



6-1-1970

An Exploration of Some Sex Differences in Agreement-Attraction Relationships

Bette Ann Havens

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

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

Recommended Citation

Havens, Bette Ann, "An Exploration of Some Sex Differences in Agreement-Attraction Relationships" (1970). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3556.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3556>

This Thesis 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.commons@library.und.edu.

AN EXPLORATION OF SOME SEX DIFFERENCES IN
AGREEMENT-ATTRACTION RELATIONSHIPS

by
Bette Ann Havens

Bachelor of Arts, Lake Erie College 1968

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

Grand Forks, North Dakota

June
1970

An Exploration of Some Sex Differences in
Agreement-Attraction Relationships

Bette Ann Havens, M.A.

The University of North Dakota, 1970

Faculty Advisor: Professor Paul Wright

The investigation was designed to explore some sex differences in agreement-attraction relationships. The investigation was divided into two parts: one part dealt with a hypothetical stranger as a partner, the other part required a known acquaintance as a partner. Pairs of same sexed subjects responded to agreement measures and to a questionnaire describing aspects of friendship. The only result in Study I was that males who agree with other males on specific daily activity have higher levels of friendship ("voluntary interdependence"), than those who are dissimilar on specific daily activity. This was the only result found using a hypothetical person as a partner. In Study II, wherein known acquaintances were partners, the results were more complicated. The hypotheses were only partially confirmed. Possible explanations for failure to confirm the hypotheses and general implications of the findings are discussed.

This Thesis submitted by Bette Ann Havens in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Paul Wright
(Chairman)

Alice T. Clark

John B. Cannon

William Johnson
Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

Title AN EXPLORATION OF SOME SEX DIFFERENCES IN AGREEMENT-ATTRACTION
RELATIONSHIPS

Department Psychology

Degree Master of Arts

In presenting this thesis 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 thesis 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 thesis 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 thesis.

Signature _____

Date _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Paul Wright for his honest concern, helpful guidance and his much appreciated encouragement; Dr. John Carman and Dr. Alice Clark for their extra time and careful consideration.

I also would like to extend special appreciation to Dr. L. C. Steckle for his continuing support, from the beginning of my venture into psychology; and my fiance, Alden A. Abraham, for his lending hand of perseverance and for his quiet understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM . . .	5
Attitude Similarity and Attraction	
Hypothetical Person and Experimental Design	
The Friendship Model	
Statement of the Problem	
III. METHOD	17
Overview	
Development of Checklists	
Acquaintance Description Form	
A Five Item Questionnaire	
Experimental Conditions	
IV. RESULTS	24
Plan of Analysis	
Study I: Reactions to a Hypothetical Stranger	
Study II: Reactions to an Actual Acquaintance	
V. DISCUSSION	33
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	37
APPENDICES	39
REFERENCES	48

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Study I: Means of ADF Scores for Subjects at Different Levels of Agreement in Specific Daily Activity and in General Areas of Interest	26
2. Study II: Summary of 2 X 2 Analysis of Variance of Mean ADF Scores for Subjects at Different Levels of Agreement in Specific Daily Activity and in General Areas of Interest	27
3. Study II: Means of ADF Scores for Pairs of Subjects at Different Levels of Agreement in Specific Daily Activity and in General Areas of Interest	28
4. Study II: Summary of 2 X 2 Analysis of Variance of Mean ADF Scores for Pairs of Subjects at Different Levels of Agreement in Specific Daily Activity and in General Areas of Interest	29
5. Results of the Duncan Multiple Range Test for ADF Scales of UV for Male Pairs, UV and SV for Female Pairs	30

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Agreement Levels and Range of Scores	22
2.	Agreement Levels and Range of Scores	23

ABSTRACT

The investigation was designed to explore some sex differences in agreement-attraction relationships. The investigation was divided into two parts: one part dealt with a hypothetical stranger as a partner, the other part required a known acquaintance as a partner. Pairs of same sexed subjects responded to agreement measures and to a questionnaire describing aspects of friendship. The only result in Study I was that males who agree with other males on specific daily activity have higher levels of friendship ("voluntary interdependence"), than those who are dissimilar on specific daily activity. This was the only result found using a hypothetical person as a partner. In Study II, wherein known acquaintances were partners, the results were more complicated. The hypotheses were only partially confirmed. Possible explanations for failure to confirm the hypotheses and general implications of the findings are discussed.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Past research in the study of interpersonal attraction covers a wide area of relationships with an appreciable amount of misguided information. Part of the confusion is due to the use of methods which are not understood sufficiently. Often scores are interpreted in such a complex fashion that they mask simple effects and lead to erroneous generalizations (Cronbach, 1958). Inconsistent findings add to the confusion (Wright, 1968). Newcomb (1961) attempted to summarize the variety of forms which attraction may take. The result is a complex picture. The review of this area by Lott and Lott (1965) suggests that the pieces of information gathered in past research need to be reorganized into a coherent picture. Finally Wright (1969 a) points out that the focus of attention should be aimed toward attraction rather than the antecedents of attraction. Newcomb (1961, p. 292) confines the area of attraction to the "behavior on the part of one person that is observed and responded to by another." Lott and Lott (1965) observe that sheer contact is necessary but not a sufficient condition for attraction. Wright (1969 a), narrowing the study of attraction to same sexed friendships, uses a criterion of the amount of interdependence between two people, independent of outside pressure or constraint toward interaction.

The relationship of attitudinal similarity and interpersonal attraction has been the focus of research in many studies. Heider (1958) developed a balance theory in which he proposed that people tend to make their "sentiment relationships harmonious with their perception of the unit relationships existent between objects" (Berscheid & Walster, 1969, p. 50). Perceived attitudinal similarity should therefore produce liking.

The converse, that attraction leads to the perception of similarity, has been studied also. Byrne and Wong (1962), for example, found that people who were prejudiced against Blacks assumed that they would agree less often with them than with a White stranger. Unprejudiced people, however, assumed they would agree on attitudes as often with a Black as with a White stranger. The degree of attraction, then, appears to influence the amount of assumed agreement on attitudes between a stranger and another person. Caution should be heeded when interpreting the significance of such studies dealing with hypothetical situations and people. As acknowledged by Smith (1957), the amount of information the subject receives about the stranger is limited, hence the extent to which the results can be interpreted is also limited.

In dealing with dyadic relationships, Wright (1969 a) has developed a model which describes a friendship between same sexed acquaintances. He considers not only a criterion of friendship but also certain benefits gained by the friendship and the degree of difficulty the partners have in maintaining the friendship. There appear to be sex differences on some of the dimensions of Wright's Friendship Model.

In an unpublished study exploring the relationship between agreement in attitudes and interests and interpersonal attraction, Wright (1969 b) found that male pairs had a higher level of friendship and a greater stimulating value when they were similar in activity preference. No such results were found in the general interest category as measured by the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey scale of values. For females, just the opposite was found. There were no significant differences in friendships between female pairs related to similarity on the activity preference scale, but higher levels of friendship and greater stimulating value were found for those who were similar rather than dissimilar on the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey scale.

Perhaps it is true that females differ from males in what they look for in a friendship, as suggested by Banta & Heatherington (1963) and Wright (1969 a). It could be that females place a greater value on areas of general interest and abstract concepts while men find daily activity an important factor in friendship. With this idea in mind, the present investigator proposes that male acquaintances who agree on specific daily activities will also have a higher level of friendship and greater stimulating value than those who find little agreement in specific daily activities. Females who agree on general, abstract areas of interest on the other hand, will have a higher level of friendship and greater stimulating value in their friendship than those who find little agreement in general abstract areas of interest. The other components of Wright's Friendship Model will be affected in one or both areas by the amount of agreement.

Two different methods will be used to investigate the hypotheses. One method will employ the use of a hypothetical stranger for a partner of the subject. The other method will require a same sexed acquaintance for the partner. The investigation will explore possible differences of the results from the two kinds of study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Where does one begin to study interpersonal attraction? One could start with an obvious facet, proximity or propinquity. It has been established, for example, that distances between houses and the direction in which a house faces influence the development of friendships. Festinger (1951) found that friendships occur frequently among next door neighbors and less frequently as the distance between neighbors becomes greater. For interpersonal attraction and surely friendship to develop, it is also obvious that more than proximity is required. As Lott and Lott (1965) point out, sheer contact is necessary but not a sufficient condition for attraction. In the personality spectrum, Winch (1955) and Izard (1960 a, 1960 b, & 1963) investigated the need complementarity and need similarity aspects of attraction. Winch (1955) for example, assumes that "spouses tend to select each other on the basis of complementary rather than similar need patterns" (Winch, 1955, p. 555). Izard (1960 a, b) assumes two people who have similar personality, also have mutually satisfying interaction and experiences. Such assumptions have been criticized (Wright, 1968) due to lack of specification of conditions under which complementarity or similarity

should facilitate attraction and lack of focusing on the personality variables which are important to consider.

Attitude Similarity and Attraction

Heider

Much of the present research done in the area of attitude similarity and attraction stems from the work of Heider. Heider (1948) states there is "a tendency to see only the positive traits in a person we like . . . sentiments and perceptions arrange themselves in such a way that simple harmonious configurations result" (Heider, 1948, p. 25). He continues that when a liked person does something another dislikes, a disharmonious situation evolves and a tendency to change that situation to a more balanced situation arises. The development of Heider's balance theory becomes structured in the following manner. Given two persons, person p and person o and a mutually relevant topic, x. If person p liked topic x, and person o liked topic x, a cognitively balanced state will be included; p will like o. There is comfort, i.e., a lack of strain and tension, in such a balanced state. Given the same situation, an unbalanced state would arise if there were dissimilar attitudes. For example, if p liked o, o liked x and p disliked x. Strain, tension and discomfort would be found in such a relationship. According to Heider, there is a tendency to change such an unbalanced state to secure a balanced state.

Newcomb

Newcomb (1967) further developed Heider's balance theory with explanations of reward and punishment. By assuming the reward

punishment ratio in interaction is more often reinforcing than extinguishing, and by assuming that rewarding effects from interaction tend to be obtained from those with whom one frequently interacts, Newcomb associates the frequency of interaction with positive attraction. In order to receive reward from the other person, one also must reward the other. Reciprocal reward is inferred.

Newcomb states that the possession of similar characteristics "predisposes individuals to be attracted to each other to the degree that those characteristics are observable and valued by those who observe them . . ." (Newcomb, 1967, p. 295). There is an exchange of communicative behavior and an opinion X, and it is received by the receiver, B. B trusts the sincerity of A and respects the knowledge of A. Reciprocal reward is established. Both are rewarded by the communicative experience more than they are punished. The degree of attraction toward co-communication therefore "varies with the perceived similarity of attitudes toward the object of communication" (Newcomb, 1967, p. 296). The perceived similarity regarding important and relevant objects, including the persons themselves, is an important aspect in interpersonal attraction.

As suggested by Lott & Lott (1965), similarity on some attitudes will be more important for some people than for others. In other words, not all the people will consider one attitude as important as another. Lott and Lott refer to Gross' (1954) study as an example. For Air Force personnel, it was found that association with common commitment to Air Force goals were important for some men, while others regarded dissatisfaction with the air site or with jobs as important

issues. It appears that individuals tend to prefer friendly associations with others who are compatible with themselves in interests, values and/or attitudes.

Byrne

Byrne, in attempting to establish the antecedents of attraction, studies attitude similarity. In one study, Byrne (1961) tested the idea that a stranger who is known to have attitudes similar to those of the subject is better liked than a stranger known to have attitudes dissimilar to those of the subject. Not only would that stranger be better liked but he also would be judged to be more intelligent, better informed, more moral and better adjusted. Byrne further hypothesized that a stranger who has similar attitudes on issues of importance to the subject and dissimilar attitudes on unimportant issues is better liked and more positively evaluated on the above four variables than a stranger for whom the reverse is true (similar attitudes on unimportant issues and dissimilar attitudes on issues of importance).

Byrne gave subjects an attitude scale and rated each item on importance. Then they were divided into four groups. Each subject in group 1 received an attitude scale of a hypothetical person with responses exactly the same as his own. Each subject in group 2 received attitude scale responses exactly the opposite to his own. Each subject in group 3 received attitude scales with similar responses on important issues and dissimilar responses on unimportant issues. Each subject in group 4 received attitude scales with similar responses on unimportant issues and dissimilar responses on important issues.

The subjects in each group were asked how they felt they would like the stranger and how well they would enjoy working with him. The first two hypotheses were confirmed.

What Byrne tried to assess follows a pattern. First, the direction and strength of affect between two people in a dyad is measured. Each feeling can be expressed along a continuum from strongly positive to strongly negative. Once interaction begins reward and punishment are crucial determinants. Congruence of an attitude of one person with another constitutes a rewarding interaction. Therefore greater attitudinal similarity would be found among friends than among non friends.

In another study, Byrne & Nelson (1965) proposed that attraction toward a stranger is a positive function of the proportion of positive reinforcements received from the stranger. The method of investigation follows a similar pattern. The subjects are given attitude scales to complete. They are given the attitude scale of a same sexed stranger and asked to make judgments of the stranger, including attraction. A linear relationship was found between the proportion of similar attitudes and degree of attraction.

A Law of Attraction was proposed: "attraction toward a stranger is a positive function of the proportion of that stranger's attitudes which are similar to those of the subject" (Byrne & Griffitt, 1966, p. 699). This relationship appears to hold true from children aged nine to college seniors, no difference across age levels were found (Byrne & Griffitt, 1966).

Hypothetical Person and Experimental Design

Is it possible to evaluate a stranger who displays certain attitudes as a positive "friend"? Can the results of a hypothetical situation be translated into predicted results of a situation involving real people? Smith (1957) studied perceived similarity of values in relation to the extent to which one believes he is accepted by another. Again hypothetical people were used and subjects were asked to relate their feelings about the stranger. Smith acknowledged, however, that the subjects did not know the strangers beyond the given statements of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey scale of values. Whether or not the subjects recognized that one stranger agreed with them on certain items while the second stranger disagreed is never determined. Since the subjects reacted in an orderly fashion Smith concluded there was a casual relationship.

Many studies investigating attitude similarity and interpersonal attraction have utilized hypothetical persons as target persons for the subjects. However, Newcomb (1961) has observed that initial reactions of real people, students living in a dormitory, do not often persist into a relationship of friendship. Therefore, initial reactions to a hypothetical person, who purportedly completed an attitude scale, in a specified way, does not evidence sound reasoning for predicting long term relationships such as friendships.

The utilization of a hypothetical person is too artificial to reflect the circumstances under which a real friendship is formed. Of course a design including a hypothetical person simplifies the

experiment and allows the experimenter to exert control over some variables, such as exposing the hypothetical person as one who has similar attitudes or dissimilar attitudes with the subjects. Such a design would gain merit if it could be shown that a hypothetical person could replace a real person as a target person for the subject. The experiment would be more complex since there are more uncontrolled variables when using real people. Nevertheless, if the results of an experiment using a hypothetical person were the same as the results of an experiment using a real person, then there would be a justification for the use of hypothetical strangers in a study investigating attitude similarity and interpersonal attraction.

The Friendship Model

Wright (1968) has criticized the methodology of some studies on interpersonal attraction, charging that the degree of similarity is often treated with greater conceptual elaboration and methodological refinement than is attraction. The focus of attention on the similarity or dissimilarity aspects frequently overshadows the individual characteristics of the subjects. Authors may be attributing certain relationships due to attraction when, in fact, attraction may be due to methodological artifacts. The many forms attraction may take, plus the number of sources of rewards on which attraction may be based, appears to be too complex a problem to be explained by one equation. Wright notes " . . . hypothesis of one dyad may not be supported for another" (Wright, 1969 a, p. 296). " . . . if one is interested in attraction within a particular kind of dyadic relationship a more stable criterion

seems to be indicated" (Wright, 1969 a, p. 297). A more concrete criterion of friendship is described in the development of Wright's friendship model. Wright concentrates on a specific relationship, friendship between same sexed pairs, rather than a global perspective of attraction. The friendship model developed was based upon relationships between real people rather than between a subject and a hypothetical person.

Friendship Variables

A more comprehensive set of friendship variables is included in Wright's model. According to the model, friendship can be measured in terms of "voluntary interdependence" (VID) between two individuals. The level of VID measures " . . . the degree to which 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" (Wright, 1969 a, p. 297). If a person spends much of his "free" time with someone, it is assumed the friendship is stronger, and is reflected in a high level of measured VID. A growing friendship would be mirrored in an increasing level of VID whereas a weakening friendship would be indicated by a decreasing degree of VID.

Since all friendships are not assumed to be perfect, Wright (1969 a, p. 298) has considered a difficult-to-maintain (DTM) variable in friendships. The level of DTM measures the degree that the friendship is

. . . marked by misunderstandings, arguments, and hard to resolve problems and to the degree that the partners have to spend time clarifying communications, soothing ruffled feelings and exercising restraint to keep the friendship intact.

Disagreement on an important issue does not necessarily mean the end of a friendship but it may make the friendship more difficult to maintain than if there were no disagreements (Are there such relationships?).

Rewards and benefits of a relationship make the friendship worthwhile. A person may value some aspects of one friendship and different aspects of another friendship. Wright (1969 a, p. 299) includes three values of friendship in his model. The first, stimulation value (SV)

. . . refers to the degree to which one person (the subject) sees another as interesting and imaginative, capable of introducing the subject to new ideas and activities and capable of leading him into an expansion and elaboration of his present knowledge and outlook. Utility value (UV) refers to the degree to which the subject sees another person as cooperative, helpful, and, in general, willing to use his time and resources to help the subject to meet his own personal goals and needs. Ego Support value (ESV) refers to 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 maintain an impression of himself as a competent, worthwhile person.

These three values are considered direct rewards of a friendship and factors which influence and facilitate the effects of "intraindividual characteristics" in a dyadic relationship.

A Pilot Study

In an unpublished study, Wright (1969 b) tested the friendship model with respect to possible effects of attitude and interest similarity. Subjects who participated in each of four studies were well acquainted same sexed partners enrolled in psychology classes. They responded to opinion, interest or agreement measures depending upon which of four different groups they participated in. Then the pairs of subjects described each other with the Acquaintance Description Form (ADF).

In the first two studies, measures of perceived and actual similarity of opinion and beliefs were not found to be related to any aspects of the friendship model.

The last two studies were concerned with similarity of preferences for specific day to day activities and similarity of interests in more general areas of concern and their relationship with various aspects of friendship.

For male pairs, mean VID scores and mean SV scores were significantly higher for the high than for the low levels of similarity in specific daily activities. There was a higher level of DTM found for similarity in both specific daily activities and general areas of interest. The mean UV scores were significantly higher for high than for low similarity in general areas of interest.

For female pairs, mean VID scores and mean SV scores were significantly higher for high than for low similarity in general areas of interest. Mean UV scores were significantly higher for high than for low similarity in both general areas of interest and specific daily activity. Finally, mean ESV scores were significantly higher for high than for low similarity in both general areas of interest and specific daily activities.

From this exploratory study, it appears that "men tend to form their stronger friendships with other men who agree with them concerning their specific day to day activity" (Wright, 1969 b, p. 10). They also find these men to be interesting and stimulating. Agreement in broader, more abstract areas of interest does not seem to affect the friendship or the stimulating value of the friendship between males.

For females, just the opposite of this was found to be true. This indicates women tend to form friendships on the basis of participation in discussions in a general area of mutual interests while men tend to form friendships with other men on the basis of mutual interest in participating in specific daily activities. It also appeared that male pairs are likely to have difficulty in maintaining their friendship if they agree on both specific daily activity and broader areas of interest, and, are not likely to have this tension if they are dissimilar in both areas. Similarity for women in either area does not seem to affect the DTM dimension.

Wright (1969 b) speculates that assuming women are passive and acquiescent, they would be likely to highlight areas of agreement and compatibility with other women while overlooking areas of conflict and disagreement. Men, however, assuming them to be aggressive and argumentative, would be alert to areas of disagreement and potential conflict with other men. For women, UV and ESV constitute a single, more general factor of "overall supportiveness" and women tend to associate such supportiveness with global similarity. For men, UV and ESV are separate entities. A male "is more likely to see ego-support in terms of its supportiveness and utility value in terms of its potential for helping him reach specific goals" (Wright, 1969 b, p. 14). A woman, however, combines favors and cooperation as well as ego support as an indication of global supportiveness.

Statement of the Problem

In general, Wright's study indicates men are more oriented toward specific action while women are more oriented toward sharing

general ideas. With this in mind, the present study was designed to investigate the following propositions, based upon agreement in both specific and general areas and it's relationship to male and female differences in friendship:

Hypothesis 1. Males who agree on specific daily activity will have a higher level of VID. Females who are similar in general areas of interest will have a high level of VID.

Hypothesis 2. Males who are similar in specific daily activity will have a high level of SV. Females who are similar in general areas of interest will have a high level of SV.

Hypothesis 3. Males who are similar in specific daily activity and in general areas of interest will have a higher level of DTM than males who are similar in specific daily activity alone. Females who have low agreement in general areas of interest will have a high level of DTM.

Hypothesis 4. Males who are similar in general areas of interest will have a high level of UV. Females who are similar in general areas of interest and in specific daily activity will have a high UV.

Hypothesis 5. Males who are similar in specific daily activity will have a high level of ESV. Females who are similar in specific daily activity and general areas of interest will have a high ESV.

The present investigation also will explore the differences between reactions to a hypothetical stranger and reactions to a real acquaintance.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Overview

The investigation was divided into two parts: one part dealt with a hypothetical person (stranger) as a partner, the other part required a known acquaintance as a partner. The method used for these two situations was similar. The subjects were students who reported to the investigator as partial fulfillment of credit requirements for an introduction to psychology course. The students were led to believe the focus of the investigation was on impression formation. In Study I the students completed two checklists. They were given the completed checklist of the hypothetical stranger and asked to examine it in order to form an idea of what this stranger was like. The subjects then described the stranger by completing the ADF. In Study II the subjects reported in same sex pairs. Each partner completed the checklists, exchanged checklists with their partner and examined the items on the exchanged checklists. They completed the ADF describing their partners. Finally they answered a five item questionnaire.

The checklists of the student and the stranger in the hypothetical situation, and of the partners in the actual situation were compared and scored for agreement of items checked. Subjects were then divided into groups according to the degree of agreement on each

checklist. Four groups resulted: (1) high agreement on specific daily activity--low agreement on general abstract areas of interest; (2) high agreement on specific daily activity--high agreement on general abstract areas of interest; (3) low agreement on specific daily activity--high agreement on general abstract areas of interest; and (4) low agreement on specific daily activity--low agreement on general abstract areas of interest. Each of the five scales of the ADF was scored and tested for differences related to the different levels of agreement.

Development of Checklists

The design of the experiment called for two kinds of checklists. One checklist was needed to describe general, abstract areas of interest, the other checklist was needed to describe specific daily activities. Twenty-five items in each checklist would be used in the actual experiment. The subjects would be asked to check ten items in each list.

One-hundred-forty-nine items describing individual activities, daily events, abstract ideas and general interests formed a preliminary list from which the original checklists evolved. The list was given to 17 graduate students in the psychology department with the instruction:

General items refer to those items which deal with all or the overall aspects of a subject without attempting to deal with specific aspects--that is, those items which are non-exclusive and widespread, indicating an extensive range or scope.

Specific items refer to those items having a special application or bearing, those which are explicit, precise and particular, and are indications of one definite instance or activity.

Indicate which of the following items you would choose as general by placing a "G" in the corresponding blank on the answer sheet, and which items you would choose as specific by placing an "S" in the corresponding blank. Indicate "G" or "S" for all items.

The 25 most frequently marked items for specific category and the 25 most frequently marked items for general category composed the checklists used in the investigation. The checklists (see Appendix A) actually used in the experiment included the following instruction:

Below are two lists of 25 items each. Check ten items in each list in which you would be most interested to participate, discuss and/or think about. Check only ten items in each list which you know to be most typical of you.

Checklist Responses for the Hypothetical Stranger

In order to supply the subjects of Study I with information about a hypothetical stranger, falsified checklists were presented to them. Ten items in each of the two checklists had to be chosen to represent another student who would be typical of the subjects. Students enrolled in an educational psychology class were given the checklists and asked to complete them. Fifty-seven females and 45 males checked ten items in each list. Response frequency for each item was tallied and ten items whose number of responses clustered around the median were chosen to be used for the strangers' checklists. For females, the items with the frequency range of 17-39 were used; for males the range was 14-30.

Acquaintance Description Form

The Acquaintance Description Form (ADF) (see Appendix B) developed by Wright (1969 a) is a person perception questionnaire measuring the degree to which the subject associates each of the components of Wright's friendship model with a specified acquaintance, the target person (TP). The five components are: (1) the level of friendship,

voluntary interdependence (VID); (2) the difficult to maintain dimension (DTM); (3) the benefits or direct rewards of the relationship which include stimulation value (SV); (4) Utility value (UV); and (5) Ego-support value (ESV).

The ADF consists of sixty items divided into six scales, a separate scale for each of the five components of the friendship model plus a correction scale, labeled "general favorability" (GF). The subject responds to each item by circling a numbered or lettered alternative of his choice. There are five alternatives to respond to each item. Each response is scored 0 - 4 and the scores on the relevant items are summed to provide a total raw score for each scale. The general favorability scale, consisting of ten "globally complimentary items" provides a means of correction for the "halo effects," since subjects have a tendency to react in a generally positive way to their more liked associates.

A Five Item Questionnaire

The last form the subjects in Study II would complete is the five item questionnaire (see Appendix C). This questionnaire would provide the subjects with a coherent explanation for exchanging their checklists with their partner. The questions used in the questionnaire asked the subjects about items his partner checked. For example, "Were you surprised with any items your partner checked?" The subject checked "Yes" or "No" in response to all five questions. Since the questionnaire was used for the sole purpose of providing the subjects in Study II with a reason for exchanging his checklist with his partner the results of the questionnaire were not used in the final analysis.

Experimental ConditionsStudy I: Response to a
Hypothetical Stranger

One-hundred-thirty-four males and 124 females participated in Study I. They were also permitted to take part in Study II. The subjects first completed the checklist. Then they received the checklist of the stranger with the following instructions:

This is a checklist which was filled out by an average college student of your approximate age and same sex. Please examine carefully those items which are checked compared to those items which are not checked. Then try to form an idea of what this person is like.

Finally the students completed the ADF describing the stranger (TP) with the following instructions:

With your present impression of the Target Person in mind (from the last checklist) please fill out this form. Think about each item carefully and mark each item as if you knew the TP quite well. Fill out the form completely and do not skip any items. Mark the answer sheet only.

The checklists of the stranger and subject were compared. Items checked on both lists scored 1 point so it was possible to obtain from 0 points, indicating no agreement, to 10 points, indicating perfect agreement. Same sexed subjects were divided into four groups according to level of agreement. The groups and the range of the scores for each level of agreement are found in Figure 1. The ADF scores were calculated for each scale and appropriately related to the level of agreement in preparation for analysis.

Females:	1. High Specific (5-8)	3. Low Specific (1-4)
	Low General (1-4)	Low General (1-4)
	2. High Specific (5-8)	4. Low Specific (1-4)
	High General (5-6)	High General (5-6)
Males:	1. High Specific (5-7)	3. Low Specific (3-4)
	Low General (1-4)	Low General (1-4)
	2. High Specific (5-7)	4. Low Specific (3-4)
	High General (5-7)	High General (5-7)

Fig. 1.--Agreement levels and range of scores

Study II: Response to an
Actual Acquaintance

There were 212 students reporting in same sex pairs in order to participate in second part of the investigation. Each partner was a known acquaintance of the other, but no criterion was established as to how long nor how well each subject knew his partner. The group was divided into 46 male pairs and 60 female pairs. Subjects first completed the checklist. Then they exchanged checklists and were given the following instruction:

Please examine the checklist of your partner and carefully note those items which are checked compared to those items which are not checked.

The subjects then completed the ADF describing their partner. Finally they answered the five item questionnaire. Again the items of the checklists were compared and scored in the same manner as in the first part of this investigation. The same subgroups were formed with the ranges of the scores as found in Figure 2. The ADF scores were calculated for each scale and appropriately related to the level of agreement in preparation for analysis.

Females:	1. High Specific (6-9) Low General (2-4)	3. Low Specific (2-5) Low General (2-4)
	2. High Specific (6-9) High General (5-10)	4. Low Specific (2-5) High General (5-10)
Males:	1. High Specific (6-9) Low General (2-4)	3. Low Specific (2-5) Low General (2-4)
	2. High Specific (6-9) High General (5-9)	4. Low Specific (2-5) High General (5-9)

Fig. 2.--Agreement levels and range of scores

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Plan of Analysis

There are primarily two sets of data from both male and female subjects. One set of data was obtained from the reactions of the subjects to the hypothetical stranger in Study I. The other set of data was obtained from the reactions of the subjects to an actual acquaintance in Study II. The male data are treated separately from the female data throughout the analysis.

In each case, there were measures of agreement on specific daily activities and agreement on general areas of interest. Also in each case, the data were divided into high versus low agreement on specific daily activities, and high versus low agreement on general areas of interest. When these dimensions are compiled simultaneously, the data results in widely disparate cell frequencies. The cell frequencies are given in Table 1 for Study I and in Table 3 for Study II. As an example of the spread of cell frequencies, in Table 3 one can see a spread of 34 subjects in one cell to 4 subjects in another cell.

In order to study the effects of the levels of agreement for each ADF scale, a 2 X 2 analysis of variance was applied to the data. However, because there were unequal frequencies in the subclasses, the computation of the sum of squares would be very complex. Therefore, an

approximate method was sought. An approximation of the weighted mean solution, as described by Walker and Lev (1953, pp. 381-382), was the method used.

After the data were divided into the various levels of agreement, the mean score for each of the five scales of the ADF was computed. Each cell in Table 1 for Study I and in Table 3 for Study II contains an entry which shows the number of subjects in the subclass and the mean score for each ADF scale of the subjects.

The mean square for error was adjusted to account for the unequal number of subjects in each subclass. This adjustment was made by multiplying the mean square within subclasses by a constant. The constant is the sum of the reciprocal of the subclass frequencies multiplied by the reciprocal of the number of subclasses which was, in all cases, one-fourth.

Then the sums of squares for the rows, columns, and interaction were computed by treating each mean in Table 1 for Study I and in Table 3 for Study II as a single observation. Summary of the results of the 2 X 2 analysis of variance is presented in Table 2 for Study I and in Table 4 for Study II.

In Study II an additional computation was necessary. Two ADF questionnaires one for each partner of the same sexed pairs, were completed. The scores of each ADF scale could not be considered independent of the other scores of the corresponding ADF scale in the pair. Therefore the scores for each scale were averaged and used as a single index before the means of the ADF scores for each agreement subclass were computed. From this step forward, the same procedure for the 2 X 2 analysis of variance, as described above, was applied to the data.

TABLE 1

STUDY I: MEANS OF ADF SCORES FOR SUBJECTS AT DIFFERENT LEVELS
OF AGREEMENT IN SPECIFIC DAILY ACTIVITY AND IN GENERAL
AREAS OF INTEREST

ADF Scales	MALE SUBJECTS				FEMALE SUBJECTS			
	Similarity in Specific High		Similarity in Specific Low		Similarity in Specific High		Similarity in Specific Low	
	Similarity in General		Similarity in General		Similarity in General		Similarity in General	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
VID	N 47	38	25	27	25	58	11	30
	M 20.06	21.13	17.44	17.92	19.52	21.22	19.28	18.27
SV	M 22.26	21.87	21.30	21.28	24.00	24.66	25.00	24.67
UV	M 18.13	19.87	19.27	19.20	18.84	19.40	18.09	18.63
DTM	M 25.02	23.87	22.20	24.04	23.00	23.81	23.73	21.93
ESV	M 18.49	19.37	19.00	18.04	18.40	18.45	20.73	18.93

Study I: Reactions to a Hypothetical Stranger

From Table 2 it can be seen that there is a significant F at the .05 level for the specific condition with VID mean score for male subjects. By examining the means of this group in Table 1, it can be said that males who are similar in specific daily activity have a higher VID mean score than males who were low in agreement in specific daily activity. There were no significant differences found for any of the other dimensions of the friendship model for males or females.

TABLE 2

STUDY II: SUMMARY OF 2 X 2 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN ADF FOR
SUBJECTS AT DIFFERENT LEVELS OF AGREEMENT IN SPECIFIC
DAILY ACTIVITY AND IN GENERAL AREAS OF INTEREST

Source	MALE SUBJECTS (N=137)				FEMALE SUBJECTS (N=124)			
	df	MS	F	P	df	MS	F	P
	VID				VID			
Specific	1	8.506	5.449	NS	1	1.750	.902	NS
General	1	.600	.384	NS	1	.010	.055	NS
Interaction	1	.084	.053	NS	1	2.640	1.360	NS
	SV				SV			
Specific	1	.598	.590	NS	1	.255	.167	NS
General	1	.041	.040	NS	1	.028	.018	NS
Interaction	1	.033	.032	NS	1	.245	.161	NS
	UV				UV			
Specific	1	.076	.106	NS	1	.572	1.040	NS
General	1	.698	.981	NS	1	.302	.549	NS
Interaction	1	.797	1.120	NS	1	.245	.161	NS
	DTM				DTM			
Specific	1	1.162	1.172	NS	1	.331	.223	NS
General	1	.118	.119	NS	1	.242	.163	NS
Interaction	1	2.830	2.855	NS	1	1.694	1.141	NS
	ESV				ESV			
Specific	1	.169	.394	NS	1	.975	1.264	NS
General	1	.003	.006	NS	1	.801	1.038	NS
Interaction	1	.846	1.751	NS	1	.807	1.046	NS

Study II: Reactions to an Actual Acquaintance

Male Subjects

No significant differences were found for male subjects between the VID mean scores and the degree of agreement on the specific daily activity or on the general areas of interest.

Tables 3 and 4 indicate a significant difference at the .05 level for SV mean scores and the general areas of interest category. It appears that a low level of agreement on general areas of interest has a higher stimulation value than a high level of agreement.

There is a significant interaction effect at the .05 level among the mean scores of UV. In order to determine which of the means differed from another, The Duncan Multiple Range Test was applied to the data.

TABLE 3

STUDY II: MEANS OF ADF SCORES FOR PAIRS OF SUBJECTS AT DIFFERENT LEVELS OF AGREEMENT IN SPECIFIC DAILY ACTIVITY AND IN GENERAL AREAS OF INTEREST

ADF Scales	MALE PAIRS				FEMALE PAIRS			
	Similarity in Specific High		Similarity in Specific Low		Similarity in Specific High		Similarity in Specific Low	
	Similarity in General		Similarity in General		Similarity in General		Similarity in General	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
VID	N 23	5	11	7	34	4	18	4
	M 23.97	25.50	25.59	25.57	28.47	24.78	27.13	26.88
SV	M 21.46	23.00	21.09	24.29	22.23	19.63	21.39	24.13
UV	M 20.70	18.90	19.27	22.70	21.01	20.75	21.06	14.87
DTM	M 21.43	21.70	20.27	18.64	20.46	24.75	20.97	24.13
ESV	M 20.04	18.30	20.27	18.64	18.75	20.40	19.50	18.75

TABLE 4

STUDY II: SUMMARY OF 2 X 2 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN ADF SCORES
FOR PAIRS OF SUBJECTS AT DIFFERENT LEVELS OF AGREEMENT
IN SPECIFIC DAILY ACTIVITY AND IN GENERAL
AREAS OF INTEREST

Source	MALE PAIRS (N=46)				FEMALE PAIRS (N=60)			
	df	MS	F	P	df	MS	F	P
		<u>VID</u>				<u>VID</u>		
Specific	1	.708	.220	NS	1	.143	.023	NS
General	1	.710	.220	NS	1	3.887	.635	NS
Interaction	1	.448	.139	NS	1	2.960	1.792	NS
		<u>SV</u>				<u>SV</u>		
Specific	1	.212	.229	NS	1	3.334	1.898	NS
General	1	5.612	6.067	.05	1	.005	.002	NS
Interaction	1	.679	.734	NS	1	7.149	4.072	.05*
		<u>UV</u>				<u>UV</u>		
Specific	1	1.409	1.241	NS	1	8.506	3.722	NS
General	1	.663	.584	NS	1	10.385	4.544	.05*
Interaction	1	6.802	5.992	.05*	1	8.751	3.829	NS
		<u>DTM</u>				<u>DTM</u>		
Specific	1	4.453	2.243	NS	1	.006	.001	NS
General	1	.466	.234	NS	1	13.757	4.532	.05
Interaction	1	.896	.451	NS	1	.306	.100	NS
		<u>ESV</u>				<u>ESV</u>		
Specific	1	.082	.052	NS	1	.202	.124	NS
General	1	2.845	1.890	NS	1	.202	.124	NS
Interaction	1	.000	.000	NS	1	1.434	.884	NS

*See Table 5

The Duncan Multiple Range Test is used to determine which comparison of means is significant. The shortest significant range is compared with each difference between the means. If the difference

exceeds the range, it is significant (Duncan, 1955). In Table 5, any two means not underscored by the same line are significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 5

RESULTS OF THE DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST FOR ADF SCALES
OF UV FOR MALE PAIRS, UV AND SV FOR FEMALE PAIRS

	<u>MALE PAIRS</u>			
UV Means (in rank order)	<u>18.90</u>	<u>19.27</u>	20.70	22.70
	<u>FEMALE PAIRS</u>			
SV Means (in rank order)	19.625	<u>21.386</u>	<u>22.235</u>	24.125
UV Means (in rank order)	14.874	<u>20.875</u>	<u>21.055</u>	<u>21.051</u>

Notes:

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different. Any two means underscored by the same line are NOT significantly different at .05 level.

The subclass that is low on both specific daily activity and on general areas of interest is significantly different from all other mean scores. Since this subgroup has the highest mean score, it can be said that males who are low in agreement have a higher UV mean score than males who are high in agreement on both categories.

The next highest UV mean score occurred in the subclass that had high agreement on both specific daily activity and on general areas

of interest. Referring to Table 5, this UV mean score was found to be significantly different from all other means in the group.

There were no significant differences found for comparisons involving the DTM or the ESV mean scores and the levels of agreement.

Females

No significant differences were found for female subjects between the VID mean scores and the degree of agreement on specific daily activity or on the general areas of interest.

There is a significant interaction effect indicated at the .05 level for the SV scale. Again the Duncan Multiple Range Test was applied to the data to determine which of the comparisons of the means differed significantly from another. By examining Table 5, it can be seen that the highest SV mean score and the lowest SV mean score are significantly different from all other means. Both of these means are in the low agreement on general areas of interest subgroup, as shown by Table 3. However, the highest mean is also in the low agreement on specific daily activity subgroup, whereas the lowest mean is in the high agreement on specific daily activity subgroup.

From Table 4 it can be seen that there is a significant difference at the .05 level for the UV mean scores in the general areas of interest category. Examining Table 3, it is found that the UV mean score is higher for the high agreement than low agreement subgroup on general areas of interest. However, the UV mean score in the subclass of agreement on specific daily activity and on general areas of interest appears conspicuously low. Therefore the Duncan Multiple Range Test was applied to the data with the results in Table 5. It can be

seen that the lowest mean score is significantly different from all other mean scores, while the other means are not significantly different from each other.

There is a significant difference at the .05 level among DTM mean scores in the general areas of interest category. The DTM mean score is higher for the low than for the high agreement level in the general areas of interest condition.

There were no significant differences found for comparisons involving the ESV mean scores.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The present study was designed to investigate the hypothesis that men tend to form friendships with other men who agree with them on specific daily activities and they would also tend to find these men interesting and stimulating. It was also hypothesized that women tend to form friendships with other women who agreed with them on general areas of interest, and they would tend to find these women interesting and stimulating.

Interpretation of the Results: Study I

It was found that males who are similar in specific daily activity have a higher level of friendship than males who are low on agreement in specific daily activity. This result supports the hypothesis that males tend to form friendships with other males who agree with them on specific daily activities. However, this finding stands alone in the present investigation since the same relationship was not found with male pairs in Study II. Furthermore, there were no other significant findings in Study I.

One questions why the results of other studies using hypothetical persons, such as Byrne's designs, are found significant while the majority of the results of Study I were not found to be significant. Two explanations are tenable.

The checklist of the hypothetical stranger appears to represent a person with whom the subjects did not tend to highly agree. This is based upon the fact that the subjects in the high agreement subclass, for both males and females, did not reach extreme high scores. The range of scores for the high agreement groups were in the distribution of 5-6, to 5-8, while a score of 10 indicates perfect agreement. This suggests that subjects did not highly agree with the hypothetical stranger on either specific daily activity or general areas of interest.

A second aspect of this investigation which may have influenced the results concerns the ADF. The mean VID scores of Study I are considerably lower than the mean VID scores of Study II. The ADF measures specific relationships between same sexed pairs, rather than global perspectives of attraction. A subject may be more cautious when responding to items concerning specific commitment and less hesitant to indicate a general willingness to be associated with a stranger.

Interpretation of the Results: Study II

Men who are less similar with other men in general areas of interest are found to be more interesting and stimulating than men who are more similar in general areas of interest. Although this finding does not confirm the hypotheses, it does indicate that men find other men who disagree with them on general areas of interest to be interesting and stimulating. The assumption that men are aggressive and argumentative is reinforced by the idea that men are not only alert to potential conflict, but they find this conflict with other men to be stimulating.

Women, on the other hand, find other women who agree less with them in both general areas of interest and on specific daily activity to be more stimulating and interesting than other women who are more similar to them in both areas. This result does not support the hypothesis. It does indicate, however, that women tend to find conflict with other women stimulating as well as interesting.

Men find other men who agree less with them on general areas of interest and on specific daily activity to be most cooperative and helpful. Also, men find other men who agree with them on general areas of interest and on specific daily activity to be cooperative and helpful. These two significant results present a dilemma, due to the polarization of agreement. It may be that men who are dissimilar in both categories offer new ideas which are useful to other men. At the same time, men who are similar in both areas may support other men by consensus. At least there appears to be consistency in the relationship since they either agree or disagree in both areas. That, in itself, may have some utility value.

Women, however, tend to find other women who agree with them on general areas of interest to be cooperative and helpful. This finding partially confirms the hypothesis and supports the idea that women are abstract and verbally-oriented. Furthermore, women tend to find other women who are dissimilar with them concerning specific daily activity and general areas of interest to have the least utility value. This suggests women find disagreement on both categories to be of little value in cooperation and helpfulness.

Women find other women who agree on general areas of interest less difficult to get along with than women who disagree with them on general areas of interest. This finding confirms the hypothesis and supports the idea that women are oriented toward general areas of interest since agreement in this area provides an easy going relationship.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore some sex differences in agreement-attraction relationships. It was hypothesized that males would tend to form friendships on the basis of mutual agreement with other men on specific daily activity. Women, on the other hand, would tend to form friendships with other women who agreed on general areas of interests.

The investigation was divided into two parts: one part dealt with a hypothetical person (stranger) as a partner, the other part required a known acquaintance as a partner. In Study I, the subjects completed two checklists. One checklist described specific daily activities, the other checklist described general areas of interest. Then they were given the completed checklists of the hypothetical stranger and asked to examine it in order to form an idea of what this stranger was like. The subjects described the stranger by completing the ADF. In Study II the subjects reported in same sexed pairs. Each partner completed the checklists, exchanged checklists with their partner and examined the items on the exchanged checklists. Then they completed the ADF describing their partners.

The subjects were divided into groups according to the degree of agreement on each checklist. Four groups resulted. Each of the

five scales of the ADF were scored and compared to the levels of agreement. Then a 2 X 2 analysis of variance was applied to the data.

In Study I, it was found that males who are similar in specific daily activity have a higher level of VID than males who are low in agreement on specific daily activity. No other significant relationships were found.

In Study II, men who are less similar in general areas of interest found other men to be more interesting and stimulating than males who are similar in general areas of interest. Women who agree less in both general areas of interest and on specific daily activity were found to be more interesting and stimulating than women who are more similar in both areas. Males who agree less with other males in both areas had a higher utility value than if they agreed highly in one of the areas. Women found other women who agree with them on general areas of interest to be of greater utility value and less likely to have difficulty in maintaining their friendships. Possible explanations for failure to confirm the hypotheses were discussed.

It was noted that the results of the two studies did not support each other. Whereas one study had a significant result, the other study did not. This suggests that studies which use a hypothetical stranger are not reflective of studies which use a known acquaintance. It was also pointed out that subjects may be more willing to accept a hypothetical stranger in a more generalized association rather than under specific commitments. Further investigations in this area are necessary before final conclusions can be drawn.

APPENDIX A - CHECK LIST

Below are two lists of 25 items each. Check ten items in each list in which you would be most interested to participate, discuss and/or think about. Check only ten items in each list which you know to be most typical of you.

I

(check 10 items)

1. study for a long time until I'm caught up
2. listen to long hair music (symphonies)
3. study at short intervals during the day
4. go to a small party with known acquaintances
5. go out for a few beers
6. spend time painting and drawing
7. work on my car
8. write creative writings such as poetry
9. skip supper
10. play pool
11. study in the library or someplace quiet
12. get up in late morning
13. skip breakfast
14. clean the room
15. sew my own outfits
16. study where there is loud noise or music
17. wash my own hair and groom it
18. go for a long walk alone
19. skip lunch
20. get at least eight hours sleep
21. watch soap operas on T.V.
22. work on an extra project for class
23. go to bed at an early hour (before midnight)
24. eat a good lunch
25. talk on the phone for a long time

II

(check 10 items)

1. law and order
2. fashions
3. philosophy of life
4. mass media

- _____ 5. welfare program
- _____ 6. economic stability
- _____ 7. historical events
- _____ 8. law
- _____ 9. armed forces
- _____ 10. automobile industry
- _____ 11. aesthetics
- _____ 12. safety on highways
- _____ 13. health
- _____ 14. music
- _____ 15. child care
- _____ 16. travel
- _____ 17. politics
- _____ 18. education
- _____ 19. international relations
- _____ 20. social life
- _____ 21. farm industry
- _____ 22. sports (spectator such as football)
- _____ 23. wild life
- _____ 24. literature
- _____ 25. poetry

APPENDIX B - ACQUAINTANCE FORM

Statements

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

1. TP can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.
2. If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on TP to be willing to loan it to me.
3. TP's ways of dealing with people make him (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 (or 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 of 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.
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 (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 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 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 had to postpone his trip for a month, I would seriously consider postponing my own trip for a month also.

APPENDIX C - QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Were you surprised with any items your partner checked? Yes No
2. Do you think you surprised your partner with any items
you checked? Yes No
3. Could you have checked more, less, or the same number
of items than the ten items? More Less Same
4. Do you feel your partner would have checked the same
items you did, if he were asked to check the list as if
he were you? Yes No
5. Do you feel your partner would have checked the same
items as your partner, if you were asked to fill out the
checklist as if you were your partner? Yes No

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Banta, T. J., & Heatherington, M. Relations between needs of friends and fiances. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 68, 401-404.
- Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. H. Interpersonal Attraction. Reading, Mass.: Addison Welson Publishing Co., 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 of positive reinforcement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1962, 1, 659-663.
- Byrne, D., & Wong, T. Racial prejudice, interpersonal attraction and assumed dissimilarity of attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 246-253.
- Byrne, D., & Blaylock, H. Similarity and assumed similarity of attitudes between husbands and wives. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 636-640.
- Byrne, D., & Golightly, C. Attitude statements as positive and negative reinforcements. Science, 1965, 146, 798-799.
- Byrne, D., & Griffett, W. A developmental investigation of the law of attraction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 699-702.
- Cronbach, L. J. Proposals leading to analytic treatment of social perception scores. Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior, Edited by Tagiuri & Petrullo. Stamford: Stamford Press, 1958, 353-380.
- Duncan, D. B. Multiple range and multiple F tests. Biometrics, 1955, 11, 1-42.
- Festinger, L. Architecture and group membership. Journal of Social Issues, 1951, 1, 152-163.
- Gross, E. Primary functions of the small group. American Journal of Sociology, 1954, 60, 24-29. Cited by A. J. Lott, & B. E. Lott, Group cohesiveness as interpersonal attraction: A review of relationships with antecedent and consequent variables. Psychology Bulletin, 1965, 64, 259-303.

- Heider, F. Perceiving the other person. Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior, Edited by Tagiuri & Petrullo. Stamford: Stamford Press, 1958, 22-26.
- Izard, C. Personality similarity and friendship. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 47-51. (a)
- Izard, C. Personality similarity, positive affect, and interpersonal attraction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 484-485. (b)
- Izard, C. 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.
- Lott, A. J., & Lott, B. E. Group cohesiveness as interpersonal attraction: A review of relationships with antecedent and consequent variables. Psychology Bulletin, 1965, 64, 259-303.
- Newcomb, T. M. Personality and Social Change: Attitude Formation in a College Community. New York: Dryden Press, 1943.
- Newcomb, T. M. The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt, 1961.
- Newcomb, T. M. The prediction of interpersonal attraction. Current Perspectives in Social Psychology, Edited by Hollander & Hunt. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Smith, A. J. Similarity of values and its relation to acceptance and the projection of similarity. Journal of Psychology, 1957, 43, 251-260.
- Walker, H., & Lev, J. Statistical Inference. New York: Holt, 1953.
- Winch, R. F. Complementary needs in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 552-555.
- Wright, P. Need similarity, need complementarity and a place of personality in interpersonal attraction. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1968, 3, 125-135.
- Wright, P. A model and technique for studies of friendship. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, 295-309. (a)
- Wright, P. Some new leads concerning agreement & friendship. University of North Dakota, 1969 (unpublished work). (b)