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CHAPTER ONE

THE NEED FOR SYSTEMATIC INVESTIGATIONS FOCUSING ON THE NATURE OF INITIAL FRIENDSHIP FORMATION

Inquiries into the nature of initial friendship formation have been largely neglected in the past. In fact, the writer is aware of only two studies that deal with initial friendship formation. Newcomb\textsuperscript{1} dealt briefly with initial friendships. Williams\textsuperscript{2} presents a largely descriptive analysis that is suggestive in nature rather than a systematic analysis of factors related to initial friendship formation. This research project will attempt to offer a systematic examination of a number of factors as they influence initial friendship choice.

A review of the literature reveals three major omissions in previous research focusing on initial friendships. First, the literature largely ignores the degree to which the independent variables of socioeconomic-status, ethnicity, race, values and organizational points influence initial friendship choice. Second, previous researchers have primarily studied the relationship of the above


independent variables to reciprocated friendships without comparing the relationships of these variables to non-reciprocated friendships and non-friendships. Third, the degree to which the sex structure of the dyad* may influence the nature of the relationship between the above mentioned independent variables and friendship formation has not been examined. This research focuses on the above three omissions by systematically examining 1), the degree to which socioeconomic-status, ethnicity, race, values, and organizational points influence initial friendship choice, 2), the relationship of the above independent variables to reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friendships, and 3), the degree to which the sex structure of the dyad influences the relationship of the above independent variables to initial friendships choice. The remainder of this chapter will present a brief overview of the strategies to be employed that will accomplish the above three objectives.

With regard to the first mentioned objective, there has been considerable empirical and theoretical interest in the degree to which socioeconomic-status, ethnicity, 

* The sex structure of the dyad may be classified into two person combinations in which females may choose females, females may choose males, males may choose females, and males may choose males.
race, values and organizational points account for friendships that have been maintained for some time. The substantive theory focusing on the relationship of the above independent variables to friendships that have been maintained for some time will be explored for clues that will enable inferring the expected relationships of these independent variables to initial friendships.

The second mentioned objective concerns the relationship of socioeconomic-status, race, ethnicity, values, and organizational points to reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friendships. Most writers suggest that one must compare how one or more independent variables are related to friendships in which both partners choose each other with the general population of non-friends. But the above suggestion for determining the relationship of a given independent variable to reciprocated and non-friendships has never been utilized in research. And non-reciprocated friendships - which represent dyads in which one partner chooses another who does not return the choice - have also been neglected.

The lack of concern with the exact nature of the relationship of the independent variables proposed for this inquiry to reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friendships has resulted in a number of theoretical inconsistencies. These theoretical inconsistencies will be explored through developing a typology which specifies the
relationship of the above independent variables to reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friendships.

The third mentioned objective concerns the nature of the relationship of socioeconomic-status, race, ethnicity, values, and organizational points to friendship formation when the sex structure of the dyad has been specified. The lack of concern with the degree to which the above independent variables are related to initial friendship formation when the sex structure of the dyad has been taken into account has resulted in a number of conceptual ambiguities. These conceptual vagaries will be explored through developing a typology which specifies the sex structure of the dyad.

The division of the dependent variable into reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friendships plus the dimension of the sex structure of the dyad will constitute a typology of friendships. Independent variables will then be examined as they are related to the dimension of reciprocity in conjunction with the dimension of sex structure.
CHAPTER TWO

HOW INITIAL FRIENDSHIPS ARE FORMED AND WHY FRIENDSHIPS EMERGE BETWEEN PERSONS OF DESIGNATED KINDS

Introduction

The discussion to follow is devoted to developing a theoretical rationale that will enable the deduction of specific hypotheses about the relationship of the independent variables selected for this inquiry to initial friendship formation. Hypotheses will be presented which state the relationship between a given independent variable and reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friendships. Hypotheses will then be presented which state the rank ordering of the strength of the relationship of the independent variables to the aforementioned trio of friendship types. Also, hypotheses will be presented which explore the relationship of a given independent variable to friendship formation when the sex structure of the dyad has been specified.

The Dimension of Reciprocity

A basic assumption of most studies dealing with friendship choice is that friendships come about through interaction with others.
Chambliss points out that one selects:

"From a stream of acquaintances some few with whom friendships are formed... The problem of explaining this selectivity may be approached on the level of interaction for it is here that selectivity takes place. Since friendships ultimately derive from experiences in interpersonal behavior, it seems reasonable to seek an explanation of the selection of friends by analyzing the interaction process."

Given this assumption, Merton has suggested that the selection of friends may be viewed as the result of "patterned sequences of social interaction ... (which) give rise to the observed patterns of friendship between people of designated kinds." Observed patterns of friendship between certain kinds of people as opposed to other kinds of people are then offered as confirmation of theoretically expected selective patterns of interaction.

The logic of what is ordinarily meant when stating that interaction is patterned such that friendship selection occurs among persons of designated kinds has also been presented by Merton in the following passage:

"This means, presumably, that the proportion of their friends having the designated ... characteristic (of social status or, in this instance,}


of racial values) is appreciably greater than the proportion of people with this characteristic in the local population."

Merton indicates that the relationship between a given independent variable and friendship selection will vary as a function of the degree to which that independent variable discriminates between friends and the general population. The design of the present study enables stating the relationship between a given independent variable as a function of the degree to which that independent variable discriminates between reciprocated friends and non-friendships. Thus, interaction is patterned such that the degree to which friendships form between persons of designated kinds is a function of the degree to which a given independent variable discriminates between reciprocated friends and non-friends.

Furthermore, the logical possibility exists for the formation of non-reciprocated friendships. Non-reciprocated friendships represent dyads in which one person chooses another who does not return the choice. Aside from logical reasons, non-reciprocated friendships represent a neglected area of empirical research. A more representative portrayal of the logical and empirical state of affairs would seem to necessitate examining the relationship of independent variables to non-reciprocated friendships along with the relationship of independent variables to reciprocated and non-friendships.
Merton is correct in suggesting that interaction is patterned such "that the proportion of ... friends having the designated characteristic (of social status, or in this instance, of racial values) is appreciably greater than the proportion of people with this characteristic in the local population." Interaction is patterned such that the degree to which friendships form between persons of designated kinds is a function of the degree to which a given independent variable discriminates between reciprocated friends and non-friends. But interaction is also patterned such that the degree to which friendships form between persons of designated kinds is a function of the degree to which a given independent variable discriminates between reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friends.

It is in this latter sense in which friendship formation is being considered here. This research is concerned with the degree to which a given independent variable discriminates between reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friendships.* And the degree to which a given

---

1loc. cit.

* The division of the dependent variable into reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friendships will also be referred to as the dimension of reciprocity or the reciprocity dimension. Whenever 'reciprocity' is used in the remainder of this research, it will be understood that reference is being made to the division of the dependent variable into reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friendships.
independent variable discriminates among different friendship types along the reciprocity dimension is a function of the degree to which friendships form among persons of designated kinds. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to examining the degree to which a given independent variable may influence patterns of interaction such that persons of designated kinds may be differentially represented along the reciprocity dimension.

The Relationships of Organizational Points, Socioeconomic-status, Race, Ethnicity, and Values to Reciprocity

One of the most frequently mentioned factors influencing selective patterns of interaction is propinquity. In this regard, Homans has mentioned that if the frequency of interaction between two or more persons increases, the degree of their liking for one another will increase. In somewhat different language, Newcomb has suggested that if other things are equal, people are most likely to be attracted toward those with whom the probabilities of interaction are the greatest. Newcomb supports


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
his sweeping generalization by illustrating an every day example of parents' love for their children, and the child's reciprocated love for his parents. Newcomb continues by remarking that this reciprocated parental-child love association occurs even though "Neither parents nor children choose each other."¹ Newcomb and Homans would agree that in this case, the probabilities of interaction between parent and child are so great, that if other things are held equal, strong positive familial attraction will develop.

It is not physical proximity or propinquity per se which increases the likelihood of attraction, but the opportunities that propinquity provides for increased interaction that influences attraction. For as Homans² points out:

Suppose that two persons are, as we say, thrown together, that interaction between them is made easy and likely because they live near one another or work on the same job. If they interact at all, they emit activities to one another, and if no special factor is present that might bias systematically their values or their activities, the chances are that each will find some of the other's activities valuable, if only because they may be obtained at less cost from him than from a third party at a greater distance: the distance of a source of reward adds something to the cost of getting it. And to the extent that each finds the other's activity valuable, each

¹Ibid.

is apt to express favorable sentiments toward the other. For this reason, an independent increase in interaction between persons is apt to be associated with an increase in liking between them.

Katz and Hill\textsuperscript{1} have used the term "Organizational points" to describe areas in geographic space where probable interactants may meet. Katz and Hill proceed to explain that organizational points are characterized by a "formal set of ties"\textsuperscript{2} that bind probable interactants to certain geographic areas instead of others. The formal ties that bind probable interactants to certain organizational points increases the probabilities of interaction at these points compared to geographic areas which are not characterized by formal ties binding probable interactants. Katz and Hill use churches, schools, and places of work as real world examples of organizational points.

Smelser\textsuperscript{3} found that organizational points (e.g., dormitories) influenced friendship selection to a greater degree than the influence of other geographic areas.


\textsuperscript{2}loc. cit., p. 32.

Newcomb\textsuperscript{1} found that organizational points (e.g., room assignments) were initially associated with friendship formation. Smelser's results reinforce the theoretical assumption that organizational points, by increasing the probabilities of interaction, influence the selection of friends to a greater degree than the influences of other geographic areas not characterized by a set of formal ties binding probable interactants. Furthermore, Newcomb's results indicate that organizational points increase the probabilities of interaction and concomitant friendship selection among initial friends.

Thus far, the discussion has only focused upon the degree to which organizational points influence friendship choice. But increasing the probabilities for interaction by virtue of similarities of organizational points does not in and of itself result in friendship choice. Campbell and Alexander\textsuperscript{2} suggest that "the value systems and normative milieus of the larger social structure typically influence the behaviors of individuals through transmission and enforcement for any given individual." In effect, participation in the larger social structure


"restricts participation to a limited group within society."  

Participation in the larger social structure as indicated through socioeconomic-status membership has been found to be related to attraction. Studies by Bonney, Smith, and Lundberg and Beazley have consistently found that high school students tend to choose friends of the same socioeconomic-status as their own. Lundberg, Lundberg and Lawsing, Lundberg and Steel, Stewart, 

---


Neugarten\(^1\), and Cook\(^2\) found that a tendency exists for students to pick as friends members of higher socioeconomic-status than themselves. These researchers also note that those of higher status who are chosen by those of lower rank usually do not return the choice. There is still a strong tendency for friendships to be characterized by status similarities. But a counter trend with the choser of a lower rank than the unreciprocating chosen is also in evidence.

The subtle influences of the class structure of the larger community, emphasis on middle class values by various institutions, the pressure of parents to associate with the right kind of people may all tend to redirect patterns of interaction from status homophily to heterophily with members of lower rank choosing those of higher rank. Those of higher rank are also influenced by the subtle aspects of status ranking and may prefer to choose those of higher rank than themselves. At the very least, one would assume that those of any rank would prefer status equals as opposed to those beneath them.

Furthermore, racial groupings may serve as a

---

\(^1\)Neugarten, Bernice L., "Social Class and Friendship Among School Children." \textit{American Journal of Sociology}, LI (January 1946), 305-313.

\(^2\)Cook, Lloyd Allen, "An Experimental Sociographic Study of a Stratified Tenth Grade Class." \textit{American Sociological Review}, X (February 1945), 250-261.
criterion of friendship choice. Criswell\textsuperscript{1}, Loomis\textsuperscript{2}, Northway\textsuperscript{3}, and Zeleny\textsuperscript{4} have all found that friendships tend to be confined to members of the same race among both primary school and high school subjects. These studies document the influences of caste in the larger American social structure which may "spill over"\textsuperscript{5} into informal relations and restrict patterns of interaction with different racial groups. One's interaction is patterned in such a way that friendships are much more likely with those of similar race rather than with those of differing races.

Moreno\textsuperscript{6}, Goodnow and Taguiri\textsuperscript{7}, and

\textsuperscript{1}Criswell, J. H., "A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom." \textit{Archives of Psychology}, XI (January 1939), 13-20.


\textsuperscript{4}Zeleny, Leslie Day, "Sociometry in the College Classroom." \textit{Sociometry}, XII (November 1949), 102-104.

\textsuperscript{5}Davis, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{6}Moreno, J. L., "Sociometry in the Classroom." \textit{Sociometry}, XII (November 1949), 102-104.

\textsuperscript{7}Goodnow and Taguiri, Renato, "Relational Analysis: An Extension of Sociometric Method with Emphasis upon Social Perception." \textit{Sociometry}, XV (February - May 1952), 91-104.
Criswell\(^1\) have found that high school students tend to pick friends from their own ethnic groups. Prior socialization by the family and homogeneous ethnic neighborhoods of origin provide internalized and enforcable mechanisms of control on the individual's freedom of friendship choice.

Palisi\(^2\) has found that choice between different ethnic groups may increase as a function of generational differences in the degree of internalization and enforcement of values and norms that dictate ethnic friendship restrictions. Especially among second and third generation ethnic group members, friendship choices with other ethnic groups begin to increase.

Marks\(^3\) and Bonney\(^4\) have found that friendships among high school students are associated with similarities of values. Newcomb\(^5\), Merton\(^6\), and

\(^1\)Criswell, J. H., "A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom." _Archives of Psychology_, XI (January 1939), 13-20.


\(^3\)Marks, J. B., "Interests, Leadership, and Sociometric Status Among Adolescents." _Sociometry_, XVII (November 1954), 340-349.

\(^4\)Bonney, op. cit.


Williams¹ all maintain that the ultimate explanation of friendship formation depends upon examining the relationship of similarities and dissimilarities of values. A person's constellation of values represents his unique participation in the social structure. Values represent "the value systems and normative milieus of the larger social structure (as they) typically influence the behaviors of individuals through transmission and enforcement by certain others for any given individual."²

If broad similarities of participation in the social structure as represented through friendships formed on the basis of similar socioeconomic-status, ethnic, and racial groupings provide more reward value than associating with those of dissimilar background characteristics; then surely one's unique participation in the social structure should be an important determinant of friendship selection. For as Secord and Backman³ point out:

"...persons tend to choose others with similar values as friends since each person, at very low cost to himself, can provide consensual validation to the other."

The above discussion of the relationship of the independent variables to friendship selection has focused

¹Williams, op. cit., Pp. 3-10.
²Campbell, op. cit.
mainly on reciprocated friendships. From the past discussion, one may assume that similarities of organizational points, ethnicity, race, socioeconomic-status, and values will be positively related to reciprocated friendship choice. But the exact nature of the relationship of the independent variables to non-reciprocated friendships has not been determined by previous researchers. A review of the literature reveals two theoretical notions which attempt to specify the relationship of selected independent variables to non-reciprocated friendships. The discussion to follow will present the theoretical outlines of both specifications such that two sets of hypotheses may be deduced.

Merton¹ has suggested that with regard to dissimilarities of values and the friendship formation process:

"In a substantial proportion, perhaps most of these cases, the fragile beginnings of a social relationship between liberals and illiberals will be broken almost before they have developed. The possible beginnings of friendship are nipped in the bud."

Interaction is patterned in such a way that the probabilities of interaction and concomitant friendship formation between those of dissimilar values are very slight. Interaction is also patterned such that friendships between those of dissimilar race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, and organizational points are very slight. From the

¹Merton, op. cit., p. 29.
previous discussion concerning the relationship of the above independent variables to reciprocated friendships it was found that similarities of race, ethnicity, socio-economic-status, values and organizational points were more highly related to reciprocated friendships than to non-friendships. Non-reciprocated friendships may occupy an intermediate position between the greater probabilities of interaction as they are exhibited among reciprocated friendships and the lower probabilities for interaction accorded to non-friendships. Thus, the above independent variables may be more highly related to reciprocated friendships than obtains among non-reciprocated friendships, with non-friendships exhibiting the weakest relationships. In hypothesis form, one might expect:

1. The single effects of similarities of socio-economic-status, ethnicity, race, values, and organizational points will be the most frequent among reciprocated friendships, less frequent among non-reciprocated friendships, and the least frequent among non-friendships.

A further specification concerning the nature of non-reciprocated friendships results from Merton's comments with regard to dissimilarities of values and

\[1\text{Merton, op. cit., p. 28.}\]
non-friendships:

"...it is not always the case that both parties to an incipient relationship will express their opposed values. Not infrequently, either because of personal timidity, or an ingrained sense of courtesy or fear of losing status, one party may respond to the unpalatable views of the other by preserving an expedient silence... The partner who has freely expressed his views and has no inkling of the punitive experience he has thus provided for his associate may continue to seek opportunities for further contact which in an appreciable proportion of cases, will meet with no success, as his timid but aggrieved acquaintance sedulously avoids him."

Merton's remarks on "fear of losing status" may also be indicative of the relationship of socioeconomic-status, ethnicity and race to initial non-reciprocated friendships along with values. Those of the more privileged socioeconomic-status, ethnic, and racial positions may not wish to jeopardize their status by choosing those of lower rank, while those of lower rank, by virtue of their value and normative milieus, may regard those of higher rank as desirable associates. Thus, the findings of Lundberg¹, Lundberg and Lawsing², Lundberg and Steel³, Stewart⁴, Neugarten⁵, and Cook⁶ indicating that those of

¹Lundberg, op. cit.
²Lundberg and Lawsing, op. cit.
³Lundberg and Steel, op. cit.
⁴Stewart, op. cit.
⁵Neugarten, op. cit.
⁶Cook, op. cit.
the higher status positions do not reciprocate choices to those beneath them in the larger social structure could be explained. There may be a greater frequency of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated status category than the chosen among non-reciprocated friendships than obtains among reciprocated friendships or non-friendships. In hypotheses form, this theoretical specification concerning the nature of non-reciprocated friendships would predict that:

1. There will be a greater frequency of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated socio-economic status category than the chosen among non-reciprocated friendships than obtains among reciprocated or non-friendships.

2. There will be a greater frequency of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated ethnic category than the chosen among non-reciprocated friendships than obtains among reciprocated or non-friendships.

3. There will be a greater frequency of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated racial category than the chosen among non-reciprocated friendships than obtains among reciprocated or non-friendships.

A typology which divides the dependent variable into reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friendships will
be instituted. This typology will enable determining whether the independent variables of socioeconomic-status, race, and ethnicity exhibit a progressively weaker relationship as one moves from reciprocated, to non-reciprocated, to non-friendships; or whether non-reciprocated friendships represent a greater frequency of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated status category than the chosen than obtains among reciprocated and non-friendships.

The Relative Strength of the Relationships of Organizational Points, Socioeconomic-status, Ethnicity, Race, and Values to Initial Friendship Formation

This section is devoted to developing the thesis that the independent variables included in this research are not equally related to the dimension of reciprocity during the initial friendship formation sequence. A set of hypotheses will be presented which state a rank ordering of the degree to which the independent variables are related to reciprocity. The rank ordering hypotheses will state that some of the independent variables will exhibit a stronger relationship to friendship formation than obtains for other independent variables.

Secord and Backman\(^1\) mention that:

---

\(^1\)Secord and Backman, op. cit., p. 260.
"One feature frequently characteristic of opening conversations is that each person attempts to discover what he has in common with the other. Inquiries are made about where the other comes from, whether he knows a mutual acquaintance..."

Initial interactants seem to be attempting to determine the backgrounds of others. Similarities of background offer a common basis for interaction. Presumably, similarities of background are rewarding and dissimilarities of background are frustrating.*

Secord and Backman⁴ further suggest that during the friendship formation process, a wide variety of readily observable cues that enable one to select others on the basis of similarity of background are available. Of special concern in this discussion are those background cues indicative of prior participation in the social structure. The writer suggests that easily observable cues indicative of prior social system participation could be telegraphed through mannerisms, clothing, speech

---

⁴loc. cit., p. 261.

*This is not a resort to the 'law of effect' in the strict psychologistic fashion. It is not presumed that similarities of social background are rewarding because similarities of background are innately rewarding and dissimilarities of background are innately frustrating. It is assumed that individuals would rather be rewarded than punished. But individuals find similarities of background rewarding for some reason. And for this discussion, the rewarding consequences individuals experience through similarity is dependent upon the ability of the larger social structure to influence friendship formation in that direction.
patterns, general physical appearance, last names, com-
ments about one's father's occupation.

Such cues would seem to be tapping broad similarities of participation in the social structure rather than more specific participation in the social structure. Although Secord and Backman's characterization of the factors influencing initial friendships is mainly descriptive, there seems to exist some theoretical justification for their statements. For, in order to determine the social backgrounds of others, one must be able to observe and respond to their behavior. In fact, Newcomb has characterized the interaction process during friendship selection as essentially an "exchange of information." The greater the amounts of interaction characterizing a given friendship, the greater amounts of information exchanged.

Asch has mentioned that the "decisive psychological fact about society is the capacity of individuals to comprehend and respond to each other's experiences and actions." Comprehension and response during friendship selection presupposes the existence of significant information regarding the desirability or undesirability

---


of others. When persons are exploring each other's backgrounds during the initial acquaintance stage, they are essentially strangers. These persons are strangers since the quantities of interaction have not proceeded sufficiently to allow great quantities of information exchange.

Newcomb\(^1\) found that the friendships of college students during the first two weeks of acquaintance were not selected on the basis of similarities of values. Rather, broad similarities of participation in the social structure such as ethnicity were related to initial friendship selection. After a period of about two months, Newcomb found that similarities of values were used as the major basis for the selection of friends. Broad similarities of social background decreased as a basis for friendship selection.

Newcomb\(^2\) suggests that during the first two weeks of acquaintance, interactants were essentially strangers who did not know each other very well. The interactants were strangers since interaction had not proceeded far enough to allow great quantities of information exchange. Since information was limited, Newcomb's subjects used the best means available to form satisfying interpersonal

\(^2\)ibid.
relationships. It was only after two months of extended interaction and concomitant extended exchanges of information that friendship selection was based upon unique similarities of background. Thus broad similarities of participation in the social structure may be more highly related to initial friendships than more specific similarities of participation in the social structure.

Homans\(^1\), Newcomb\(^2\), and Secord and Backman\(^3\) all suggest that the opportunities propinquity provides for increased interaction should be operative during initial friendship formation. As Secord and Backman\(^4\) point out:

"At the first meeting of the hypothetical group, beneath the hum of polite conversations...each person explores, at varying degrees of cost to himself, the rewards available in potential relations with persons around him...His estimate of cost will be affected by factors (such as) sheer distance--it takes less effort to talk to the girl standing close to him than to Miss B., who is across the room."

Thus, when strangers first meet, communicating with those nearest costs less in time and energy than communicating with those at a greater distance. Since persons know little else about each other, if for no other reason than for the sake of economy, propinquity may

\(^1\)Homans, op. cit.

\(^2\)Newcomb, op. cit., 1956.

\(^3\)Secord and Backman, op. cit.

\(^4\)ibid.
provide the basis for increased probabilities of interaction and concomitant attraction.

Newcomb\(^1\) found that organizational points (i.e., room assignments) were initially associated with friendship formation. And as was indicated before, Newcomb's subjects did not initially form friendships on the basis of value similarities. Thus, similarities of organizational points may also be more strongly related to initial friendships than similarities of values are related to initial friendships.

To review the discussion thus far, the interaction process may be viewed as essentially an exchange of information. One must be able to observe and respond to the attributes of others to facilitate friendship choice on the basis of these attributes. The amounts of information exchanged during the initial friendship formation phase are meager compared to the greater amounts of information exchanged among friendships that have been maintained for some time. The independent variables for this research may be thought of as conditional upon differing amounts of information exchange such that a rank ordering of the strength of the relationship of the independent variables to friendship formation may be stated. In hypotheses form, one may expect the following

\(^1\)Newcomb, op. cit., 1956.
rank ordering of relationship:

1. The single effects of similarities of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, and organizational points will occur in greater frequencies among initial reciprocated friendships than similarities of values will occur among initial reciprocated friendships.

2. The single effects of similarities of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, and organizational points will occur in greater frequencies among initial non-reciprocated friendships than similarities of values will occur among initial non-reciprocated friendships.

3. The single effects of similarities of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, and organizational points will occur in smaller frequencies among non-friendships than similarities of values will occur among non-friendships.

The Relationship of the Independent Variables to Friendship Formation When Taking the Sex Structure of the Dyad into Account

Developmental psychologists have long since documented the tendency for pre-adolescents and to a lesser degree adolescents to confine friendships to those of the same sex.
Gronlund has been one of the most recent researchers to find that senior high school boys and girls tend to mutually over-select members of the same sex as friends. Gronlund found that mutual cross-sex choices were higher for adolescents than for pre-adolescents. But the general tendency still more accurately reflected sex homophily rather than heterophily among mutual friends.

Gronlund mentions that the terms "'sissy' and 'Tomboy' are well known labels for the boy and girl who dare venture into the ...activities of members of the opposite sex." Such labels may act as constraints which tend to produce over-selection of members of the same sex among pre-adolescents. Sarnoff suggests that in contrast to constraints which tend to limit pre-adolescent cross-sex choices, adolescents experience pressures toward cross-sex choices from peers, family, and other informal and formal groupings. Although pre-adolescent pressures for reducing cross-sex choices do not exist to the same degree among adolescents, their effects may still influence low degrees of cross-sex choices. Interest in the opposite sex, while being influenced by family,

---

2ibid.
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peers, and other informal and formal groupings, may also depend to some degree upon the feelings of insecurity and inferiority when dealing with members of the opposite sex.

Gronlund\(^1\) further mentions that the types of criteria used to select friends tend to influence the number of cross-sex choices. When the criteria of friendship choice is based upon some common interest or activity, cross-sex choices decrease and same-sex choices increase. Such findings tend to support the assumption that same-sex friendships may represent a type of 'platonic' relation in which attraction is based upon a number of shared interests and activities. Cross-sex friendships decline since shared interests and activities are many times patterned on the basis of whether one is a male or a female. For example, a boy probably would not expect a girl to be interested in pheasant hunting, but he may be attracted to other males who are interested in hunting. Commonality of interests and activities may be the basis for same-sex friendships while cross-sex friendships may represent the effects of attraction based upon interest in the opposite sex, infatuation, etc... In hypothesis form, one might expect:

1. Similarities of interests and activities to

\(^1\)op. cit., p. 105.
occur in greater frequencies among same-sex friendships and less frequently among cross-sex friendships.

Furthermore, social attributes may differently define the types of cross-sex choices for males and females. For example, Gronlund found that while teen-age girls tended to disregard socioeconomic-status as a criterion of choice, males generally chose females of the same or higher status positions. The fact that females tended to disregard socioeconomic-status when choosing males as friends may indicate that females might also disregard other social background characteristics as well when choosing males as friends. Thus, females might also disregard the racial and ethnic backgrounds of males to greater degrees than males disregard the ethnic and racial backgrounds of females. Females may be more susceptible to becoming romantically involved and totally oblivious to the social world around them by virtue of prior family and peer group socialization into the role of the romantic lover.

Thus, females may be more prone to choose males on the basis of infatuation or love than exists for males choosing females. If this is the case, then females would be much less likely to be influenced by the

\[1\] op. cit., p. 107.
realities of normative and valuative pressures around them. The lack of such influence would be observed through fewer female-male friendships formed on the basis of prior participation in the social structure than obtains for males choosing females.

Another theoretical orientation would also predict that females may be less subject to normative and valuative pressures when choosing males than obtains for males choosing females. The female's role in society is many times reactive rather than active. Females do not usually ask males for dates, or for a dance. The male is generally considered as the initiator in many cross-sex encounters while the female generally reacts to the male's advances.

If one assumes that the female role is more reactive than the male role in cross-sex interactions, then females may be less likely to choose males on the basis of normative and valuative criteria due to the rather meager opportunities the female role provides for such choices. This theoretical orientation would also predict that females would be less likely to choose males of similar social background characteristics than obtains for males choosing females.

To review the discussion thus far, two different theoretical orientations have been developed which lead to the same prediction among cross-sex choices. Both
orientations predict that females will exhibit a lesser tendency to choose males on the basis of social background characteristics than obtains for males choosing females. The first theoretical orientation assumes that females may be more likely to become romantically involved with males than obtains for males becoming romantically involved with females. The females' greater tendency toward romantic involvements increases the tendency toward becoming oblivious to the social world around them than obtains for males. The greater tendency for females to become romantically involved and oblivious to the social world around them will result in fewer females choosing males on the basis of social background characteristics than obtains for males choosing females.

The second theoretical orientation would also predict that females would be less likely to choose males on the basis of social background than obtains for males choosing females. In this case, the reason for the above prediction rests upon the differences in initiating interaction that exists between the male and female roles in American society. The female role is more reactive while the male role is more active. The male initiates interaction while the female reacts to the male's intentions. Males may be more likely to choose females with regard to social background characteristics than obtains for females since the female role offers less opportunity for
such choices.

But Gronlund is the only researcher to mention that females disregard socioeconomic considerations when choosing males as friends. In fact, there is some reason to believe that females may be more inclined to choose males of the same or higher status than obtains for males choosing females. As Neugarten\(^1\) points out, the primary means of adult female upward or downward mobility is through the status of her marriage partner.

Thus, family and peer group pressures for adolescent females to associate with 'good' boys may be much stronger than comparable pressures for adolescent males choosing females. From this theoretical orientation, females might be much more likely to choose males of the same or higher socioeconomic-status than would result for males choosing females. Females may be more likely to choose males with particular reference to status considerations. Ethnicity and race may also be much more salient with regard to females choosing males than for males choosing females since ethnicity and race also may influence status position.

At this point, one could state two competing sets of hypotheses. One set of hypotheses would state that

the influence of social background would be more highly related to male-female friendships than would obtain among female-male friendships. The second set of hypotheses would predict the complete opposite set of relationships among male-female and female-male friendships. But rather than presenting two competing sets of hypotheses, a set of null hypotheses will be presented. In null hypotheses form, one would expect:

1. The single effects of similarities of socioeconomic-status, race, and ethnicity will occur in equal frequencies among both female-male and male-female friendships.

2. The single effects of similarities of socioeconomic-status, race, and ethnicity will occur in equal frequencies among both female-male and male-female non-friendships.

3. The single effects of the choser representing a lower socially designated racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic-status category than the chosen will occur in equal frequencies among both female-male and male-female friendships.

4. The single effects of the choser representing a lower socially designated racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic-status category than the chosen will occur in equal frequencies among both female-male and male-female non-friendships.
Empirical data will be examined to determine whether either one of the two competing theoretical orientations more accurately portrays the state of affairs among initial friendships. Empirical analysis may reveal a greater tendency for females to select males as friends on the basis of similarities of social background than obtains for males choosing females. If this is true, then more proof is offered in support of the theoretical orientation which suggests that females are more strongly influenced by the effects of the larger social structure than obtains for males. Conversely, analysis of the data may indicate that males rather than females are more likely to form cross-sex friendships with those of similar social background. In this case, more support is given to the theoretical orientation that predicts a stronger influence of the social structure upon males than obtains for females in cross-sex choices.

The observation of systematic divergences indicative of a greater tendency for females to select males of higher socially designated social categories than obtains for males choosing females will suggest that the theoretical orientation which predicts such empirical results is more valid than its competing theoretical counterpart. But the empirical data may reveal observed relationships which run completely contrary to those predicted by the theoretical orientation suggesting that the social
structure will have a more pervasive effect on females than obtains for males in cross-sex choices. In this case, more support can be given to the theoretical orientation which suggests that males rather than females are more likely to have their cross-sex friendship choices determined by considerations of social structure.

Systematic divergences may be observed which lend support to neither one nor the other of the two theoretical systems which predict the opposite directions of the strength of the relationship between social background and cross-sex friendships. If this is the case, then the null hypotheses cannot be rejected and one must assume that the effects of social background are equally related to both female-male and male-female cross-sex friendships.

Thibaut and Kelley\(^1\) mention that certain social attributes may differentially serve as criteria of choice among female-female and male-male friendships. Thibaut and Kelley suggest that the reason why dormitory residence may be more representative of college coed friendships than male college friendships is due to the coeds' decreased sphere of interaction and freedom as compared to the male college population.

There have been no investigations examining the relationships of ethnicity, race, and socioeconomic-status to male-male friendships and female-female friendships. One might assume that Thibaut and Kelley's suggestion that females may experience less freedom of interaction may also be observed through stronger relationships on all of the above mentioned independent variables to female-female friendships than obtains for male-male friendships. Hypotheses to this effect could be presented.

But the fact that the only independent variable researched in this area is from friendships that have been maintained for some time suggests that even Thibaut and Kelley's results may not account for the state of affairs among initial friendships. Given the non-existence of research on initial friendships in this area, rather than finding a given independent variable more strongly related to female-female friendships than to male-male friendships, the complete opposite set of relationships may obtain. In other words, a given independent variable may be more highly related to male-male friendships than to female-female friendships.

Rather than present specific hypotheses with regard to the differential relationship of selected independent variables to male-male and female-female friendships, the null hypothesis stating that a given independent variable
is equally related to both sex types will be presented. In null hypotheses form, one would expect:

1. The single effects of similarities of organizational points, race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic-status will occur in equal frequencies among both female-female and male-male reciprocated friendships.

2. The single effects of similarities of organizational points, race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic-status will occur in equal frequencies among both female-female and male-male non-reciprocated friendships.

3. The single effects of similarities of organizational points, race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic-status will occur in equal frequencies among both female-female and male-male non-friendships.

Empirical data will then be analyzed to determine whether a given independent variable follows the null hypothesis, or whether any systematic divergences from the null hypothesis are in evidence. Any systematic divergences will be of two kinds. Either an independent variable will be more strongly related to male-male than to female-female friendships, or any independent variable will be more strongly related to female-female friendships than obtains among male-male friendships.
The sex dimension will be divided into female-female, female-male, male-female, and male-male dyads. The above typological division of the sex structure of the dyad will then be instituted to determine which of all the hypotheses specifying the sex structure of the dyad portray the actual state of affairs among initial friendships.

Hypotheses which State both the Magnitude and the Order of the Relationships of the Independent Variables to the Reciprocity-Sex Typology

The past discussion of the relationship of the independent variables to friendship formation has relied heavily upon Merton's conceptual distinction between friends and non-friends. According to Merton\(^1\):

"This means, presumably, that the proportion of their friends having the designated similar characteristic (of social status or, in this instance, of racial values) is appreciably greater than the proportion of people with this characteristic in the local population."

Thus, Merton suggests that the strength of the relationship of similarities on a given independent variable to friendship formation will be a function of the degree to which that independent variable discriminates between friends and non-friends. The greater the number of similarities found among friendships when compared to the

---

\(^1\) Lazarsfeld and Merton, op. cit., p. 26.
number of similarities among non-friendships, the stronger the relationship between a given independent variable and friendship formation.

The hypotheses previously presented have all followed the pattern outlined in the above paragraph. These hypotheses indicated that a given independent variable may be differently related to the dimensions of reciprocity and sex structure, but they did not specify the magnitude of the relationships. These hypotheses specify only the relative order of the relationship of a given independent variable to reciprocity and sex structure. These hypotheses do not specify a common standard against which the magnitude of the differences in the ordering of a relationship to reciprocity and sex structure can be stated.

Merton has hinted at the conceptual framework needed to formulate hypotheses which specify both order and magnitude by suggesting that with regard to similarities of racial values among friends:

"They will have more liberal friends than 'would be expected' under the hypotheses that they choose their friends without regard to their racial values..."

An independent variable should be able to discriminate along the dimensions of reciprocity and sex structure in

1 Merton, op. cit., 1954, Pp. 19-20
the hypothesized direction. Also, these hypothesized discriminations must be observed as diverging from the frequencies one would expect if in actuality there was no relationship between an independent variable and the dimensions of reciprocity and sex structure. Generally, the relationship that one would expect if in actuality there was no relationship between a given independent variable and the dimensions of reciprocity and sex structure can be assumed to be a function of pure chance variation. Thus, a given independent variable should not only discriminate along the dimensions of reciprocity and sex structure in the hypothesized direction, but it should also discriminate in frequencies greater than expected by chance.*

When discussing the relationship of the independent variables to the dimension of reciprocity, hypotheses were presented which predicted a progressively weaker

---

*The phrase 'expected by chance' does not refer to that branch of inferential statistics which attempts to determine the probability of sample values occurring due to random sampling error. Rather, the above phrase is meant to refer only to the value that would result purely as a function of the given distribution of values on an independent variable among a group of respondents. The assumption of statistical independence does not offer a standard against which one may calculate the degree to which observed sample values represent unknown population values. Rather, statistical independence is used as a standard against which to calculate the degree to which an observed value on a given variable is likely to result from the distribution of values that the variable exhibits among a group of respondents.
relationship between a given independent variable as one moved from reciprocated, to non-reciprocated, to non-friendships. The dimension of magnitude will be combined with the dimension of order such that the following hypothesis may be presented:

1. Under the assumption of no relationship between the independent variables of socioeconomic-status, ethnicity, race, values, and organizational points and friendship formation, the single effects of similarities on these independent variables will occur in frequencies less than expected by chance among non-friendships, in frequencies greater than expected by chance among non-reciprocated friendships, and the greatest divergences from chance will be observed among reciprocated friendships.

When discussing the relationship of the independent variables to the dimension of reciprocity, hypotheses were presented which stated that a particular type of selective interaction with the choser of a lower socially designated status position than the chosen would be more likely among non-reciprocated friendships than among reciprocated or non-friendships. The dimension of magnitude will be combined with the dimension of order to produce the following hypotheses:

1. Under the assumption of no relationship between
socioeconomic-status, and friendship formation, the number of dyads with the choser of a lower socioeconomic-status position than the chosen will occur in frequencies greater than expected by chance among non-reciprocated friendships and in frequencies less than expected by chance among reciprocated or non-friendships.

2. Under the assumption of no relationship between ethnicity and friendship formation, the number of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated ethnic category than the chosen will occur in frequencies greater than expected by chance among non-reciprocated friendships and in frequencies less than expected by chance among reciprocated or non-friendships.

3. Under the assumption of no relationship between race and friendship formation, the number of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated racial category than the chosen will occur in frequencies greater than expected by chance among non-reciprocated friendships and in frequencies less than expected by chance among reciprocated or non-friendships.

As a result of comparing the interaction process during friendship formation with the state of affairs among friendships that had been maintained for some time,
a rank ordering of the strength of the relationship of the independent variables to the dimension of reciprocity was presented. The dimension of magnitude will be combined with the dimension of order such that the following hypotheses concerning the rank ordering of the independent variables to reciprocity may be stated:

1. Under the assumption of no relationship between the independent variables of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, organizational points, and values to friendship formation, the single effects of similarities of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, and organizational points will occur in frequencies greater than expected by chance among reciprocated friendships and similarities of values will occur in frequencies less than expected by chance.

2. Under the assumption of no relationship between race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, organizational points, and values to friendship formation, the single effects of similarities of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, and organizational points will occur in frequencies greater than expected by chance among non-reciprocated friendships and similarities of values will occur in frequencies less than expected by chance.
3. Under the assumption of no relationship between the independent variables of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, organizational points and values to friendship formation, the single effects of similarities of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, and organizational points will occur in frequencies less than expected by chance among non-friendships and similarities of values will occur in frequencies greater than expected by chance.

During the discussion of the relationship of the independent variables to friendship formation when the sex structure of the dyad was considered, a number of hypotheses were presented that specified order but not magnitude. The hypotheses to follow will specify both the magnitude and order of the relationships of the independent variables to friendship formation when the sex structure of the dyad is considered.

1. Under the assumption of no relationship between interests and activities and friendship formation, similarities of interests and activities will occur in frequencies greater than expected by chance among same-sex friendships and less than expected by chance among cross-sex friendships.

2. Under the assumption of no relationship between
interests and activities and friendship formation, similarities of interests and activities will occur in frequencies greater than expected by chance among same-sex non-reciprocated friendships and less than expected by chance among cross-sex non-reciprocated friendships.

3. Under the assumption of no relationship between interests and activities and friendship formation, similarities of interests and activities will occur in frequencies greater than expected by chance among cross-sex non-friendships and in frequencies less than expected by chance among same-sex non-friendships.

Gronlund found that females were more likely than males to choose members of the opposite sex without regard to social background characteristics. Family and peer group socialization into the role of the romantic lover may be much more intense among females. Furthermore, since the female role in American society is more reactive than active when compared to the male role one would also expect females to be less likely to choose males on the basis of social background than obtains for males choosing females.

But a competing theoretical orientation would predict just the opposite relationships between the effects of the social structure on female-male friendships and
male-female friendships. Peer group and family pressures for associating with the right kind of young men may be much more in evidence than comparable pressures placed upon males choosing females. When combining the dimension of magnitude with the dimension of order, the following null hypotheses emerge:

1. Under the assumption of no relationship between the independent variables of socioeconomic-status, race, and ethnicity and friendship formation, similarities on these independent variables will occur in equal frequencies among both female-male and male-female friendships.

2. Under the assumption of no relationship between the independent variables of socioeconomic-status, race, and ethnicity and friendship formation, similarities on these independent variables will occur in equal frequencies among both female-male and male-female non-friendships.

3. Under the assumption of no relationship between the independent variables of socioeconomic-status, race, and ethnicity and friendship formation, the single effects of the choser representing a lower socially designated status category than the chosen will occur in equal frequencies among both female-male and male-female friendships.
4. Under the assumption of no relationship between the independent variables of socioeconomic-status, race, ethnicity and friendship formation, the single effects of the choser representing a lower socially designated status category than the chosen will occur in equal frequencies among both female-male and male-female non-friendships.

Theory and research dealing with the relationship of similarities of socioeconomic-status, race, ethnicity and organizational points to female-female and male-male friendships was too meager to state specific hypotheses. Rather, a number of null hypotheses were presented. In null hypotheses form with the combined ordinal-magnitude dimensions considered one would expect:

1. Under the assumption of no relationship between the independent variables of socioeconomic-status, race, ethnicity and organizational points and friendship formation, the single effects of similarities on the above independent variables will occur in equal frequencies among both female-female and male-male reciprocated friendships.

2. Under the assumption of no relationship between the independent variables of socioeconomic-status, race, ethnicity and organizational points
and friendship formation, the single effects of similarities on the above independent variables will occur in equal frequencies among both female-female and male-male non-reciprocated friendships.

3. Under the assumption of no relationship between the independent variables of socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity and organizational points and friendship formation, the single effects of similarities on the above independent variables will occur in equal frequencies among both female-female and male-male non-friendships.

An Outline of Hypotheses

A substantial number of hypotheses have been presented in this chapter. These hypotheses are based on a number of different theoretical positions. The outline of hypotheses presented below will attempt to briefly review both the numerous hypotheses and their theoretical underpinnings.

Furthermore, the outline of hypotheses may be used as a simplified guide to the analysis and interpretation sections. One need not page through the lengthy sections on theory in order to be aware of the theoretical concerns being discussed. One has only to refer to the
outline of hypotheses presented below.

I. Hypotheses relating the effects of selected independent variables to the dimension of friendship reciprocity.

A. The most general theoretical orientation would predict that similarities on a given independent variable will exhibit a progressively weaker relationship as one moves from reciprocated, to non-reciprocated, to non-friendships.

1. Hypotheses stating the ordinal relationship of selected independent variables to the friendship reciprocity dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SES</td>
<td>Reciprocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethnicity</td>
<td>Friendships ---- SI largest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Race</td>
<td>Non-reciprocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Values</td>
<td>Friendships ---- SI smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational points</td>
<td>Non-Friendships -------- SI smallest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Hypotheses stating the relationship of selected independent variables to the friendship

*'SI' stands for a similarity index. The similarity index represents a composite index of the relationship of similarities on an independent variable to friendship formation. The similarity index will be explained and defined in detail in the next chapter which is devoted to the methods used in obtaining and handling data.
reciprocity dimension when considering both
the order and the magnitude of the relation­ship:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SES</td>
<td>Reciprocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Race</td>
<td>Friendships ——— SI ( \geq 1.00 ) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ethnicity</td>
<td>Non-reciprocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Values</td>
<td>Friendships ——— SI &gt; 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Points</td>
<td>Non-Friendships ——— SI &lt; 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. A further specification of the above theoretical orientation would lead to the statement of additional hypotheses. These hypotheses result from viewing non-reciprocated friendships as resulting from a particular type of selective interaction.

1. Hypotheses stating the ordinal relationship of selected independent variables to the friendship reciprocity dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The choser of a lower socially designated SES, Ethnic, or Racial category than the chosen.</td>
<td>Reciprocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendships ——— SI smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-reciprocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendships ——— SI greatest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Friendships ——— SI smaller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\): \( > 1.00 \)' stands for SI values that are greater than chance. \( \gg 1.00 \)' stands for SI values that diverge the
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2. Hypotheses stating the relationship of selected independent variables to the friendship reciprocity dimension when considering both the order and the magnitude of the relationship:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The chooser of a lower socially designated SES, Ethnic, or Racial category than the chosen.</td>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships ( \text{--- SI } \leq 1.00 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships ( \text{--- SI } &gt; 1.00 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Friendships ( \text{--- SI } \leq 1.00 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. The second section of the theory chapter was devoted to presenting hypotheses stating the rank ordering of the strength of the relationship of selected independent variables to the friendship reciprocity dimension. The main theoretical assumption to be tested is that the quantities of information exchanged during the initial friendship formation sequence will limit the relationship of value similarity to friendship choice. But the quantities of information exchanged will be adequate to produce stronger relationships to the friendship reciprocity dimension greatest from chance in a positive direction. \( \ll 1.00 \) stands for SI values that occur in frequencies less often than expected by chance. \( \lll 1.00 \) stands for SI values that diverge the greatest from chance in a negative direction.
for the independent variables of SES, Race, Ethnicity, and Organizational points than obtains for the effects of Value homophily.

Three clusters of independent variables can be delineated. The independent variables of SES, Race, and Ethnicity will be called the 'Social Background Cluster.' Homerooms and roommates will be called the 'Organizational Point Cluster.' And the independent variables indicative of values will be called the 'Value Cluster.'

1. Hypotheses stating the ordinal relationship of the Social Background, Organizational Point, and Value Clusters according to the rank ordering of the relationships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Social Background Cluster</th>
<th>Value Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similarities on the Social Background Cluster compared to Similarities on the Value Cluster</td>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI greater SI less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI greater SI less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI smaller SI greater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. The third section of the theory chapter was devoted to examining the relationship of selected independent variables to the dimension of friendship reciprocity when the sex structure of the dyad was specified. This section of the outline will briefly summarize the major theoretical concerns and hypothetical expectancies presented in the third section of the theory chapter which focused on specifying the sex structure of the dyad.

A. Hypotheses were presented which compared the effects of similarities of interests and activities among same-sex and cross-sex friendships. Similarities of interests and activities were predicted to occur in greater frequencies among same-sex friendships than would obtain among cross-sex friendships.
1. Hypotheses concerned with the order of the relationship of similarities of interests and activities among same-sex and cross-sex friendships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similarities of Interests and Activities</td>
<td>Same-sex Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI smaller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Hypotheses concerned with the magnitude and order of the relationship of similarities of interests and activities among same-sex and cross-sex friendships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similarities of Interests and Activities</td>
<td>Same-sex Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI &gt; 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables under Consideration</td>
<td>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same-sex Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI &gt; 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI &lt; 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Competing sets of hypotheses were presented which stated the relationship of selected independent variables to male-female and female-male friendships. One theoretical conception predicted that male-female friendships will be influenced by the effects of the larger social structure to a greater degree than would obtain among female-male friendships. Prior theory and research also indicated that social background factors were much more salient for female-male friendships than obtained for male-female friendships. Rather than presenting specific sets of competing hypotheses, a number of null hypotheses were presented.

1. Null hypotheses which suggest that an equal ordinal relationship between the effects of the social structure and female-male and
male-female friendships will obtain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similarities of SES, Ethnicity, or Race</td>
<td>Female-Male Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI = SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI = SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI = SI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The choser of a lower socially designated SES, Ethnic, or Racial category</td>
<td>Female-Male Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>I* = I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>I = I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>I = I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I* rather than 'SI' is used as an index of relationship for those hypotheses suggesting that the choser will
2. Null hypotheses which suggest that an equal ordinal-magnitude relationship between the effects of the social structure and female-male and male-female friendships will obtain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similarities of SES, Ethnicity, or Race</td>
<td>Female-Male Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>( S_I &gt; 1.00 ) = ( S_I )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>( S_I &gt; 1.00 ) = ( S_I )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>( S_I &gt; 1.00 ) = ( S_I )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

be of a lower socially designated social background category than the chosen. 'I' is an index of the degree to which persons choose others of higher social rank than themselves. A further definition of 'I', the derivation of 'I', and the relationship between 'I' and 'SI' will be presented in chapter four.
### Variables under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male-Female Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-Male Friendships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The choser of a lower socially designated SES, Ethnic, or Racial category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reciprocated Friendships</th>
<th>$\geq 1.00 = \text{I}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$\leq 1.00 = \text{I}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

B. It was suggested that existing theory and research would not enable predicting whether the social background and organizational point clusters were more highly related to female-female friendships or to male-male friendships. Since prior theory and research did not enable stating the direction of these relationships, a null hypothesis was instituted which stated that selected independent variables were equally related to female-female and male-male friendships. The null hypothesis for both the ordinal and the ordinal-magnitude modes of analysis will be presented below.
1. The null hypothesis presenting the order of the relationship of similarities of social background and organizational points clusters among female-female friendships and male-male friendships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similarities on the Social Background and Organizational Point Clusters</td>
<td>Female-Female Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI = SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI = SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI = SI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The null hypothesis presenting the relationship of similarities of social background and organizational point clusters among female-female friendships and male-male friendships when one is concerned with both the order and the magnitude of the relationship:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables under Consideration</th>
<th>Relationship to the Friendship Reciprocity Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similarities on the Social Background and Organizational Point Clusters</td>
<td>Female-Female Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$S_I &gt; &lt; 1.00 = SI$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$S_I &gt; &lt; 1.00 = SI$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>$S_I &gt; &lt; 1.00 = SI$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE

WHAT IS A FRIENDSHIP: THE CONFOUNDING EFFECTS OF ROW AND COLUMN MARGINAL TOTALS

This chapter describes the methods used in the data gathering process and the procedures used in the statistical analysis of the data. Information about relevant characteristics of the respondents is also presented.

The Respondents

The data for this research were gathered from 95 teenage respondents participating in a special program for members of the lower class during the summer of 1966 at a medium sized mid-western state university. The participants were chosen for the program from the recommendations of high school teachers, counselors, and various community leaders in the south western quadrant of the state. The participants represented those types of youth who would not ordinarily complete a program of higher education although they were considered to possess the necessary scholastic abilities. The purpose of the special program was to improve the probabilities for these participants to pursue education beyond the high school level. The participants were not selected with any special reference to the research problem being explored here.
A number of tables are presented below which will enable a more precise determination of some relevant characteristics of the respondents. Specifically, the distributions of age, race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic-status will be presented for both male and female respondents.

Table 3-1: The Age of Respondents by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 3-1 reveals that about equal proportions of both males and females were included in the program. Also the above table indicates that a majority of both males and females were between 16 and 17 years old. About 20% of both males and females were 15 years old while the number of 18 year olds for both sexes was quite small.
Table 3-2: The Racial and Ethnic Identifications of Respondents by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 3-2 indicates that the black and white races represent about equal proportions of the total group of 95 respondents. A closer look at the data on race reveals that while there are a few more white females than black males, there are also a few more black males than white males.

The above table also indicates that the ethnic group identities of Italian, Polish, English, German, Irish, French, and Russian are represented among the 48 white subjects. Among white males the frequencies of
respondents with German and French ethnic backgrounds
combine to produce a frequency greater than the combined
frequencies for the five remaining ethnic categories.
The ethnic categories of German and Irish represent about
80% of all white female respondents. There are no white
females of Russian or English ethnic background. And fe­
males of Italian, Polish, and French background are not
represented in frequencies greater than two.

Table 3-3: The Socioeconomic-Status Distribution of
Respondents by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $30 per week</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $30 &amp; 39 per week</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $40 &amp; 49 per week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $50 &amp; 59 per week</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $60 &amp; 69 per week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $70 &amp; 79 per week</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $80 &amp; 89 per week</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $90 &amp; 99 per week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $100 &amp; 119 per week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120 per week or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 3-3 indicates that among both males and fe­
males a sizable majority of respondents come from families
in which weekly income ranges from $40-89. The same
table also indicates that the family incomes of all but 6 of the 95 respondents are $119 per week or less. Thus, an overwhelming majority of the respondents' weekly family incomes suggest lower class background. Middle and upper class social backgrounds must be regarded as almost non-existent.

Data Collection Techniques

Two basic techniques were used to collect data on the relevant variables for this research. One type of data collection technique produced information that was taken from questionnaires. The other type of data collection technique was the use of the program's administrative records.

The completion of the questionnaires was considered part of the program's normal activities. The questionnaires were administered at the beginning of the second week of the program. Questionnaire administration was under the joint direction of sociological researchers and members of the program's staff. The questionnaires were administered in each of the ten homerooms of the project. There were no more than ten respondents in any of the ten homerooms. Individual explanations were given to participants who requested assistance. Originally, 101 youth were participating in the program. Six participants failed to complete the questionnaires and were not included.
in this research.

Initial friendships were determined from an open end item on the questionnaire that asked each respondent to indicate his closest friends in the program from a complete listing of the participants. The operational indicant of the dependent variable differs from sociometric questions that ask the respondent 'Whom do you like.' The operational indicant for the dependent variable asks the respondent 'Who are your closest friends' and not 'Who would you like to choose as your friends.' According to Riley, the form of question used for this research elicits a report of actual relationships rather than preferred ones.

Williams suggests that the dependent variable is an immediate common sense designation of a relationship as a friendship. Williams also argues that there is no way to determine which friendships are superficial and fragile compared to those which exemplify intense commitment, great intimacy, and strong solidarity.

Williams' criticism of the failure of the dependent variable to isolate continuums of commitment, intimacy,

---

2Williams, op. cit., p. 5.  
3Williams, op. cit., p. 6.
and solidarity would seem more applicable to friendships with extended histories of interaction than to initial friendships. The measure of the dependent variable would fail to isolate friendships with extended histories from friendships which were recently formed among studies that attempt to measure friendship choice after protracted periods of interaction. But measurements were taken during the beginning of the second week of acquaintance. Thus, it would seem unlikely that the dependent variable fails to isolate continuums of intimacy, commitment, and solidarity. Such failure on the part of the measure of the dependent variable seems unlikely since the early measurement of friendship choice reduces the chances for continuums of intimacy, commitment, and solidarity to develop. Rather, most of the friendships measured are probably fragile and superficial given the short time period of mutual interaction among respondents.

Lundberg indicates that the dependent variable gives only those "friendships which respondents are willing to have the investigator know these relationships."¹ Friendships which respondents interpret as 'unacceptable' may be underrepresented while those friendships the respondent considers 'acceptable' may be overrepresented.

Lundberg's criticisms are well taken. But the only alternative to asking respondents to verbalize their friendships would be to observe the respondents during the friendship formation process. And the use of observation would necessitate dealing with the validity and reliability of observers' inferences of what does and what does not constitute a friendship. Both the questionnaire and the observer approach to measuring friendship choice are to some degree invalid and unreliable measures.

The main problem encountered when using the questionnaire center around the respondents' unwillingness to admit certain friendships to the researcher. And when using the strategy of observing friendship formation, one must deal with the many observer biases which may interfere with inferring a true friendship or non-friendship.

On a more general level, Lundberg's criticisms focus on problems of validity and reliability which are inherent in the questionnaire approach. Friendships which respondents do not wish to verbalize are probably under-represented. But knowledge of another's unacceptable traits or engaging in unacceptable activities with another would seem dependent on the development of interpersonal relationships of intense commitment, great intimacy, and strong solidarity. Given the high probability of fragile and superficial friendships in the present
research, the probabilities for the development of interpersonal relationships that respondents may not wish to reveal seem rather small.

Socioeconomic-status was determined by asking the respondents to estimate their family income to the best of their ability. The lowest category was "Less than $30 per week," "$30-39 per week" was the next lowest category, followed by "$40-49 per week." Ten dollar increments continued until the category of $90-99 per week. The final two categories were $100-119 per week, and $120 or more per week. Ethnicity was determined by asking respondents to indicate the ethnic background of their father from a listing of ethnic groups. The listing of ethnic groups that the respondents were able to choose may be determined from a copy of the questionnaire presented in the Appendix. Race was determined from the ethnic classification question. Values relative to interests, hobbies, school, sports, dating practices, and leisure time activities were determined from the questionnaire. The exact questions given to respondents concerning interests, hobbies, school, sports, dating practices, and leisure time activities can be found in the Appendix.

Quite a large number of questionnaire value items are explored in this research. The outline of values presented below represents an attempt to systematize the
rather large number of value items into more manageable proportions. The outline below presents broad categories which on the face of it seem to be tapping values toward a similar given object. The broad categories presented below are: (I) interests and activities, (II) self ratings (i.e., the value of one's self), (III) the values of alternative courses of action pertinent to young people (e.g., whether one would rather be a good student or good in sports, whether one would rather date a good student or a star athlete), (IV) aspirations, and (V) expectations.

Outline of Values

I. Interests and Activities (i.e., the values attached to various interests and activities):

A. School related interests and activities:

"What program are you taking in high school?"

1. not yet decided
2. vocational
3. commercial
4. don't know
5. general
6. college preparatory
7. other (What?.................)

"During the regular school year, how much time, on the average, do you spend doing homework outside school?"

1. none, or almost none
2. less than \(\frac{1}{2}\) hour a day
3. about \(\frac{1}{2}\) hour a day
4. about 1 hour a day
5. about \(1\frac{1}{2}\) hours a day
6. about 2 hours a day
7. three or more hours a day
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"Suppose you had an extra hour to use in high school, how would you use it? (Check only one)."

1. to take another course
2. for athletics
3. for club or extracurricular activity
4. to study in study hall
5. to do something else in study hall

B. Leisure time interests and activities:

"What is your favorite way of spending your leisure time?"

1. organized sport
2. unorganized sports
3. being with the group
4. spectator sports
5. dating
6. dancing
7. hobbies
8. indoor activities
9. watching t.v.
10. records or radio
11. reading
12. other, telephone

II. Self Ratings (i.e., the value of one's self):

A. Self rating in participation in school activities other than sports:

"How would you rate your participation in school activities other than sports?"

1. much above average
2. somewhat above average
3. average
4. somewhat below average
5. much below average

B. Self rating of sports ability:

"How would you rate your ability in sports?"

1. much above average
2. somewhat above average
3. average
4. somewhat below average
5. much below average
C. Self rating of popularity with the opposite sex:

"How do you rate your popularity with the opposite sex?"

1. much above average
2. somewhat above average
3. average
4. somewhat below average
5. much below average

III. The Values of Alternative Courses of Action Pertinent to Young People:

"(For boys only) If you could be remembered at your high school for being one of the things below, which one would you want it to be?"

1. most popular
2. athletic star
3. brilliant student
4. other (Specify .............)

"(For girls only) If you could be remembered at your high school for being one of the things below, which one would you want it to be?"

1. most popular
2. leader in activities
3. brilliant student
4. other (Specify .............)

"Would you rather be a good student or good in sports?"

1. good student
2. good in sports
3. can't decide
4. both
5. definitely do not want to be either

"Would you rather be a good student or well-liked by others of your sex?"

1. good student
2. well-liked by others of my sex
3. can't decide
4. both
5. definitely do not want to be either
"Would you rather be a good student or popular with those of the opposite sex?"

1. good student
2. popular with those of the opposite sex
3. can't decide
4. both
5. definitely do not want to be either

"Would you rather be a good student or a leader in school activities?"

1. good student
2. leader in school activities
3. can't decide
4. both
5. definitely do not want to be either

"(For girls only) Suppose you had a chance to go out with either a star athlete, or a boy who is the best student in class, or the best looking boy in class. Which one would you rather go out with?"

1. star athlete
2. best student
3. best looking

"(For boys only) Suppose you had a chance to go out with either a cheerleader, or a girl who is the best student in class, or the best looking girl in class. Which one would you rather go out with?"

1. cheerleader
2. best student
3. best looking

IV. Aspirations:

"If you were free to go as far as you wanted to go in school, how far would you like to go?"

1. I'd like to quit right now
2. I'd like to continue in high school for awhile
3. I'd like to graduate from high school
4. I'd like to go to secretarial or trade school
5. I'd like to go to college for awhile
6. I'd like to graduate from college
7. I'd like to do graduate work beyond college

"Would you like to go to college after high school?"

1. yes
2. undecided
3. no

V. Expectations:

"Sometimes what we would like to do isn't the same as what we expect to do. How far in school do you expect you really will go?"

1. I think I really will quit school as soon as I can
2. I think I really will continue in high school for awhile
3. I think I really will graduate from high school
4. I think I really will go to secretarial school or trade school for awhile
5. I think I really will go to college for awhile
6. I think I really will graduate from college
7. I think I really will do graduate work beyond college

"Are you planning to go to college after high school?"

1. yes
2. undecided
3. no

Organizational points are operationally defined as homeroom and roommate assignments. Those of similar homerooms and those who are roommates are assumed to be under the influence of greater probabilities of interaction than obtains for persons who share dissimilarities.
on these geographic areas. The data on organizational points were available from the program's administrative records.

For each participant in the program, an IBM card was punched with the participant's identification number, sex, values, ethnicity, race, socioeconomic-status, and roommate and homeroom assignments. This deck of 95 cards was then expanded to represent every possible two person choser-chosen combination. The expanded deck contained 8930 IBM cards, each representing a choser-chosen dyad. Each choser-chosen card contained relevant data on the independent variables for both members of the dyad. All of the variables relate to dyadic members as both subjective chosers and objects of being chosen.

The expansion of the original deck to account for every possible choser-chosen combination allows the researcher to use the dyad as the unit of analysis. The dyad as a relational unit has two points of view. Both members of a dyad are objects to each other and also both have subjective roles.\(^1\) Each pair of respondents are viewed as two dyads. One dyad offers A the possibility of choosing B as a friend and the other offers B the opportunity to choose A as a friend.

\(^1\)Riley, op. cit., p. 730.
Each dyad was then classified according to its sex structure. Dyads in which every possible female could choose every other possible female were classified as female-female dyads. Dyads in which every possible female could choose every possible male were classified as female-male dyads. Dyads in which every possible male could choose every possible female were classified as male-female dyads. Dyads in which every possible male could choose every other possible male were classified as male-male dyads.

Dyads were also classified according to the degree of friendship reciprocity. All dyads in which neither party chose each other were classified as non-friendships. Dyads in which one person chose another who did not return the choice were classified as non-reciprocated friendships. Those dyads in which both partners chose each other were classified as reciprocated friendships.

The table below presents the number of dyads found when the dimensions of sex structure was combined with the reciprocity dimension. Six participants chose none of their fellow participants as friends. Seventy-eight participants chose between 1 and 3 others as friends. Eleven participants chose 4 or more others as friends, while no one chose more than 6 others as friends.
Table 3-4: The Distribution of Dyads in the Combined Reciprocity-Sex Structure Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reciprocated Friendships</th>
<th>Female-Female Friendships</th>
<th>Female-Male Friendships</th>
<th>Male-Female Friendships</th>
<th>Male-Male Friendships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>2184</td>
<td>2440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>2236</td>
<td>2236</td>
<td>2610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Among reciprocated female-female and male-male friendships, the actual number of dyads is represented by the number in the above table. Among reciprocated same sex friendships, the actual number of dyads is twice as great as the actual number of friendships since each member of the friendships dyad chooses the other.
A Procedure for Controlling for the Effects of Unequal Marginal Distributions on a Given Independent Variable

A procedure was employed that controlled for the possibility of obtaining a relationship between a given independent variable and friendship choice due to the row and column marginals. For example, among reciprocated male-male friendships, the following frequencies of racial similarities were obtained.

Table 3-5: Observed Frequencies: The Relationship of Similarities of Race to Reciprocated Male-Male Friendships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chosen</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be observed from the above table, similarities of race seem to exhibit a stronger relationship for blacks choosing blacks than for whites choosing whites since $\frac{33}{41}$ or 80% of the blacks compared to only $\frac{6}{14}$ or 43% of the whites confine friendships to members of the same race. Furthermore, 39 of the 55 reciprocated male-
male friendship dyads represent similarities of race. Thus, 71% of all the reciprocated male-male friendships are among those of the same race.

But the above analysis of the relationship of similarities of race to reciprocated male-male friendships has not accounted for the effects of the unequal row and column marginal totals. By multiplying 41 by 41 and 14 by 14, and dividing both of these products by 55, the respective frequencies that one would expect among blacks choosing blacks and whites choosing whites just on the basis of chance may be calculated. As Table #3-6 indicates, such calculations reveal that 30.56 black choosing black dyads and 3.56 white choosing white dyads could have occurred merely due to the chance effects of the racial distribution of reciprocated male-male friendships.

Table 3-6: Expected Frequencies: The Relationship of Similarities of Race to Reciprocated Male-Male Friendships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chosen</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>E= 30.56</td>
<td>E= 10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>E= 10.44</td>
<td>E= 3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SI = $\sum_{E}$ on the $\sum_{E}$ diagonal

$SI = \frac{33 + 6}{30.56 + 3.56} = 1.14$
Since 2.44 more dyads than would be expected by chance occur among whites choosing whites the above proposed stronger relationship between race for blacks than for whites becomes merely a figment of the larger number of black friendships compared to white friendships. Also, the former over-all relationship of 71% between similarities of race and friendship formation seems much less impressive when one observes that \((33+6) - (30.56 + 3.56)\) produces only 4.88 more dyads than one would expect by chance.

In general form, by multiplying the row marginal by the column marginal and dividing by \(N\) for each cell, one may arrive at the frequencies expected due to the chance distribution of a given independent variable among a given group of respondents. The expected frequencies presented in the above table were calculated by using this procedure.

Let \(E\) stand for the frequency expected by chance. Let \(O\) stand for the actual frequency observed to occur in a given cell. If \(O/E\) for a given cell equals 1.00, then that observed frequency occurs only as often as expected by chance. If \(O/E\) is greater than 1.00 for a given cell, then that observed frequency occurs more often than expected by chance. If \(O/E\) is less than 1.00 for a given cell, than that frequency occurs less often than expected by chance.
A similarity index (i.e., SI) was calculated for all the independent variables included in this research. By \((\text{row marginal})(\text{column marginal})/N\) for a given cell along the diagonal produces the frequency of similarities expected by chance. To return to the previous example of similarities of race to male-male reciprocated friendships, by \(33 + 6/30.56 + 3.56\) an index (i.e., SI) of the overall relationship of similarities of race to friendship formation may be calculated. Since the O/E's for each cell on the diagonal are greater than 1.00, the above procedure of \(\sum O/\sum E\) will also produce a number greater than 1.00. The exact number for \(\sum O/\sum E\) along the diagonal—(i.e., SI)—in the above table is 1.14.

When one \(\sum O/\sum E\) for all the cells on the diagonal, any one O/E that is greater than 1.00 may be offset by another O/E that is less than 1.00. In essence, by \(\sum O/\sum E\) for each cell on the diagonal, an index of the overall relationship of similarities on a given independent variable is obtained. The above similarity index is not directly reflecting the actual O/E for any single cell on the diagonal, but does indicate the degree of similarity between chosers and chosen on all the possible values of a given independent variable. This index of similarity (i.e., SI) was applied to all the independent
variables analyzed in this research.*

*Those hypotheses concerned with the choser representing a lower socially designated social category than the chosen will be tested through the use of 'I' as an index of relationship rather than SI. SI is not applicable in this case since one is not concerned with the degree of similarity. 'I' represents an index of the degree to which friendships are formed on the basis of the choser representing a lower socially designated social category than the chosen. In the case of reciprocated male-male friendships, 'I' is represented by the observed frequency in the upper right hand corner of Table #3-5 over the expected frequency in the upper right hand corner of Table #3-6. The ratio obtained is 8/10.44 = 0.77. In general form, 'I' is calculated by $\Sigma O/\Sigma E$ for those cells which indicate that the choser is of a lower socially designated social category than the chosen.

With regard to race, the white race is operationally defined as 'socially superior' to the black race. The ethnic identities of Italian, Polish, and Russian parentage are operationally defined as 'socially less prestigious' than those of English, German, Irish and French decent. And those who come from families with weekly incomes of $69 or less are operationally defined as 'socially less desirable' than those respondents who come from families with weekly incomes of $70 or more.

'I'-which represents a measure of the degree to which chosers are of a lower socially designated social position than the chosen-will be used for those hypotheses to which it applies. As was the case for SI, I represents a measure which is unaffected by the row and column marginals.
The Similarity Index and Hypotheses that Test for Order Compared to Hypotheses which Test for Order and Magnitude

The similarity index will hereafter be referred to as 'SI'. For the hypotheses which are concerned with order only, observed frequencies which produces $S_{IRF} > S_{INR} > S_{INF}$ * will offer evidence of confirmation. For those hypotheses which state both order and magnitude, observed frequencies must be in the form $S_{IRF} > S_{INR} > 1.00 > S_{INF}$ in order to provide confirmation.

Those hypotheses concerned with order need not conform to the more rigorous standards required of the hypotheses stating both order and magnitude. In the case of the hypotheses concerned with order, all that is required is that $S_{IRF}$ be greater than $S_{INR}$ than $S_{INF}$. But the hypotheses concerned with both order and magnitude must produce observed frequencies that differ in specified ways from the assumption of statistical independence. For not only the order of the relative hypotheses must be preserved, but also $S_{IRF}$ and $S_{INR}$ must occur in frequencies greater than chance while $S_{INF}$ must occur in

* The subscripts 'RF', 'NR', and 'NF' represent a shorthand method to identify different categories along the reciprocity dimension. 'RF' stands for reciprocated friendships, 'NR' stands for non-reciprocated friendships, and 'NF' stands for non-friendships. When combined with SI as above, the subscripts identify similarity index values for different degrees of reciprocity.
frequencies less than expected by chance.

And since SI and I are derived according to the same procedures, the same rules for ordinal and ordinal-magnitude confirmation also apply to those hypotheses dealing with the choser representing a socially designated less desirable social category than the chosen.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE PREEMINENCE OF SIMILARITIES OF ORGANIZATIONAL POINTS IN ACCOUNTING FOR INITIAL FRIENDSHIP CHOICE

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three main sections. The first section is devoted to determining the degree to which the hypotheses stating the relationship of selected independent variables to the friendship reciprocity dimension are supported by empirical data. The second section is devoted to examining the degree to which empirical data support the hypotheses concerned with the rank ordering of the strength of the independent variables to initial reciprocity. The final section of this chapter is devoted to determining which of the competing theoretical orientations that specify the sex structure of the dyad account for the relationship of the independent variables to friendship reciprocity.

The Relationship of Similarities on Selected Independent Variables to Friendship Reciprocity

The most general theoretical orientation presented in the theory chapter would predict that similarities on a given independent variable will exhibit a progressively weaker relationship as one moves from reciprocated, to
non-reciprocated, to non-friendships. Similarities of
organizational points, socioeconomic-status, race, eth­
nicity, and values should represent progressively smaller
SI values as one moves from reciprocated, to non-recipro­
cated, to non-friendships. The empirical analysis to
follow will test the above general hypothesis.

Variable under Consideration: Socioeconomic-status.

Table 4-1: The Relationship of Similarities of Socio­
economic-status to Initial Friendship
Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for Socioeconomic-status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.93 (N=156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.94 (N=291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.90 (N=8469)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order:

The \( SI_{RF} \) (i.e., similarity index for reciprocated 
friendships) = 0.93 is greater than \( SI_{NF} \) (i.e., similarity 
index for non-friendships) = 0.90. The largest SI (i.e., 
similarity index) value of 0.94 is to be found among non­
reciprocated friendships. But the \( SI_{NR} \) (i.e., similarity 
index for non-reciprocated friendships) is only .01 
greater than the SI value for reciprocated friendships.
Thus, the expected progression of weaker relationships between similarities of socioeconomic-status and the friendship reciprocity dimension has not been met since non-reciprocated rather than reciprocated friendships exhibit the highest SI value. Furthermore, since the respective SI values for both reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships are only .03 and .04 greater than the SI value for non-friendships, the degree to which similarities of socioeconomic-status are related to initial friendship formation must be regarded as quite weak.

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

Although the SI values for reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships are greater than the SI value for non-friendships the SI values for all three reciprocity categories are less than 1.00. Thus, similarities of SES occur in frequencies less than chance among all categories on the reciprocity dimension. When viewing the relationship of similarities of SES to the dimension of friendship reciprocity within the framework of the ordinal-magnitude mode of analysis, similarities of SES fail to exhibit any substantial relationship to initial friendship formation.
Variable under Consideration: Race.

Table 4-2: The Relationship of Similarities of Race to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI = 1.06 (N = 104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI = 1.30 (N = 133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI = 1.04 (N = 5055)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order:

$SI_{RF}$ (similarity index for reciprocated friendships) = 1.06 is only .02 greater than SI for non-friendships = 1.04 while the SI for non-reciprocated friendships = 1.30 is .26 greater than SI for non-friendships. The expected progressively weaker relationship between similarities of race and the friendship reciprocity dimension does not obtain. Furthermore, since the SI for reciprocated friendships is only .02 greater than the SI for non-friendships, the relationship between similarities of race and initial reciprocated friendships must be regarded as essentially non-existent. The fact that the non-reciprocated similarity index is .26 greater than the SI for non-friendships indicates that similarities of race are the most highly related to non-reciprocated friendships.
Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

According to the expected relationship between similarities of race and the friendship reciprocity dimension, similarities of race will occur in frequencies less than expected by chance among non-friendships, in frequencies greater than chance among non-reciprocated friendships, and the greatest positive divergences from chance will occur among reciprocated friendships. But the SI for non-friendships is .04 greater than would be expected under the assumption of statistical independence. Furthermore, the SI for reciprocated friendships is only .02 greater than the SI for non-friendships, while the SI for non-reciprocated friendships is .26 greater than the SI for non-friendships.

Thus, the hypothesized divergences from chance are not confirmed by the data. The only substantial divergence from chance worthy of mention would be that similarities of race are more indicative of non-reciprocated friendships than similarities of race are indicative of reciprocated friendships.

Variable under Consideration: Ethnicity.

Analysis of Order:

The SI for reciprocated friendships = 1.10 is .15 greater than \( SI_{NF} \) (i.e., similarity index for non-friends)
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Table 4-3: **The Relationship of Similarities of Ethnicity to Initial Friendship Reciprocity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.10 (N=116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.05 (N=83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.95 (N=1055)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= 0.95, while \(SI_{NR} = 1.05\) is .05 less than \(SI_{RF}\). The trend of this relationship is in the direction of the hypothesis which states that as one moves from reciprocated, to non-reciprocated, to non-friendships, similarities of ethnicity will become less frequent. But the differences of the SI values between reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships is only .05. Furthermore, the difference between \(SI_{RF}\) and \(SI_{NF}\) is .15 and the difference between \(SI_{NR}\) and \(SI_{NF}\) is only .10. Although the relationship of similarities of ethnicity to the dimension of friendship reciprocity is in the hypothesized direction, the rather small differences of SI values between adjacent categories along the reciprocity dimension indicates that not many more similarities of ethnicity characterize reciprocated friendships when compared to non-reciprocated friendships. Also, not many more similarities of ethnicity characterize non-reciprocated friendships when compared...
to non-friendships. Thus, although similarities of ethnicity follow the hypothesized progression, the over-all differences in the number of similarities between any two adjoining categories of friendship reciprocity are small. Although the data confirm the progression hypothesis, the strength of the relationship of similarities of ethnicity to friendship formation is weak.

**Analysis of Order and Magnitude:**

$S_{INP}$ is less than 1.00, while $S_{INR}$ is greater than 1.00 and $S_{IRF}$ is greater than $S_{INR}$. Thus, the hypothesized divergences from the assumption of statistical independence have been met. But the divergences from statistical independence are small. $S_{INF}$ is only .05 less than 1.00. $S_{INR}$ is only .05 greater than 1.00 and $S_{IRF}$ is only .05 greater than $S_{INR}$. Although the divergences from chance are in the expected direction, the differences in SI values from one adjacent category to another are so small that the over-all relationship between similarities of ethnicity and the reciprocity dimension is quite weak.

**Variable under Consideration:** Organizational Points.

**Analysis of Order:**

$S_{IRF}$ = 2.07 is 1.25 greater than $S_{INF}$ = 0.82. But
Table 4-4: The Relationship of Similarities of Room Assignments to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for Room Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=2.07 (N=142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=2.27 (N=204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.82 (N=4111)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SI\textsubscript{NR}= 2.27 is 1.45 greater than SI\textsubscript{NF}. Although SI\textsubscript{RF} and SI\textsubscript{NR} exhibit many more similarities of room assignments than SI\textsubscript{NF}, SI\textsubscript{RF} exhibits slightly fewer similarities than SI\textsubscript{NR}. Thus, the hypothesized progression of the strength of the relationship of organizational points to the reciprocity dimension does not obtain. But similarities of roommates discriminate quite well between reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships on the one hand, and non-friendships on the other hand.

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

SI\textsubscript{RF} is twice as great as chance and SI\textsubscript{NF} is .18 less than 1.00. But SI\textsubscript{NR} is 1.27 greater than 1.00. Similarities of room assignments occur in frequencies substantially greater than expected by chance. But SI\textsubscript{RF} and SI\textsubscript{NR} do not conform to the hypothesized progression of the strength of the relationship. Here again, the expected
progressively weaker relationship between similarities of room assignments as one moves from reciprocated, to non-reciprocated, to non-friendships is not supported by the data. But similarities of room assignments do occur in frequencies less than chance among non-friendships and in frequencies substantially greater than chance among reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships.

**Variable under Consideration:** Organizational Points.

**Table 4-5: The Relationship of Similarities of Homerooms to Initial Friendship Reciprocity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for Homerooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI = 1.63$ (N=156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI = 1.54$ (N=291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>$SI = 0.77$ (N=8469)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Order:**

$SI_{RF} = 1.63$ is .09 greater than $SI_{NR} = 1.54$ and $SI_{NR}$ is .77 greater than $SI_{NF} = 0.77$. Thus, there are a greater number of similarities of homerooms among reciprocated friendships, a fewer number of similarities among non-reciprocated friendships, and the fewest number of similarities among non-friendships. The trend of the relationship of similarities of homerooms to the dimension
of reciprocity would seem to confirm the hypothesis that a progressively fewer number of similarities of organizational points will be observed as one moves from reciprocated, to non-reciprocated, to non-friendships. But, the difference in the strength of the relationships of similarities of organizational points to reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships is less than .10, while the above two dimensions have SI values at least .77 greater than the SI value for non-friends. Although the differences in the strength of the relationships between the categories of reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships is less substantial than the differences in the strength of the relationships of both of the above two categories to the category of non-friendships, the relationship of similarities of homerooms to the reciprocity dimension follow the hypothesized progression.

**Analysis of Order and Magnitude:**

$SI_{RF}$ is .09 greater than $SI_{NR}$, and $SI_{NR}$ is .54 greater than 1.00. Also, $SI_{NF}$ is .33 less than 1.00. Thus, similarities of homerooms occur in frequencies less than chance among non-friendships, in frequencies greater than chance among non-reciprocated friendships, and the greatest positive divergences from chance are found among reciprocated friendships. It would seem that the data confirm the hypothesis about the relationship of organizational
points to the friendship reciprocity dimension under the assumption of statistical independence.

Both $SI_{NR}$ and $SI_{NF}$ diverge at least .30 from 1.00 in the hypothesized direction, while $SI_{NR}$ and $SI_{RF}$ differ in the hypothesized direction by less than .10. Thus, the hypothesized differences in the strengths of the relationship between categories of reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships is less substantial than the differences in the strengths of the relationships of the above two categories compared to the category of non-friendships. Although similarities of homerooms do not discriminate as well between reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships as obtains for the above two friendship types and non-friendships, the general trend of the relationship is in the hypothesized direction.

Variable under Consideration: Values.

Table 4-6: The Relationship of Similarities of Interests and Activities to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for Interests and Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=1.09$ (N=111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=1.03$ (N=248)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=0.89$ (N=6112)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Order:

Since $SI_{RF} = 1.09$ is greater than $SI_{NR} = 1.03$, which is greater than $SI_{NF} = 0.89$, the hypothesis stating the relationship between similarities of values and the dimension of friendship reciprocity has been confirmed. The similarity index values for both reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships are at least .14 greater than $SI_{NF}$. But $SI_{RF}$ is only .06 greater than $SI_{NR}$. Thus, similarities of values do not discriminate as well between reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships as similarities of values discriminate between the above two friendship types and non-friendships.

Analysis of Magnitude and Order:

Since $SI_{RF}$ is greater than $SI_{NR}$, which is greater than 1.00, and 1.00 is greater than $SI_{NF}$, the magnitude and order of the relationship of similarities of values to the friendship reciprocity dimension follows the hypothesized direction. But this relationship must be regarded as quite weak since the strongest divergences from chance found among reciprocated friendships are only .09 greater than 1.00, and $SI_{NR}$ is only .03 greater than 1.00.

Variable under Consideration: Values.
Table 4-7: The Relationship of Similarities of Interests and Activities to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocated</th>
<th>Similarity Index for Time Spent on Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.15 (N=138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.81 (N=281)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.96 (N=7928)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order:

\[ SI_{RF} = 1.15 \text{ is greater than } SI_{NR} = 0.81. \] But \( SI_{NR} \) is .15 less than \( SI_{NF} = 0.96. \) Thus, the hypothesis stating the relationship between similarities of values and the friendship reciprocity dimension is not confirmed. But since \( SI_{RF} \) is .19 greater than \( SI_{NF} \), similarities of values do discriminate between reciprocated and non-friendships.

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

\[ SI_{RF} \text{ is .15 greater than 1.00 and } SI_{NF} \text{ is .04 less than 1.00}. \] But \( SI_{NR} \) is .19 less than 1.00. Thus, the hypothesis stating the relationship between similarities of values and the friendship reciprocity dimension has not been confirmed. Although \( SI_{RF} \) is .15 greater than 1.00, \( SI_{NF} \) is only .04 less than 1.00. Therefore, the
degree to which similarities of values discriminate between reciprocated and non-friendships when considering both order and magnitude is quite small.

**Variable under Consideration:** Values.

**Table 4-8: The Relationship of Similarities of Interests and Activities to Initial Friendship Reciprocity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for the Use of an Extra Hour in High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.23 (N=136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.98 (N=256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.94 (N=8214)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Order:**

Since $SI_{RF} = 1.23$ is greater than $SI_{NR} = 0.98$, and $SI_{NF} = 0.94$ is less than $SI_{NR}$, one might be led to conclude that the hypothesis concerning the relationship between similarities of values and the reciprocity dimension has been confirmed. But $SI_{NR}$ is only .04 greater than $SI_{NF}$. The fact that $SI_{RF}$ is .29 greater than $SI_{NF}$ suggests that similarities of values discriminate quite well between reciprocated and non-friendships.
Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

The fact that $S_{IRF}$ is less than 1.00 prevents stating that similarities of values are related to the reciprocity dimension when one considers both the order and the magnitude of the relationship. $S_{IRF}$ is .23 greater than 1.00, while $S_{INF}$ is only .06 less than 1.00. Thus, similarities of values discriminate to a small degree between reciprocated and non-friendships.

Variable under Consideration: Values.

Table 4-9: The Relationship of Similarities of Interests and Activities to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for Leisure Time Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=1.16$ (N=156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=1.19$ (N=288)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=0.96$ (N=8469)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order:

Since $SI_{RF} = 1.16$ is .03 less than $SI_{NR} = 1.19$, the hypothesis stating that similarities of values are related to the reciprocity dimension cannot be confirmed. But since the SI values for both reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships are at least .20 greater than
SI_{NF} = 0.96, one can state that similarities of values discriminate quite well between the above two friendship types and non-friendships.

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

SI_{RF} and SI_{NR} are both greater than 1.00 and SI_{NF} is less than 1.00. But SI_{NR} is .03 greater than SI_{RF}. Thus, the hypothesis stating the relationship between similarities of values and the reciprocity dimension is not confirmed. Both SI_{RF} and SI_{NR} are at least .16 greater than 1.00. But SI_{NF} is only .04 less than 1.00. Thus, although similarities of values occur in frequencies greater than expected by chance among reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships, similarities of values occur in frequencies almost equal to chance among non-friendships.

Variable under Consideration: Values.

Analysis of Order:

SI_{RF} = 1.00 is only .02 greater than SI_{NF} = 0.98. Furthermore, SI_{NR} = 1.12 is .12 greater than SI_{RF}. Thus, the expected progressively weaker relationship between similarities of values and the dimension of reciprocity is not confirmed by the data.
Table 4-10: The Relationship of the Values of Alternative Courses of Action to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index on What a Student would like to be Remembered as in High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI = 1.00 (N = 145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI = 1.12 (N = 272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI = 0.98 (N = 7506)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

$S_{RF}$ is 1.00. Furthermore, $S_{NR}$ is .12 greater than $S_{RF}$, and $S_{NF}$ is only .02 less than 1.00. Thus, the hypothesis stating the magnitude and order of the relationship of similarities of values to the reciprocity dimension has not been confirmed.

Variable under Consideration: Values.

Analysis of Order:

$S_{NR} = 0.90$ is .07 less than $S_{RF} = 0.97$, but $S_{NF} = 0.96$ is only .01 less than $S_{RF}$. Thus, the hypothesis stating the relationship of similarities of values to the reciprocity dimension has not been met.
Table 4-11: The Relationship of the Values of Alternative Courses of Action to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index on Whether a Student would rather be a Good Student or Good in Sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.97 (N=126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.90 (N=291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.96 (N=8269)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

Since $SI_{RF}$ and $SI_{NR}$ are less than 1.00 and $SI_{NF}$ is only .04 less than 1.00, the hypothesis specifying both the order and the magnitude of the relationship of similarities of values to the friendship reciprocity dimension has not been confirmed.

Variable under Consideration: Values.

Analysis of Order:

$SI_{NF} = 0.96$ is only .06 less than $SI_{NR} = 1.02$, but $SI_{RF} = 1.37$ is .35 greater than $SI_{NR}$. Although the degree to which similarities of values discriminate between non-reciprocated and non-friendships is rather slight, the greater discrimination between reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships suggests that similarities of values
are related to reciprocated friendships.

Table 4-12: The Relationship of the Values of Alternative Courses of Action to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index on Whether a Student would rather be a Good Student or Popular with his Own Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.37 (N=90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.02 (N=291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.96 (N=8269)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

Since $S_{RF}$ is greater than $S_{NR}$, and $S_{NR}$ is greater than 1.00 while $S_{NF}$ is less than 1.00, it seems as if the hypothesis stating the magnitude and order of the relationship between similarities of values and the reciprocity dimension has been confirmed by the data. But since $S_{NR}$ is only .02 greater than 1.00 and $S_{NF}$ is only .04 less than 1.00, the degree to which the relationship follows in the hypothesized direction is rather small.

Variable under Consideration: Values.

Analysis of Order:

Since $S_{NR} = 0.95$ is less than $S_{NF} = 0.96$, the hypothesis stating the relationship between similarities
of values and the dimension of friendship reciprocity has not been confirmed. But $SI_{RF} = 1.14$ is .18 greater than $SI_{NF}$. Thus, similarities of values do discriminate between reciprocated friendships and non-friendships.

Table 4-13: The Relationship of the Values of Alternative Courses of Action to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index on Whether one would rather be a Good Student or Popular with the Opposite Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=1.14$ (N=92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=0.95$ (N=291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=0.96$ (N=8469)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

Since $SI_{NR}$ is less than 1.00, the hypothesis stating the relationship between similarities of values and the reciprocity dimension has not been confirmed. But $SI_{RF}$ is .14 greater than 1.00 and $SI_{NF}$ is .04 less than 1.00. Thus, there seems to exist a slight relationship between similarities of values and reciprocated friendships when specifying both the order and the magnitude of the relationship.

Variable under Consideration: Values.
### Table 4-14: The Relationship of Similarities of the Values of Alternative Courses of Action to Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index on Whether One would Rather be a Good Student or Good in School Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI = 1.01$ (N=156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI = 1.01$ (N=291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>$SI = 0.96$ (N=8469)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Order:**

Since $SI_{RF} = 1.01$ equals $SI_{NR}$, the hypothesis stating the relationship between similarities of values and the friendship reciprocity dimension has not been confirmed. Both $SI_{RF}$ and $SI_{NR}$ are .05 greater than $SI_{NF} = 0.96$. But this difference is so slight one may reasonably assume that no relationship exists.

**Analysis of Order and Magnitude:**

Since $SI_{RF}$ equals $SI_{NR}$, the hypothesis stating that $SI_{RF}$ will be greater than $SI_{NR}$, and that $SI_{NR}$ will be greater than 1.00 while $SI_{NF}$ will be less than 1.00 is not confirmed. $SI_{RF}$ and $SI_{NR}$ are .01 greater than 1.00 and $SI_{NF}$ is .04 less than 1.00. But these differences are so slight that one may assume that no relationship exists.
Variable under Consideration: Values.

Table 4-15: The Relationship of Similarities of the Values of Alternative Courses of Action to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index on the Type of Person One would like to go out on a Date with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated</td>
<td>SI=1.03 (N=150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated</td>
<td>SI=0.92 (N=279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.97 (N=8113)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order:

Even though SI\textsubscript{RF} = 1.03 is greater than SI\textsubscript{NF} = 0.97, this difference is only .06. Furthermore, the expected progressively weaker relationship between similarities of values and the friendship reciprocity dimension is not confirmed since SI\textsubscript{NR} = 0.92 is less than SI\textsubscript{NF}. Thus, the hypothetical relationship between similarities of values and the reciprocity dimension has not been confirmed.

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

SI\textsubscript{RF} is .03 greater than 1.00, while SI\textsubscript{NF} is .03 less than 1.00. But these hypothesized divergences from chance are quite small. Furthermore, SI\textsubscript{NR} is .05 less than SI\textsubscript{NF}. Thus, the hypothesis stating the order and the
magnitude of the relationship between similarities of values and the friendship reciprocity dimension is not confirmed.

Variable under Consideration: Values.

Table 4-16: The Relationship of Similarities of the Value of One's Self to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for Self Ratings in School Activities other than Sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.94 (N=156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.97 (N=291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.95 (N=8496)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order:

Since $SI_{NR} = 0.97$ is .03 greater than $SI_{RF} = 0.94$ and only .02 greater than $SI_{NF} = 0.95$, the hypothesis stating the relationship between similarities of values and the reciprocity dimension has not been confirmed.

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

$SI_{RF}$ is .03 less than $SI_{NR}$. Also, $SI_{NR}$ is .03 less than 1.00 and $SI_{NF}$ is .05 less than 1.00. Thus, the hypothesis stating the relationship between similarities of
values and friendship reciprocity has not been confirmed.

**Variable under Consideration:** Values.

**Table 4-17: The Relationship of Similarities of the Value of One's Self to Initial Friendship Reciprocity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for Self Ratings of Sports Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.84 (N=152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.97 (N=291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.05 (N=8469)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Order:**

Since $SI_{RF} = 0.84$ is less than $SI_{NR} = 0.97$ and $SI_{NF} = 1.05$ is greater than $SI_{NR}$, a negative relationship between similarities of values and the friendship reciprocity dimension is in evidence. Since $SI_{NR}$ is .13 greater than $SI_{RF}$ and $SI_{NF}$ is .08 greater than $SI_{NR}$, the negative relationship cannot be considered to be very strong.

**Analysis of Order and Magnitude:**

Since $SI_{RF}$ is less than $SI_{NR}$ and $SI_{NR}$ is less than 1.00 while $SI_{NF}$ is greater than 1.00, there exists a negative relationship between similarities of values and the friendship reciprocity dimension. But since these
divergences in the opposite direction are small, one must regard this negative relationship as very weak.

**Variable under Consideration:** Values.

**Table 4-18:** The Relationship of Similarities of the Value of One's Self to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for Self Ratings of Popularity with the Opposite Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.75 (N=156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.05 (N=291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.21 (N=8469)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Order:**

SI$_{RF}$ = 0.75 is less than SI$_{NR}$ = 1.05, and SI$_{NF}$ = 1.21 is greater than SI$_{NR}$. Rather than confirming the hypothesis between similarities of values and the reciprocity dimension, the complete opposite type of relationship emerges. Furthermore, since SI$_{RF}$ is .30 less than SI$_{NR}$ and SI$_{NF}$ is .16 greater than SI$_{NR}$, one may assume that a rather strong negative relationship exists between similarities of values and friendship reciprocity.

**Analysis of Order and Magnitude:**

Since SI$_{RF}$ is .30 less than SI$_{NR}$ and SI$_{NF}$ is .16...
greater than 1.00, the relationship between similarities of values and the friendship reciprocity dimension appears in the opposite direction. Furthermore, it appears as if there exists a rather strong negative relationship between similarities of values and friendship reciprocity.

Variable under Consideration: Values.

Table 4-19: The Relationship of Similarities of Aspirations to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index for How Far One would like to go in School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.89 (N=132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.13 (N=291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.97 (N=8269)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order:

Since $SI_{NR} = 1.13$ is .24 greater than $SI_{RF} = 0.89$ one cannot accept the hypothesis concerning the relationship between similarities of values and the friendship reciprocity dimension. $SI_{NR}$ is .16 greater than $SI_{NF} = 0.97$. Thus, similarities of values discriminate between non-reciprocated friendships and non-friendships.

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

Since $SI_{RF}$ is .11 less than 1.00, one cannot accept
the hypothesis concerning the relationship between similarities of values and the friendship reciprocity dimension. \( SI_{NR} \) is .13 greater than 1.00. But \( SI_{NF} \) is only .03 less than 1.00. Thus, the degree to which similarities of values discriminate between non-reciprocated and non-friendships is small.

**Variable under Consideration:** Values.

**Table 4-20: The Relationship of Similarities of Aspirations to Initial Friendship Reciprocity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocation</th>
<th>Similarity Index on Whether One Would Like to go to College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>( SI=0.99 ) (( N=150 ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>( SI=1.03 ) (( N=291 ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>( SI=0.92 ) (( N=8469 ))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Order:**

Since \( SI_{RF} = 0.99 \) is less than \( SI_{NR} = 1.03 \) one cannot assume that similarities of values are related to the dimension of reciprocity in the hypothesized direction. \( SI_{RF} \) is .07 greater than \( SI_{NF} = 0.92 \) and \( SI_{NR} \) is .11 greater than \( SI_{NF} \). Thus, there are a few more similarities among reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships than obtains among non-friendships.
Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

$SI_{NR}$ is 1.03. But $SI_{RF}$ is less than 1.00. Thus, one cannot assume that similarities of values are related to the dimension of friendship reciprocity in the hypothesized direction. $SI_{NF}$ is .08 less than 1.00. But $SI_{NR}$ is only .03 greater than 1.00. Thus, only a very few more similarities of values are found among non-reciprocated friendships than obtains among non-friendships.

Variable under Consideration: Values.

Table 4-21: The Relationship of Similarities of Expectations to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index on how Far One Really Expects To Go In School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI_{RF}=1.17 \ (N=139)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI_{NR}=1.07 \ (N=291)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>$SI_{NF}=0.93 \ (N=8269)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order:

Since $SI_{RF}=1.17$ is greater than $SI_{NR}=1.07$ and $SI_{NR}$ is greater than $SI_{NF}=0.93$, the hypothesis concerning the relationship of similarities of values to the dimension of friendship reciprocity is confirmed. The
relationship is not exceedingly strong since the differences in SI values between friendship categories is only .10.

**Analysis of Order and Magnitude:**

Since $SI_{RF}$ is greater than $SI_{NR}$ and $SI_{NR}$ is greater than 1.00 while $SI_{NF}$ is less than 1.00, the hypothesis stating the relationship between similarities of values and the friendship reciprocity dimension is confirmed. But since $SI_{NF}$ and $SI_{NR}$ differ from chance in the hypothesized direction by only .07, the confirmed relationship must be regarded as rather weak.

**Variable under Consideration:** Values.

**Table 4-22: The Relationship of Similarities of Expectations to Initial Friendship Reciprocity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarity Index For Plans For Going To College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=1.04$ (N=150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=1.08$ (N=291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>$SI=0.99$ (N=8469)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Order:**

Although $SI_{NR} = 1.08$ is greater than $SI_{NF} = 0.99$, $SI_{RF} = 1.04$ is not greater than $SI_{NR}$. Thus, the expected
The relationship between similarities of values and the reciprocity dimension is not confirmed. But $S_{NR}$ is .09 greater than $S_{NF}$. Thus, similarities of values discriminate to a small degree between non-reciprocated and non-friendships.

**Analysis of Order and Magnitude:**

Since $S_{NR}$ is .04 greater than $S_{RF}$, the expected relationship between similarities of values and the reciprocity dimension is not confirmed. $S_{NR}$ is .08 greater than 1.00. But $S_{NF}$ is only .01 less than 1.00. Thus, the degree to which similarities of values discriminate between non-reciprocated and non-friendships must be regarded as almost negligible.
The Relationship of the Choser Representing a Lower Socially Designated Social Background Category than the Chosen to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

A further specification of the relationship of selected independent variables to the friendship reciprocity dimension was also given. According to this further specification, a greater frequency of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated socioeconomic-status, ethnic, or racial position will occur among non-reciprocated friendships than obtains among reciprocated and non-friendships. The discussion to follow will enable testing the empirical soundness of the above hypothesis.

Variable under Consideration: Socioeconomic-status.

Table 4-23: The Relationship of the Choser Representing a Lower Socially Designated Socioeconomic-status Position than the Chosen Friendship Reciprocity  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Index Values for Socioeconomic-status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>I=1.22 (N=38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>I=1.06 (N=76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>I=0.98 (N=2316)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since the general hypothesis tested here is not concerned with the degree of similarity, the similarity index (i.e., SI) is inappropriate. 'I'—which represents a
Analysis of Order:

Although there are more chosers of a lower socioeconomic-status position among non-reciprocated friendships than occurs among non-friendships, there are more chosers of a lower socioeconomic-status position among reciprocated friendships than occurs among non-reciprocated friendships. Thus, the hypothesis suggesting that non-reciprocated friends will have more dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated SES position than obtains among reciprocated and non-friendships is not confirmed by the data.

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

The number of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated SES position occurs in frequencies slightly less than chance among non-friendships and in frequencies slightly greater than chance among non-reciprocated friendships. But the greatest positive divergences from chance are to be found among reciprocated friendships. Thus, the expected hypothetical relationship is not confirmed by the data.

measure of the degree to which chosers are of a lower socially designated social category than the chosen—will be used for the present analysis. A more extended discussion of the derivation and logic of 'I' as a measure of relationship was presented on page 84.
Variable under Consideration: Ethnicity.

Table 4-24: The Relationship of the Choser Representing a Lower Socially Designated Ethnic Position than the Chosen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Index Values for Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>I=0.73 (N=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>I=0.81 (N=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>I=0.98 (N=2388)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order:

With regard to ethnicity, one finds that there are more dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated ethnic category among non-reciprocated friendships than obtains among reciprocated friendships. But there are more dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated ethnic category among non-friendships than obtains among non-reciprocated friendships. Thus, the hypothesis stating that dyads in which the choser will be of a lower socially designated ethnic category than the chosen will be more prevalent among non-reciprocated friendships than obtains among the other two friendship types is not confirmed by the data.
Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

The number of dyads found among reciprocated and non-friendships occur in frequencies less than expected by chance. But the number of dyads among non-reciprocated friendships also occur in frequencies less than expected by chance. Thus, the hypothesis suggesting that a greater number of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated ethnic category will occur the most frequently among non-reciprocated friendships is not confirmed by the data.

Variable under Consideration: Race.

Table 4-25: The Relationship of the Choser Representing a Lower Socially Designated Racial Category than the Chosen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Index Values for Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>I = 0.74 (N = 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>I = 0.67 (N = 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>I = 0.96 (N = 2359)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Order:

There are more dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated racial category among reciprocated and non-friendships than obtains among non-reciprocated
friendships. Thus, rather than confirmation of the ex­ected relationship, the complete opposite relationship appears when one inspects the data. Not only is it im­possible to confirm the hypothesis that the greatest pro­portion of dyads with the choser of a lower socially des­ignated racial category than the chosen will be found among non-reciprocated friendships, but the observed re­lationship occurs in frequencies that run completely con­trary to the expected relationship.

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

The number of dyads found among non-friendships and reciprocated friendships occur in frequencies less than expected by chance. And the divergences from chance in a negative direction are the most pronounced among non-re­ciprocated friendships. Thus, the expected relationship does not obtain when analyzed for the order and magnitude of the relationship.

Summary

This section has been concerned with testing the gen­eral hypothesis that similarities of socioeconomic-status, race, ethnicity, organizational points, and values are related to friendship formation. The similarity hypoth­esis suggested that similarities on the above independent variables will represent progressively fewer dyads as one
moves from reciprocated, to non-reciprocated, to non-friendships. Both the ordinal and the combined ordinal-magnitude modes of analysis were employed to examine the relationship of similarities on the above independent variables to initial reciprocity.

When the above hypothesis was analyzed with respect to order, only similarities of organizational points offered consistently strong relationships in the hypothesized direction. But even with regard to organizational points, the consistency of the ordinal hypothesis was not always upheld since $SI_{RF} = 2.07$ for similarities of room assignments was .20 less than $SI_{NR} = 2.27$. Furthermore, although the ordinal hypothesis was upheld for similarities of homerooms, the relationship was not equally strong among all adjacent cells since the difference between $SI_{RF} = 1.63$ and $SI_{NR} = 1.54$ was only .09 while the difference between $SI_{NR}$ and $SI_{NF}$ was .77.

The analysis of order documented either a weak or an inconsistent relationship between similarities of socioeconomic-status, race, and ethnicity and friendship formation. Similarities of socioeconomic-status exhibited an inconsistent relationship to the reciprocity dimension since $SI_{NR} = 0.94$ was greater than $SI_{RF} = 0.93$. Similarities of race exhibited a fairly strong inconsistent relationship to friendship formation since $SI_{NR} = 1.30$ was .24 greater than $SI_{RF} = 1.06$. Similarities of ethnicity
exhibited a rather weak relationship in the expected direction since the greatest differences in SI values among adjacent cells along the reciprocity dimension was only .10.

Similarities of values exhibited both inconsistent and weak relationships to the reciprocity dimension when examined according to the ordinal hypothesis. Aside from the above two shortcomings, similarities of values also exhibited negative relationships to the friendship reciprocity dimension. And in a few instances, similarities of values exhibited rather strong negative relationships to the reciprocity dimension. Thus, when one considers the observed similarities on all of the independent variables tested for the order of their relationship to the reciprocity dimension, similarities of values are the least likely to be related to friendship formation in the hypothesized direction.

The inconsistency of the relationship between similarities of socioeconomic-status and friendship formation was transformed into a partially negative relationship when the analysis was concerned with both order and magnitude since both $SI_{RF}$ and $SI_{NR}$ occurred in frequencies less often than expected by chance. The inconsistent relationship between similarities of race and initial reciprocity also became partially negative since $SI_{NF}$ was .04 greater than 1.00.
When both order and magnitude were taken into account, the previously weak relationship between similarities of ethnicity and initial reciprocity became even weaker since the largest SI difference along adjacent cells of the reciprocity dimension in the expected direction was reduced to .05.

Similarities of values exhibited the same tendencies toward greater inconsistencies and weaker relationships when the analysis was concerned with both the order and the magnitude of the relationship. But aside from these two shortcomings, some of the negative relationships were found to hold when scrutinized with regard to both order and magnitude. Here again, similarities of values exhibited the weakest relationship to initial friendship reciprocity.

The relationship between similarities of organizational points and the friendship reciprocity dimension were found to hold when analyzed for both the order and the magnitude of the relationship. Although these relationships were still in evidence, they were reduced in strength. The previous large differences in the hypothesized direction between reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships on the one hand and non-friendships on the other were reduced considerably by the introduction of the magnitude dimension.

A further specification of the relationship of
selected independent variables to the friendship reciprocity dimension was also explored. According to this further specification, a greater frequency of dyads with the chooser of a lower socially designated socioeconomic-status, ethnic, or racial position were predicted to occur among non-reciprocated friendships than would occur among reciprocated and non-friendships. Inspection of the data from both the ordinal and the ordinal-magnitude modes of analysis failed to confirm the above hypothetical expectancies.
The Rank Ordering of the Strength of the Relationship of
Selected Independent Variables to
Initial Friendship Reciprocity

The general hypothesis to be tested in this section suggests that similarities of organizational points and similarities of social background will be more strongly related to initial friendships than obtains for similarities of values. The above rank ordering hypothesis results from assuming that the quantities of information exchanged during the initial friendship formation sequence will be inadequate to produce as strong a relationship between similarities of values and friendship choice than obtains for similarities of social background or similarities or organizational points. The discussion to follow will enable testing the rank-ordering hypothesis.

Throughout the remainder of this analysis, 'SI' and 'I' will not be presented along with their respective index values. Only the index values themselves will be presented. It should be clear from the discussion before each tabular presentation whether or not 'I' or 'SI' is the index value being presented. All hypotheses focusing on the degree of similarity and friendship formation obviously refer to 'SI.' And only those hypotheses which refer to a particular type of chooser-chosen relationship predicted to occur most frequently among non-reciprocated
friendships will necessitate the use of 'I'.

Furthermore, the number of dyads observed to occur in a given cell along the initial reciprocity dimension will not be presented. These observed frequencies were presented in the previous section. The observed frequencies of dyads will be presented when the initial reciprocity dimension is combined with the dimension of sex structure. But this section focuses on the rank-ordering hypothesis while the third section of this chapter combines both the initial friendship formation dimension with the sex structure dimension. Presentation of such dyadic tallies in this section would be redundant.
The Rank-Ordering of Similarities of Organizational Points and Similarities of Values to Initial Friendship Formation

This section focuses on the hypothesis suggesting that similarities of organizational points will be more strongly related to initial friendship reciprocity than obtains for similarities of values. The discussion to follow will enable testing the above general hypothesis.

Analysis:

Table # 4-26 indicates that in each case the hypothesis stating the rank-ordering of the strength of the relationship of similarities of organizational points and similarities of interests and activities to the dimension of initial reciprocity is confirmed. Similarities of homerooms and room assignments are much more strongly related to initial friendship choice than are similarities of interests and activities.

Analysis:

Table # 4-27 indicates that the rank-ordering hypothesis specifying the strength of the relationship of organizational points and values to the reciprocity dimension has been confirmed. The only value item that even comes close to invalidating the rank-ordering hypothesis pertains to the value question asking respondents whether
Variables under Consideration: Organizational Points and Values.

Table 4-26: The Rank Ordering of Similarities of Organizational Points (Room Assignments and Homerooms) and Similarities of Values (Interests and Activities) to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarities of Organizational Points</th>
<th>Similarities of Values (Interests and Activities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Assignments</td>
<td>Homerooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Variables under Consideration:** Organizational Points and Values

**Table 4-27:** The Rank-Ordering of Similarities of Organizational Points (Room Assignments and Homerooms) and Similarities of Values (Values of Alternative Courses of Action) to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarities of Organizational Points</th>
<th>Similarities of Values (Values of Alternative Courses of Action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Assignments</td>
<td>Homerooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they would like to be a good student or whether they would prefer to be well liked by members of their own sex. But even here, \( S_{RF} = 1.63 \) for similar homerooms is .26 greater than \( S_{RF} = 1.37 \) for similarities of values. Thus, one may be reasonably assured that similarities of organizational points are much more strongly related to initial friendship choice than obtains for similarities of values which assess the merit of alternative courses of action.

**Analysis:**

Table # 4-28 indicates that similarities of organizational points are much more strongly related to friendship formation than obtains for similarities of ratings of self. Thus, the rank-ordering hypothesis is confirmed by the data.

**Analysis:**

From Table # 4-29, it becomes apparent that similarities of room assignments and homerooms are much more indicative of initial friendships than obtains for similarities of aspirations. Also, similarities of homerooms and room assignments are more strongly related to initial friendship formation than obtains for similarities of expectations.
Variables under Consideration: Organizational Points and Values.

Table 4-28: The Rank-Ordering of Similarities of Organizational Points (Room Assignments and Homerooms) and Similarities of Values (Values of One's Self) to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarities of Organizational Points</th>
<th>Similarities of Values (Values of One's Self)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Assignments</td>
<td>Home-rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variables under Consideration: Organizational Points and Values.

Table 4-29: The Rank-Ordering of Similarities of Organizational Points (Room Assignments and Homerooms) and Similarities of Values (Aspirations and Expectations) to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarities of Organizational Points</th>
<th>Similarities of Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Assignments</td>
<td>Home-rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

From the above tabular presentations, it becomes apparent that similarities of organizational points are more highly related to initial friendship formation than obtains for similarities of values. Thus, one may assume that the hypothesis stating the rank-ordering of the strength of the relationship of organizational points and values to initial friendship formation has been confirmed.
The Rank-Ordering of Similarities of Social Background and Similarities of Values to Initial Friendship Formation

This section focuses on the hypothesis suggesting that similarities of social background will be more strongly related to initial friendship reciprocity than obtains for similarities of values. The discussion to follow will enable testing the above general hypothesis.

Analysis:

As can be seen through inspection of Table # 4-30, the hypothesis stating the rank ordering of the strength of the relationship of similarities of values and similarities of social background to the dimension of friendship reciprocity is not supported by the data. In every instance, there seems to exist no clear trend in the hypothesized direction. Thus, one may assume that similarities of social background are not more strongly related to the friendship reciprocity dimension than are similarities of interests and activities. In fact, at times similarities of interests and activities are more strongly related to the dimension of friendship reciprocity than obtains for similarities of social background.

Variables under Consideration: Social Background Characteristics and Values
### Variables under Consideration:

Table 4-30: **The Rank-Ordering of Similarities of Social Background (Socioeconomic-status, Ethnicity, and Race) and Similarities of Values (Interests and Activities) to Initial Friendship Reciprocity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarities of Social Background</th>
<th>Similarities of Values (Interests and Activities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-31: The Rank-Ordering of Similarities of Social Background (Socioeconomic-status, Ethnicity, and Race) and Similarities of Values (Interests and Activities) to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarities of Social Background</th>
<th>Similarities of Values (Values of Alternative Courses of Action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

The above table indicates that the observed frequencies for similarities of socioeconomic-status and the observed frequencies for similarities of the values of alternative courses of action do not occur in the hypothesized direction. Among the sections of the above table presenting the observed frequencies for similarities of race and values one finds that $SI_{NR} = 1.30$ for race while the highest comparable $SI$ value for alternative courses of action is only 1.12. But the expected divergences in the hypothesized direction are not found among reciprocated and non-friendships. Although similarities of race occur in frequencies substantially greater among non-reciprocated friendships, the expected relationship is not observed among reciprocated and non-friendships. Thus, the hypothesis suggesting that similarities of race will be more highly related to initial reciprocity than obtains for similarities of values is not confirmed by the data.

The rank-ordering hypothesis is weakly supported by three of the value of alternative courses of action items and ethnicity. But the rank-ordering hypothesis is not supported by the remaining three value items. Thus, given the rather weak positive relationship between only three of the value of alternative courses of
Variables under Consideration: Values and Social Background Characteristics.

Table 4-32: The Rank-Ordering of Similarities of Social Background (Socioeconomic-status, Ethnicity, and Race) and Similarities of Values (Values of One's Self) to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarities of Social Background</th>
<th>Similarities of Values (Values of One's Self)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
action items and ethnicity one may conclude that the rank-ordering hypothesis is not confirmed.

**Analysis:**

As can be seen from Table # 4-32, self rating of school related activities are no more strongly related to the dimension of reciprocity than are similarities of socioeconomic-status. Similarities of race and ethnicity exhibit slightly higher SI values than obtains for similarities of ratings of self on sports ability, popularity with the opposite sex, and school related activities. But the degree to which the observed frequencies follow in the expected direction is rather weak. When compared to the quite substantial observed frequencies found in the hypothesized direction for the rank ordering of the organizational point cluster and the value cluster to the reciprocity dimension, the degree to which similarities of ratings of self and similarities of social background follow in the hypothesized direction must be regarded as rather weak.

**Variables under Consideration:** Social Background Cluster and the Value Cluster.

**Analysis:**

Similarities of socioeconomic-status and aspirations do not occur in frequencies that allow confirmation of
Table 4-33: The Rank-Ordering of Similarities of Social Background (Socioeconomic-status, Ethnicity, and Race) and Similarities of Values (Aspirations and Expectations) to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Similarities of Social Background</th>
<th>Aspirations</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Socioeconomic-status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the rank-ordering hypothesis. Among the sections of the
table presenting the observed similarities of race, ethnici-
city, and aspirations; there exists no substantial rela-
tionship in the hypothesized direction. Furthermore, the
observed frequencies for similarities of socioeconomic-
status and expectations do not allow confirmation of the
rank-ordering hypothesis. With regard to the observed
frequencies for similarities of race, ethnicity, and ex-
pectations; one finds frequencies which both support and
fail to support the rank-ordering hypothesis. Since
similarities of socioeconomic-status and similarities of
expectations occur in frequencies contrary to those ex-
pected, and since the observed frequencies for similari-
ties of race, ethnicity, and expectations fail to produce
a consistent pattern in the expected direction, one can-
ot accept the rank-ordering hypothesis.

Summary

From the above tabular presentations, it becomes
apparent that similarities of social background do not
occur in frequencies greater than obtains for similari-
ties of values in any consistent pattern. One cannot
state that the observed similarities of social background
and the observed similarities of values conform to the
rank-ordering hypothesis. Thus, the rank-ordering hy-
pothesis with regard to similarities of social background
and similarities of values cannot be confirmed.
The Relationship of Similarities of Organizational Points and Similarities of Social Background to Initial Friendship Reciprocity

No specific hypothesis was presented suggesting that the social background and organizational point clusters would be differentially related to initial friendship choice. But an examination of the table below reveals a rather interesting finding.

Variable under Consideration: Organizational Points and Social Background

Table 4-34: The Relationship of Similarities of Organizational Points (Room Assignments and Homerooms) and Similarities of Social Background (Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic-status) to Initial Friendship Formation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reciprocity Dimension</th>
<th>Similarities of Organizational Points</th>
<th>Similarities of Social Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Assignments</td>
<td>Homerooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Analysis:

Table # 4-34 indicates that in every instance, similarities on the organizational point cluster are much more strongly related to initial friendships than obtains for similarities of race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic-status. Similarities of homerooms and to an even greater degree similar room assignments are much more strongly related to initial reciprocity than obtains for similarities of social background.
The Relationship of Selected Independent Variables to Initial Friendship Reciprocity when the Sex Structure of the Dyad has been Specified

This section is devoted to determining which of the various theoretical orientations that indicate the relationship of selected independent variables to friendship formation when the sex structure of the dyad is taken into account are confirmed by empirical data. The first hypothesis specifying the sex structure of the dyad focuses on the relationship of similarities of interests and activities to same-sex and cross-sex friendships. According to the interests and activities hypothesis, similarities of interests and activities will be more highly related to same-sex friendships than obtains among cross-sex friendships. The observed frequencies that will enable testing the interest and activity hypothesis among same-sex and cross-sex friendships are presented below.

Variables under Consideration: Interests and Activities.

Analysis of Order:

If one compares the frequencies observed from Table # 4-35 with the expected frequencies presented in Section III A 1 of the outline of hypothesis, it becomes obvious that the only interest and activity item that follows in the hypothesized direction deals with which type of activity a
Table 4-35: The Relationship of Similarities of Interests and Activities among Same-Sex and Cross-Sex Initial Friendships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>High School Programs Taken</th>
<th>Time Spent on Homework</th>
<th>Use of an Extra Hour in High School</th>
<th>Leisure Time Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same-Sex Friendships</td>
<td>Cross-Sex Friendships</td>
<td>Same-Sex Friendships</td>
<td>Cross-Sex Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.24 N=108</td>
<td>SI=1.19 N=6</td>
<td>SI=1.17 N=128</td>
<td>SI=1.45 N=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.96 N=161</td>
<td>SI=1.45 N=87</td>
<td>SI=1.06 N=194</td>
<td>SI=1.45 N=87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.82 N=3754</td>
<td>SI=1.01 N=2358</td>
<td>SI=0.88 N=3618</td>
<td>SI=1.05 N=4310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A student would engage in if he had a spare hour in school. All the other items dealing with similarities of interests and activities among same-sex and cross-sex friendships do not follow in the hypothesized direction.

Furthermore, if one examines the sections of the above table presenting the frequencies that do discriminate in the hypothesized direction, one finds that $S_{RF}$ for same-sex friendships is only .11 greater than $S_{RF}$ for cross-sex friendships. Also, $S_{NR}$ and $S_{NF}$ for same-sex friendships are only 10 greater than the respective SI's for non-reciprocated and non-friendships among cross-sex friendships. Thus, even the item that does discriminate in the hypothesized direction represents only a small number of dyads in the expected direction.

**Analysis of Order and Magnitude:**

None of the interest and activity items occur in frequencies similar to the expected frequencies presented in Section III A 2 of the outline of hypotheses. For every interest and activity item there is at least one SI value that occurs in frequencies contrary to those expected among cross-sex friendships. Among cross-sex friendships, frequencies are observed to occur in amounts greater than chance when the hypothesis would predict that frequencies should occur less often than expected by chance, or frequencies are observed to occur less
often than expected by chance when the hypothesis would predict that frequencies should occur more often than expected by chance.

Among same-sex friendships, there is one main shortcoming which serves to invalidate the interest and activity hypothesis among both reciprocated and non-reciprocated friendships. Frequencies are observed to occur less often than expected by chance when the hypothesis would have predicted that the SI values should be greater than 1.00. From the above ordinal-magnitude mode of analysis, the relationships in the expected direction become even more inconsequential than resulted from the previous ordinal analysis.

The hypotheses presented in III B of the outline of hypotheses represent competing theoretical conceptions about the relationship of social background characteristics to female-male and male-female friendships. One theoretical orientation would predict a stronger relationship between the social background cluster and female-male friendships than obtains among male-female friendships. A competing theoretical orientation would predict a stronger relationship between social background characteristics and male-female friendships than obtains among female-male friendships. The tables presented below will allow determining which of the two competing
theoretical orientations most accurately portrays the state of affairs among initial friendships.

The tables to be presented below will follow the order of hypotheses presented in Section III B of the outline of hypotheses. According to the order presented in III B, competing theoretical orientation #1 suggests that male-female friendships will be influenced by the effects of the social background cluster to a greater degree than obtains among female-male friendships. The second competing theoretical orientation suggests that social background characteristics will be more indicative of female-male friendships than obtains among male-female friendships.

Variables under Consideration: Social Background Characteristics

Analysis of Order:

Table # 4-36 indicates that neither females nor males consistently choose members of the opposite sex on the basis of socioeconomic-status. Since neither one of the competing hypotheses is confirmed by the data, one cannot assume that similarities of socioeconomic-status are differentially related to female-male friendships or to male-female friendships.

$SINR$ is 0.00 for both cross-sex friendship types and the SI values differ by only .01 between non-friendship
Table 4-36: The Relationship of Similarities of Social Background Characteristics to Female-Male Friendships and Male-Female Friendships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Socioeconomic-status</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female-Male Friendships</td>
<td>Male-Female Friendships</td>
<td>Female-Male Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated *</td>
<td>SI=1.61 N=14</td>
<td>SI=1.61 N=14</td>
<td>SI=0.00 N=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated</td>
<td>SI=0.71 N=49</td>
<td>SI=0.59 N=38</td>
<td>SI=0.00 N=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=1.00 N=2174</td>
<td>SI=0.96 N=2184</td>
<td>SI=1.00 N=245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The analysis of the relationship of selected independent variables to female-male and male-female friendships will not be concerned with cross-sex reciprocated friendships. The analysis will not be concerned with cross-sex reciprocated friendships since female-male and male-female reciprocated friendships are not
cross-sex types for similarities of ethnicity. Thus, one cannot confirm either of the competing hypotheses predicting the relationship of similarities of ethnicity to cross-sex friendships.

There is a slight tendency for males to select females more often on the basis of similarities of race than obtains for females choosing males. But the relationship indicating that males are influenced to a greater degree than females in choosing members of the opposite sex on the basis of similarities of race is weak since the differences in SI values between non-reciprocated cross-sex types is only .07 and the differences in SI values between non-friends cross-sex types is only .03.

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

Since the SI values for both male-female and female-male non-reciprocated friendships occur in frequencies less than expected by chance, one cannot confirm either of the competing hypotheses. One is not able to confirm statistically independent of each other. If one knows the SI values and the N of either reciprocated female-male or reciprocated male-female friendships, one automatically knows that the other sex type will have the same SI value and N as the previously known sex type. Whenever an asterisk appears next to reciprocated friendships, it will be understood that the analysis is not concerned with reciprocated cross-sex choices.
whether similarities of socioeconomic-status are more highly related to female-male or male-female friendships.

$SINR$ for both female-male and male-female dyads equals 0.00 and $SINF$ for female-male and male-female friendships both occur in frequencies expected by chance for similarities of ethnicity. Thus, similarities of ethnicity are about equally related to both female-male friendships and male-female friendships.

With regard to race, $SINR$ values diverge quite substantially from chance in the direction of competing hypothesis # 1. But $SINF = 0.97$ for male-female friendships is only .03 less than 1.00. Furthermore, $SINR = 1.40$ for female-male friendships is .40 greater than chance and $SINF$ is equal to 1.00 for female-male friendships. Thus, although the SI values among male-female friendships might suggest that similarities of race exhibit a moderately strong relationship, inspection of the left half of the section of the table dealing with race reveals that similarities of race exhibit about equally strong relationships among both female-male and male-female friendships.

Variables under Consideration: Social Background Characteristics

Analysis of Order:

By comparing the observed frequencies in Table # 4-37
Table 4-37: The Relationship of the Choser Representing a Lower Socially Designated Social Background Category than obtains for the Chosen among Female-Male and Male-Female Friendships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Reciprocity</th>
<th>Socioeconomic-status</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female-Male Friendships</td>
<td>Male-Female Friendships</td>
<td>Female-Male Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated * Friendships</td>
<td>I=1.56 N=14</td>
<td>I=1.56 N=14</td>
<td>I=0.00 N=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>I=0.96 N=49</td>
<td>I=1.56 N=38</td>
<td>I=0.00 N=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>I=1.00 N=2174</td>
<td>I=1.00 N=2184</td>
<td>I=1.00 N=245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the frequencies expected in the outline of hypotheses, it becomes apparent that neither one of the competing hypotheses are confirmed by the data. There is no consistent pattern of frequencies in the above table that would enable rejecting one of the competing hypotheses in favor of the other. There is no consistent pattern of frequencies that would enable stating whether a greater frequency of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated social background characteristic than the chosen obtains among female-male friendships or male-female friendships.

**Analysis of Order and Magnitude:**

Inspection of the above table reveals that the observed frequencies of the choser representing a lower socially designated social background category confirms neither of the competing hypothesis. There is no consistent pattern that would enable stating that either female-male or male-female friendships diverge from chance according to either one of the competing hypotheses. Thus, the frequency of dyads with the choser representing a lower socially designated SES, ethnic, or racial category than the chosen is inconsistently related to female-male friendships and male-female friendships.

The final theoretical discussion focusing on specification of the sex structure of the dyad suggested that
existing theory and research would not enable predicting whether the social background and organizational point clusters were differentially related to female-female friendships or to male-male friendships. Rather than stating specific hypotheses, a null hypothesis was invoked which stated that the above two clusters of variables were equally related to both female-female and male-male friendships. The analysis to follow will attempt to determine whether the null hypothesis presents a valid portrayal of the relationship of the above selected independent variables to female-female and male-male friendships. If the null hypothesis proves to be an invalid portrayal, systematic divergences will be examined according to the tabular divergences presented in III C of the outline of hypotheses.

Variables under Consideration: Organizational Points and Social Background Characteristics

Analysis of Order:

As can be seen from Table # 4-38, similarities of socioeconomic-status and race are more strongly related to male-male friendships than to female-female friendships. Also, similarities of race are more highly related to male-male friendships than are similarities of socioeconomic-status. Similarities of ethnicity do not
Variables under Consideration: Organizational Points.

Table 4-38: The Relationship of Similarities of Organizational Points (Homerooms and Room Assignments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homerooms</th>
<th>Room Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated</td>
<td>SI=2.05</td>
<td>SI=1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>N=58</td>
<td>N=84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated</td>
<td>SI=1.20</td>
<td>SI=1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>N=76</td>
<td>N=128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.92</td>
<td>SI=0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=1672</td>
<td>N=2440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variables under Consideration: Social Background Characteristics.

Table 4-38: Similarities of Social Background (Socio-economic-status, Ethnicity, and Race) to Female-Female Friendships and Male-Male Friendships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic-status</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendships Reciprocated</td>
<td>Female-Female Friendships</td>
<td>Male-Male Friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.80 N=58</td>
<td>SI=0.86 N=84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocated Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.88 N=76</td>
<td>SI=0.89 N=128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Friendships</td>
<td>SI=0.86 N=1672</td>
<td>SI=0.83 N=2440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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seem to exhibit any consistent relationship either to male-male friendships or to female-female friendships.

The SI values for room assignments indicate that similarities on this organizational point are more indicative of male-male friendships than obtains for female-female friendships. But the above direction of the strength of the relationship is not observed for similarities of homerooms. Rather, similarities of homerooms follow neither of the two divergences from the null hypothesis in any consistent fashion.

Analysis of Order and Magnitude:

All six SI values for socioeconomic-status are less than 1.00. Thus, there is no basis for suggesting that similarities of socioeconomic-status are differentially related to female-female and male-male friendships when one is concerned with the ordinal-magnitude mode of analysis. The relationship of similarities of ethnicity and race to female-female and male-male friendships are inconsistent. The SI values for similarities of race and ethnicity neither lend support to the null hypothesis nor to either one of the two possible directions indicating a differential relationship to female-female and male-male friendships.

The systematic divergences from 1.00 for room assignments indicate a stronger relationship to male-male
friendships than obtains for female-female friendships. But the above divergences from chance are not observed among similarities of homerooms. The divergences from 1.00 for similarities of homerooms indicate an inconsistent relationship to both same-sex friendship types.

Summary

The ordinal mode of analysis revealed that only one similarity of interest and activity item was more highly related to same-sex friendships than obtained for cross-sex friendships. But this one interest and activity item did not discriminate to a great degree since the largest difference in SI values in the hypothesized direction was only .11. When the analysis was concerned with both the order and the magnitude of the relationship, none of the four interest and activity items exhibited observed frequencies that would confirm the expected stronger relationship among same-sex rather than cross-sex friendships. Thus, both the ordinal analysis and to a greater degree the ordinal-magnitude analysis failed to confirm the hypothesized stronger relationship of interests and activities to same-sex rather than cross-sex friendships.

The social background cluster was found to be inconsistently related or equally related to female-male and male-female friendships. Specifically, similarities on the social background cluster and the frequency of dyads
with the chooser representing a lower socially designated social background category than the chosen were found to be either inconsistently related or equally related to female-male and male-female friendships. Thus, neither one of the two competing hypotheses predicting opposing influences of the social background cluster on female-male and male-female friendships was confirmed since the observed frequencies were by and large either inconsistently or equally related to both of the aforementioned sex types.

Focusing on the analysis of the ordinal relationship of the organizational point and social background clusters to female-female and male-male friendships revealed that similarities of roommates, socioeconomic status, and race were more highly related to male-male dyads than to female-female dyads. But the differences in SI values indicative of a stronger relationship in the direction of male-male friendships were small. Furthermore, similarities of homerooms—which represents the other organizational point variable—and similarities of ethnicity—which represents the other social background variable—were not found to be more highly related to male-male friendships.

When analyzing the relationship of the organizational point and social background clusters within the framework of the ordinal-magnitude mode only similarities of
roommates remained more strongly related to male-male friendships than obtained among female-female friendships. From the ordinal-magnitude mode of analysis, similarities of roommates, socioeconomic-status, ethnicity, and race were either inconsistently or about equally related to female-female and male-male friendships. Whereas similarities of roommates, socioeconomic-status, and race exhibited a slightly stronger relationship to male-male friendships than resulted for female-female friendships; only similarities of homerooms exhibited the same direction of relationship when scrutinized from the ordinal-magnitude mode of analysis.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE INCONSEQUENTIAL RELATIONSHIP OF RACE TO INITIAL FRIENDSHIPS: THE FACILITATIVE EFFECTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL POINTS

Introduction

This chapter is divided into two main sections. The first section presents a brief review of the major findings of this study. The second section focuses on the interpretation of these findings within the context of the theoretical orientations presented in Chapter Two.

Summary of Findings

This research focused on the relationships of socio-economic-status, race, ethnicity, values and organizational points to initial friendship formation. Hypotheses were presented which stated:

a. the relationship of the above independent variables to reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friends during the initial friendship formation sequence,

b. a rank-ordering of the strength of the relationships of the above mentioned independent variables to initial friendship reciprocity,

c. the relationships of a number of the above independent variables to initial reciprocity
when the sex structure of the dyad was taken into account.

With the exception of the rank-ordering predictions, all other hypotheses were analyzed from both an ordinal and a combined ordinal-magnitude mode of analysis. And throughout the entire hypotheses testing enterprise, the ordinal mode of analysis offered less stringent rules for theoretical confirmation than resulted with the combined ordinal-magnitude mode of analysis. Any theoretical prediction that indicated confirmation or rejection when using the ordinal mode of analysis was observed to produce relationships that were less positive or more negative by virtue of the combined ordinal-magnitude mode of analysis. As opposed to the ordinal mode of analysis, the ordinal-magnitude mode of analysis revealed observed frequencies which discriminated to a lesser degree along the categories of both the reciprocity dimension and the dimension of sex structure.

The relationship of socioeconomic-status, ethnicity, race, values, and organizational points to the reciprocity dimension were stated in the form of two general hypotheses. One general hypothesis stated that similarities on all of the independent variables would be more highly related to reciprocated friendships than would obtain for non-reciprocated friendships, while the fewest similarities would be found among non-friendships. The second general
hypothesis suggested that a greater frequency of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated socio-economic-status, racial, or ethnic category would occur among non-reciprocated friendships than would obtain among reciprocated or non-friendships.

Analysis of the data revealed that none of the social background variables occurred in frequencies substantial enough to confirm the second mentioned general hypothesis. The observed relationships of ethnicity, race, socioeconomic-status and values to reciprocity did not confirm the general hypothesis stating the relationship between similarities on these independent variables and initial friendships. But analysis from both the ordinal and the combined ordinal-magnitude modes indicated that similarities of organizational points were substantially related as expected.

Two general hypotheses stating the rank-ordering of the strength of the relationships of selected independent variables to friendship formation were also empirically examined. Similarities of organizational points and similarities of social background were hypothesized to produce a stronger relationship to the friendship reciprocity dimension than would obtain for similarities of values. The above hypotheses rested on the assumption that the quantities of information exchanged during the initial friendship formation sequence were insufficient.
to produce a relationship as substantial for similarities of values as would obtain for similarities of social background or organizational points.

The analysis of the data revealed that similarities of organizational points were consistently more highly related to friendship formation than obtained for similarities of values. But analysis of the data also indicated that the rank-ordering hypothesis was not confirmed for similarities of values and similarities of social background.

Thus, the assumption that the amounts of information exchanged during the initial friendship formation sequence would be inadequate to produce as strong a relationship between similarities of values and reciprocity than would obtain for similarities of social background must be rejected. But no comparable rejection is indicated with regard to the assumption which predicted the organizational point-value rank-ordering hypothesis.

No hypothesis was presented suggesting that organizational points and social background factors would be differentially related to initial reciprocity. But analysis of the data revealed that similarities of organizational points were substantially related to reciprocity while similarities on the social background cluster were either weakly, inconsistently, or negatively related to initial friendship choice.
Hypotheses suggesting the relationship of selected independent variables to initial friendship formation when the sex structure of the dyad had been specified were also analyzed against empirical data. Similarities of interests and activities were hypothesized to occur in greater frequencies among same-sex friendships than would obtain among cross-sex friendships. Only one of the four interest and activity items discriminated in the hypothesized direction. And the degree to which the above item followed in the hypothesized direction was quite weak. Thus, the hypothesis stating that similarities of interests and activities would be more highly related to same-sex friendships than would obtain among cross-sex friendships was not confirmed by the data.

The social background cluster was found to be inconsistently related or equally related to female-male and male-female friendships. Similarities on the social background cluster and the frequency of dyads with the choser representing a lower socially designated social background category than the chosen were found to be either inconsistently related or equally related to female-male and male-female friendships. Thus, neither one of the two theoretical orientations predicting opposing influences of the social background cluster on female-male and male-female friendships was confirmed since the observed frequencies were by and large either inconsistently
or equally related to both of the aforementioned sex types.

Analysis of the relationship of the organizational point and social background clusters to female-female and male-male friendships revealed that similarities of roommates, socioeconomic-status, and race were more highly related to male-male dyads than to female-female dyads. But the differences in the SI values indicative of a stronger relationship in the direction of male-male friendships were small. Furthermore, similarities of homerooms which represents the other organizational point variable and similarities of ethnicity which represents the other social background variable were not found to be more highly related to male-male friendships.
Interpretation

The present research has indicated that an analysis which combines both ordinal and magnitude dimensions when testing hypotheses on friendship choice offers more stringent rules for confirmation than obtains with the use of the ordinal mode of analysis alone. In fact, the combined ordinal-magnitude mode of analysis provided rules of confirmation so stringent that only similarities of organizational points were found to be substantially related to initial reciprocity. Similarities of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, and values were either weakly, inconsistently, or negatively related to initial friendships. And those hypotheses which predicted that non-reciprocated friendships might have resulted from a particular type of selective interaction with the choser of a lower socially designated social background characteristic than the chosen were also solidly rejected within the ordinal-magnitude context. Furthermore, those hypotheses which predicted the relationship of organizational points, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic-status, and values to initial reciprocity when the sex structure of the dyad had been specified produced consistently less convincing results when examined from the combined ordinal-magnitude mode of analysis.
Previous researchers had not considered the possible effects of the distribution of values on a given independent variable and friendship choice. The rather subdued relationships obtained through the procedure outlined in this research that controls for the distribution of values on a given independent variable may indicate that the results of previous friendship studies are not as definitive as was previously thought. For, if the above mentioned controls are not instituted, the researcher may be reporting findings which are merely due to the distribution of values on predictor variables rather than identifying correlates of friendship choice.

Only similarities of organizational points followed in the direction of exhibiting a progressively weaker relationship from reciprocated, to non-reciprocated, to non-friendships. Similarities of social background and values produced either weak, inconsistent, or negative relationships to reciprocated, non-reciprocated, and non-friendships. Thus, all that can be suggested is that the opportunities for interaction provided by organizational points play an important role in facilitating initial friendship formation. Since the social background and value clusters were either weakly, inconsistently, or negatively related to initial reciprocity, one cannot assume that similarities on either of the above two clusters of independent variables increase the
probabilities of interaction and concomitant initial attraction.

The weak, inconsistent, or negative relationships of the value cluster to initial reciprocity is not entirely surprising since similarities of values were expected to represent fewer friendship dyads than would obtain for the social background or organizational point clusters. But the inconsistent, weak, or negative relationships of the variables indicative of social background relative to the rather substantial relationships between organizational points and initial reciprocity were completely unanticipated. And the above unanticipated results will be a major focus of discussion later in this chapter.

Analysis of the relationship of the social background cluster to the dimension of initial reciprocity also failed to confirm the hypothesis that there would be more dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated socioeconomic-status, ethnic, or racial category than the chosen among non-reciprocated dyads than would obtain among the other two friendship types. Thus, one cannot assume that initial non-reciprocated friendships result from persons of the more privileged positions not wishing to jeopardize their status. Nor can one assume that those of lower rank define those of higher rank as desirable associates during the initial friendship formation.
process.

The analysis also revealed that selected independent variables did not consistently discriminate between different sex types along the dimension of sex structure. And the inconsistent array of relationships of independent variables to the different sex types indicates that specification of sex types and the substantial theoretical literature which suggests that interpersonal relationships are structured by sex is not applicable to the initial friendships examined here.

Furthermore, there existed the possibility that the sex structure of the dyad may have masked the true relationships of the independent variables to initial friendship reciprocity. But similarities of interests and activities were observed to occur in about equal frequencies among both male-male and female-female friendships. Similarities of social background and the frequency of dyads with the choser of a lower socially designated social category than the chosen occurred in about equal or inconsistent frequencies among female-male and male-female friendships. And both the social background and organizational point clusters produced SI values which were only slightly more strongly related to male-male dyads than obtained for female-female dyads.

Not all of the hypotheses prior to specification of the sex structure were examined within the context of the
sex typology. But when examination of the relation of independent variables to initial reciprocity was combined with the dimension of sex structure, no appreciably substantial relationships were observed that were not in evidence when using the reciprocity dimension alone.

All of the prior theory and research cited in Chapter Two when examining the influences of sex on friendship choice was obtained from inquiries into the nature of friendships that had been maintained for some time. Thus, there may be some reason to believe that the specification of the sex structure of the dyad might prove useful in unravelling the relationship of organizational points, social background factors and values to friendships that have been maintained for some time. But the results of this inquiry suggest that hypotheses specifying the relationships of the above three clusters of independent variables to reciprocity are not indicative of initial friendship formation. Furthermore, the sex structure of the dyad may not provide any more information about the types of relationships between the above mentioned independent variables and initial friendships than obtains from merely examining the relationships of the aforementioned variables to reciprocity.

As was suggested earlier, one of the most interesting findings of this research occurred during the analysis of the rank-ordering hypotheses. The data supported the
social background-value prediction. Similarities of organizational points were found to be much more highly related to initial friendships than obtained for similarities of values. But similarities of social background were not found to occur in frequencies consistently greater than obtained for similarities of values. And when the relationships of similarities of organizational points to friendship formation were compared to the relationships that obtained for similarities of social background, the former cluster exhibited substantially higher SI values than obtained for the later.

Similarities of organizational points were expected to be more strongly related to initial friendships than would obtain for similarities of values since the interaction process had not preceded to the point to allow friendship formation on the basis of one's unique participation in the social structure. The interaction process was conceived as progressive sequences of exchanges of information. As the quantities of information proceed, greater knowledge about one's unique participation in the social structure (i.e., values) is made available to others. And since initial interactants know little about each others' values, if for no other reason than for the sake of parsimony, friendships will be formed among those sharing similar organizational points. Thus, the observed stronger relationships between similarities
of organizational points and initial reciprocity than obtained for similarities of values strengthens the above theoretical argument.

But the inability of the social background cluster to discriminate along the initial reciprocity dimension to any substantial degree than obtained for the value cluster deserves a more extended discussion.

As was the case with organizational points and values, similarities of social background were expected to be more strongly related to initial friendships than would obtain for similarities of values since the interaction process had not reached the point to allow friendship formation on the basis of one's unique participation in the social structure. It was suggested that cues concerning socioeconomic-status could be telegraphed through style of dress, remarks about one's father's occupation, etc. Ethnicity could be discerned through last names. And in most cases, race was believed to be an instantly observable cue apparent during the first meeting. These cues indicative of social background were seen as dependent on appreciably fewer amounts of information exchange than would be the case for determining one's unique participation in the social structure (i.e., values). Thus, similarities of social background were expected to be much more highly related to initial friendship formation than would obtain for similarities of values.
One might argue that the reason for the lack of confirmation of the social background-value hypothesis is due to the nature of the social background variables themselves. The variable of socioeconomic-status pertains only to those of the lower socioeconomic groupings. And since one is examining a rather homogeneous socioeconomic grouping, one cannot expect to find a substantial degree of discrimination with regard to friendship formation.

Also similarities of ethnicity are significant independent variables only to the degree that ethnic groups inculcate and enforce patterns of ethnic segregation. In fact, Palisi found that similarities of friendships on the basis of ethnicity decline as a function of a reduction in the internalization and enforcement of norms and values that dictate ethnic friendship restriction. The subjects under investigation may represent second and third generation ethnic group members who are not influenced by values and norms which dictate ethnic group segregation as obtained among their first generation forefathers.

But the independent variable of race does not suffer from an undue amount of homogeneity nor a lack of social structural relevancy. Race is not a homogeneous variable since the respondents represent about equal proportions
of black and white. And the writer is aware of no literature which would suggest that the independent variable of race has lost much of its potency in determining informal relations.

The rather homogeneous nature of the values of the independent variable of socioeconomic-status and the possibility of the structural irrelevancy of the independent variable of ethnicity may account for the fact that these two variables are not more highly related to friendship formation than obtains for similarities of values. But the independent variable of race does not succumb to either of the above two short commings. Yet similarities of race are not more highly related to initial friendship choice than obtains for similarities of values. Nor do similarities of race exhibit a relationship to initial reciprocity that in any way compares to the substantial relationship found on all indicators of organizational points.

It seems highly unlikely that the reason why similarities of race exhibit a relationship to initial friendships that is quite a bit less than obtains for organizational points rests on assuming that the quantities of interaction had not preceeded to allow information concerning race to be made available to other interactants. Quite to the contrary, race is an almost instantly observable cue indicating social background.
One might argue that similarities of social background and similarities of values do not conform to the rank-ordering hypothesis since both the social background and value clusters are used about equally as often as a basis for friendship choice. According to this argument, one would have to assume that the quantities of interaction had reached a stage where both cues indicative of social background and values were used about equally as often as a basis of friendship choice. As the quantities of information proceed, more information about one's participation in the social structure is made available to others. And as the quantities of interaction increase, there is an increasing progression toward the formation of friendships on the basis of one's unique participation in the social structure.

But if this explanation is correct, then why do similarities of organizational points exhibit the strongest relationship to initial friendship formation? Newcomb, Homans, and Secord and Backman all maintain that similarities on variables indicative of propinquity

---

1Newcomb, "The Prediction of Interpersonal Attraction," op. cit.,


3Secord and Backman, op. cit., p. 261.
are only initially related to friendship choice. If the quantities of information exchanged had reached the point where both similarities of social background and similarities of values were used about equally as often as a basis for friendship choice, then surely one would not expect similarities on the variables indicative of pro-pinquity to be so much more strongly related to friendship choice than obtained for similarities of social background and similarities of values. In fact, Newcomb found that whereas organizational points were initially related to friendship choice, they failed to discriminate as a function of the degree to which similarities of values were used as a basis of friendship choice.

Thus, it seems unlikely that the reason why similarities of social background are not substantially more strongly related to initial friendships than obtains for similarities of values is due to the equal use of the above two clusters as a basis of friendship choice. For if the interaction process has progressed to the stage to allow the equal use of the social background and value clusters as basis for friendship choice, then surely organizational points should have lost some of their potency in accounting for friendship choice.

The discussion thus far has substantiated one main

---

conclusion. The relationship of similarities of organizational points to the initial reciprocity dimension indicates that propinquity provides ample opportunities for increased interaction and concomitant friendship formation. When strangers first meet, communicating with those nearest costs less in time and energy than communicating with those at a greater distance. Since persons know little else about each other, if for no other reason than for the sake of economy, propinquity provides a basis is for increased probabilities of interaction and concomitant attraction.

The reward value associated with those nearest to one's self increases the probabilities of interaction with those others. Since the reward values are greater with those who share similar organizational points, similarities on these geographic arenas exhibit a substantial relationship to initial friendship formation.

It was suggested that associating with those of similar socioeconomic-status, race, ethnicity, and values would also provide more reward value than associating with persons who exhibited dissimilarities on the above attributes. Furthermore, one must be able to observe and respond to the attributes of others to facilitate friendship choice on the basis of these attributes. And the amounts of information exchanged during the initial friendship formation sequence would seem adequate to
telegraph broad similarities of social background, but inadequate for persons to observe others unique participation in the social structure. Thus, both similarities of organizational points and social background should be more highly related to initial friendship formation than obtains for similarities of values.

Associating with those of similar social structural attributes is rewarding while associating with those of dissimilar social structural attributes is frustrating. It was further suggested than friendships formed on the basis of similarities of organizational points will in time progress toward friendships formed on the basis of similarities of social background characteristics, and finally to friendships formed on the basis of similarities of unique participation in the social structure. For as Newcomb aptly remarks:

"...the likelihood of being continually rewarded by a given person varies with the frequency with which that person is in turn rewarded, and thus we have a proposition of reciprocal reward: the likelihood of receiving rewards from a given person, over time, varies with the frequency of rewarding him."\(^1\)

But the above theoretical progression is dependent on the probability of finding others of similar social background at a given organizational point. For as Newcomb\(^2\)

\(^1\)Newcomb, op. cit., p. 576.

\(^2\)Newcomb, op. cit., p. 580.
further remarks, "when roommate assignments had, literally, been drawn from a hat,... at the end of the semester inter-roommate attraction was only slightly higher than that between non-roommates." Since assignment to similar organizational arenas was a chance affair, organizational points might not only have offered an arena for more intense friendships, but also an arena for more intense hatreds.

"... and thus we have a proposition of reciprocal (frustration): the likelihood of (being frustrated by) a given person, over time, varies with the frequency of (frustrating) him."

The reason why social background characteristics were not found to be substantially related to initial friendships may have resulted from the chance assignment of subjects to their respective organizational points. For not only were respondents 'reciprocally rewarded' during their initial interactions, but they were also 'reciprocally frustrated'. The processes of 'reciprocal reward' and 'reciprocal frustration' may have cancelled each other as a function of the haphazard distribution of social background characteristics provided by the organizational points used in this research.

Organizational points may act as a type of facilitator variable in the friendship formation process. But the direction of the facilitative influence may depend on the distribution of social background characteristics.
possessed by others at a given organizational point. If a given organizational point offers information exchanges with others of similar social background, one would expect a rather rapid progression toward friendship formation of the basis of social background characteristics. And as a given organizational point offers actors an ever more diverse collection of social backgounds from which to choose, the concomitant progression toward friendship formation between those of similar social background becomes less pronounced.

If the above notions are correct, then a number of clues about the nature of initial friendship formation are in evidence. One might suggest that the greater the diversity offered by a given organizational point, the greater the tendency for changes in friendship patterns in the future. And the greater the similarity offered by a given organizational point, the less the likelihood for changes in friendship patterns in the future. Thus, the relative stability or instability of initial friendships may vary as a function of the relative rewarding or frustrating experiences offered by a given organizational point. And whether initial interpersonal experiences are rewarding or frustrating may depend on the degree to which a given organizational point offers interactions with others who are relatively similar or relatively diverse.
with regard to participation in the larger social structure.

Furthermore, one might also suggest some of the personal-psychological and administrative-organizational consequences which may be conditional on the degree to which a given organizational point offers rewarding or frustrating interpersonal experiences. Given the highly mobile nature of the present society, persons are continually entering novel organizational arrangements which offer new opportunities for the development of interpersonal relations. From a personal-psychological point of view, such organizational shifts may vary on a continuum of pleasure-pain as a function of the reward value of the frustration value offered by one's new set of probable interactants. From an administrative-organizational point of view, the degree to which organizational points offer satisfying interpersonal arrangements may ultimately affect the probability of success or failure in achieving organizational objectives.
APPENDIX
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STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire will help us to get a better picture of the kinds of young people who entered the Programs this summer. Your answers are confidential and will be combined with those from thousands of other young people.

Please answer each question. Most questions can be answered by putting an X beside your answer. Please print or write carefully answers to the other questions.

Name: ____________________________
(Print) First  Middle  Last

Home Mailing Address: ____________________________
Number  Street

City or Town  State

Date of Birth:  ___________  _________  _________
Month  Day  Year

Place of Birth: ____________________________
City or Town  State

184
(1) I am:

1____ Male
2____ Female

(2) How old are you:

1____ 12 years old or younger
2____ 13 years old
3____ 14 years old
4____ 15 years old
5____ 16 years old
6____ 17 years old
7____ 18 years old
8____ 19 years old
9____ Over 19 years old

(3) What is the highest school grade which you have completed?

1____ 8th grade
2____ 9th grade
3____ 10th grade
4____ 11th grade
5____ 12th grade

(4) Were you attending school last spring?

1____ Yes
2____ No

(5) What is the name of the school you most recently attended?

________________________________________
Name of School

________________________________________
Location (City or Town), State

(6) Was this

1____ A public school
2____ A parochial school
3____ A private school
(7) What program have you been taking (or did you take) in school?

1____ Vocational
2____ Commercial
3____ General
4____ College preparatory (academic)
5____ Other, what?____________________

(8) In how many school years did you fail to get promoted to the next grade?

1____ 3 or more years failed
2____ 2 years failed
3____ 1 year failed
4____ 0 years failed (always promoted)

(9) How many students attend your high school?

1____ Less than 100
2____ 100 - 299
3____ 300 - 499
4____ 500 - 999
5____ 1,000 - 2,000
6____ More than 2,000

(10) Will you return to the same school next fall?

1____ Yes
2____ No, What school?_____________________

Where?_____________________

(11) Generally speaking, how were your grades in school last year?

1____ Near or at the top of the class
2____ Above average, but not the top
3____ About average
4____ A little below average
5____ Far below average
6____ Grades were not given in my school

(12) Think of all the report card grades you received during your most recent school year. Out of every ten grades received, how many were failure marks?

1____ More than half
2____ About half
3____ 3 or 4 out of ten
4. About 2 out of ten
5. About 1 out of ten
6. Less than 1 out of ten
7. None at all last year
8. Didn't get report cards

(13) How far in school would you like to go if you could have your wish come true.

1. Get out as soon as possible
2. A little more high school
3. Finish high school
4. Business or technical school
5. Some college
6. Two year or junior college
7. Four years of college
8. More than 4 years of college

(14) Now thinking realistically, how far do you believe you actually will go?

1. Get out as soon as possible
2. A little more high school
3. Finish high school
4. Business or technical school
5. Some college
6. Two year or junior college
7. Four years of college
8. More than 4 years of college

(15) How many times have you thought seriously about dropping out of school?

1. Very often, 5 times or more
2. Often, 3 or 4 times
3. Twice
4. Once
5. Never

(16) Check the size of the place in which you now live:

1. On a farm
2. On a reservation
3. In the country but not on a farm
4. In a village with fewer than 2,500 people
5. In a small city with between 2,500 and 24,999 people
6. In a city with 25,000 to 99,999 people
7. In a large city with 100,000 to a million people
8. In a very large city with one million or more people
(17) What language is commonly used in your home?

1____ Only English
2____ English and another language

(What?)_______________________

3____ Only another language,

(What?)_______________________

Family background. Check which group is the chief origin of your father's and mother's family:

(18-19) (20-21)
Father's Family  Mother's Family

1____ 1____ Negro
2____ 2____ Indian
3____ 3____ Chinese
4____ 4____ Japanese
5____ 5____ Polynesian

6____ 6____ Puerto Rican
7____ 7____ Cuban
8____ 8____ Mexican

9____ 9____ Italian
10____ 10____ Polish
11____ 11____ Greek

12____ 12____ English
13____ 13____ German
14____ 14____ Irish
15____ 15____ French
16____ 16____ Russian

17____ 17____ Don't know
18----- ----- Other__ What?

(22) Are your parents living?

1____ Both living
2____ Only mother living
3____ Only father living
4____ Neither living

(23) Do you live with . . .

1____ Mother and father
2 _____ Mother and stepfather
3 _____ Father and stepmother
4 _____ Mother (not father)
5 _____ Father (not mother)
6 _____ None of the above (Whom? ________)

(24) How many adults and children now live with your family? (Count yourself.)

Number ______________.

What was the highest grade in school completed by your father and your mother?

(25) Father  (26) Mother

1 _____ _____ No schooling
2 _____ _____ 1 to 5 grades
3 _____ _____ 6 to 8 grades
4 _____ _____ 9 to 11 grades
5 _____ _____ 12 grades (high school grad.)
6 _____ _____ Technical or business school
7 _____ _____ Some college
8 _____ _____ College graduate
9 _____ _____ Don't know

(27) What do you think your family income has been during the last year? If you don't know, make the best guess you can.

1 _____ Less than $30 a week
2 _____ 30 to $39 a week
3 _____ 40 to $49 a week
4 _____ 50 to $59 a week
5 _____ 60 to $69 a week
6 _____ 70 to $79 a week
7 _____ 80 to $89 a week
8 _____ 90 to $99 a week
9 _____ 100 to $119 a week
10 _____ $120 or more a week

(28) How sure are you that this figure is correct?

1 _____ Quite sure it is right
2 _____ Probably it is pretty close
3 _____ Not too sure
4 _____ Just a wild guess
Check the present employment situation of your father or mother.

(29) (30)
Father or Stepfather Mother or Stepmother
1_____ _____ Works full time
2_____ _____ Works part time
3_____ _____ Unable to work
4_____ _____ Looking for work
5_____ _____ Keeps house
6_____ _____ Not living in home

How many brothers and sisters do you have who are younger than you?

(31)_____ Number of younger brothers
(32)_____ Number of younger sisters

How many brothers and sisters do you have who are older than you?

(33)_____ Number of older brothers
(34)_____ Number of older sisters

If you have older brothers or older sisters, answer this question. Indicate how far each went in school. (Example: Suppose you have three older brothers. Two dropped out of school--so place the numeral "2" on line 1. One graduated from high school--so place the numeral "1" on line 3.)

(35-36) (37-38)
Older Older
Brothers Sisters
1_____ _____ Dropped out of school
2_____ _____ Are still in high school
3_____ _____ Graduated from high school
4_____ _____ Had some business or technical schooling
5_____ _____ Attended college but did not graduate
6_____ _____ Are still in college
7_____ _____ Graduated from college

(39-40) What kind of work would you really like to be doing ten years from now?

___________________________________________
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(41-42) What kind of work do you think you will actually be doing ten years from now?

(43) What feeling did your parents have about your going to the program this summer?

1. Didn't care one way or the other
2. Very unfavorable
3. Somewhat unfavorable
4. Mixed feelings
5. Somewhat favorable
6. Very favorable
7. I don't know

(44) What feeling did your very best friend have about your going to the program this summer?

1. Didn't care one way or the other
2. Very unfavorable
3. Somewhat unfavorable
4. Mixed feelings
5. Somewhat favorable
6. Very favorable
7. Never talked about it

(45) Where did you FIRST hear about the program? (Check one.)

1. A teacher
2. A guidance counselor
3. My principal
4. A minister or priest
5. A parent or other relative
6. A friend in school
7. Someone else, (name his job)________________
8. From radio or TV
9. From a local newspaper
10. A sign or notice in school
11. A sign or notice elsewhere

(46) How many students from your school are attending this program?
(47) Have you ever taken part in a summer program like this one?

1____ No
2____ Yes, at this place
3____ Yes, at another place,
   Where?______________________

(48-49) What was the MAIN reason you decided to come to the program this summer?

________________________________________

________________________________________
June 1966

Name ..............................................

This questionnaire is to help us learn about your interests and attitudes about different situations in your high school and here. Feel free to answer the questions exactly the way you feel. This is an attitude questionnaire not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. All the information will be tabulated statistically and no one's responses will be identified.

Try to go through the questionnaire quickly without spending too much time on any single question. Answer all the questions in order without skipping any. Most of the questions can be answered by placing a cross in a box, (like this: ( ) or by putting numbers on a short line (like this: . ? .). Specific instructions are given where needed. Disregard the numbers on the left of the boxes, they are only to aid in tabulating your answers for statistical analysis. If you have a problem, raise your hand, and the research worker who has given you the questionnaire will come to your desk and answer your questions. When you are finished, give the questionnaire to the researcher.

(You may start immediately)
1-4. What program are you taking in high school?

1 ( ) not yet decided
2 ( ) vocational
3 ( ) commercial
4 ( ) don't know
5 ( ) general
6 ( ) college preparatory
7 ( ) other (What? . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .)

5. If you were free to go as far as you wanted to go in school, how far would you like to go?

1 ( ) I'd like to quit right now.
2 ( ) I'd like to continue in high school for awhile.
3 ( ) I'd like to graduate from high school.
4 ( ) I'd like to go to secretarial or trade school.
5 ( ) I'd like to go to college for awhile.
6 ( ) I'd like to graduate from college.
7 ( ) I'd like to do graduate work beyond college.

6. Sometimes what we would like to do isn't the same as what we expect to do. How far in school do you expect you really will go?

1 ( ) I think I really will quit school as soon as I can.
2 ( ) I think I really will continue in high school for awhile.
3 ( ) I think I really will graduate from high school.
4 ( ) I think I really will go to secretarial or trade school.
5 ( ) I think I really will go to college for awhile.
6 ( ) I think I really will graduate from college.
7 ( ) I think I really will do graduate work beyond college.

7. What subjects do you like best in high school?
   (Check only the ones you like best)

1 ( ) science courses (physics, biology, etc.)
2 ( ) mathematics courses (geometry, etc.)
3 ( ) social science (civics, history, etc.)
4 ( ) English (including speech)
5 ( ) shop or vocational courses like home economics or commercial studies
6 ( ) physical education
7 ( ) foreign languages
8 ( ) music
9 ( ) art
0 ( ) other (What? ..........................)

8. What subjects do you like least in high school?
   (Check only the ones you like least)

1 ( ) science courses (physics, biology, etc.)
2 ( ) mathematics courses (geometry, etc.)
3 ( ) social science (civics, history, etc.)
4 ( ) English (including speech)
5 ( ) shop or vocational courses like home economics or commercial studies
6 ( ) physical education
7 ( ) foreign languages
8 ( ) music
9 ( ) art
0 ( ) other (What? ..........................)

9. During the regular school year, how much time, on the average, do you spend doing homework outside school?

1 ( ) none, or almost none
2 ( ) less than ½ hour a day
3 ( ) about ½ hour a day
4 ( ) about 1 hour a day
5 ( ) about 1½ hours a day
6 ( ) about 2 hours a day
7 ( ) 3 or more hours a day

10. How do you rate yourself in school ability compared with your close friends in your high school?

1 ( ) I am the best
2 ( ) I am above average
3 ( ) I am average
4 ( ) I am below average
5 ( ) I am the poorest

11. Where do you think you would rank in your class in your high school?

1 ( ) among the best
2 ( ) above average
3 ( ) average
4 ( ) below average
5 ( ) among the poorest
12. Forget for a moment the grades you actually got in high school, what kind of grades do you think you are capable of getting?

1 ( ) mostly A's
2 ( ) mostly B's
3 ( ) mostly C's
4 ( ) mostly D's
5 ( ) mostly E's

13. Do you think you have the ability to complete college?

1 ( ) yes, definitely
2 ( ) yes, probably
3 ( ) not sure either way
4 ( ) probably not
5 ( ) no

14-17. How do you rate your ability in the following school subjects compared with those in your high school class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Are you planning to go to college after high school?

1 ( ) yes
2 ( ) undecided
3 ( ) no

19. Would you like to go to college after high school?

1 ( ) yes
2 ( ) undecided
3 ( ) no
20-23. If you were in college, how important do you think each of the following will be to you? (Rank from 1 to 4. 1 is the most important and 4 is the least important.)

. . . the stimulation of new ideas
. . . preparation for making a living
. . . campus activities and social life
. . . new friends who share my interests

24. What would you like to study in college?

1 ( ) undecided
2 ( ) a liberal arts program
3 ( ) a science program
4 ( ) a business program
5 ( ) engineering
6 ( ) agriculture
7 ( ) pre-medicine, pre-dentistry, pre-law
8 ( ) education
9 ( ) other (Specify . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .)

25. Suppose you had an extra hour to use in high school, how would you use it? (Check one only)

1 ( ) to take another course
2 ( ) for athletics
3 ( ) for club or extra curricular activity
4 ( ) to study in study hall
5 ( ) to do something else in study hall

26. During the regular school year, about how much time, on the average, do you spend watching TV on a week-day?

1 ( ) none, or almost none
2 ( ) about ½ hour a day
3 ( ) about 1 hour a day
4 ( ) about 1½ hours a day
5 ( ) about 2 hours a day
6 ( ) about 3 hours a day
7 ( ) 4 or more hours a day

27-28. What is your favorite way of spending your leisure time?

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
29. In your high school crowd, which things are important for you to do in order to be popular in the group? (Check as many as apply)

1 ( ) be a good dancer
2 ( ) have sharp clothes
3 ( ) have a good reputation
4 ( ) stirring up a little excitement
5 ( ) have money
6 ( ) getting into trouble
7 ( ) smoking
8 ( ) being up on cars
9 ( ) know what's going on in the world of popular singers and movie stars
0 ( ) other (What? . . . . . . . . . . . . . .)

30. Which things are important for you to do in order to be popular in the group? (Check as many as apply)

1 ( ) be a good dancer
2 ( ) have sharp clothes
3 ( ) have a good reputation
4 ( ) stirring up a little excitement
5 ( ) have money
6 ( ) getting into trouble
7 ( ) smoking
8 ( ) being up on cars
9 ( ) know what's going on in the world of popular singers and movie stars
0 ( ) other (What? . . . . . . . . . . . . . .)

31-34. Different people strive for different things. Here are some things that you have probably thought about. Among the things you strive for during your high school days, just how important is each of these? (Rank from 1 to 4. 1 is the most important, 4 is the least important.)

... pleasing my parents
... learning as much as possible in school
... living up to my religious ideals
... being accepted and liked by other students

35. Below is a list of items on which some parents have rules for their teen-age children, while others don't. Check each item that your parents have definite and strict rules for. (Check as many as apply)
1 ( ) time for being in at night on weekends
2 ( ) amount of dating
3 ( ) against going steady
4 ( ) time spent watching TV
5 ( ) time spent on homework
6 ( ) against going around with certain boys
7 ( ) against going out with certain girls
8 ( ) eating dinner with the family
9 ( ) no rules for any of the above items

36. Check the category which comes closest to your feeling about yourself. (Check only one)

1 ( ) I don't like myself the way I am; I'd like to change completely.
2 ( ) There are many things I'd like to change, but not completely.
3 ( ) I'd like to stay very much the same; there is very little I would change.

37. (For girls only) Suppose you had a chance to go out with either a star athlete, or a boy who is the best student in class, or the best looking boy in class. Which one would you rather go out with?

1 ( ) star athlete
2 ( ) best student
3 ( ) best looking

38. (For boys only) Suppose you had a chance to go out with either a cheerleader, or a girl who is the best looking girl in class. Which one would you rather go out with?

1 ( ) cheerleader
2 ( ) best student
3 ( ) best looking

39. Do you feel that you really are a part of your class group? (Check one answer)

1 ( ) really a part of my class group
2 ( ) included in most ways
3 ( ) included in some ways, but not in others
4 ( ) don't feel I really belong

40. If you had a chance to transfer to another class group, how would you feel about moving? (Check one answer)

1 ( ) would want very much to move
2 ( ) would rather move than stay where I am
3 ( ) would make no difference to me
4 ( ) would rather stay where I am than move
5 ( ) would want very much to stay where I am

41-43. How does your class group compare with other class groups on each of the following points?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Not as good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>than</td>
<td>the same</td>
<td>most as most as most</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The way the students get along together in class. (Check one answer) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( )

The way the students stick together outside of class. (Check one answer) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( )

The way the students help each other with their work. (Check one answer) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( )

44. Let's say that you had always wanted to belong to a particular club in your high school, and then finally you were asked to join. But then you found out that your parents didn't approve of the group. Do you think you would . . .

1 ( ) definitely join anyway
2 ( ) probably join
3 ( ) probably not join
4 ( ) definitely not join

45. What if your parents approved, but the teacher you like most disapproved of the group. What would you do . . .

1 ( ) definitely join anyway
2 ( ) probably join
3 ( ) probably not join
4 ( ) definitely not join
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46. But what if your parents and teachers approved of the group, but by joining the club you would break with your closest friend, who wasn't asked to join. Would you . . .

1 ( ) definitely join anyway
2 ( ) probably join
3 ( ) probably not join
4 ( ) definitely not join

47. Which one of these things would be hardest for you to take - your parent's disapproval, your teacher's disapproval, or breaking with your friend?

1 ( ) parent's disapproval
2 ( ) teacher's disapproval
3 ( ) breaking with a friend

48. Thinking back to the 7th and 8th grades, did you enjoy them more than you enjoy high school, or do you enjoy high school more?

1 ( ) 7th and 8th more
2 ( ) high school more
3 ( ) both the same

49. Thinking back to the past year, did you enjoy high school more, or do you enjoy this program more?

1 ( ) enjoy high school more
2 ( ) enjoy this program more
3 ( ) both the same

50. Complete the following sentence by checking one of the following endings. (Check one)

A person who is alone is . . .

1 ( ) bored or unhappy
2 ( ) lonely
3 ( ) afraid
4 ( ) better off
5 ( ) relaxed, thinking, or reading
6 ( ) happy

51. (For boys only) If you could be remembered at your high school for being one of the things below, which one would you want it to be?

1 ( ) most popular
2 ( ) athletic star
3 ( ) brilliant student
4 ( ) other (Specify . . . . . . . . . . . .)

52. (For girls only) If you could be remembered at your high school for being one of the things below, which one would you want it to be?
1 ( ) most popular
2 ( ) leader in activities
3 ( ) brilliant student
4 ( ) other (Specify . . . . . . . . . . . .)

53. Who are your best friends in your class? (Write their first and last names.)

54. Who are your best friends among all the students in the Project including the members of your class? (Write their first and last names.)

55. In your class, who are the best students? (Write their first and last name.)

56. Who are the most popular students in your class? (Write their first and last name.)

57. Name the students in your present class, with whom you would prefer to work on a class assignment. (Write their first and last names.)
58. Would you rather be a good student or good in sports?
   1 ( ) good student
   2 ( ) good in sports
   3 ( ) can't decide
   4 ( ) both
   5 ( ) definitely do not want to be either

59. Would you rather be a good student or well-liked by others of your sex?
   1 ( ) good student
   2 ( ) well-liked by others of my sex
   3 ( ) can't decide
   4 ( ) both
   5 ( ) definitely do not want to be either

60. Would you rather be a good student or popular with those of the opposite sex?
   1 ( ) good student
   2 ( ) popular with those of the opposite sex
   3 ( ) can't decide
   4 ( ) both
   5 ( ) definitely do not want to be either

61. Would you rather be a good student or a leader in school activities?
   1 ( ) good student
   2 ( ) leader in school activities
   3 ( ) can't decide
   4 ( ) both
   5 ( ) definitely do not want to be either

62. How important is it to your closest FRIENDS that you get good grades?
   1 ( ) very important
   2 ( ) important
   3 ( ) not particularly important
   4 ( ) my grades don't matter to my friends at all
63. How important is it to your parents that you get good grades?

1 ( ) very important
2 ( ) important
3 ( ) not particularly important
4 ( ) grades don't matter to my parents at all.

64. How do you rate your popularity with students of your sex?

1 ( ) much above average
2 ( ) somewhat above average
3 ( ) average
4 ( ) somewhat below average
5 ( ) much below average

65. How do you rate your popularity with students of the opposite sex?

1 ( ) much above average
2 ( ) somewhat above average
3 ( ) average
4 ( ) somewhat below average
5 ( ) much below average

66. How would you rate your ability in sports?

1 ( ) much above average
2 ( ) somewhat above average
3 ( ) average
4 ( ) somewhat below average
5 ( ) much below average

67. How would you rate your participation in school activities other than sports?

1 ( ) much above average
2 ( ) somewhat above average
3 ( ) average
4 ( ) somewhat below average
5 ( ) much below average

68-73. In your high school, what does it take to get to be important and looked up to by other students. (Rank from 1 to 6. 1 is for the most important; 6 is for the least important.)

. . . coming from the right family
. . . being a leader in activities
. . . having a nice car
. . . getting high grades
. . . being an athletic star
. . . being in with the leading crowd

74. Below is a list of all the students in the Project. Would you read each person's name and check whether you would recognize him or her if you saw him (her).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>I would recognize this student</th>
<th>I would not recognize this student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>I would recognize this student</td>
<td>I would not recognize this student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>I would recognize this student</td>
<td>I would not recognize this student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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