as important as my relationship with my best girl friend.
- .56352 5) He seems to be interested in what I have to say.
- .50762 2) He is very understanding toward my problems.
- .35376 23) We sometimes go on casual dates together.
- .33213 37) This relationship could not change because he has a romantic interest in someone else.
- .32501 7) He keeps confidential, those things I tell him in private.
- .31846 36) This relationship could not change because I have a romantic interest in someone else.

APPENDIX D

VALIDATION INDEX

1. Please indicate the type of relationship you have or have had with the person you are describing.

Platonic	Semi-Platonic	Neutral	Semi-Romantic	Romantic
1	2	3	4	5

2. Please indicate how close you feel to the individual.

Close	Somewhat Close	Neutral	Somewhat Distant	Distant
1	2	3	4	5

3. Please indicate how often you see the individual now or have seen the individual in the past.

Every Day	Once a Week	Once a Month	Several Times a Year	Once a Year
1	2	3	4	5

4. Please indicate how satisfactory this relationship is for you.

Very Satisfying	Satisfying	Neutral	Unsatisfying	Very Unsatisfying
1	2	3	4	5

Please indicate how often you engage in or used to engage in the following activities with this individual:

5. Talking on the telephone

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

6. Exchanging letters

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

7. Sitting and talking

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

## 8. Eating together

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

## 9. Play in sports together

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

## 10. Watch sports together

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

## 11. Watching movies together

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

## 12. Studying together

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

## 13. Going for automobile drives together

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

## 14. Going for walks together

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

## 15. Going to dances together

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

## 16. Going to parties together

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

## 17. Casual dating

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

18. Serious dating

Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Once in a While	Never
1	2	3	4	5

19. Please indicate the approximate length of time this relationship has been going on, or how long it did go on.

---

20. If this relationship no longer exists, please indicate how long it has been since it ended.

---

21. Please indicate the following:

A. Your Social Security Number \_\_\_\_\_

B. Your age \_\_\_\_\_

C. The psychology course for which you are doing this.

---

APPENDIX E

## ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM

### Statements

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

1. TP can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.
2. If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on TP to be willing to loan it to me.
3. TP's ways of dealing with people make him (or her) rather difficult to get along with.
4. TP has a lot of respect for my ideas and opinions.
5. TP is a conscientious person.
6. If I hadn't heard from TP for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact him (her) just for the sake of keeping in touch.
7. When we get together to work on a task or project, TP can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems.
8. If I were looking for a job, I could count on TP to try his best to help me find one.
9. I can count on TP's being very easy to get along with, even when we disagree about something.
10. If I have an argument or disagreement with someone, I can count on TP to stand behind me and give me support when he thinks I am in the right.
11. TP is fair and open-minded.

12. If I had a choice of two good part-time jobs, I would seriously consider taking the somewhat less attractive job if it meant that TP and I could work at the same place.
13. TP is the kind of conversationalist who can make me clarify and expand my own ideas and beliefs.
14. TP is willing to use his skills and abilities to help me reach my own personal goals.
15. I can count on having to be extra patient with TP to keep from giving up on him (her) as a friend.
16. I can converse freely and comfortably with TP without worrying too much about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate or just plain silly.
17. TP is emotionally steady and even-tempered.
18. If TP and I could arrange our class or work schedules so we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as TP.
19. TP can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it weren't for him (her).
20. TP is a good, sympathetic listener when I have some personal problem I want to talk over with someone.
21. I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with TP from "falling apart."
22. If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on TP to notice it and appreciate my ability.
23. TP is a hard-working person.
24. If I had decided to leave town on a certain day for a leisurely trip or vacation and discovered that TP was leaving for the same place a day later, I would seriously consider waiting a day in order to travel with him (or her).
25. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP introduces viewpoints that help me to see things in a new light.
26. I can count on TP to be a good contact person in helping me to meet worthwhile people and make social connections.
27. I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to TP about topics he considers controversial or touchy.



28. TP has confidence in my advice and opinions about practical matters and personal problems.
29. TP is a very well-mannered person.
30. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together.
31. I can count on TP to be ready with really good suggestions when we are looking for some activity or project to engage in.
32. If I have some more or less serious difference with a friend or acquaintance, TP is a good person for acting as a go-between in helping me to smooth out the difficulty.
33. I have a hard time really understanding some of TP's actions and comments.
34. If I am in an embarrassing situation, I can count on TP to do things that will make me feel as much at ease as possible.
35. TP is an intellectually well-rounded person.
36. If I had no particular plans for a free evening and TP contacted me suggesting some activity I am not particularly interested in, I would seriously consider doing it with her (him).
37. TP has a way of making ideas and topics that I usually consider useless and boring seem worthwhile and interesting.
38. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on TP to help with errands or chores to make things as convenient for me as possible.
39. I can count on TP's acting tense or upset with me without my knowing what I've done to bother him (her).
40. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on TP to be happy and congratulatory about it.
41. TP is a tactful person.
42. TP is one of the persons I would go out of my way to help if he were in some sort of difficulty.
43. TP can come up with good, challenging questions and ideas.
44. TP is willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects, even if he is not directly involved.

45. I can count on TP's being willing to listen to my explanations in a patient and understanding way when I've done something to rub him (her) the wrong way.
46. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP listens and reacts as if my thoughts and ideas make a lot of sense.
47. TP is generous.
48. If I had just gotten off work or out of class and had some free time, I would wait around and leave with TP if he were leaving the same place an hour or so later.
49. TP is the kind of person from whom I can learn a lot just by listening to him talk or watching him work on problems.
50. I can count on TP to be willing to loan me personal belongings (for example, his books, car, typewriter, tennis racket) if I need them to go somewhere or get something done.
51. I can count on communication with TP to break down when we try to discuss things that are touchy or controversial.
52. TP considers me a good person to have around when he needs someone to talk things over with.
53. TP is a thoughtful person.
54. I try to get interested in the activities that TP enjoys, even if they do not seem especially appealing to me at first.
55. TP is the kind of person who is on the lookout for new, interesting and challenging things to do.
56. If I were sick or hurt, I could count on TP to do things that would make it easier to take.
57. I can count on TP to misunderstand me and take my actions and comments the wrong way.
58. I can count on TP to come up with really valuable advice when I need help with practical problems or predicaments.
59. TP is a helpful, cooperative person.
60. If TP and I were planning vacations to the same place and at about the same time and he (she) had to postpone his (her) trip for a month, I would seriously consider postponing my own trip for a month also.

61. TP keeps me pretty well informed about his (her) true feelings and attitudes about different things that may come up.
62. If TP were to move away or "disappear" for some reason, I would really miss the special kind of companionship he (she) provides.
63. TP thinks and acts in ways that "set him (her) apart" and make him (her) distinct from other people I know.
64. When I am with TP, I get the impression that he (she) is "playing a role" or trying to create a certain kind of "image."
65. I can count on TP to do and say things that express what he (she) really feels and believes, even if they are not the things he (she) thinks are expected of him (her).
66. Some of the most rewarding ideas, interests and activities I share with TP are the kinds of things I find it difficult to share with any of my other acquaintances.
67. When I am with TP, he (she) seems to relax and be himself (herself) and not think about the kind of impression he (she) is creating.
68. If I were trying to describe TP to someone who didn't know him (her), it would be easy to fit him (her) into a general class or type of person.
69. When TP and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship I don't get from any of my other acquaintances.
70. TP is the kind of person I would miss very much if something happened to interfere with our acquaintanceship.

APPENDIX F

BASIC FACTORS OF PLATONIC AND ROMANTIC  
HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS: 1973 DATA

Factor 1 Platonic (20%)

Males

.94771	18)	Serious dating
.88824	17)	Casual dating
.82691	16)	Going to parties together
.78225	6)	Exchanging letters
.63411	12)	Studying together
.61364	11)	Watching sports together
.60537	14)	Going for walks together
-.60208	70)	She is really responsible for the relationship being platonic
.57349	9)	Play in sports together
.55154	52)	I can tell her things I could not tell my best male friend
.54769	5)	Talking on the telephone
.45803	4)	How satisfactory this relationship is for you
.45060	10)	Watch sports together
-.40684	78)	VID
.39165	56)	I like the relationship because we need and care about each other
.38454	13)	Going for automobile drives together
.37936	7)	Sitting and talking

Males

- .35173 65) This relationship could not change because we know each other too well
- .32681 42) She is easy to be with because nothing sexual is expected or anticipated
- .32425 67) The relationship could not change because I have a romantic friend

Factor 2 Platonic (9%)Males

- .92222 38) She brightens my spirits
- .87340 50) When I am in a bad mood or tense, she can cheer me up
- .78981 39) She is fun to talk to and be with
- .69536 44) She seems to understand me quite well
- .64597 7) Sitting and talking
- .56372 24) She provides emotional comfort when I need it
- .54136 36) She is open minded
- .50803 54) She is a good listener
- .47758 71) She has many of the qualities that I would want in a future marriage partner
- .47478 23) She is easy to talk to concerning my problems
- .43639 77) G.F.
- .39043 10) Watch sports together
- .38428 67) The relationship could not change because I have a romantic friend
- .37144 78) VID
- .33661 53) The relationship could change to a romantic relationship
- .31963 32) I am relaxed when I am with her

Factor 3 Platonic (8%)Males

.90863	43)	The relationship is easy to maintain because there is no reason to be phony with her
.89316	31)	I trust her
.87170	32)	I am relaxed when I am with her
.71009	30)	I can confide in her about most things without worrying about her telling others
.52243	55)	We can talk to each other about almost anything
-.40984	77)	G.F.
.37347	54)	She is a good listener
.34152	69)	I am really responsible for the relationship being platonic
-.32853	65)	The relationship could not change because we know each other too well
.31503	39)	She is fun to talk to and be with
.30690	13)	Going for automobile drives together
.30324	2)	How close you feel to the individual
.30018	72)	I have the same feelings for her as I would have for a sister

Factor 4 Platonic (7%)Males

.91274	21)	How long has it been since it ended
.84224	20)	Does this relationship no longer exist
-.63084	62)	I do not find her physically attractive
.59402	29)	I find her physically attractive
-.45736	56)	I like the relationship because we need and care about each other
.42657	3)	How often you see the individual

Factor 5 Platonic (6%)Males

.83309	73)	SV
.68084	79)	PQP
-.46386	11)	Watching movies together
.44769	1)	Type of relationship
.39999	78)	VID
.39649	69)	I am really responsible for the relationship being platonic
-.35579	52)	I can tell her things I could not tell my best friend
-.34852	63)	The platonic relationship is more important to me than my closest same sex relationship

Factor 6 Platonic (6%)Males

-.82173	46)	She offers advice on matters concerning girls
-.81109	34)	I can talk to her about the girls I date
.68849	74)	UV
-.65002	25)	She gives me advice on my dating problems
-.63478	41)	When she has a personal dating problem, she will discuss it with me
-.46304	24)	She provides emotional comfort when I need it
-.39027	37)	We can talk about things openly and freely
-.38125	72)	I have the same feelings for her as I would have for a sister
-.33529	66)	The relationship could not change to a romantic one because she has a romantic friend
-.32562	13)	Going for automobile drives together
-.32175	5)	Talking on the telephone
-.30731	40)	She helps me with my problems



Factor 7 Platonic (6%)Males

- .52392 52) I can tell her things I couldn't tell my best male friend
- .40929 70) She is really responsible for the relationship being platonic

Factor 8 Platonic (5%)Males

- .91590 68) The relationship is easy to maintain because there are no games involved as in the case of many romantic relationships
- .47175 65) The relationship could not change because we know each other too well
- .41114 1) Type of relationship
- .39511 9) Play in sports together
- .39321 23) She is easy to talk to concerning my problems
- .39026 69) I am really responsible for the relationship being platonic
- .38456 64) My current romantic relationship is more important to me than my platonic relationship
- .35597 61) It is hard to discuss personal problems with a romantic friend
- .33388 67) The relationship could not change because I have a romantic friend

Factor 9 Platonic (5%)Males

- .86740 22) Age of subject
- .79981 27) We share common interests
- .45725 55) We can talk to each other about almost anything
- .35565 67) The relationship could not change because I have a romantic friend

Males

.34744 36) She is open minded

Factor 10 Platonic (4%)Males

.83145 35) I can talk to her about sex

.64329 3) How often have you seen the individual

.54100 72) I have the same feelings for her as I would have for a sister

.46016 40) She helps me with my problems

.31772 69) I am really responsible for the relationship being platonic

-.31073 59) She gives me confidence in myself

-.30701 77) GF

Factor 11 Platonic (3%)Males

-.85535 58) This platonic relationship is currently more important to me than my current romantic relationship

-.69388 60) I am more at ease with my platonic friend than with my romantic friend

-.48805 63) The platonic relationship is more important to me than my closest same sex friendship

.42422 55) She seems to understand me quite well

.39846 13) Going for automobile drives together

.32448 4) How satisfactory this relationship is for you

-.31982 66) The relationship could not change to a romantic one because she has a romantic friend

.31928 64) My current romantic relationship is more important to me than my platonic relationship

Factor 12 Platonic (3%)Males

- .90554 76) ESV
- .55074 49) We respect each other
- .50231 78) VID
- .45709 64) My current romantic relationship is more important to me than my platonic relationship
- .38308 4) How satisfactory this relationship is for you
- .36053 72) I have the same feelings for her as I would have for a sister
- .35065 39) She is fun to talk to and be with
- .34836 63) The platonic relationship is more important to me than my same sex relationship
- .32239 57) On some subjects, she is the only person I can talk to
- .32018 29) I find her physically attractive

Factor 13 Platonic (3%)Males

- .76519 33) I feel happy when I am with her
- .73912 59) She gives me confidence in myself
- .71234 45) She is almost always sympathetic concerning my problems and emotions
- .52761 71) She has many of the qualities that I want in a future marriage partner
- .46178 40) She helps me with my problems
- .34900 37) We can talk about things freely and openly
- .34588 23) She is easy to talk to concerning my problem
- .34579 49) We respect each other
- .33465 77) G.F.

Males

- .32441 1) Type of relationship
- .31885 29) I find her physically attractive
- .30218 62) I do not find her physically attractive

Factor 14 Platonic (3%)Males

- .90330 75) DTM
- .55663 45) She is almost always sympathetic concerning my problems and emotions
- .48387 54) She is a good listener
- .46961 25) She gives me advice on my dating problems
- .39891 63) The platonic relationship is more important to me than my closest same sex relationship

Factor 15 Platonic (2%)Males

- .82692 15) Going to dances together
- .57404 57) On some subjects, she is the only person I can talk to
- .38779 48) She is as important to me as friends of my own sex
- .33457 59) She gives me confidence in myself
- .32307 23) She is easy to talk to concerning my problems
- .30868 67) The relationship could not change because I have a romantic friend

Factor 16 Platonic (2%)Males

- .91237 8) Play in sports together
- .46635 5) Talking on the telephone
- .40284 1) Type of relationship

Males

- .35299 69) I am really responsible for the relationship being platonic
- .33704 48) She is as important to me as friends of my own sex
- .31153 40) She helps me with my problems

Factor 17 Platonic (2%)Males

- .45147 12) Studying together
- .36888 36) She is open minded
- .34596 5) Talking on the telephone
- .33940 64) My current romantic relationship is more important to me than my platonic relationship
- .30801 72) I have the same feelings for her as I would have for a sister

Factor 18 Platonic (2%)Males

- .92630 19) Length of relationship
- .55541 2) How close you feel to the individual
- .40545 56) I like the relationship because we need and care about each other
- .36313 65) The relationship could not change because we know each other too well
- .35437 61) It is hard to discuss personal problems with a romantic friend
- .33876 77) G.F.
- .31322 29) I find her physically attractive

Factor 19 Platonic (2%)Males

- .78762 28) I find it easier to talk to her than girls with whom I have a romantic interest in
- .48234 14) Going for walks together
- .36729 52) I can tell her things I could not tell my best male friend
- .33465 42) She is easy to be with because nothing sexual is expected or anticipated

Factor 20 Platonic (1%)Males

- .81896 47) I do not believe our relationship can become romantic
- .77904 53) The relationship could change to a romantic relationship
- .77101 51) I do not believe we could enjoy the relationship as much if it were romantic
- .61815 26) We sometimes go out on casual dates
- .55965 10) Watch sports together
- .55309 42) She is easy to be with because nothing sexual is expected or anticipated
- .47096 13) Going for automobile drives together
- .45375 65) This relationship could not change because we know each other too well
- .44210 2) How close you feel to the individual
- .42351 41) When she has personal or dating problems, she will discuss it with me
- .38166 78) VID
- .36279 62) I do not find her physically attractive
- .35788 14) Going for walks together
- .35180 9) Play in sports together

Males

- .34804 69) I am really responsible for the relationship being platonic
- .33644 48) She is as important to me as friends of my own sex
- .33247 52) I can tell her things I could not tell my best male friend
- .31544 36) She is open minded
- .31378 44) She seems to understand me quite well
- .30327 37) We can talk about things freely and openly

Factor 1 Romantic (18%)Males

- .81998 23) She is easy to talk to concerning my problems
- .65962 24) She provides emotional comfort when I need it
- .50322 50) When I am in a bad mood or tense, she can cheer me up
- .45316 40) She helps me with my problems
- .42980 31) I trust her
- .42379 30) I can confide in her about most things without worrying about her telling others
- .41820 4) How satisfactory this relationship is for you
- .41152 52) I can tell her things I could not tell my best friend
- .35950 45) She is almost always sympathetic concerning my problems and emotions
- .34936 59) She gives me confidence in myself
- .31986 38) She brightens my spirits
- .31582 2) How close you feel to the individual
- .30854 39) She is fun to talk to and be with
- .30773 49) We respect each other

Factor 2 Romantic (7%)Males

.83700	11)	Watching movies together
.77698	16)	Going to parties together
.76403	17)	Casual dating
.72903	18)	Serious dating
.72030	13)	Going for automobile drives together
.66676	15)	Going to dances together
.64919	14)	Going for walks together
.62347	5)	Talking on the telephone
.55716	10)	Watch sports together
.53292	7)	Sitting and talking
.50137	8)	Eating together
-.46545	1)	Type of relationship
.35932	26)	We sometimes go out on casual dates
-.35210	47)	I do not believe our friendship could become romantic
.35113	6)	Exchanging letters
.33058	3)	How often you see the individual
.31170	67)	The relationship could not change because I have a romantic friend
.30836	12)	Studying together
.30707	57)	On some subjects, she is the only person I can talk to

Factor 3 Romantic (5%)Males

.86270	62)	I do not find her physically attractive
-.83201	29)	I find her physically attractive



Males

- .43822 63) The platonic relationship is more important to me than my closest same sex relationship
- .38066 47) I do not believe our relationship can become romantic
- .32371 31) I trust her
- .31032 7) Sitting and talking

Factor 4 Romantic (4%)Males

- .70265 37) We can talk about things openly and freely
- .71548 35) I can talk to her about sex
- .58375 55) We can talk to each other about almost anything
- .53975 38) She brightens my spirits
- .38363 50) When I am in a bad mood or tense, she can cheer me up
- .30453 70) She is really responsible for the relationship being platonic

Factor 5 Romantic (4%)Males

- .75753 58) This platonic relationship is currently more important to me than my current romantic relationship
- .73053 64) My current romantic relationship is more important to me than my platonic relationship
- .53988 60) I am more at ease with my platonic friend than with my romantic relationship
- .50816 63) The platonic relationship is more important to me than my closest same sex relationship
- .33995 67) The relationship could not change because I have a romantic friend

Factor 6 Romantic (4%)Males

- .78355 21) How long has it been since it ended
- .77521 20) Does this relationship no longer exist
- .49639 43) The relationship is easy to maintain because there is no reason to be phony with her
- .37296 3) How often you see the individual
- .35327 48) She is as important to me as friends of my own sex
- .33906 26) We sometimes go out on casual dates
- .32915 2) How close you feel to the individual
- .30703 56) I like the relationship because we need and care about each other

Factor 7 Romantic (3%)Males

- .73187 74) UV
- .72243 73) SV
- .43236 25) She gives me advice on my dating problems
- .40111 77) GF
- .34139 59) She gives me confidence in myself
- .31744 49) We respect each other

Factor 8 Romantic (3%)Males

- .74249 54) She is a good listener
- .70065 36) She is open minded
- .59982 27) We share common interests
- .47211 31) I trust her
- .42749 55) We can talk to each other about almost anything

Males

- .41596 30) I can confide in her about most things without worrying  
about her telling others
- .31158 49) We respect each other

Factor 9 Romantic (3%)Males

- .85910 79) PQP
- .85622 78) VID
- .77242 77) GF
- .43205 76) ESV
- .32652 8) Eating together

Factor 10 Romantic (3%)Males

- .79715 9) Play sports together
- .41773 12) Studying together
- .37932 67) The relationship could not change because I have a  
romantic friend
- .37122 8) Eating together
- .31652 3) How often you see the individual

Factor 11 Romantic (2%)Males

- .78584 61) It is hard to discuss personal problems with a romantic  
friend
- .45649 76) ESV
- .30847 8) Eating together
- .30235 53) The relationship could change to a romantic relationship

Factor 12 Romantic (2%)Males

- .72297 28) I find it easier to talk to her than girls with whom I have a romantic friendship
- .70401 44) She seems to understand me quite well
- .39035 59) She gives me confidence in myself
- .37806 40) She helps me with my problems
- .33276 10) Watch sports together

Factor 13 Romantic (2%)Males

- .63246 45) She is almost always sympathetic concerning my problems and emotions
- .50949 72) I have the same feelings for her as I would have for a sister
- .40130 40) She helps me with my problems
- .39881 1) Type of relationship
- .32893 25) She gives me advice on my dating problems

Factor 14 Romantic (2%)Males

- .83891 69) I am really responsible for the relationship being platonic
- .45153 70) She is really responsible for the relationship being platonic

Factor 15 Romantic (2%)Males

- .77945 68) The relationship is easy to maintain because there are no games involved as in the case of many romantic relationships
- .64560 42) She is easy to be with because nothing sexual is expected or anticipated

Males

- .44483 49) We respect each other
- .37500 43) The relationship is easy to maintain because there is no reason to be phony with her

Factor 16 Romantic (2%)Males

- .66167 39) She is fun to talk to and be with
- .65095 71) She has many of the qualities I want in a future marriage partner
- .41245 38) She brightens up my spirits
- .38127 26) We sometimes go out on casual dates
- .30328 48) She is as important to me as friends of my own sex
- .30015 46) She offers advice on matters concerning girls

Factor 17 Romantic (2%)Males

- .86161 32) I am relaxed when I am with her
- .33372 71) She has many of the qualities that I would want in a future marriage partner
- .31553 59) She gives me confidence in myself

Factor 18 Romantic (2%)Males

- .81305 51) I do not believe we could enjoy the relationship as much if it were romantic
- .59117 66) The relationship could not change to a romantic one because she has a romantic friend
- .52090 19) Length of the relationship
- .44018 47) I do not believe our relationship can become romantic
- .35706 53) The relationship could change to a romantic relationship

Males

- .31753 72) I have the same feelings for her as I would have for a sister
- .30211 67) The relationship could not change to a romantic one because I have a romantic friend

Factor 19 Romantic (2%)Males

- .65670 41) When she has a personal or dating problem, she will discuss it with me
- .63940 57) On some subjects, she is the only person I can talk to
- .42679 52) I can tell her things I can not tell my best male friends
- .39435 4) How satisfactory is the relationship for you
- .35162 1) Type of relationship
- .34076 2) How close do you feel to the individual
- .32191 12) Studying together
- .32093 56) I like the relationship because we need and care about each other

Factor 20 Romantic (2%)Males

- .80970 22) Age of subject
- .47792 65) The relationship could not change because we know each other too well
- .34541 26) We sometimes go out on casual dates

Factor 21 Romantic (1%)Males

- .81450 34) I can talk to her about the girls I date
- .44005 65) The relationship could not change because we know each other too well
- .34871 25) She gives me advice on my dating problems

Males

-.30248 73) SV

Factor 22 Romantic (1%)Males

-.67371 33) I feel happy when I am with her

-.44167 6) Exchange letters

Factor 23 Romantic (1%)Males

-.80669 75) DTM

.38042 12) Studying together

.37954 63) The platonic relationship is more important to me than my closest same sex relationship

Factor 1 Platonic (45%)Females

.89232 63) We confide in each other

.88561 49) I can talk to him as easily as I can with my best girl friend

.86695 44) We discuss sexual matters

.86510 67) He is concerned about me

.84512 50) We can discuss problems concerning our romantic dating partners

.81930 7) Sitting and talking

.81442 64) He gives me confidence in myself

.80561 5) Talking on the telephone

.80536 39) He might become a romantic partner because we can talk so easily together and we respect each other

.80101 37) I feel that our relationship is as important as my relationship with my best girl friend

Females

- .78609 4) How satisfactory this relationship is for you
- .77864 8) Eating together
- .77686 46) I often give him advice on his problems
- .77589 15) Going to dances together
- .77019 61) I can talk more frankly and openly with him than I can with my romantic partner
- .76355 43) We have a mutual trust for each other
- .74239 11) Watching movies together
- .73793 38) If either of us wanted to do something important, but not alone, we could do it together and have a good time
- .73534 6) Exchanging letters
- .73061 17) Casual dating
- .72900 52) We discuss all subjects freely and openly
- .71848 51) He is fun to be with
- .71101 62) He is more important to me than my best girl friend
- .71083 55) He has most of the qualities I want in a future marriage partner
- .67800 53) I feel very relaxed with him
- .66953 22) Age of subject
- .65345 9) Play in sports together
- .65289 27) He seems to be interested in what I have to say
- .65022 54) We are completely honest with each other
- .63544 45) We sometimes go on casual dates together
- .63268 3) How often you see the individual
- .63048 13) Going on automobile drives together
- .61478 19) Length of time the relationship has been going on



Females

- .60609 48) He is easy to talk to
- .59909 69) I find him physically unattractive
- .54720 29) He keeps confidential those things I tell him in private
- .53908 31) I don't see us becoming romantic friends because we know each other too well
- .53431 60) This relationship is easier to maintain than a romantic or same sex friendship because we do not play games, and emotions such as jealousy and envy are not involved
- .51905 71) I find him physically attractive
- .50336 68) Our relationship will never become romantic because it would somehow ruin a perfect relationship
- .49517 47) He is a good listener
- .43930 33) We respect each other
- .43672 70) I have the same feelings for him as I would have for a brother
- .41100 30) He usually gives me good advice to my problems
- .40389 32) If I am depressed, he can cheer me up
- .39752 65) It is me who is keeping this relationship a platonic one
- .37379 58) This relationship could not change because I have a romantic interest in someone else
- .37208 66) It is he who is keeping this relationship a platonic one
- .32989 12) Studying together
- .31817 1) Type of relationship

Factor 2 Platonic (10%)Females

- .85979 24) He is very understanding toward my problems
- .84235 26) We can talk together on almost all matters
- .83959 30) He usually gives me good advice on my problems

Females

- .82195 2) How close you feel to the individual
- .82099 32) If I am depressed, he can cheer me up
- .81821 23) We discuss highly personal matters
- .81763 35) I can discuss things with him that I couldn't discuss with my best girl friend
- .79487 72) He is less important to me than my best girl friend
- .78805 33) We respect each other
- .76559 28) We can tell each other exactly how we feel without being embarrassed
- .75721 25) When I am depressed, I go to him for encouragement or consolation
- .74796 34) I can call him any time of the day and I know he will be there to talk
- .74194 29) He keeps confidential, those things I tell him in private
- .70577 27) He seems to be interested in what I have to say
- .68728 31) I don't see us becoming romantic friends because we know each other too well
- .68172 22) Age of subject
- .63600 19) Length of time this relationship has gone on
- .62347 1) Type of relationship
- .60500 57) Our relationship is important to us because we care about and need each other
- .60117 6) Exchanging letters
- .60107 66) It is he who is keeping this relationship a platonic one
- .58088 42) We have common interests
- .57665 69) I find him physically unattractive
- .55236 51) He is fun to be with
- .54289 65) It is me who is keeping this relationship a platonic one

Females

- .54110 36) We have no sexual attraction for each other
- .54103 16) Going to parties together
- .53354 59) This relationship could not change because he has a romantic interest in someone else
- .46802 45) We sometimes go on casual dates together
- .45880 62) He is more important to me than my best girl friend
- .44419 58) This relationship could not change because I have a romantic interest in someone else
- .44090 8) Eating together
- .41676 15) Going to dances together
- .39028 41) We are not wary of each other. We can talk about almost anything from dating problems to family problems
- .38754 9) Play in sports together
- .37831 5) Talking on the telephone
- .37749 68) Our relationship will never become romantic because it would somehow ruin a perfect relationship
- .36386 17) Casual dating
- .35077 71) I find him physically attractive
- .35070 70) I have the same feelings for him as I would have for a brother
- .35011 39) He might become a romantic partner because we can talk so easily together and we respect each other
- .34052 13) Going for automobile drives together
- .34032 3) How often you see the individual
- .33030 55) He has most of the qualities I want in a future marriage partner
- .32935 61) I can talk more frankly and openly with him than I can with a romantic partner
- .92409 21) How long since it ended

Females

- .91365 20) Does this relationship no longer exist
- .31861 77) G.F.
- .30832 38) If either of us wanted to do something important, but not alone, we could do it together and have a good time

Factor 4 Platonic (4%)Females

- .79401 12) Studying together
- .79308 14) Going for walks together
- .51158 16) Going to parties together
- .50835 57) Our relationship is important to us because we care about and need each other
- .50268 10) Watch sports together
- .35251 41) We are not wary of each other. We can talk about almost anything from dating problems to family problems

Factor 5 Platonic (3%)Females

- .62903 36) We have no sexual attraction for each other
- .58395 58) This relationship could not change because I have a romantic interest in someone else
- .55597 70) I have the same feelings for him as I would have for a brother
- .37451 9) Play in sports together
- .35899 68) Our relationship will never become romantic because it would somehow ruin a perfect relationship
- .34703 17) Casual dating
- .34429 59) This relationship could not change because he has a romantic interest in someone else
- .31633 1) Type of relationship

Females

.30346 72) He is less important to me than my best girl friend

Factor 6 Platonic (3%)Females

.87877 73) SV

.37474 79) PQP

.30955 42) We have common interests

Factor 7 Platonic (3%)Females

.88219 18) Serious dating

.66428 10) Watch sports together

.47322 75) DTM

-.43775 42) We have common interests

Factor 8 Platonic (2%)Females

-.81086 78) VID

.73821 77) GF

-.67013 79) PQP

.39041 40) This platonic relationship is as important to me as my romantic relationship

.30294 37) I feel that our relationship is as important to me as my relationship with my best girl friend

Factor 9 Platonic (2%)Females

.83962 76) ESV

.66119 74) UV

-.39556 46) I often give him advice on his problems

Factor 10 Platonic (2%)Females

- .77210 56) I don't see this relationship becoming romantic because we are too much alike
- .44135 3) How often you see the individual
- .37103 59) This relationship could not change because he has a romantic interest in someone else

Factor 11 Platonic (2%)Females

- .65410 75) UV
- .50211 53) I feel very relaxed with him
- .33935 70) I have the same feelings for him as I would have for a brother

Factor 12 Platonic (2%)Females

- .52862 71) I find him physically attractive
- .39008 69) I find him physically unattractive
- .36164 25) When I am depressed, I go to him for encouragement or consolation
- .32764 60) This relationship is easier to maintain than a romantic or same sex friendship because we do not play games, and emotions such as jealousy and envy are not involved
- .31496 59) This relationship could not change because he has a romantic interest in someone else

Factor 13 Platonic (2%)Females

- .58944 54) We are completely honest with each other
- .56261 68) Our relationship will never become romantic because it would somehow ruin a perfect relationship
- .47768 47) He is a good listener

Females

- .40806 48) He is easy to talk to
- .35265 60) This relationship is easier to maintain than a romantic or same sex friendship because we do not play games, and emotions such a jealousy and envy are not involved
- .33961 43) We have a mutual trust for each other
- .30380 64) He gives me confidence in myself

Factor 14 Platonic (1%)Females

- .57182 41) We are not wary of each other. We can talk about almost anything from dating problems to family problems
- .34678 65) It is me who is keeping this relationship a platonic one
- .33213 28) We can tell each other exactly how we feel without being embarrassed

Factor 1 Romantic (29%)Females

- .76624 79) PQP
- .71578 77) GF
- .68645 24) He is very understanding toward my problems
- .67752 2) How close you feel to the individual
- .63753 66) It is he who is keeping this relationship a platonic one
- .63214 78) VID
- .61176 30) He usually gives me good advice on my problems
- .58007 55) He has most of the qualities I want in a future marriage partner
- .57283 20) Does this relationship no longer exist
- .57041 25) When I am depressed, I go to him for encouragement or consolation
- .54748 72) He is less important to me than my best girl friend

Females

- .49909 43) We have a mutual trust for each other
- .49636 42) We have common interests
- .48780 52) We discuss all subjects openly and freely
- .46813 21) How long has it been since it ended
- .46759 4) How satisfactory this relationship is for you
- .43086 7) Sitting and talking
- .42104 26) We can talk together on almost all matters
- .41715 57) Our relationship is important to us because we care about and need each other
- .38968 39) He might become a romantic partner because we can talk so easily together and we respect each other
- .37266 33) We respect each other
- .36357 3) How often you see the individual
- .33610 38) If either of us wanted to do something important, but not alone, we could do it together and have a good time
- .32075 23) We discuss highly personal matters
- .31524 32) If I am depressed, he can cheer me up
- .30728 67) He is concerned about me
- .30237 40) This platonic relationship is as important to me as my romantic relationship

Factor 2 Romantic (7%)Females

- .85431 59) This relationship could not change because he has a romantic interest in someone else
- .82655 58) This relationship could not change because I have a romantic interest in someone else
- .35708 39) He might become a romantic partner because we can talk so easily together and we respect each other



Females

- .30568 31) I don't see us becoming romantic friends because we know each other too well

Factor 3 Romantic (5%)Females

- .79877 6) Exchanging letters
- .78300 1) Type of relationship
- .75194 18) Serious dating
- .63749 35) I can discuss things with him that I couldn't discuss with my best girl friend
- .61723 13) Going for automobile drives together
- .60929 44) We discuss sexual matters
- .56909 68) Our relationship will never become romantic because it would somehow ruin a perfect relationship
- .56378 14) Going for walks together
- .45678 62) He is more important to me than my best girl friend
- .41540 37) I feel that our relationship is as important as my relationship with my best girl friend
- .40828 36) We have no sexual attraction for each other
- .40786 11) Watching movies together
- .37336 72) He is less important to me than my best girl friend
- .36093 2) How close you feel to the individual
- .34373 78) VID
- .33640 46) I often give him advice on his problems
- .33310 57) Our relationship is important to us because we care about and need each other
- .33303 23) We discuss highly personal matters
- .31440 5) Talking on the telephone

Females

-.30030 10) Watch sports together

Factor 4 Romantic (4%)Females

-.78101 12) Studying together  
 -.68785 8) Eating together  
 -.62029 17) Casual dating  
 -.55917 11) Watching movies together  
 -.54709 10) Watch sports together  
 -.46673 3) How often you see the individual  
 -.42233 7) Sitting and talking  
 -.36098 4) How satisfactory this relationship is for you  
 -.35369 9) Play in sports together  
 -.32692 16) Going to parties together  
 -.31144 67) He is concerned about me  
 -.30751 20) Does this relationship no longer exist  
 -.30575 13) Going for automobile drives together

Factor 5 Romantic (4%)Females

.74065 74) UV  
 .64791 76) ESV  
 .55811 73) SV  
 -.55614 50) We can discuss problems concerning our romantic dating partners  
 -.48049 41) We are not wary of each other. We can talk about almost anything from dating problems to family problems  
 -.34299 16) Going to parties together

Females

- .32801 52) We discuss all subjects openly and freely  
 -.31314 77) GF  
 -.30080 29) He keeps confidential, things I tell him in private

Factor 6 Romantic (3%)Females

- .76342 15) Going to dances together  
 -.57978 5) Talking on the telephone  
 -.31688 3) How often you see the individual

Factor 7 Romantic (3%)Females

- .95254 22) Age of subject  
 -.93423 19) Length of time the relationship went on  
 -.58414 47) He is a good listener  
 -.52998 48) He is easy to talk to

Factor 8 Romantic (3%)Females

- .80576 65) It is me who is keeping this relationship a platonic one  
 -.31556 17) Casual dating

Factor 9 Romantic (2%)Females

- .64366 43) We have a mutual trust for each other  
 .50388 9) Play in sports together  
 .38910 48) He is easy to talk to

Factor 10 Romantic (2%)Females

- .74873 71) I find him physically attractive
- .62942 69) He is more important to me than my best girl friend
- .41821 34) I can call him anytime of the day and I know he will be there to talk
- .34418 51) He is fun to be with
- .33365 53) I feel very relaxed with him

Factor 11 Romantic (2%)Females

- .84649 61) I can talk more frankly and openly with him than I can with my romantic partner
- .55691 60) This relationship is easier to maintain than a romantic or same sex friendship because we do not play games, and emotions such as jealousy and envy are not involved
- .40268 50) We can discuss problems concerning our romantic dating partners

Factor 12 Romantic (2%)Females

- .75276 46) I often give him advice on his problems
- .50082 7) Sitting and talking
- .49957 23) We discuss highly personal matters
- .49687 52) We discuss all subjects openly and freely
- .36105 41) We are not wary of each other. We can talk about almost anything from dating problems to family problems
- .31710 53) I feel very relaxed with him
- .31476 63) We confide in each other
- .30497 51) He is fun to be with

Females

- .30273 34) I can call him anytime of the day and I know he will be there to talk
- .30097 57) Our relationship is important to us because we care about and need each other

Factor 13 Romantic (2%)Females

- .77225 70) I have the same feelings for him as I would have for a brother
- .70237 31) I don't see us becoming romantic partners because we know each other too well
- .65984 36) We have no sexual attraction for each other
- .42908 42) We have common interests
- .42644 68) Our relationship will never become romantic because it would somehow ruin a perfect relationship
- .36950 30) He usually gives me good advice to my problems
- .34457 60) This relationship is easier to maintain than a romantic or same sex friendship because we do not play games, and emotions such as jealousy and envy are not involved
- .31604 64) He gives me confidence in myself
- .30937 39) He might become a romantic partner because we can talk so easily together and we respect each other
- .30895 4) How satisfactory this relationship is for you

Factor 14 Romantic (2%)Females

- .69436 56) I don't see this relationship becoming romantic because we are too much alike
- .43323 30) He usually gives me good advice to my problems
- .34967 29) He keeps confidential, those things I tell him in private
- .34522 26) We can talk together on almost all matters

Females

-.30773 53) I feel very relaxed with him

Factor 15 Romantic (2%)Females

.71633 64) He gives me confidence in myself

.46072 63) We confide in each other

.40939 40) This relationship is as important to me as my romantic relationship

.33182 67) He is concerned about me

Factor 16 Romantic (2%)Females

-.75557 32) If I am depressed, he can cheer me up

-.75229 38) If either of us wanted to do something important, but not alone, we could do it together and have a good time

-.68809 67) He is concerned about me

-.62277 51) He is fun to be with

-.61402 33) We respect each other

-.57826 47) He is a good listener

-.57616 27) He seems to be interested in what I have to say

-.39576 53) I feel very relaxed with him

-.32096 25) When I am depressed, I go to him for encouragement or consolation

.32086 77) GF

-.30237 64) He gives me confidence in myself

Factor 17 Romantic (2%)Females

-.80957 75) DTM

Females

- .41271 34) I can call him anytime of the day and I know he will be there to talk
- .36828 66) It is he who is keeping this relationship a platonic one

Factor 18 Romantic (1%)Females

- .67363 49) I can talk with him as easily as I can with my best girl friend
- .44849 62) He is more important to me than my best girl friend
- .38955 41) We are not wary of each other. We can talk about almost anything from dating problems to family problems
- .38148 39) He might become a romantic partner because we can talk so easily together and we respect each other
- .37732 16) Going to parties together
- .35716 72) He is less important to me than my best girl friend
- .31312 37) I feel that our relationship is as important as my relationship with my best girl friend
- .31242 27) He seems to be interested in what I have to say
- .30251 35) I can discuss things with him that I couldn't discuss with my best girl friend
- .30035 63) We confide in each other

Factor 19 Romantic (1%)Females

- .77070 45) We sometimes go on casual dates together
- .48630 29) He keeps confidential, those things I tell him in private
- .46951 21) How long it has been since it ended
- .35039 40) This platonic relationship is as important to me as my romantic relationship
- .32452 53) I feel very relaxed with him

Factor 20 Romantic (1%)Females

- |          |     |  |
|----------|-----|--|
| -0.75474 | 28) | We can tell each other exactly how we feel without being embarrassed |
| -0.40461 | 54) | We are completely honest with each other                             |
| -0.33121 | 3)  | How close you feel to the individual                                 |



## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Banta, T. J., & Hetherington, M. Relations between needs of friends and fiancés. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 54, 401-404.
- Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. Interpersonal attraction. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.
- Byrne, D. Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 713-715.
- Byrne, D., & Nelson, D. Attraction as a linear function of proportion and positive reinforcements. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 659-663.
- Edwards, A. L. Manual, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1954.
- Guinsburg, P. F. An exploratory study of platonic opposite sex friendships. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Dakota, 1970. (a)
- Guinsburg, P. F. The generation of items for the platonic opposite sex friendship scale. Unpublished manuscript, University of North Dakota, 1970. (b)
- Guinsburg, P. F. The generation of factors concerning the platonic opposite sex friendship. Unpublished manuscript, University of North Dakota, 1970. (c)
- Izard, C. E. Personality similarity and friendship. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 47-51. (a)
- Izard, C. E. Personality similarity, positive affect and interpersonal attraction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 484-485. (b)
- Izard, C. E. Personality similarity and friendship: A follow-up study. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 598-600.
- Levinger, G., & Breedlove, J. Interpersonal attraction and agreement: A study of marriage partners. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 367-372.

- Lewis, C. S. The four loves. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1960.
- Lindem, A. Personal communication, 1970.
- Murstein, B. L. The complementary need hypothesis in newlyweds and middle aged married couples. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 194-197.
- Newcomb, T. M. The prediction of interpersonal attraction. American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586.
- Reilly, M., Commins, W. D., & Steffic, E. C. The complementarity of needs in friendship choice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 292-294.
- Rubin, I. M. The social psychology of romantic love. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, 1969.
- Swenson, C. H. Love: A self-report analysis with college students. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1961, 17, 167-171.
- Swenson, C. H., & Gilner, F. Factor analysis of self-report statements of love relationships. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1964, 20, 186-188.
- Winch, R. F. Complementary needs in mate selection: A test of one kind of complementarity. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 52-56. (a)
- Winch, R. F. The theory of complementary needs in mate selection and final results on the test of the general hypothesis. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 552-565. (b)
- Wright, P. Need similarity, need complementarity and the place of personality in interpersonal attraction. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1968, 3, 126-135.
- Wright, P. A model and a technique for studies in friendship. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, 295-309.
- Wright, P. Personal communication, 1971.