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Abstract

A 2 X 3 X 2 design was used to investigate effects of sex of subject, sextyping of subject, and sex of target person on types of friendship formed. Male and female subjects were classified as having either high or low levels of femininity using the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. Subjects then completed Wright’s ADF-F for their best male friend and best female friend. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) using difference scores resulted in a main effect for sex of subject indicating a significant sex of subject by sex of target person interaction. Males had higher mean ratings for male best friends and females had higher mean ratings for female best friends for voluntary interdependence and person-qua-person scales.

A MANOVA conducted using mean scores on the ADF-F resulted in a significant main effect for sex of subject. Females had significantly higher means than males on voluntary interdependence, person-qua-person, utility value, ego support value, stimulation value, self-affirmation value, security value, general favorability, and emotional expression. Males had significantly higher means than females for maintenance difficulty and social regulation. There was also a significant main effect for level of femininity. Individuals with high levels
of femininity had significantly higher means than individuals with low levels of femininity on all but two scales, exclusiveness and social regulation. Possible explanations for the results are discussed.
The Effects of Sex and Sextyping in Same-Sex and Cross-Sex Friendships

Researchers have often been interested in why individuals choose to be involved in certain relationships and choose not to remain in others. One explanation follows from social exchange theories of interpersonal relationships which postulate that people will try to maximize their pleasure and minimize their pain. From this one can infer that individuals remain in relationships because they find them pleasurable or rewarding or leave because they do not find them rewarding. Because of individual differences, what one person finds rewarding may not be what another finds rewarding. Thus, within a particular type of relationship, there will be various forms of that relationship because of the different individuals involved.

Because of its unique and complex nature, friendship is an interpersonal relationship that has not received much attention from quantitative researchers until recent years. In the past friendship has typically been included in the category of close relationships such as romantic relationships. More recently, however, researchers have recognized that the friendship relationship is different from a romantic relationship and therefore needs to be investigated separately.
Understanding how friendships are formed and why they are maintained is a challenging goal. Even though we have all been involved in friendships, it is not always easy to explain why we have the friends we do or why our friendships vary in character and intensity.

In this paper, the focus will be on one type of friendship: best friends. Specifically, the effects of sex of subject and masculinity/femininity on best friendships will be explored.

**Gender**

As with other relationships, there are many factors that may affect the friendships that people form. One factor that may influence the friendships people form is gender. That is, men and women find different aspects of friendship rewarding and therefore form different types of relationships with their friends.

It is often assumed when one refers to "women's friendships" or "men's friendships", one is talking of same-sex friendship, that is, women's friendships with other women and men's friendships with other men. As a result, there has generally been more research investigating sex differences between same-sex friendships than there has been for cross-sex friendships.

Caldwell and Peplau (1982) conducted two studies to investigate similarities and differences among unmarried college students' same-sex
friendships in three areas. They suggest one area in which there may be sex differences or similarities is the number of friends or frequency of get-togethers with friends. In addition, they suggest two other areas of importance: the degree of intimacy and the type of interaction in which males and females engage.

The authors point out two potential problems in the study of friendship. First, in response to conflicting results about men's and women's friendships, Caldwell and Peplau are wary of gross generalizations about sex differences in friendships. They stress the importance of paying attention to the demographic characteristics of the sub-populations being researched. They also point out that definitions used in friendship research may influence findings. It is possible that males and females define their friendships in different ways and that sex differences in friendship may reflect variations in how one defines friendship and not in the friendship itself.

To address these two potential problems, Caldwell and Peplau chose the sub-population of college students to control for demographic differences. College-aged respondents were chosen because Caldwell and Peplau believe that "students are in a situation where both the opportunities and constraints on friendships for women and men may be most comparable" (p. 722). In
addition, they provided respondents with definitions of three levels of friendship: casual, good and intimate.

Male and female participants completed a self-reported questionnaire. Respondents were asked to report quantitative information about their friendships, such as the number of casual, good, and best friendships they had, the frequency of getting together with same-sex friends during an average week, and the frequency of getting together with a same-sex best friend who lived near them. Another series of questions asked respondents' preferences for emotional intimacy and shared activities with their friends. Respondents were also asked to report about their relationship with their best friend. Specifically, they were asked to name the three most important things they did with their best friend that "helped form the basis of their friendship". (p. 725). Responses to this question were coded into one of three categories: talk, activity, and other. Finally, respondents reported three topics they most often discussed with their best friend and responses were coded into one of four categories: personal, activity, people, and other.

Results revealed no sex differences among the following quantitative aspects of friendship: total number of friends, or number of casual, good and intimate friends, number of hours spent with friends in an average week.
However, men were more likely than women to get together with more friends in an average week.

When reporting about their best friend, women were more likely than men to report getting together "just to talk". The authors suggest that this increased incidence of talking may indicated a greater level of emotional sharing. Women and men reported a preference to have a few intimate friends rather than many less intimate "good " friends.

Women were also more likely than men to report that they would prefer talking with a same-sex friend over doing an activity. For men, the preference was reversed. They preferred doing an activity over talking with a same-sex friend. In addition, men were more likely to prefer a same-sex friend who enjoys similar activities as themselves than one who has similar views.

When asked to report the three most important things that "helped form the basis of their friendship", women were more likely than men to report talking, and men were more likely than women to report some type of activity. In addition, women were more likely than men to talk about personal topics and other people in their discussions with their best friends. Thus, it appears that female’s same-sex friendships are based on and maintained on a level of emotional intimacy that is not experienced in men’s activity oriented same-sex friendships.
Similar findings were reported by Aukett, Ritchie and Mill (1988) who replicated Caldwell and Peplau's study among New Zealand men and women. Results revealed that, as in the United States, New Zealand women preferred to have a few close same-sexed friends from whom they get emotional support and obtain therapeutic value. Men, on the other hand, preferred to have more less-intimate same sex friends. New Zealand men, like American men, were more likely than women to prefer doing activities with their same-sex friends. Women, on the other hand preferred to talk with their same sexed friends.

Taken together these results suggest there are distinct differences between men's and women's same-sex friendships. Women tend to prefer to spend time talking with their same-sex friends. Males, on the other hand, tend to engage in participation in activities with their same-sex friends.

Davidson and Duberman (1982) felt that the widely accepted stereotype that women are more self-disclosing, more intimate, spontaneous and affectionate than men did not take content of conversation into account. As a result, they classified the content of conversations that males and females discussed with their same-sexed best friend into three levels: topical, relational and personal. They found that women are more likely to talk about relational and personal things than men. However, women and men are comparable in how often they talk at the topical level. When asked which content level is most
important to them, women considered all three levels to be important indicating their need to relate with friends on a broader level than men do. Men, on the other hand, reported the topical level to be most important in their conversations, indicating their desire to talk less about interrelationships and personal feelings.

A second study that investigated the topics which males and females discuss was conducted by Reisman (1990). Hungarian and American college students were asked to report how often they supposed each gender discussed each of ten conversation topics. Males were rated as being more likely than females to talk about sports, athletics, politics and current events, while females were expected to talk more about eating, food and personal appearance. Females also reported that they discussed personal problems and feelings more often than males. Both also perceive males to be less disclosing of their feeling, including anger, and personal concerns.

When asked what topics they preferred to discuss, women were more likely than men to prefer talking about their feelings and problems. However, both sexes preferred not to talk about angry feelings.

Although males do not discuss their feelings and problems as often as females, males indicated a desire to discuss their feelings and personal problems more often than they do.
Relating these feelings back to the exchange theory presented earlier it can be inferred that in same-sex friendships females find disclosure of personal information and feelings rewarding while males are rewarded by participation in activities and discussions at a less personal, more topical level.

In his study of intimacy among high school students and young adults, Reisman (1990) found that females report significantly more self-disclosure with their same sex friends than do males. However, there were differences between the high school and young adult samples. Adolescent males reported similar levels of self-disclosure among their same-sex and cross-sex friendships, but adolescent females reported less self-disclosures in their cross-sex friendships than in their same-sex friendship. Among young adults, males reported higher levels of self-disclosure with females than with males, but female young adults reported similar levels of self-disclosure with their female and male friends. Thus, each sex appears to become more self-disclosing with the opposite sex as they get older.

Hacker (1981) interviewed same-sex and cross-sex dyads to investigate the levels of self-disclosure and closeness or depth of relationships. Respondents were classified into low, moderate and high disclosures. Results indicated no sex differences in level of disclosure between male and female same-sex dyads. However, a significant difference did emerge in cross-sex
dyads. Females were more likely than males to be low disclosures in cross-sex friendships. The content of what these dyads revealed to each other was also examined. Males were more likely than females to reveal strengths and weaknesses to both their same-sex and cross-sex friends. However no male revealed only weaknesses and no female revealed only strengths.

Aukett, Ritchie and Mill (1988) found that males reported that they obtained more therapeutic value from their friendships with females than with their friendships with males. The authors suggest that this finding indicates that men are dependent on women for the personal intimate contact they do not receive from their same-sex friendships. That is, although males find their activity-oriented friendships with males rewarding, they also have a need to be self-disclosing and they turn to their female friends for this aspect.

Sapadin (1988) conducted a mail survey of professional working males and females to ascertain possible gender differences between same-sex and cross-sex friendships. Friendships were evaluated on overall quality, degree of intimacy, enjoyment and nurturance. Aside from gender, age and marital status also served as independent variables. Women’s same-sex friendships were rated higher on overall quality than were men same-sex friendships; and women rated their same-sex friendships higher in quality than their cross-sex
friendships. For males, there was no difference in overall quality between their same-sex and cross-sex friendships.

Women also rated their same-sex friendships to be more intimate, enjoyable and nurturing than men rated their same-sex friendships. Regarding cross-sex friendships, males were more likely than females to find cross-sex friendships nurturing. Women found their same-sex friendships to be more intimate, enjoyable and nurturing than their cross-sex friendships whereas men were more likely to find their cross-sex friendships more enjoyable and nurturing than their same-sex friendships. However, males felt that their friendships with males and females involved similar levels of intimacy.

Most of the research presented above approaches the study of friendship rather simplistically. Strength of friendship was measured by the level of emotional intimacy, the amount of self-disclosure or the amount of time spent doing various activities, including talking. These studies focussed on the presence or absence of these aspects of friendship but neglected to understand why the friendship persists.

**Wright's Model: The ADF-F**

Another approach to studying friendship which incorporates both the existence and persistence of a friendship was developed by Wright (1984). Wright first developed his model and a corresponding measurement tool in
1969. Over the years each has undergone changes and revisions resulting in the model to be discussed below. Wright notes that prior to the introduction of his model, friendship tended to be viewed from one of two perspectives in the literature. As presented earlier, exchange theories postulate that friendships are formed and maintained simply because the people involved in the relationship find the friendship rewarding. It follows that the stronger the friendship, the more rewarding the friendship and, conversely the weaker the friendship, the less rewarding the friendship.

A second perspective, descriptive psychology, asserts that friendships have an intensive quality about them. Some friendships exist even when specific rewards that may have led to the development of the relationship can no longer be identified.

Wright's model incorporates both schools of thought. He believes that friendships are formed and maintained because they are rewarding, but the rewardingness need not imply selfishness, self-centeredness or exploitation on the part of the persons involved. Rather, the rewardingness follows from the facilitated expression of behavioral tendencies related to the self and its attributes (Wright 1984, p. 117). Thus, the motivation for friendships is self-referent, that is, friendships are maintained because of the way these friendships are rewarding to a person's concept of who he or she is.
Wright goes on to define friendship as "a relationship involving voluntary or unconstrained interaction in which the participants respond to one another personally, that is, as unique individuals rather than as packages of discrete attributes, or mere role occupants" (Wright 1984, p. 119).

Wright developed the Acquaintance Description Form (ADF) based on his model and the observations that 1) friendships vary in strength or intensity, 2) friendship is a voluntary relationship, 3) friendships are rewarding but, 4) friendships are rewarding in different ways, and 5) that friendships experience times of strain or tension. Over the years, in response to previous research, the form has been modified to its present form, the ADF-F (Wright, 1985).

The ADF-F is comprised of thirteen five-item sub-scales. Two of the scales address the concepts that friendship is a voluntary relationship and that a friendship is unique to a particular person. Five of the scales measure the self-referent rewardingness of the relationship. One scale measures the extent to which tension or strain exists in the relationship; and one scale assesses the overall favorability a person feels for a friend. Four scales were more recently appended to the ADF-F and are primarily used to distinguish friendships from other personal relationships in which people are involved.
The first scale, the VID scale, measures voluntary interdependence or the extent to which two friends commit themselves to spend free time together. Wright postulates that the higher the level of VID, the stronger the friendship.

A second measure of the strength of friendship is measured in Person-Qua-Person scale, PQP. Items in this scale measure the "degree to which two individuals react to one another as unique, genuine and irreplaceable in the friendship" (Wright, 1985, p.44). Thus, Wright proposes that strong friendships score high on either Voluntary Interdependence (VID) or Person-Qua-Person (PQP) scales, or on both. Coupled together these two scales serve as an index of overall strength of friendship.

Wright identifies five areas in which friendships provide interpersonal rewards or friendship value. Utility Value (UV) measures "the degree to which a subject regards an acquaintance as willing to use his or her time and personal resources to help the subject to meet needs or reach personal goals" (Wright, 1985, p. 44). Ego Support Value (ESV) measures "the degree to which a subject regards an acquaintance as supportive, and, in general, as behaving in ways that help the subject to maintain an impression of herself or himself as a competent worthwhile person" (Wright, 1985, p. 44). Stimulation Value (SV) measures "the degree to which a subject regards an acquaintance as interesting and stimulating and as capable of fostering an expansion or
elaboration of the subject's knowledge, perspectives, or respective of favorite activities" (Wright, 1985, p.44). Self-Affirmative Value (SAV) measures "the degree to which a subject regards an acquaintance as behaving in ways that facilitate the subject's recognition and expression of his or her more important and highly valued self-attributes" (Wright, 1985, p.46). Security Value (Sec V) measures "the degree to which a subject regards an acquaintance as safe and non-threatening due to his or her disinclination to behave in ways that would betray trust" (Wright, 1985 p.54).

The maintenance difficulty scale, MD, reflects the extent to which individuals in a relationship deem it necessary to "spend time and effort clarifying actions or comments, soothing ruffled feelings or, in general, exercising patience and restraint to keep the relationship form deteriorating or dissolving" (Wright, 1985, p.44).

The general favorability scale, GF, was used in the initial phases of developing the ADF-F as a correction factor to adjust scale scores that were highly intercorrelated. Although it is no longer suggested that scores be adjusted using the GF scale, the scale is still included in the construct.

Wright suggests that friendships differ from other personal relationships, such as marriage, in terms of the expectations from and commitments to the relationship. The following four scales address these areas. Exclusiveness
measures (Excl) "the degree to which a personal relationship is regarded as strictly dyadic, with the person involved expecting and claiming proprietary access to specified forms of interaction and mutually involving activities" (Wright, 1985, p.53). Permanence (Perm) measures "the degree to which a personal relationship is regarded to be either difficult or inappropriate to dissolve in spite of changing circumstances and, in effect, as permanently binding upon the parties involved" (Wright, 1985, p. 53). Social Regulation (SoRG) refers to "the extent to which specified forms of interaction and mutually involving activities in a personal relationship are influenced by social norms and the expectations of relevant other persons" (Wright, 1985, p. 53). Salience of Emotional Expression (EMO) refers to "the degree to which overt expressions of positive affect, such as liking, affection and personal appreciation are regarded on essential aspect of a personal relationship" (Wright, 1985, p. 53).

Wright (1982) conducted a study in which male and female college students completed the ADF for one of five levels of acquaintances: best friend, good friend, moderate friend, friendly acquaintance, or formal acquaintance. The purpose of the study was to determine if the ADF differentiated the varying degrees of friendship.¹

¹ The 1982 study used the ADF prior to the inclusion of the Excl, SoRg, Perm and Emo scales.
Analyses of variance on mean ADF scales revealed significant differences between males' and females' ratings of the various target persons. Female subjects were more likely than males to differentiate among the various levels of acquaintanceship. For females, the mean ADF scores were significantly higher for a best friend than for a good friend on all scales except for maintenance difficulty. However, male differences between best and good friends were only reflected in significant differences between the friendship strength scales, VID, PQP and their combination total friendship. Similar results occurred at lower levels of friendship with females distinguishing between friendly and formal acquaintances on seven of the scales and males distinguishing between these two levels of friendship only on the VID scale.

In addition to differentiating between the various levels of friendship more so than males, females had higher intercorrelations between the scales for all but three scales than did males. Correlations involving maintenance difficulty were significantly lower for females than for males for the following scales: stimulation value, utility value, ego support value, self-affirmation value, person-qua-person, and total friendship.

Partial correlations were computed holding voluntary interdependence and Person-qua-person constant to see which of these two measures of friendship strength is more closely related to the other scales. Again, significant
sex differences were revealed.

Controlling for PQP, female's partial correlations between voluntary interdependence and utility value, ego support value, and self-affirmation value were all significant. For males, only the relationship between voluntary interdependence and utility value was significant.

Partial correlations controlling for VID were significant between PQP and all five value scales for both females and males, and the partial correlation between PQP and MD was significantly more negative for females than for males.

Thus, controlling for voluntary interdependence, men and women are similar in that they associate the self-referent rewards of a friendship with the uniqueness of the individual involved in the relationship. Where females and males tend to differ is in the extent to which they associate the self-referent rewards with voluntary interdependence. Within levels of person-qua-person, females are likely to associate the rewards of a friendship with the level of voluntary participation in the friendship, whereas for males, there is no significant relationship.

These findings, in conjunction with the findings that females discriminate between various levels of friendship more so that men, led Wright to conclude that women view their friendships in a more holistic manner than do men. For
women, if a friend is a "good" friend, she is good in all areas of friendship; and if she is a "best" friend she is the "best" in all of the friendship values. However, men differentiate between their friends to the extent that a "good" friend may be a good friend with respect to some areas of the friendship and not to others.

As a part of developing the ADF-F, Wright (1985) conducted a study to determine if the relationship differentiation scales, Excl, Perm, SoRg and EMO discriminate between friendships and heterosexual love. Non-student volunteers used the ADF-F to evaluate their best same-sex and opposite-sex friend, their spouse, fiancé or current romantic interest.

Results revealed that women differentiated between their same-sex and opposite-sex friends on VID and SoRg measures. VID means were significantly higher for females' female friends than for their male friends, and SoRG means were significantly higher for their male friends than for their female friends. Thus, females are more likely to spend their otherwise noncommitted time with their female friends than with their male friends and are more attuned to the social norms influencing their opposite-sex friendships than their same-sex friendships.

Male subjects differentiated between their same-sex and opposite-sex friends such that the Excl and SoRg means were higher for their female friends than for their male friends. The finding that males rate their female friends
higher in the Excl scale indicates that they perceive their best female friendships to be relatively exclusive with those individuals involved. In addition, they are more aware of other individuals' expectations of this cross-sex friendship.

In his 1982 studies of men's and women's friendships, Wright explored the development of friendship strength as measured by Person-Qua-Person and Voluntary Interdependence. VID and PQP ratings for specified levels of friendship were obtained from male and female undergraduate college students. To assess possible changes in VID and PQP across time, some of the subjects reported VID and PQP measures for persons with whom they were friends for one month or less. Others reported VID and PQP scores for friends of 4 to 6 months, and others for friendship one year or longer.

Findings revealed that for females, as a friendship becomes stronger, behavioral interdependence (VID) and level of personalized interest and concern (PQP) develop concurrently and in the first six months they developed rapidly.

For men, behavioral interdependence increases rapidly in the first few months. Personalized interest on the other hand develops at a somewhat slower rate in the early stages if a friendship, but eventually reaches a comparable level with VID after the six-month interval.

These results led Wright to question the earlier suggestion that women are more likely than men to react to their friendship in a holistic way. Because
VID and PQP measures for friends of one year or more were at the same level and were basically comparable between men and women, Wright postulated that men's long-term friendships may be more similar to women's long-term friendships than was previously thought.

In a second study, (Wright, 1982) male and female college students completed ADF information for a good same-sex friend whom they had known for a year or more. Results revealed that intercorrelations for all scales except maintenance difficulty and voluntary interdependence were significant for males and females.

Controlling for PQP, partial correlations with VID were significant for four of the five value scales for females: stimulation value, utility value, ego support value, and self-affirmation value. For males, VID was significantly related to all five value scales including maintenance difficulty.

Earlier findings from Wright's study of the various levels of friendship revealed that only three of the value scales were related to VID for females and only one of the scales was related for men. Coupled with the above results, these findings suggest that for high levels of friendship, that is one's best friends, males are just as likely as females to discriminate between their friends and one's best friends are the best in every way.

Wright concludes that the sex differences observed in these studies:
...differ in ways that are interesting, persistent, and fully in keeping with traditional sex roles and socialization patterns that define women as affective and socioemotionally oriented and men as instrumental and task oriented. Thus, a woman is somewhat more likely to emphasize personalism, self-disclosure, and supportedness in her friendships. A man is somewhat more likely to emphasize external interest and mutually involving activities (p.19)

Another interesting finding in the above results is that over time, as a friendship develops and becomes stronger, the difference observed between the sexes diminishes.

The studies discussed to this point have demonstrated how males' and females' friendships differ. However, as Wright (1988) points out,

Virtually all close friendships involve shared interests and activities, various kinds of intimacy including self-disclosures and the sharing of confidences, emotional support, small talk, shop talk and the exchanges of personal favors (p. 70).

Thus, while males and females may differ in the types of friendships they form, they also have some similarities.

Role of Sextyping

While Wright gives us some insight into the role of gender in friendships, gender is predisposed to be confounded with other variables. One variable that is highly correlated with gender is the sextyping of an individual. According to Bem (1981) "the process by which a society thus transmutes male and female into masculine and feminine is known as the process of sextyping" (p.354).
Most societies have different roles and characteristics which they expect from each gender. That is to say, there are roles which are traditionally expected of males and are therefore considered masculine traits. In our society, traits that are typically considered to be masculine tend to be more instrumental and agentic. Similarly, there are traits which are traditionally expected of females and are therefore considered feminine traits. These traits are typically more expressive and communal in our society.

For many years, masculinity and femininity have been considered to be opposite ends of a bipolar scale so that if an individual is considered to be masculine, they are not feminine. However in the seventies Bem (1974) and Spence and Helmrich (1978) postulated that masculinity and femininity are not bipolar opposites of a singular scale, rather they are independent dimensions. Under this assumption, if an individual is highly masculine, he or she does not necessarily lack femininity. Thus it is possible for a person to possess masculine traits and feminine traits.

Bem (1974) and Spence and Helmrich (1978) have each introduced assessment inventories that measure levels of masculinity and femininity. The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence and Helmrich, 1978) are each self-administered
questionnaires that are comprised of items that are collapsed into three subscales. The BSRI is comprised of masculine items, feminine items, and neutral items. The PAQ is comprised of masculine items, feminine items, and items which stereotypically vary in desirability between the two sexes.

Both inventories measure the sextyping of an individual. Levels of masculinity and femininity are used in combination to classify individuals into one of four sextypes. Typically a median split method is used to classify subjects. Scores for males and females are combined for each of the scales. Median normative scores are then determined for the masculine and feminine scales. Individuals are then classified according to the relation between their score for each scale and that scale’s median. If they fall above the median they are considered to be high on that scale, and if they fall below the median they are considered to be low on that scale.

The term androgynous has been introduced to characterize individuals who are high on both masculinity and femininity scales. Individuals scoring high on masculinity and low on femininity are classified as masculine. Masculine males are referred to as either traditional males or sex-typed males. Masculine females are referred to as cross-sex-typed. Individuals who are high on femininity and low on masculinity are classified as feminine. Feminine females are referred to as traditional females or sex-typed females. Males who are
feminine are referred to as cross-sex-typed. Individuals who are low on both masculinity and femininity are classified as undifferentiated.

Several researchers have demonstrated that sex-typing of an individual is related to various aspects of personal relationships. Barth and Kinder (1988) conducted a study which investigated the effects of gender and sex-typing of subject on level of involvement and level of depth in same six friendships.

Undergraduate students were classified via Spence and Helmrich's (1978) Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) into four groups: sex-typed males, sex-typed females, androgynous males and androgynous females. Participants were provided with definitions of casual, good, and close friendships and were asked to provide the following information for a friend in each of these categories: the duration of the friendship, how much time is spent with the friend, and three topics often discussed in conversations with each friend. Participants also completed a measure of friendship involvement and is comprised of items representing "overt actions in the categories of joint activity, self-disclosure, other-enhancement, other-disparagement, norm regulation, and physical contact" (Barth and Kinder p. 265). Participants are asked to report on the likelihood of each action to occur in the friendship using a 5-point scale with "1" representing not at all likely and "5" representing
extremely likely. The overall mean probability rating is a measure of personal involvement.

Responses to the question asking respondents to report three topics of conversation discussed with friends in each category were coded into one of three categories to ascertain the level of depth of the friendship.

A multivariate analyses of variance did not reveal significant main effects for either gender or sex role orientation of the subjects or the interaction. However, univariate analyses of variance revealed that females' same-sex friendships were significantly more involved, demonstrated greater depth, and were of longer duration than males same-sex friendships.

Intercorrelations were computed between Z-transformations of each of the subscales of the involvement scale. Females had significantly higher Z-transformation correlations than males (which supports Wright's conclusion that females tend to form friendships that meet a variety of needs while males form different friendships to meet different needs.)

There was a significant main effect for gender role for involvement such that androgynous participants had a higher mean probability rating than their sex-typed counterparts. In addition, the gender x sex role interaction was significant. For sex-typed individuals, gender differences for involvement were greater than for androgynous individuals, thus "sex role orientation affects the
magnitude of sex differences in the involvement of same-sex friendships" (p. 357).

Females' friendships were found to be of longer duration than males. It was suggested by Barth and Kinder that females tended to maintain same-sex friendships for a longer period of time and that gender differences such as increased self-disclosure found in previous studies may be due to the longer duration of females friendships.

Lavine and Lombardo (1984) investigated the effects of gender and sex-role of subject on levels of self-disclosure to four different target persons: mother, father, best female friend, and best male friend. Undergraduate subjects were classified as either androgynous, traditional, or undifferentiated using the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Subjects were classified using the median split method. Subjects completed a self-disclosure questionnaire for each of the four target persons.

The self-disclosure questionnaire was comprised of items tapping six categories 1) attitudes and opinions, 2) tastes and interests, 3) work, 4) personality, 5) the body, and 6) opinions about sex. The categories were then identified as either intimate or non-intimate. Intimate categories included personality, the body, and opinions about sex. Non-intimate categories
included attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, and work. In addition, all categories taken together comprised total self-disclosure.

Analyses of total self-disclosure revealed that androgynous individuals, regardless of their gender, disclosed more to targets than their traditional and undifferentiated counterparts. Undifferentiated individuals disclosed the least, and traditional individuals disclosed significantly less than androgynous individuals and significantly more than undifferentiated individuals. Among target persons, best male and best female friends were equally disclosed to. In addition, best male and best female friends were disclosed to more than mothers who were disclosed to more than fathers.

The ANOVA investigating gender differences on disclosure of intimate items revealed that the gender main effect was not significant. This finding does not support previous findings that females are more self-disclosing than males. Although the main effect for gender was not significant, the three-way interaction of other main effects and interactions were significant including gender, sex role and target.

For females, androgynous females disclosed most about intimate topics to their best female friend followed by their best male friend followed by their mother. Traditional females disclosed most to their female best friend and disclosed to a lesser but equal extent with their best male friend and mother.
Undifferentiated females disclosed less than androgynous and traditional females to all targets with one exception. Undifferentiated females disclosed to their best male friend in a pattern similar to traditional females.

Among males, androgynous males were the only males who self-disclosed about intimate topics to their best male friend and best female friend at similar levels. Similar to their female counterparts, undifferentiated males disclosed significantly less than androgynous males. Compared to traditional males, undifferentiated males disclosed less to their fathers and to their female friends.

These findings indicate that the sex-role of an individual and not gender has more of an influence on the extent to which a person self-discloses.

Fischer and Narus (1981) investigated possible effects of sextyping of subject on intimacy levels with the person closest to the subject who was not blood relative. Undergraduate subjects were classified as androgynous, sextyped (traditional), and undifferentiated using the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Subjects also completed an intimate scale, a self-esteem scale, and a need for others scale. Subjects were asked to choose the person closest to them excluding parents and siblings, although spouses were permitted. Thus, four types of relationships were investigated: male-male, male-female, female-male, and female-female.
An analysis of covariance revealed that self-esteem, need for others and age of subject significantly affected intimacy scores. Therefore, intimacy scores were adjusted and analysis of variance and multiple regressions were conducted on the adjusted scores.

Results of the ANOVA revealed that males scored lower on intimacy than females. In addition, relationships with males were perceived as significantly less intimate than relationships with females.

Overall, androgynous individuals were highest on overall intimacy followed by traditional and undifferentiated individuals. Androgynous individuals were significantly more intimate than undifferentiated individuals, but not more so than traditional individuals. This pattern was similar but not significant for male subjects. However, for females, the pattern was similar and was significant.

Androgynous individuals also had higher intimacy scores in three of the four types of relationships: female-female, male-female, and female-male. However, this pattern did not emerge in the male-male relationships. In female’s friendships with other females, androgynous individuals were not only more intimate than undifferentiated females, but also more intimate than sextyped females.
Among the four types of relationships, female-female relationships were most intimate followed by female-male, male-female and male-male relationships.

Masculine and feminine scores, self-esteem scores, need scores and age of subject were all entered into a stepdown multiple regression analysis of unadjusted intimacy scores. Results revealed that for females' relationships, femininity was the only sex role significantly related to intimacy. For males, self-esteem was related to intimacy levels in male-male relationships.

It should be noted that in Fischer and Narus' study it was possible for individuals to choose a romantic partner as the target person. It is possible that the inclusion of romantic relationships may make the above findings ungeneralizable to friendships that do not include romantic relationships.

Williams (1980) also investigated the effects of sextyping of subject on intimacy levels. However, the target person was designated as the same-sex best friend. Using the Personal Attributes Questionnaire individuals were classified as sextyped, cross sextyped, androgynous and undifferentiated using the median split method. Unlike Fischer and Narus (1981), there were cross sextyped individuals in Williams' study.

A self-esteem scale measuring emotional intimacy served as the dependent variable. Multiple regression analysis of sextyping on intimacy
controlling for father's education revealed that masculinity is negatively related
and femininity is positively related to expression of intimacy.

The regression of gender on intimacy controlling for father's education
demonstrated that males express less emotional intimacy in same-sex
friendships than females. However, when gender is controlled for, masculinity
is no longer related to decreased levels of expression of intimacy. This occurs
because males usually score higher on masculinity than females.

When the interaction terms for gender and sex role are entered into the
regression, there are no gender differences of the effects of sex role on
expression of intimacy in same sex friendship.

The sextyping of individuals does have an effect on the level of emotional
intimacy in same sex friendships. For males, androgynous and cross-sextyped
individuals score higher on emotional intimacy than undifferentiated males with
no difference between sextyped and undifferentiated individuals. For females,
androgynous and sex-typed individuals score higher on emotional intimacy than
undifferentiated individuals, with no difference between cross-sextyped and
undifferentiated individuals.

Although females reported higher levels of emotional intimacy in their
same sex friendships than males, it appears that the sex-typing of an individual,
regardless of gender, may determine the amount of emotional intimacy they
experience in same sex friendship. For both males and females, increased levels of femininity was related to increased levels on emotional intimacy.

In summary, when sextyping of an individual is not taken into consideration, females are more likely than males to self-disclose in their same-sex friendships. In addition, female-female friendships are typically more nurturant, personal and emotional than female-male friendships and male-male relationships. Males get more therapeutic value from their cross-sex friendships, and prefer to do activities with their same-sex friends.

Wright's studies (1984,1985) demonstrate that for same-sex friendships females had higher intercorrelations among most of the scales of the ADF-F than males did. Within voluntary independence, males and females similarly view the rewards of a friendship with the uniqueness of the person in the relationship. However, within person-qua-person, females are more likely than males to associate the rewards of a friendship with the level of voluntary participation in the friendship.

For cross-sex friendships, females were more likely to spend uncommitted time with their same-sex friends than with their cross-sex friends. Males were more likely to feel their cross-sex friendships are more exclusive than their same-sex friendships. For both sexes, there was a higher degree of social regulation in their cross-sex friendships than in their same-sex
friendships.

However, Wright (1982) also found in friendships of six months or more, differences between the sexes on levels of voluntary interdependence and person-qua-person tend to diminish suggesting that males’ and females’ friendships may be more similar than we think.

The research on sextyping demonstrates that the level of femininity that an individual has may be more of a determinant of the type of friendship a person forms than that person’s gender. High levels of femininity in androgynous males and females, traditional females and cross-sextyped males, had higher intimacy scores than their counterparts. In addition, androgynous males and females self-disclosed more than their undifferentiated counterparts, but not significantly more than their sextyped counterparts.

The present research extends Wright’s research by including sextyping of an individual in addition to the gender of both the subject and target persons. In the present study the sextyping of subjects was determined via Spence and Helmrich’s Personal Attributes Questionnaire. In addition, subjects completed Wright’s ADF-F for their best female friend and their best male friend.

It is hypothesized that overall, females will have higher means than their male counterparts on the ADF-F scales. In addition, for each gender, it is hypothesized that individuals with high levels of femininity will have significantly
higher means than individuals with low levels of femininity.

With regard to the gender of the target best friend, it is hypothesized that females will have higher means than males for both their same-sex and cross-sex friendships. Also, regardless of gender of subject, means for same-sex friendships will be significantly higher than for cross-sex friendships.

Method

Subjects.

Two hundred fifty three undergraduate students at a mid-sized university served as subjects for the study. There were a total of 119 males and 124 females; 10 subjects did not report their gender and were subsequently excluded from the analyses. Subjects were drawn from a subject pool of students enrolled in introductory social science courses. Participation in the subject pool was required for course credit. Subjects were between the ages of 17 and 44. However, almost all (98 percent) were within normal undergraduate age range (17 to 22).

Instruments.

The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence & Helmrich, 1978) was used to determine individuals' sextyping. The PAQ is comprised of 24 items rated on a five-point scale ranging from 0 to 4. Each item is anchored with bipolar opposites. Eight of the items comprise the masculinity scale which
represents traits that have been judged to be more characteristic of males than females. Items on this scale measure instrumental or agentic traits. The femininity scale is comprised of eight items judged to be more characteristic of females than males. These items measure interpersonally oriented or expressive traits. For the masculinity and femininity scales the items are traits that are socially desirable to some extent in both sexes. The remaining eight items comprise a masculinity-femininity scale. This scale contains items for which the social desirability differs for males and females.

A principal components analysis of the sixteen items comprising the masculinity and femininity scales revealed two factors. The first factor was comprised of the eight femininity items; and the second factor was comprised of the eight masculinity items. Internal consistency reliabilities using Cronbach’s alpha were .47 for the masculinity scale and .77 for the femininity scale.

The median split method was used to classify subjects. Because an unequal number of male and female subjects participated in the study the median for each sex on both the masculine and feminine scales were obtained. The medians for each scale for each sex were then averaged to obtain the median used to classify all subjects.

Subjects were classified based on their level of femininity into two groups. Subjects with femininity levels below the median were categorized as
"low femininity" subjects. Those with femininity levels above the median were categorized as "high femininity" levels. Two males and seven females could not be classified due to missing data and were subsequently excluded from analyses. After subjects with incomplete data were omitted from analyses, there was a total of 234 subjects, 117 males and 117 females.

Insert table 1 about here

Wright's Acquaintance Description Form-Final (ADF-F) was used as a measure of friendship. The ADF-F is comprised of 13 scales. Measures of relationship strength or intensity are measured via voluntary interdependence (VID) and person-qua-person (PQP). Maintenance difficulty (MD) measures the tension or strain in a relationship. Measures of interpersonal rewards include: utility value (UV), ego support value (ESV), stimulation value (SV), self-affirmation value (SAV) and security value (SecV). General favorability, (GF) measures overall levels of favorability. Scales which differentiate between different types of interpersonal relationships include exclusiveness (Excl), salience of emotional expression (Emo), social regulation (SoRg) and permanence (Perm). (For a full description of the ADF-F scales see page 14 above.)
Internal consistency reliabilities using Cronbach's alpha were conducted for the 13 subscales of the ADF-F for both the male and female best friend. For male best friend, Cronbach's alpha scores were .59 or higher for all scales except permanence ($\leq .45$). For female best friend, reliabilities were .54 or higher except for permanence ($\leq .39$).

Procedure.

Subjects were tested in groups of 50 to 70. Each subject completed the PAQ and the ADF-F using their best male and best female friend as the target persons. The order in which subjects completed the ADF-F was balanced so that half of the subjects completed the ADF-F for their best male friend and then their best female friend and half completed the ADF-F for their best female friend and then their best male friend. Subjects were also asked to report how long they had known their best male and best female friends. After completing the study each subject was debriefed. Debriefing included a description of the independent variable, sextyping of subject, and an explanation of the ADF-F. Subjects were also provided with an opportunity to have any questions answered.
Analysis.

A three factor, repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance was conducted with two between subjects factors (sex of subject: male or female; level of femininity: high or low) and one within-subject factor (sex of target best friend: male and female). A procedure for repeated measures suggested by McCall and Applebaum (1974) was used. The three-way interaction and two-way interactions involving the within subjects factor was tested by first computing a difference score between each subjects' ratings of male and female targets. The difference scores are then subjected to a two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) involving the between subjects independent variables, sex of subject and sextype of subject. A significant two-way interaction effect on these difference scores would indicate an interaction between the significant independent factor and the within subjects factor.

The two-way interaction and main effects not involving the within subjects independent variable were tested by simply computing the mean of each subjects' ratings of the male and female targets and then analyzing them in a two-way MANOVA involving the between subjects factors. A significant interaction in this analysis would indicate interaction between the two between subjects independent variables; and significant main effects would indicate significant main effects for each independent variable.
Results

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted using the difference scores of the thirteen scales. Difference scores were computed by subtracting the mean rating on each scale for a subject's best female friend from the mean rating on that scale for a subject's best male friend. Because the length of time that a subject has known his or her best male and female friends may have some impact on the analysis a covariate variable was also used in the MANOVA. Similar to the difference scores for the thirteen ADF-F scales, a difference score for length of time was computed by subtracting the length of time a subject knew his/her female best friend from the length of time he/she knew his/her male best friend.

The gender by level of femininity interaction did not reach significance (F (1,214) = .62, p = 0.83). The main effect for sex of subject reached significance (F (1,214) = 4.69, p < .001) indicating a significant sex of subject by sex of target person interaction. Males had higher mean ratings for male best friends and females had higher mean ratings for female best friends for the

____

Insert tables 3 and 4 about here

____
two scales measuring strength of relationship: voluntary interdependence and person-qua-person.

The main effect for femininity level did not reach significance ($F(1, 214) = 1.03, p = .42$).

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted using the means of the thirteen scales for best male and female friend. The gender by level of femininity interaction did not reach significance ($F(1, 230) = 1.61, p = 0.08$).

The main effect for sex of subject reached significance ($F(1, 230) = 6.33, p < .001$). Females had significantly higher means than males
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on voluntary interdependence, person-qua-person, utility value, ego support value, stimulation value, self-affirmation value, security value, general favorability, and emotional expression. Males had significantly higher means than females for maintenance difficulty and social regulation.

The main effect for level of femininity also reached significance ($F(1, 230) = 4.67, p < .001$). Individuals with high levels of femininity had
significantly higher means than individuals with low femininity on all but two of the scales, exclusiveness and social regulation.

Pearson correlations were computed between each of the thirteen ADF-F scales and level of femininity and level of masculinity. Femininity significantly correlated with each of the thirteen scales. Masculinity was negatively correlated with emotional expression, but did not significantly correlate with any of the other scales.

Discussion

The present study was conducted to investigate possible effects of sex of subject and level of femininity on same-sex and opposite-sex best friends. The interaction of sex of subject and level of femininity was not significant, however both main effects were significant. The main effect for gender using the mean ratings for best male and best female friends indicates that females have
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significantly higher ratings than males for both measures of relationship strength: voluntary interdependence (VID) and person-qua-person (PQP). It should be noted that on average, the subjects in the present study knew their best male and best female friends for three and a half years. These findings do not support those of Wright (1982) who found that after a period of six months, men's and women's same-sexed friendships reached similar levels of VID and PQP.

In addition, females had higher means than males for all five scales that measure interpersonal rewards: utility value, ego support value, stimulation value, self-affirmation value and security value. Females' means were also higher for females on the general favorability and emotional expression scales.

It appears that for females the label "best friend" implies a very strong relationship with a person with whom a female can relate on a very emotional and value oriented level. High means on the interpersonal reward scales indicates that females look to their best friends for support, encouragement, stimulation, trust, and expression of emotions. Males, on the other hand, had significantly higher means than females for maintenance difficulty and social regulation.

It appears that females' best friend relationships are more complex, showing high levels of importance ascribed to sharing of emotions and values.
Males' best friends do not need to live up to such multi-level demands, therefore, it is easier for them to "absorb" conflict in a relationship. Conflict with females' best friends may rise from more personal roots, therefore, these relationships can tolerate less conflict in order to survive.

These findings suggest that males and females may not look to their best friends for similar reasons. Females are more likely to get together with their friends "just to talk" whereas males are more likely to get together to do an activity (Caldwell and Peplau, 1982; Aukett, Ritchie and Mill, 1988). For females to establish and maintain their highly emotional and value-oriented friendships it would be necessary to create opportunities in which such emotional ties can be expressed. Thus, females are more likely to spend a lot of time talking with friends. Males, on the other hand, are not as dependent on social support from their best friends, and may not feel the need to spend time talking with friends to maintain the relationship.

The main effect for level of femininity resulted in higher means for individuals with high level of femininity on all the scales except for exclusiveness and social regulation. As measured by the PAQ, higher levels of femininity indicate that a person has reported his or herself to be more emotional, able to devote self completely to others, gentle, helpful to others, kind, aware of others feelings, understanding of others, and very warm in relations with others.
These are all characteristics which would facilitate actions leading to higher levels of interpersonal rewards, general favorability, and increased strength of relationship as measured by the ADF-F. These findings are supported by the significant correlations between the thirteen scales of the ADF-F and levels of femininity.

The relevance of the significant positive relationship between level of femininity and the ADF-F scales is more striking when the relations between levels of masculinity are considered. The main effect for femininity is independent of level of masculinity for individuals. This is also supported by the correlations between the ADF-F scales and level of masculinity, only one of which reached significance. It should be noted, however, that the Cronbach's Alpha score for masculinity was relatively low (.47) which may have had some impact on the correlations. Thus, these results should be interpreted with caution.

The main effect for sex of subject using the difference scores and controlling for length of time that an individual has know his/her best friends indicates a significant interaction between sex of subject and sex of best friend. For males and females, means on the two scales measuring overall strength of friendship, voluntary interdependence and person-qua-person were higher for their same-sex friends than for their cross-sex friends. It is possible that
individuals use a different set of criteria for measuring their cross-sex friendships and that these criteria are not tapped by Wright's ADF-F.

In our society cross-sex friendship can be a very sensitive subject for individuals. People are often questioned about the type of relationship they have with a cross-sex individual. It is sometimes assumed that in a cross-sex relationship there are romantic intentions, even though this is not always the case. Individuals often feel the need to describe their cross-sex friendships as "just a friend" which implies that the relationship is inferior to any romantic relationship that others may have assumed.

It appears that males and females do differ in the way they view their best friendships, and that high levels of femininity are related to the aspects of friendship measured by the ADF-F. This is not surprising since many of the scales, especially the interpersonal reward scales, measure aspects of friendship that require higher levels interpersonal and emotionally oriented personality traits. Therefore, it is possible that the ADF-F is somehow measuring the level of femininity of the friendship relationship itself.

The results of this study add to the literature in the area of friendship, and describe the effects of sex and sextyping on this relationship. Further investigation of friendship could investigate the role of target person's sextyping
in the friendship. In addition, it would also be interesting to investigate cross-sex friendship in closer detail.
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### Appendix 1

**Personal Attributes Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all aggressive</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all independent</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all emotional</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very submissive</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all excitable in a major crisis</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very excitable in a major crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very passive</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all able to devote self completely to others</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Able to devote self completely to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rough</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all helpful to others</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very helpful to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all competitive</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very home oriented</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very worldly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all kind</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent to others’ approval</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Highly needful of others’ approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings not easily hurt</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Feelings easily hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all aware of feelings of others</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very aware of feelings of others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Rating (A-E)</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can make decisions easily</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Has difficulty making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives up very easily</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Never gives up easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never cries</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Cries very easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels very inferior</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Feels very superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all self-confident</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very self-confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all understanding of others</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very understanding of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very cold in relations with others</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very warm in relations with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little need for security</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Very strong need for security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goes to pieces under pressure</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>Stands up well under pressure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 2

ADF-F

1. TP can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.

2. If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on TP to be willing to loan it to me.

3. TP makes it easy for me to express my most important personal qualities in my everyday life.

4. Because I think of my relationship with TP as a "one-and-only" arrangement, I would consider it wrong to form the same type of relationship with anyone else unless TP and I had already decided to call it quits.

5. TP's ways of dealing with people make him/her rather difficult to get along with.

6. If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on TP to notice it and appreciate my ability.

7. TP is a genuinely likeable person.

8. When I get together with TP, my emotional reactions are strong enough that I am definitely aware of them.

9. I can converse freely and comfortably with TP without worrying about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate, of just plain silly.

10. Because of the kind of relationship we have, most people would think it unnatural or improper if TP and I did not spend quite a bit of time together.

11. If I hadn't heard from TP for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact her/him just for the sake of keeping in touch.
12. If TP were to move away or "disappear" for some reasons, I would really miss the special kind of companionship (s)he provides.

13. If I were asked to guess how long my relationship with TP will last, I would say I consider myself committed to the relationship "till death do us part."

14. When we get together to work on a task or project, TP can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems.

15. If I were looking for a job, I could count on TP to try his/her best to help me find one.

16. TP is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to express my true thoughts and feelings.

17. Because my relationship with TP is not the kind that people ordinarily get jealous about, I would consider it perfectly all right if TP were to have the same basic type of relationship with another person or persons.

18. I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with TP from "falling apart."

19. If I am in an embarrassing situation, I can count on TP to do things that will make me feel as much as ease as possible.

20. If I were asked to list a few people that I thought represented the very best in "human nature," TP is one of the person I would name.

21. When TP and I get together, we spend a certain amount of time talking about the good feelings and emotions that are associated with our relationship.

22. TP is the kind of person who likes to "put me down" or embarrass me with seemingly harmless little jokes or comments.
23. If I thought realistically about it, I would conclude that at least half the things TP and I do together are necessary because of people's expectations or other social pressures that have nothing to do with the really personal aspects of our relationship.

24. If TP and I could arrange our schedules so that we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as TP.

25. TP expresses so many personal qualities I like that I think of her/him as being "one of a kind," a truly unique person.

26. I consider my relationship with TP so permanent that if (s)he had to move to a distant city for some reasons, I would move to the same city to keep the relationship going.

27. TP can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it weren't for him/her.

28. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on TP to help with errands or chores to make things as convenient for me as possible.

29. TP treats me in ways that encourage me to be my "true self."

30. Considering the kind of relationship we have, there are certain kinds of things that TP and I do together that I would consider inappropriate for either of us to do with any one else.

31. I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to TP about topics that (s)he considers controversial or touchy.

32. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on TP to be happy and congratulatory about it.

33. TP has the kind of personal qualities that would make almost anyone respect and admire her/him if they got to know her/him well.
34. If I thought realistically about my relationship with TP, I would conclude that many other things are more important than its emotional aspects.

35. I feel free to reveal private or personal information about myself to TP because (s)he is not the kind of person who would use such information to my disadvantage.

36. Many of my acquaintances have such definite ideas about the responsibilities that go along with my relationship with TP that they would strongly disapprove if I did not live up to them.

37. If I had decided to leave town on a certain day for a leisurely trip or vacation and discovered that TP was leaving for the same place a day later, I would seriously consider waiting a day in order to travel with him/her.

38. "False sincerity" and "phoniness" are the kinds of terms that occur to me when I am trying to think honestly about my impressions of TP.

39. If my relationship with TP became too dissatisfying to be worth the trouble, I could call it off or ease out of it with little difficulty.

40. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP introduces viewpoints that help me see things in a new light.

41. TP is willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects, even if (s)he is not directly involved.

42. TP is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to do the kinds of things I really want to do.

43. Because I regard my relationship with be a pretty exclusive thing, I would consider it wrong for either of us to develop the same basic type of relationship with anyone else unless we had decided to go out separate ways.

44. I have a hard time really understanding some of TP's actions and comments.
45. If I have to defend any of my beliefs or convictions, TP is the kind of person who supports me, even if (s)he does not share those beliefs or convictions with me.

46. TP is a pleasant person to be around.

47. If I thought realistically about it, I would conclude that I spend very little time thinking about the emotions I most often experience in my relationship with TP.

48. When I am with TP, I feel free to "let my guard down" completely because (s)he avoids doing and saying things that might make me look inadequate or inferior.

49. The kinds of things TP and I do together are strongly influenced by definite social obligations that go along with the kind of relationship we have.

50. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together.

51. When TP and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship I don't get from any of my other acquaintances.

52. If something happened so that my relationship with TP was no longer satisfying, I would keep on with it anyway for legal, moral or ethical reasons.

53. I can count on TP to be ready with really good suggestions when we are looking for some activity or project to engage in.

54. If I were sick or hurt, I could count on TP to do things that would make it easier to take.

55. Doing things with seems to bring out my more important traits and characteristics.

56. Because I regard my relationship with TP to be a "one-and-only" arrangement, I would be very disappointed if I found out that TP had developed the same basic type of relationship with any one else.
57. I can count on communication with TP to breakdown when we try to discuss things that are touchy or controversial.

58. TP has a way making me feel like a really worthwhile person, even when I do not seem to be very competent or successful at my more important activities.

59. It is easy to think of favorable things to say about TP.

60. If I were to list the most important aspects of my relationships with TP, positive emotional experiences are among the things I would include.

61. TP is quick to point out anything that (s)he sees as a flaw in my character.

62. If I thought about it really objectively, I would conclude that society has quite a few rules and regulations about the kind of relationship I have with TP.

63. If I had just gotten off work or out of class and had some free time, I would wait around and leave with TP if (s)he were leaving the same place an hour or so later.

64. TP is the kind of person I would miss very much if something happened to interfere with our acquaintanceship.

65. If I thought realistically about it, I would conclude that my relationship with TP could easily be dissolved if necessary.
Table 1

**Number of Subjects in Each Level of Femininity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Femininity</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Femininity</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Femininity</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Cronbach's Alpha Scores for ADF-F Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADF-F Scale</th>
<th>Male Best Friend</th>
<th>Female Best Friend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary interdependence (VID)</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-qua-person (PQP)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance difficulty (MD)</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility value (UV)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego support value (ESV)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation value (SV)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation value (SAV)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security value (SecV)</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General favorability (GF)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusiveness (Excl)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional expression (Emo)</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social regulation (SoRg)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanence (Perm)</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
ADF-F Means Difference Scores of Male and Female Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADF-F Scale</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary interdependence (VID)</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>-.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-qua-person (PQP)</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance difficulty (MD)</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility value (UV)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego support value (ESV)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation value (SV)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation value (SAV)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security value (SecV)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General favorability (GF)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusiveness (Excl)</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional expression (Emo)</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social regulation (SoRg)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanence (Perm)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note  Difference score = Mean rating for male best friend - mean rating for female best friend.
*  p < .05
Table 4

**ADF-F Mean Rating Scores For Best Male Friend and Best Female Friend Of Male and Female Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADF-F Scale</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best Male Friend</td>
<td>Best Female Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary interdependence (VID)</td>
<td>4.25&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.94&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-qua-person (PQP)</td>
<td>4.56&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.36&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance difficulty (MD)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility value (UV)</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego support value (ESV)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation value (SV)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation value (SAV)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security value (SecV)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General favorability (GF)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusiveness (Excl)</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional expression (Emo)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social regulation (SoRg)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanence (Perm)</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

<sup>ab</sup> Means in a given row not having a common superscript differ significantly (p = .05)
Table 5
ADF-F Means of Male and Female Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADF-F Scale</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary interdependence (VID)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-qua-person (PQP)</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance difficulty (MD)</td>
<td>2.42*</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility value (UV)</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego support value (ESV)</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation value (SV)</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation value (SAV)</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security value (SecV)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General favorability (GF)</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusiveness (Excl)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional expression (Emo)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social regulation (SoRg)</td>
<td>2.51*</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanence (Perm)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*  p < .05
Table 6
ADF-F Means of Subjects With Low Femininity and High Femininity Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADF-F Scale</th>
<th>Low Femininity</th>
<th>High Femininity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary interdependence (VID)</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-qua-person (PQP)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance difficulty (MD)</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility value (UV)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego support value (ESV)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation value (SV)</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation value (SAV)</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security value (SecV)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General favorability (GF)</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusiveness (Excl)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional expression (Emo)</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>5.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social regulation (SoRg)</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanence (Perm)</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.46*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
### Table 7

**Intercorrelations of ADF-F Scales With Femininity and Masculinity of Subject**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADF-F Scale</th>
<th>Femininity</th>
<th>Masculinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary interdependence (VID)</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-qua-person (PQP)</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance difficulty (MD)</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility value (UV)</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego support value (ESV)</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation value (SV)</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-affirmation value (SAV)</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security value (SecV)</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General favorability (GF)</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusiveness (Excl)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional expression (Emo)</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social regulation (SoRg)</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanence (Perm)</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, two-tailed
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