NOTICE

AVIS

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

An Integration of Friendship and Social Support:
Relationships with Adjustment in College Students

Vicki B. Veroff

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Psychology

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

December 1995

Canada

Name _Vicki Veroff_

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS
Architecture	0729
Art History	0377
Cinema	0900
Dance	0378
Fine Arts	0357
Information Science	0723
Journalism	0391
Library Science	0399
Mass Communications	0708
Music	0413
Speech Communication	0459
Theater	0465

EDUCATION
General	0515
Administration	0514
Adult and Continuing	0516
Agricultural	0517
Art	0273
Bilingual and Multicultural	0282
Business	0688
Community College	0275
Curriculum and Instruction	0727
Early Childhood	0518
Elementary	0524
Finance	0277
Guidance and Counseling	0519
Health	0680
Higher	0745
History of	0520
Home Economics	0278
Industrial	0521
Language and Literature	0279
Mathematics	0280
Music	0522
Philosophy of	0998
Physical	0523

Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0527
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0340
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Technology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS
Language	
General	0679
Ancient	0289
Linguistics	0290
Modern	0291
Literature	
General	0401
Classical	0294
Comparative	0295
Medieval	0297
Modern	0298
African	0316
American	0591
Asian	0305
Canadian (English)	0352
Canadian (French)	0355
English	0593
Germanic	0311
Latin American	0312
Middle Eastern	0315
Romance	0313
Slavic and East European	0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY
Philosophy	0422
Religion	
General	0318
Biblical Studies	0321
Clergy	0319
History of	0320
Philosophy of	0322
Theology	0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES
American Studies	0323
Anthropology	
Archaeology	0324
Cultural	0326
Physical	0327
Business Administration	
General	0310
Accounting	0272
Banking	0770
Management	0454
Marketing	0338
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	
General	0501
Agricultural	0503
Commerce-Business	0505
Finance	0508
History	0509
Labor	0510
Theory	0511
Folklore	0358
Geography	0366
Gerontology	0351
History	
General	0578

Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	
General	0615
International Law and Relations	0616
Public Administration	0617
Recreation	0814
Social Work	0452
Sociology	
General	0626
Criminology and Penology	0627
Demography	0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0631
Individual and Family Studies	0628
Industrial and Labor Relations	0629
Public and Social Welfare	0630
Social Structure and Development	0700
Theory and Methods	0344
Transportation	0709
Urban and Regional Planning	0999
Women's Studies	0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
Agriculture	
General	0473
Agronomy	0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition	0475
Animal Pathology	0476
Food Science and Technology	0359
Forestry and Wildlife	0478
Plant Culture	0479
Plant Pathology	0480
Plant Physiology	0817
Range Management	0777
Wood Technology	0746
Biology	
General	0306
Anatomy	0287
Biostatistics	0308
Botany	0309
Cell	0379
Ecology	0329
Entomology	0353
Genetics	0369
Limnology	0793
Microbiology	0410
Molecular	0307
Neuroscience	0317
Oceanography	0416
Physiology	0433
Radiation	0821
Veterinary Science	0778
Zoology	0472
Biophysics	
General	0786
Medical	0760

EARTH SCIENCES
Biogeochemistry	0425
Geochemistry	0996

Geodesy	0370
Geology	0372
Geophysics	0373
Hydrology	0388
Mineralogy	0411
Paleobotany	0345
Paleoecology	0426
Paleontology	0418
Paleozoology	0985
Palynology	0427
Physical Geography	0368
Physical Oceanography	0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
Environmental Sciences	0768
Health Sciences	
General	0566
Audiology	0300
Chemotherapy	0992
Dentistry	0567
Education	0350
Hospital Management	0769
Human Development	0758
Immunology	0982
Medicine and Surgery	0564
Mental Health	0347
Nursing	0569
Nutrition	0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology	0380
Occupational Health and Therapy	0354
Ophthalmology	0381
Pathology	0571
Pharmacology	0419
Pharmacy	0572
Physical Therapy	0382
Public Health	0573
Radiology	0574
Recreation	0575

Speech Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES
Pure Sciences	
Chemistry	
General	0485
Agricultural	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmaceutical	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0405
Physics	
General	0605
Acoustics	0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy	0798
Fluid and Plasma	0759
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0463
Applied Sciences	
Applied Mechanics	0346
Computer Science	0984

Engineering	
General	0537
Aerospace	0538
Agricultural	0539
Automotive	0540
Biomedical	0541
Chemical	0542
Civil	0543
Electronics and Electrical	0544
Heat and Thermodynamics	0348
Hydraulic	0545
Industrial	0546
Marine	0547
Materials Science	0794
Mechanical	0548
Metallurgy	0743
Mining	0551
Nuclear	0552
Packaging	0549
Petroleum	0765
Sanitary and Municipal	0554
System Science	0790
Geotechnology	0428
Operations Research	0796
Plastics Technology	0795
Textile Technology	0994

PSYCHOLOGY
General	0621
Behavioral	0384
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0989
Psychobiology	0349
Psychometrics	0632
Social	0451

♻

ABSTRACT

An Integration of Friendship and Social Support:
Relationships with Adjustment in College Students

Vicki B. Veroff, Ph.D.
Concordia University, 1996

A conceptual integration of friendship and social support, explored via factor analysis, was examined in relation to adjustment in 242 undergraduate university men and women. Despite considerable overlap between theoretical components of adult friendship and social support, empirically these two areas have remained quite distinct. The present study sought to consolidate the two important research areas, looking at sex differences and the ways in which interpersonal resources can facilitate adjustment. Subjects were recruited from two local universities for this questionnaire-based study. Participants provided information about their best same-sex friend, their social network as a whole, a romantic relationship (if applicable) and various aspects of adjustment, including depression, self-esteem, quality of life and physical symptoms. Best friend and social network items, respectively, were grouped into subscales representing previously postulated dimensions of friendship and social support. These subscales were entered into exploratory factor analyses, separately for best friend and for network, to determine whether as predicted, friendship and support would combine conceptually. The factors which emerged were entered into hierarchical multiple regressions in order to investigate the connections between these relationship factors, daily hassles and

adjustment. The results suggest that relationship factors, particularly those offered by a large, high-quality social network, offer protective benefits for college students. Further, having a trusted, satisfying best friendship and a high-quality romantic relationship appears to enhance certain aspects of adjustment for students as well. Daily hassles were found to detract significantly from the well-being of young men and women. From a theoretical perspective, support was gained for viewing friendship and support not as distinct constructs, but rather, as joint contributors to the phenomena of interpersonal relationships. Practical implications include the need to examine ways of helping college students with small, less than adequate social networks build larger, more beneficial sets of resources.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dorothy Markiewicz, for her thoughtful guidance throughout this project. I also thank the other internal members of my thesis committee, Bill Brender and Bill Bukowski, for their insightful commentaries on the manuscript. Without this valuable feedback, my thesis would be a work of lesser quality.

I am forever indebted to my ace statistician, Jacky Boivin, who has served above and beyond the call (and I do mean many calls) of duty as both friend and advisor. This thesis would have been impossible without her patient explanations and recommendations.

Both thanks and apologies are due to my children, Amanda and Daniel, for tolerating my repeated disappearances into the office to "work on my thesis". From here on in my time is devoted to you, without thoughts of dissertations dancing in my head.

To my husband Jeff, I once again give my undying gratitude for providing the means to an end. Without the computers, modem, printers and paper (yes, I know, 1500 sheets of paper in one month), etc., this endeavour would have been impossible. I also thank him for guiding me through the endless formatting and reformatting...and reformatting...of this thesis. In return, a small part of my time from here on in will be devoted to you, too.

Finally, I wish to thank all those who participated in this project. It is only due to their collaboration that the interesting data in this study could be obtained.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

The human condition is a social condition. From our earliest attachments in infancy to a growing need for peers and finally intimate partners, humans live and develop in an interpersonal milieu. The importance of this interpersonal world is reflected in the vast amount of literature on this topic. Two major areas of study, social support and friendship, have accumulated independently, but with minor exceptions have yet to be integrated conceptually or empirically. The present study attempted to integrate these important constructs—friendship and social support—into a unified model of the social world, examining empirically the relationship of this model to adjustment in college men and women. Given that sex differences in interpersonal relationships have been reported extensively in the past, an important focus of the present study was to compare and contrast the proposed model of the social world in men and women, looking at sex differences in the nature of personal relationships as well as in the connection between such relationships and adjustment.

Various conceptualizations of social support will be summarized followed by a review of some key social support research, including data on sex differences, the whole of which is intended to illustrate current work in the area. A similar presentation of friendship theory and research will provide the opportunity to compare and contrast friendship and support both as theoretical constructs and as the foci of empirical research. These reviews should make clear the gaps that remain to be filled in each domain as well as the means by which these two major concepts can be integrated.

1

An additional focus of the present study was to examine how friendship might play a role in buffering the effects of daily hassles in the lives of university students. Much of the literature on social support concerns adaptation in the face of various life events, whether major or minor, and the ways in which stressors and social resources interact to impact on adjustment. Comparable research has not been undertaken directly in the friendship literature. Thus, the present study sought to clarify the role friendship and social support play in potentially alleviating or influencing daily hassles.

Social Support Theories in Historical Perspective

Within the last 20 years, recognition of the possible supportive properties of personal relationships has grown. Based on physiological models, Cassel (1974) and Cobb (1976) first raised the issue of whether environmental factors such as social interaction could counteract the effects of stressful life events, thereby influencing human resistance and vulnerability to illness. Research in this area flourished, and psychologists began to ponder the nature and mechanisms of social support. Nevertheless, the empirical work on social support has far exceeded the rate of theoretical advancements. Interestingly, although the former has generally centred on a restricted set of support functions and their effects on adaptation, the latter can be seen to include a wide range of dimensions which overlap with much of what has been written on friendship. These parallels will be addressed further on in this paper.

2

Structural versus functional support

A basic premise in the social support literature is that support can be separated into structural and functional components. The issue of network provisions and their relative contribution to adjustment is subsumed under the heading of functional support. Functional support refers to the various benefits available to an individual from social network members. In an approach reminiscent of Sullivan's (1953) work, theorists have occasionally described social support as the degree to which a person's basic social needs (e.g. affection, belonging, security) are gratified through interaction with others (Kaplan, Cassel, & Gore, 1977; Thoits, 1982). Thus, support provisions have been postulated which would serve to meet one's social needs, such as affect, affirmation and aid (Kahn & Antonucci, 1980), or uniqueness of the person, intimacy, mutual responsibility/caring and the provision of support, affection and security (Dean & Lin, 1977; Kaplan, Cassel, & Gore, 1977).

In the empirical literature, a basic set of support functions has been adopted by most authors, consisting of instrumental aid, which includes material and financial assistance as well as the provision of needed services; information or appraisal support, referring to assistance with defining, understanding and coping with events; and emotional support, which includes comfort and empathy (e.g. Dunkel-Schetter & Wortman, 1981; Holahan & Moos, 1981; Kaplan, Cassel, & Gore, 1977; Thoits, 1986; Veiel, 1985).

Two other support provisions have also been used in research but with

3

less frequency than the previous three. Social companionship (Cohen, Sherrod, & Clark, 1987; Cohen & Wills, 1985; Hays & Oxley, 1986; Weinberg & Marlowe, Jr., 1983) consists of spending time with others in leisure and recreational activities, which might be presumed to foster feelings of acceptance and belonging, and which may serve as a distraction from disturbing thoughts or events. This component of a relationship, while postulated as a support dimension, is most often seen as a dimension of friendship (see review to follow).

The second support dimension to be used somewhat infrequently is esteem support (Cohen, Sherrod, & Clark, 1987; Cohen & Wills, 1985; Mitchell & Hodson, 1986), which refers to the knowledge that one is valued and accepted. Despite its seemingly inherent importance, esteem support has sometimes been confused or combined with the term emotional support. For example, the description of "emotional support" provided by Cohen and McKay (1984) emphasized self-evaluation and esteem-building rather than emotionally supportive behaviours such as comfort or sympathy. Thoits' (1986) definition of "socioemotional aid" included elements of emotional support, esteem support and belonging, and the two former properties were clearly encompassed in Wallston et. al's (1983) "expressive/affective" support functions. Emotional and esteem support will be isolated here (and have been by other authors) for conceptual clarity and in recognition of the practical value of each construct; there seem to be clear differences between assistance in emotional adaptation

4

(emotional support) and direct contributions to or enhancement of self-worth (esteem support). That is, emotional support is what is needed when one is upset or requires solace. Esteem can be fostered by emotional support in that if one is made to feel better and more able to cope, one's sense of mastery and thus self-worth is enhanced. There are, however, more direct means of building esteem which can occur via personal relationships. In the face of stressful life events, esteem support can serve to counterbalance feelings of helplessness and self-deprecation (Cohen & Wills, 1985). It should be noted, however, that esteem-building does not necessarily have to serve a supportive function; even in the absence of negative life events, one can benefit from being encouraged to look at one's positive attributes, receiving compliments and being asked for (valued) advice. As such, esteem "support" can be considered a dimension of social support as well as a more general function of personal relationships (see discussion on friendship dimensions, to follow).

The other category of social provisions in the social support literature is labelled structural support. Structural support refers to the underlying organization of an individual's social network and his/her degree of affiliation with that network. For example, network size and frequency of contact indicate how many potential resources one has available and how often these resources are actually used (i.e. network involvement), respectively. Density refers to the degree to which members of a social network know each other, thereby forming a social subgroup to which one belongs. In a network of 20 people, density

would be very high if most of the people knew each other (e.g. a group of friends who interact both as a group and in various subsets), whereas the density rating would be zero if there were no mutual relationships (i.e. an individual with a set of independent relationships). Finally, social integration is the individual's membership and involvement in community and group activities (e.g. religious affiliations, clubs, political organizations).

These structural properties reveal little about the specific social mechanisms which might operate within one's network. However, according to anomie theory (Durkheim, 1951), membership in socially cohesive groups (whether dense friendship groups or social organizations) allows people to derive rules of acceptable conduct which prevent them from experiencing feelings of uncertainty and despair. In a similar vein, Cohen and Wills (1985) suggested that large social networks yield regular positive experiences and a set of stable, socially rewarded roles within the community; the results of such provisions can include positive affect, a sense of stability and predictability in one's life, and feelings of enhanced self-worth. In support of this hypothesis, small low-density networks have been found to contribute to greater feelings of loneliness (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980; Stokes, 1985), presumably because they offer fewer resources as well as limited group experiences. Kohut (1984) viewed supportive interactions with network members as bolstering one's sense of self and fostering more effective adjustment during periods of life stress (e.g. transitions). Finally, symbolic interactionists (e.g. Mead, 1934; Stryker,

6

1980) postulated that self-identity is derived from and maintained by role relationships. In other words, social interaction promotes favourable self-evaluation and the development of social identities, both of which are important facets of psychological well-being.

Each of these theories suggests that membership in a social network can facilitate well-being, and that the degree of functional support available is linked to the structural properties of the network (structural support). This hypothesis makes intuitive sense from a practical perspective as well: there is a greater likelihood that one's needs can be met in a large network than in a smaller network. As noted by Gottlieb (1985), a single friend or family member can be severely taxed by demands to furnish all relationship provisions, whereas when the burden is shared, individual resources may be more able to give of themselves. It is hypothesized that in the present study, network factors will make a greater contribution to adjustment than will individual relationship factors.

The social support dimensions used in this study thus included the structural features of network size, density, network involvement and social integration as well as the functional dimensions material aid, advice and emotional support. Esteem support was also included as a functional support provision, although an alternate point of view on this dimension was considered, as noted above. Some of the empirical work using these support dimensions will be summarized below.

7

Sex Differences in the Nature of Social Support

Sex differences have received relatively little attention in the social support literature (Stokes & Wilson, 1984). The available data seem to support the contention, described in 1949 by sociologist Talcott Parsons, that women's roles tend to be "expressive" (i.e. emotional, intimate) whereas men take on a more "instrumental" role (i.e. rational, task-oriented). Even in modern university samples, when gender differences might be expected to have diminished significantly due to the "equal rights [for both sexes]" movement, women have still been found more likely than men to provide or receive emotional support (Burda Jr., Vaux, & Schill, 1984; Hays & Oxley, 1986; Hirsch, 1979; Janicki, Smith, & Rose-Kasnor, 1990[1]; Stokes & Wilson, 1984), to share confidences (Burke & Weir, 1978), to spend time with their support persons (Hays & Oxley, 1986) and to rate their social networks more favourably (e.g. Burda Jr., Vaux, & Schill, 1984; Cohen et al., 1984; Hays & Oxley, 1986; Lepore, 1992). In one study, women reported significantly larger social networks than men as well (Burda Jr., Vaux, & Schill, 1984). Finally, in a study of male and female managers in the workplace, McDonald (1988) found that women viewed support as being unhelpful if there was no consideration of feelings involved, whereas men expressed dissatisfaction with support if there was no provision of direct aid.

---

[1] Although this study was on "friendship behaviour", it is being included here because support was specifically assessed.

These data suggest a sex difference in the perceived value of different support dimensions, along the lines of the expressive/instrumental dichotomy. It should be pointed out, however, that at least two studies on college students found that men as well as women were more satisfied with relationships when expressive qualities were present (e.g. emotional dependence, relationship awareness, self-disclosure) (Frazier & Esterly, 1990; Jones, 1991), and Monsour (1992) found that affection was an important predictor of relationship satisfaction for male students. Thus, the expressive/ instrumental dichotomy, though seemingly pervasive, is neither universal nor absolute.

Men and women also seem to differ in the sources from whom they are willing or able to accept support. For example, Argyle and Furnham (1983) found that the majority of women's support came from friends and family members, whereas men reported getting more support from spouses and work superiors; each gender was thus supported in the domain to which it traditionally "belonged" and felt comfortable. Similarly, both Craig (1988) and Inglis (1988) found that men were more likely than women to receive support from a superior at work, although there were no sex differences in other sources of support. Finally, in a study by Stokes and Wilson (1984), men were found to require a close confidant relationship in order to accept or receive social support; conversely, women were able to receive support from any and all sources. Clearly, much remains to be learned about the ways in which gender and social support are related. One goal of the present study was to shed more

9

light on this interesting issue.

Friendship Theories in Historical Perspective

Despite extensive research on the determinants and parameters of social

interaction, little emphasis has been placed on the nature and functions of adult

friendship per se. Most of the empirical work in adult interpersonal relations has

focused on testing theories such as social reinforcement (Byrne & Clore, 1970;

Lott & Lott, 1974), social exchange (Thibault & Kelley, 1959) and equity (Hatfield

& Traupmann, 1981; Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1977), or examining

singular dimensions of friendship in detail, such as similarity (e.g. Bailey, Finney,

& Helm, 1975; Black, 1974) and self-disclosure (e.g Aries & Johnson, 1983;

Habif, 1982; Hays, 1985; Stokes, Fuehrer, & Childs, 1980; Williams, 1985).

With respect to theory, a great deal of attention has been given to general

social development or to peer relations in children (e.g. popularity; social skills

deficits), without a comparable focus on friendship in adults. Nevertheless,

certain of the extant theories can be extended to address the construct of adult

friendship. For example, Sullivan (1953), a psychiatrist who also wrote about

social and personality development in children, developed a model focusing on

the concept of social needs which have the potential to be fulfilled via

relationships including but not limited to friendships. Sullivan postulated the

existence of a number of relationship functions, including affection, self-

disclosure, companionship and the enhancement of self-worth, each of which

10

was hypothesized to meet a particular social need.

Sullivan made an important original contribution in that he emphasized the value of individual friendships as opposed to peers in general. Sullivan thus contributed to the eventual realization that group factors (e.g. popularity) notwithstanding, having just one reciprocal close friend can positively affect both general and social self-esteem (Bukowski & Newcomb, 1987; McGuire & Weisz, 1982). The present study will provide the opportunity to compare the relative benefits of a best same-sex friendship and a complete social network to self-esteem and other facets of adjustment. As noted earlier, it is hypothesized that for young adults, social network provisions will be a better predictor of well-being than what is offered by a same-sex best friend.

A second notable theory of relationships was developed by Weiss (1974). Weiss' work was not in the area of friendship per se, but he described six important social functions which he stipulated were necessary for individuals to feel supported and avoid loneliness. These functions included attachment, social integration, reassurance of worth, reliable alliance, guidance, and the opportunity for nurturance.

Weiss associated each of his provisions with a particular resource class (e.g. friends provide social integration, family members offer reliable alliance). However, the specific connections between resource class and social provision have yet to be demonstrated empirically. The possibility exists that each function can be fulfilled by multiple contacts, or that several provisions can occur

11

within the context of a single relationship. It can be hypothesized that although certain social resources may serve an exclusive function (e.g. a buddy for tennis, a source of support for a circumscribed problem), most relationship provisions can be obtained from a wide range of relationships, and close friends in particular have the potential to fulfill most or all of Weiss' functions. This question will be addressed in the present study.

Based on the work of Sullivan (1953) and/or Weiss (1974), various authors have postulated the existence of key friendship dimensions such as emotional security/support and the provision of a context for social growth (e.g. Hartup & Sancilio, 1986). Other authors have described interpersonal relationships from the perspective of relationship goals or rewards, in the tradition of social exchange and equity theories (e.g. Berscheid & Walster, 1978; Blau, 1964; Homans, 1961; Thibault & Kelly, 1959). For example, the relationship dimensions suggested by Foa and Foa (1974), with the exception of love, tend to be largely instrumental in nature (i.e. money, goods, services, information, status). In some cases, new ideas about friendship have developed out of multiple sources, combining the more interpersonally-based dimensions of Sullivan (1953) and Weiss (1974) with the reward-based focus of exchange and equity theorists. Such models included instrumental functions along with components such as enhanced self-worth, intimacy/affection and sociability/companionship (e.g. Furman & Buhrmester, 1985; LaGaipa, 1977).

All the models described thus far have attempted to describe the

12

functional aspects of relationships such as friendship, but none adequately sought to conceptualize the complex nature of adult friendship. For example, none of these earlier authors fully explained the specific ways in which adult friendship might enhance well-being, translating these rewards into meaningful dimensions, and using these dimensions to distinguish between different adult relationship types (e.g. close friends, casual friends, marital partners).

One author has developed a more comprehensive theory of the nature and properties of nonkin relationships. Wright (1978; 1984; 1985) was the first and perhaps only theorist to specifically address the domain of adult friendship. Wright's basic assumption is that relationships (e.g. friendships, romantic dyads) are formed and maintained because they are rewarding, which is a direct derivative of social reinforcement theory (Byrne & Clore, 1970; Lott & Lott, 1974). His approach has been to specify a set of largely nontangible interpersonal rewards which serve to fulfill individuals' self-referent motives. Self-referent motives express the individual's concern for his or her own well-being and worth, and friends are thought to provide a means of fulfilling or facilitating the expression of such concerns.

Wright (1978; 1984; 1985) stipulated that not every relationship can fulfill all motives, and that each motive will have different degrees of import for each individual, depending on his or her life history and current life situation. Given these qualifications, Wright specified a set of relationship components or functions which are associated with the fulfilment of the self-referent motives

(see Table 1), derived from both intuitive and empirical sources (see Wright, 1984 for details). After a number of revisions, his model includes 13 functions or dimensions, nine of which are relevant to the study of adult friendship[2].

The first two dimensions are not rewards per se, but together provide a general overview of relationship strength. Voluntary Interdependence (VID), the single most sensitive indicator of relationship strength (Wright, 1984), includes the commitment of two people to spend time together in the absence of pressures or constraints to do so, and the associated overlap of their lives. Person-Qua-Person (PQP) is the extent to which a relationship is characterized by mutual personalized interest and concern, reflected in members' response to each other as unique, genuine and irreplaceable. Interestingly, Wright's person-qua-person is quite similar to Ainsworth's (1989) definition of affectional bonds, although the latter was derived from the literature on attachment. She described the affectional bond as a relatively long-enduring tie in which the partner is valued as a unique individual and is interchangeable with none other. It should be noted that voluntary interdependence and person-qua-person together differentiate most clearly between levels of friendship (e.g. close versus casual friends).

---

[2] The remaining scales serve the purpose of differentiating between relationship types (e.g. between friendship, romantic relationships and marriage), thus are not relevant to the study of friendship alone.

Table 1. Dimensions of Wright's Model (Lea, 1989)

Relationship Strength

Voluntary Interdependence   - commitment to spend time together
Person-Qua-Person   - view of partner as unique, special

Interpersonal Rewards

Utility Value   - willingness of partner to provide time, resources and assistance
Ego Support Value   - partner contribute to feelings of self-worth and competence
Stimulation Value   - partner is interesting, stimulating
Self-Affirmation Value   - partner facilitates recognition and expression of highly valued self-attributes
Security Value   - trust and loyalty

Tension or Strain

Maintenance Difficulty   - tension or strain associated with partner's personality or traits
    - tension or strain associated with impersonal (i.e. situational) factors

Relationship Differentiation

Exclusiveness   - proprietary expectation of exclusivity
Salience of Emotional Expression   - the role of affection in the dyad
Social Regulation   - regulation of relationship by social norms and expectations
Permanence   - anticipation of difficulties associated with attempts at dissolution

Wright (1984; 1985) goes on to describe five rewards or values derived from close relationships, which contribute to the fulfilment of the self-referent motives. The first reward, Utility Value (UV), refers to a friend's willingness to use his or her time and personal resources to aid the fulfilment of the partner's needs and activities. Stimulation Value (SV) is the extent to which an interesting, stimulating friend encourages the expansion of one's knowledge, perspective or repertoire of favoured activities, thereby facilitating the growth and positive elaboration of one's self-attributes.

Security Value (SecV) refers to the belief that one's partner is safe and nonthreatening, that he or she would not betray trust, humiliate or draw attention to one's points of weakness or self-doubt. According to Wright (1984), the development of a significant relationship probably requires a minimum level of Security Value. Interestingly, Sullivan (1953) also considered trust to be a critical component underlying the development of self-disclosure and intimacy in friendships (Buhrmester & Furman, 1986). Other authors have viewed trust similarly (e.g. Monsour, 1992; Reis & Shaver, 1988). In fact, it might be questioned whether trust, or security value, is a relationship provision per se, or rather, a necessary precondition which can dictate and later reflect the overall quality of a relationship. This prerequisite for the development of intimate relations may lie beneath conscious awareness in most individuals. As noted by Monsour (1992), this lack of awareness may explain the fact that whereas trust has been identified as contributing significantly to the definition and direction of

16

friendship (Bigelow, 1977; Davidson & Duberman, 1982), as well as to satisfaction with male friendships (Jones, 1991), trust is infrequently mentioned spontaneously by subjects in friendship research as a component of intimacy (Helgeson, Shaver, & Dyer, 1987; Waring et al., 1980). A secondary goal of the present study was to understand the role of trust (security value) in close friendships and social networks.

Wright's Ego Support Value (ESV) is the tendency of a friend to help his or her partner maintain an impression of him/herself as competent and worthwhile; that is, the individual is helped to see and evaluate the self in a positive way. Finally, Self-Affirmation Value (SAV) refers to a friend's facilitation of the expression and recognition of one's most important and highly valued self-attributes. Ego support value and self-affirmation value reflect the grounds of friendship in which an individual can test out various parts of him or herself, to find strengths that may not have found expression in other relationships (Rubin, 1985). Ego support and self-affirmation also comprise that part of relationships which ego psychologists term the "self-object". In close relationships, self-objects such as friends, lovers and spouses are used to maintain, restore or consolidate one's internal experience. These significant others confirm one's belief in the self and provide a continuing sense of inherent value and worth via affirmation, admiration and compassion (Solomon, 1990).

In Wright's theory, relationships can also be characterized by certain problems or strains, termed Maintenance Difficulties (Wright & Conneran, 1989).

17

Maintenance difficulties may be interpersonal in nature (e.g. personality conflicts), or due to external or circumstantial factors which serve to keep friends apart (e.g. relocation, time constraints).

Finally, Global Favorability (GF), originally meant as a correction factor for a possible halo effect, reflects the degree to which a person responds to his or her friend in a globally positive or negative way. While this scale has some value as a general indicator of friendship, it has been found to overlap somewhat with maintenance difficulty items (Lea, 1989) and as such would likely benefit from some minor revisions.

Wright's (1978; 1984; 1985) model has received some empirical support using the Acquaintance Description Form (ADF), a 65-item questionnaire designed to tap each of the proposed relationship functions. In one paper, Wright (1985) reported obtaining test-retest reliabilities on the ADF of .84 and higher on almost all scales (exceptions were .72 for maintenance difficulty and .79 for security value, both in men). Cronbach's alphas were all over .83, again with the exception of maintenance difficulty (.76). Similar results were obtained by Wright and Keple (1981), who also reported split-half reliabilities from .79 to .94.

The ADF was used in exploratory factor analyses by Lea (1989) on 105 single undergraduate men and women, with interesting results. Using eight scales, Lea obtained a four-factor solution which included Friendship Strength (voluntary interdependence plus person-qua-person), Maintenance Difficulty

(high maintenance difficulty, negative global favorability), a Utilitarian Rewards factor (high utility value, moderate voluntary interdependence and ego support), and a Self-Referent Rewards factor (high stimulation value, moderate self-affirmation and ego support values). Lea (1989) concluded that Wright's (1978; 1984; 1985) model was operationalized and supported adequately by the ADF in most respects, but that it could be improved. Specifically, Lea noted that direct evidence for the model's predictive validity had yet to be obtained, and that it lacked the detail necessary to allow adequate specification and testing of a particular factor structure.

In a more recent study, Wright reported principal components analyses on a large sample of university students, approximately half male and half female, describing their same-sex best friends with the ADF (Duck & Wright, 1993). All of Wright's subscales, including the relationship differentiation scales, were used in this exploratory analysis. Two factors with eigenvalues greater than 2.00 emerged; the first, which was described as reflecting a strong, rewarding relationship, comprised all the friendship rewards plus Emotional Expression. The second factor seemed to reflect possessiveness and enmeshment in the relationship. It is hypothesized that a primary factor reflecting relationship strength or quality will also emerge in the present study, although it is uncertain which subscales will load on this factor, given the inconsistency in previous factor analyses with the ADF and the fact that social support dimensions are being added to the measure in the present study.

Wright's model has a number of worthwhile features. First, it is unique in both its breadth and depth relative to other theories of adult friendship. Wright made an original contribution to the field as well in that he extended the concepts of social reinforcement and exchange theories beyond the concrete to address the specific nontangible, self-enhancing aspects of friendship. Further, not only did Wright conceptualize relationships in a new way, but he followed through with attempts to operationalize and empirically verify his proposed set of friendship values. Thus, Wright's model and dimensions served as a guide for the conceptualizations and methodology of the current investigation. The relationship dimensions chosen for study thus included Wright's Voluntary Interdependence (companionship), Person-Qua-Person, Security Value, Stimulation Value and Maintenance Difficulty. Certain of Wright's subscales can be said to overlap with the social support dimensions being studied, thus were used as such: Utility Value (concrete or material aid) and Ego Support as well as Self-Affirmation Value (combining to comprise esteem support). Finally, five more dimensions were included based on the work of other friendship theorists. These dimensions consist of Affection, Confiding, Emotional Support, Advice and Satisfaction with the Relationship or Network.

Sex Differences in the Nature of Friendship

Unlike the case in the social support literature, behavioural and attitudinal sex differences in friendship have been subject to extensive investigation. As

20

noted by Wright (1988), there may be a tendency for researchers to exaggerate observed differences. Nevertheless, the sheer number and variety of studies reporting such differences attest to some areas of distinctiveness between men and women. Wright himself, in an attempt to challenge the prevailing dichotomization of men's and women's friendships as "instrumental" and "expressive", respectively, found that although not less instrumental, women did tend to be more expressive than men (Duck & Wright, 1993). In that study, women's friendships were described as more affirming, secure, emotionally expressive and generally favourable than were men's. Unfortunately, although sex differences in friendship can be said to exist, there is little information about the possible implications of these differences for adjustment. As mentioned earlier, one important goal of the present study was to examine the relative impact of both friendship and social support functions on adaptation in men versus women.

Early views on friendship, based less on empirical data than on intuition, tended to characterize men's relationships as ideal, whereas women were considered too immature, unstable and jealous to have "real" relationships (Tiger, 1969). In the more recent literature, men's friendships have been noted not for their superiority but for their shortcomings (Rubin, 1985). This new perspective, biased in its own right (Wood, 1993), can be seen as a common thread through much of the ensuing review.

The very nature of friendship, or what are considered to be important

21

aspects of a relationship, seems to vary for male and female dyads. Women report having greater expectations from friendship than do men (Rubin, 1985), a finding which appears to hold cross-culturally (Morse, 1983). Morse noted that when asked to rate the importance of various relationship characteristics in terms of what they would require in a good same-sex friend, Australian and Brazilian women rated almost every trait (e.g. empathy, emotional support, trust, companionship) as being more important than did men.

Perhaps as a result of their high expectations, women seem less likely than men to sustain limited relationships and seek out friends who can serve a broad spectrum of functions (Buhrke & Fuqua, 1987; Rubin, 1985; Wright, 1982). They may prefer having a select number of high quality friends than numerous less gratifying relationships. In support of this hypothesis, Kraus et al. (1993) found that in their sample of college students, women tended to have fewer friends and engaged in fewer activities with friends but described their relationships as higher in quality than did men. Men, who have often been socialized to avoid personal disclosure and feelings and who spend much of their childhood in action-centred, competitive group situations (Pogrebin, 1988), may expect satisfaction of fewer needs and thus tolerate less "complete" relationships than women. In fact, in Rubin's (1985) study, men reported seeking out other men for recreational activities and to discuss "weighty" matters (e.g. work, politics, intellectual concerns), while women were chosen to share their softer, emotional side. Women did not compartmentalize their relationships

in this way.

One of friendship's most well-researched issues is that of gender differences in nonromantic intimacy. Lewis (1978) defined intimacy as "mutual self-disclosure and other kinds of verbal sharing, as declarations of liking or loving the other, and as demonstrations of affection such as hugging and nongenital caressing". Various researchers have found a greater tendency for women to emphasize the personal, intimate elements of a relationship such as self-disclosure, support and emotional quality, whereas men's friendships are more likely to be characterized by shared interests and mutual activities (Ashton, 1980; Hays, 1984, 1985; Helgeson, Shaver, & Dyer, 1987; Rubin, 1985; Williams, 1985; Wright, 1982). Affection is also more likely to be present in the same-sex relationships of women (Hays, 1984). In a study by Buhrke and Fuqua (1987), female university students described their same-sex friendships as being closer than male students described theirs, and women reported having better knowledge of their female friends than men reported having of their male friends. These results suggest a greater propensity on the part of women to engage in and foster empathy via intimate exchanges.

Studies on self-disclosure elicited findings similar to the data on general intimacy. Johnson and Aries (1983) found that college women conversed more and in greater depth than did college men, although some men did converse about intimate topics in depth. Aries and Johnson (1983), studying the parents of college students, found strikingly similar results. Sex differences in confiding

23

were also noted by Williams (1985), Gitter and Black (1976), and by Wright (1989) in a review article; however, Gitter and Black (1976) noted that in their university sample, men confided less than women about intimate topics but not with respect to superficial information.

In terms of the role disclosure plays in personal relationship development, Hays (1985) found that women in his university sample engaged in personal communications earlier in the friendship process than did men. However, Stokes, Fuehrer and Childs (1980), who also studied a university population, noted that the men in their sample were more willing to confide in strangers whereas the women would rather have confided in close others. This rather unique finding implies different levels of comfort for men and women vis a vis confiding in close versus nonclose others. Men may prefer self-disclosure to be a less prominent feature of their ongoing relationships, whereas women favour the opposite and tend to lead the friendship in that direction. This possibility is consistent with the idea that men are socialized to view personal revelations as an indication of weakness; disclosure in situations where a relationship with the confidant is unlikely (e.g. to strangers) means that the risk of eventual belittlement is greatly reduced. Although it is impossible to determine the origin of such behaviour, the proposed study will test the hypotheses that women are more likely to disclose intimate information to best friends and network members than are men. Further, based on the discussion above, it is predicted that reported intimacy in general (e.g. emotional support, affection) will be less

24

present for men than for women.

There are studies focusing on various aspects of friendship in which sex differences were not obtained. For example, in response to questions on the meaning and value of friendship, young men and women in Tesch and Martin's (1983) sample did not differ in the characteristics or dimensions of friendship generated. Rose (1985) also found minimal sex differences in college students' descriptions of same-sex friendships, including qualities of acceptance, help, intimacy and companionship. The only significant difference was in loyalty, which was a greater expectation on the part of women. Hays (1985) found sex differences on some aspects of friendship behaviour (cited earlier) in his college sample, but found no differences in friendship intensity ratings, or in the costs and benefits perceived by men and women to be associated with close relationships. Ashton (1980) also found some sex differences, cited above, but a greater number of similarities were found between men and women, including intimacy, emotional expressiveness, commitment, communication and like temperament. Wright (1982) pointed out that in his study, sex differences became smaller and fewer as friendships increased in duration and strength. He concluded that there are probably more similarities than differences between women and men.

In a study by Reis, Senchak and Solomon (1985), it was concluded that men are as capable as women of interacting intimately, given a conducive environment or set of conditions. These authors asked both members of same-

25

sex dyads to report retrospectively on the conversation they had while walking to the research laboratory. Analyses of these reports revealed that men's "free" social interactions were less intimate than those of women. However, when these men and women were specifically asked to engage in an intimate conversation with their same-sex best friend, no sex differences as rated by self and trained observers emerged. Based on these data and the finding by Caldwell and Peplau (1982) that men and women have a comparable desire for intimate friends, Reis, Senchak and Solomon (1985) postulated that while equally capable, men may simply be more likely than women to choose not to interact intimately, particularly if the situation is not quite appropriate.

In fact, the research on sex differences does provide some support for these general assertions. It can be seen that although the friendships of men and women are clearly not identical, with some features more important to or present in each type of relationship, there are certainly important similarities. Many men desire close friendships (Caldwell & Peplau, 1982), recognize the value of intimacy in such relationships (e.g. Ashton 1980; Tesch & Martin, 1983), and derive some support from them (Burke & Weir, 1978; Hays & Oxley, 1986; Hirsch, 1979; Stokes & Wilson, 1984; Waring & Patton, 1984). Men are obviously capable of having intimate conversations both spontaneously (Aries & Johnson, 1983; Johnson & Aries, 1983) and upon request (Reis, Senchak, & Solomon, 1985), even though such conversations occur less spontaneously and at a lower frequency than in women's friendships (Aries & Johnson, 1983;

Johnson & Aries, 1983).

Clearly, men have the capacity to understand and enact all dimensions of friendship. As Hays (1985) stated, the sex differences often observed may be more stylistic than substantial. It can be suggested that although women more often emphasize the intimate dimensions of friendship, both in terms of their needs and expectations, some men do recognize and express these requirements. Certainly men are presumed to experience some of the same socioemotional needs as women; men may be conditioned via the socialization process to repress, deny or fear such feelings, tendencies which are reflected in the nature of many male friendships (Aries & Johnson, 1983; Johnson & Aries, 1983). Thus, whereas men may be socialized to repress certain of their social needs, or at least to expect that these needs will remain unfulfilled, women seem to be socialized to value closeness and emotional expressiveness in good friends; through experience, these latter characteristics become important needs which friendships are expected to satisfy. Some support for this hypothesis comes from a recent study on affiliation motivation in adolescents (Wong & Csikszentmihalyi, 1991). Both male and female adolescents with high affiliation motivation desired to be with friends more than those with low motivation. However, gender rather than affiliative orientation predicted the extent to which the sample actually spent time with friends versus alone. That is, girls spent significantly more time with friends and less time alone than did boys, regardless of affiliative orientation. It is also noteworthy that whereas highly

27

affiliative girls appeared to feel better (e.g. happier, more involved, feeling better about themselves) than less affiliative girls, the reverse was true for boys: Highly affiliative boys reported more negative feeling states than those with low affiliative orientations. This last finding may reflect the dissatisfaction associated with unmet needs; these highly affiliative boys expressed a strong wish for social companionship, but were perhaps unlikely to have those needs gratified in the context of typical male friendships. From a different perspective, these boys may have been socialized to value independence and therefore may have regarded their "inappropriate" need for their friends as signs of weakness or inadequacy.

In support of the position that men desire and are capable of having intimate relationships in the right circumstances, it should be noted that men's same-sex friendships may not be their closest relationships. Given the effects of socialization and role expectations, it may be particularly difficult for two men to express and meet each other's intimate needs. Several authors have shown that men prefer women as confidants (e.g. Helgeson, Shaver, & Dyer, 1987) or best friends (Rose, 1985; Rubin, 1985) and find women warmer and more empathic than men (e.g. Gibbs, Auerbach, & Fox, 1980). It may be, then, that in most cases men's closest relationships do not occur with other members of their gender, but with female partners, whether romantic or Platonic. The present study was not able to study this possibility directly, since in order to avoid the issue of sexual involvement, the current focus was limited to same-sex best

28

friends. However, using a subgroup of the main sample, the potential benefits of

an opposite-sex intimate relationship above and beyond the effects of a best

same-sex friend (and social network) on adjustment were examined. These

analyses provided one way of looking at the benefits to men of a relationship

with a male best friend versus a girlfriend (and the opposite was examined for

women)[3].

A Comparison of The Dimensions of Friendship and Social Support

When comparing the bodies of literature on friendship and social support,

there emerges a distinct similarity between descriptions of each construct, i.e.

the functional dimensions of friendship and the provisions of support. Table 2

provides a summary of some of the dimensions postulated by theorists in each

domain. The most obvious correspondence occurs in relation to the first support

provision, Instrumental Aid; although conceptualized primarily as a facet of

social support, almost every friendship theorist has touched on this dimension.

In fact, instrumental help has generally been the first support dimension to be

included along with other relationship dimensions in studies of friendship,

usually in relation to children or young adolescents (e.g. Bukowski, Hoza, &

Boivin, 1994; Furman & Buhrmester, 1985). Information/appraisal was included

---

[3] These analyses made an assumption of heterosexual orientation, generally supported by making cross-reference to the Social Network Questionnaire. The possible incidence of homosexual relationships in this sample would therefore be too small to make a significant difference in the results.

Table 2. A Comparison of Friendship and Social Support Dimensions

	Friendship		Social Su
Dimension	Designation(s)	Author(s)	Designation(s)
Instrumental Aid	Instrumental Aid Goods/Services/Money Utility Value	- LaGaipa, 1971 - Furman & Buhrmester, 1985 - Foa & Foa, 1974 - Wright, 1978, 1984, 1985	Aid Tangible Aid
Advice/ Shared Information	Information Guidance Stimulation Value	- Foa & Foa, 1974 - Weiss, 1974 - Wright, 1984, 1985	Information/ Appraisal Support
Emotional Support	Emotional Security And Support	- Hartup & Sancilio, 1986	Support Socioemotional Aid Emotional Support
Esteem Support	Increased Self-Worth Identity Status Reassurance of Worth Ego Support Value/ Self-Affirmation Value Enhanced Self-Worth	- Sullivan, 1953 - LaGaipa, 1971 - Foa & Foa, 1974 - Weiss, 1974 - Wright, 1984, 1985 - Furman & Buhrmester, 1985	Affirmation Esteem Support

Companionship	Sociability
	Social Integration/
	  Opportunity for Nurturance
	Voluntary Interdependence
	Companionship/
	  Opportunity for Nurturance
	Social Companionship
		- LaGaipa, 1971
		
		- Weiss, 1974
		- Wright, 1984, 1985
		
		- Furman & Buhrmester, 1985
		- Hartup & Sancilio, 1986
			Social Companionship

Security*	Reliable Alliance Security Value	- Weiss, 1974 - Furman & Buhrmester, 1985 - Wright, 1984, 1985	Security
Affect*	Affection Attachment Love Intimacy & Affection	- Sullivan, 1953 - LaGaipa, 1971 - Weiss, 1974 - Foa & Foa, 1974 - Furman & Buhrmester, 1985	Affection Affect

* These dimensions have been included in theoretical models but have not been used empirically in the social support literature.

30

l Social Support·Dimensions

Social Support

Author(s)	Designation(s)	Author(s)
ɜGaipa, 1971 ɹrman & Buhrmester, 1985 ɔa & Foa, 1974 'right, 1978, 1984, 1985	Aid Tangible Aid	- Kahn & Antonucci, 1980 - Kaplan, Cassel, & Gore, 1977 - Dunkel-Schetter & Wortman, 1981 - Holahan & Holahan, 1981 - Veiel, 1985 - Thoits, 1986
ɔa & Foa, 1974 /eiss, 1974 /right, 1984, 1985	Information/ Appraisal Support	- Kaplan, Cassel, & Gore, 1977 - Dunkel-Schetter & Wortman, 1981 - Holahan & Holahan, 1981 - Veiel, 1985 - Thoits, 1986
ɑrtup & Sancilio, 1986	Support Socioemotional Aid Emotional Support	- Dean & Lin, 1977 - Thoits, 1986 - Kaplan, Cassel, & Gore, 1977 - Dunkel-Schetter & Wortman, 1981 - Holahan & Holahan, 1981 - Veiel, 1985
ɹllivan, 1953 ɪGaipa, 1971 ɪa & Foa, 1974 'eiss, 1974 right, 1984, 1985 ɪrman & Buhrmester, 1985	Affirmation Esteem Support	- Kahn & Antonucci, 1980 - Cohen & Wills, 1985 - Mitchell & Hodson, 1986 - Cohen, Sherrod, & Clark, 1987
ɪGaipa, 1971 'eiss, 1974 'right, 1984, 1985 ɪrman & Buhrmester, 1985 ɑrtup & Sancilio, 1986	Social Companionship	- Weinberg & Marlowe, Jr., 1983 - Cohen & Wills, 1985 - Hays & Oxley, 1986 - Cohen, Sherrod, & Clark, 1987
ɪiss, 1974 ɾman & Buhrmester, 1985 ight, 1984, 1985	Security	- Dean & Lin, 1977 - Kaplan, Cassel, & Gore, 1977
llivan, 1953 ɜaipa, 1971 isɔ, 1974 ɪ & Foa, 1974 ɪnan & Buhrmester, 1985	Affection Affect	- Dean & Lin, 1977 - Kaplan, Cassel, & Gore, 1977 - Kahn & Antonucci, 1980

s but have not been used empirically in the social support literature.

30

in Foa and Foa's (1974) list of friendship resources and corresponds somewhat to friendship dimensions such as guidance and stimulation value (although Wright's stimulation value refers more to new suggestions about activities and projects than to assistance in coping with stressful life events). Weiss' (1974) guidance may be seen as touching on this dimension of advice or shared information as well. The only direct reference to emotional support in the friendship literature occurs in Hartup and Sancilio's (1986) model, termed "Emotional Security and Support". On the other hand, there is a close correspondence between the friendship functions enhanced self-worth or self-esteem and esteem support. Social companionship or belonging has also been included in both friendship and social support theories.

Other overlapping dimensions can be found which occur with less frequency than those specified above and/or have been postulated in theory but have rarely been incorporated into empirical work. For example, the supportive value of Affection or Affect (Dean & Lin, 1977; Kahn & Antonucci, 1980; Kaplan, Cassel & Gore, 1977) can be seen to correspond to the affective quality of friendship. A sense of security is noted by both social support theorists (Dean & Lin, 1977; Kaplan, Cassel, & Gore, 1977) and writers in the area of friendship (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985; Weiss, 1974; Wright, 1984, 1985).

It should be noted that although the structural features of a support network do not correspond directly to dimensions postulated in the friendship literature, there is a conceptual similarity between factors such as network

involvement or social integration and Wright's (1984, 1985) voluntary

interdependence; that is, voluntary interdependence--the degree of connection

in a relationship--considered across the range of one's associations would

reflect the sum total of connectedness in one's network.

It can be seen that the similarities between friendship and social support

are notable, and the complementarity of these two constructs--which is the

central premise underlying this investigation--will be addressed in more detail

further on in this paper.

Research on Social Support and Adjustment

The standard paradigm in social support research has involved examining

the relationship between individuals' available support and various aspects of

their emotional and physical adaptation. Often the samples under study were

those undergoing a major life crisis or transition, such as pregnancy, serious

illness, unemployment or bereavement. For example, with respect to the former,

various authors have found that social support from friends and family can

significantly reduce the risk of depressive symptomatology during pregnancy and

in the postpartum period, in both adolescents (e.g. Turner, Grindstaff, & Phillips,

1990) and older mothers (e.g. Collins et al., 1993). Similar support benefits

have been found for single mothers (D'Ercole, 1988), new mothers of premature

and full-term infants (Crnic et al., 1983), women in the process of divorce

(Kurdek, 1988; Leslie & Grady, 1988) and those coping with chronic parenting

32

stress (Quittner, Glueckauf, & Jackson, 1990).

In terms of more serious life stressors, high quality social support has been associated with improved psychological and sometimes physiological outcome in individuals with conditions such as HIV+ (Hays, Turner, & Coates, 1992), spinal cord injuries (Schulz & Decker, 1985), arthritis (Affleck et al., 1994; Goodenow, Reisine, & Grady, 1990), infertility (Veroff & Brender, 1987) and clinical depression (e.g. Billings & Moos, 1985; Overholser, Norman, & Miller, 1987). The spouses and caregivers of such patients, who are often at serious risk themselves for emotional and physical disorders, have been found to benefit from social support as well (Baron et al., 1990; Pagel & Becker, 1987; Tompkins, Schulz, & Rau, 1988). Finally, apart from medical afflictions, support seems to have beneficial effects on individuals undergoing traumata such as the aftermath of a natural disaster (e.g. Kaniasty & Norris, 1993). The question of interest in these studies has been to what extent a high-quality support network can modify the potential negative impact of stressful life events. This particular paradigm centres largely around the buffering hypothesis, which asserts that there is an interactive relationship between social support and stressful life events. Specifically, people with or without strong support networks are expected to function equally well in the absence of negative life events. However, as life stressors increase, individuals with strong social support systems should have fewer symptoms, whereas those with little or no social support may be more vulnerable to psychological and physical distress (Cassel, 1974; 1976). In

contrast, the main or direct effects hypothesis predicts that social support affects well-being independent of the influence of major life stressors. That is, the better supported an individual is, the less psychological distress he or she will experience at any given time, regardless of number or intensity of life stressors.

Although a number of authors report evidence supporting both the buffering and the direct effects hypotheses (Cohen & Hoberman, 1983; Gore, 1978; Habif & Lahey, 1980), many have found support for either the former (e.g. Cohen, Sherrod, & Clark, 1986; Cutrona, 1984; Hays, Turner, & Coates, 1992; Pagel & Becker, 1987; Wilcox, 1981) or the latter (e.g. Bell, LeRoy, & Stephenson, 1982; Demakis & McAdams, 1994; Ganster, Fusilier, & Mayes, 1986; Holahan & Moos, 1981; Overholser, Norman, & Miller, 1987; Turner, Grindstaff, & Phillips, 1990). In a comprehensive review of the literature, Cohen and Wills (1985) found that confirmation of the buffering hypothesis seemed most likely when the instrument used focused on functional support, including esteem and information/ appraisal support, whereas evidence for the main effects hypothesis was particularly strong when the measure used assessed a broad range of support resources. Support for the main effects model was expected in the present study, given the extensive conceptualization and operationalization not only of both the functional and structural components of social support, but of additional dimensions of friendship as well.

The review by Cohen and Wills (1985) is valuable not only in its ability to shed light on a complex issue, but in that it highlights the potential benefits of

support in the absence of major life events. In fact, several studies have been conducted on the relationship between support and functioning in a nonspecific life event sample. One approach has been to take a community sample and obtain information about the incidence of various life stressors in the sample; the impact of social support on adjustment is then assessed (e.g. Andrews et al., 1978; Wethington & Kessler, 1986; Wilcox, 1981). Often, the sample is described not in terms of major life events but rather, in terms of the minor annoyances or stressors that must be dealt with in the course of everyday life (e.g. traffic, family conflicts, plumbing problems), termed "daily hassles" (e.g. Felsten & Wilcox, 1992; Holahan & Holahan, 1987; Kanner et al., 1981; Kohn, Lafreniere, & Gurevich, 1991; Monroe, 1983). Researchers have recently begun to note that daily hassles can themselves have a significant impact on physical and psychological adaptation (e.g. Blankenstein & Flett, 1992; Cummins, 1988; Felsten & Wilcox, 1992; Kohn, Lafreniere, & Gurevich, 1991; Zika & Chamberlain, 1987). While not in the same league as bereavement or unemployment, everyday annoyances apply to everyone and tend to be repetitive, additive and can be perceived as relatively problematic. In fact, hassles have consistently been shown to be a better predictor of adjustment than major life events (e.g. DeLongis et al., 1982; Holahan & Holahan, 1987; Holahan, Holahan, & Belk, 1984; Kanner et al., 1981; Monroe, 1983; Weinberger, Hiner, & Tierney, 1987; Zarski, 1984), thus warranting their inclusion in the present study. It is reasonable to assume that as in the case of

major life events, social support has the potential to be beneficial on a more routine basis, in the face of daily hassles. In fact, research has generally supported this hypothesis (Andrews et al., 1978; Ganster, Fusilier, & Mayes, 1986; Wethington & Kessler, 1986; Wilcox, 1981). However, little if any research has addressed the issue of ways in which friendship may moderate the effects of life stress. In the present study, it was predicted that for individuals at every level of hassles, both friendship and social support functions would impact positively on adjustment (main effects hypothesis). A direct inverse relationship between hassles and adjustment was also expected. It should be noted that despite the former prediction, the possibility of an interaction between friendship, support and daily hassles (the buffering effect) was also examined.

Several studies have looked at college samples in relation to social support (e.g. Cohen, Sherrod, & Clark, 1986; DeMakis & McAdams, 1994; Lakey & Cassady, 1990; Lepore, 1992; Procidano & Heller, 1983), with the implicit assumption that students attending college are likely to represent a group which is relatively free from major life stressors but subject rather to a variety of daily hassles (which again supports the focus on hassles in the present study). These data have indicated a relationship between perceived support availability and reduced levels of depressive and anxiety-related symptomatology. Social support has also been linked to other aspects of well-being in students, including various dimensions of college adjustment (Schwitzer, Robbins, & McGovern, 1993; Weir & Okun, 1989), loneliness

(Pierce, Sarason, & Sarason, 1991), life satisfaction (Demakis & McAdams, 1994), feelings of self-worth and happiness (Valentiner, Holahan, & Moos, 1994) and even grade point average (Cutrona et al., 1994). Although the sources of support are not specified in many studies, familial support may be particularly important for college students beyond the effects of friend support (e.g. Berman & Sperling, 1991[4]; Cutrona et al., 1994; Pierce, Sarason, & Sarason, 1991; Valentiner, Holahan, & Moos, 1994). It was hypothesized that in the present study, family members (i.e. parents) would be an important source of support. That is, in analyses examining the perceived relative importance (rank) of various network members in providing relationship benefits, parents were expected to be among the top-ranked providers.

Despite the consistency of the findings linking support with adaptation, certain aspects of social "support" have been found in recent studies to have detrimental effects on adjustment. For example, consistent with Wright and Conneran's (1989) concept of maintenance difficulties, Ell and Haywood (1984) observed that personal relationships can be principal sources of stress, and that social networks do not always act in the individual's best interests. Vinokur and VanRyn (1993) reported that "social undermining"--actions that directly undermine or diminish one's sense of self-worth--impacted more strongly on mental health than the more positive dimensions of social support. Further, in a

---

[4]Although the study by Berman & Sperling looked at parental attachment rather than family support per se, it can be seen as support for the premise that familial relations can facilitate students' adjustment.

study of social network development in college freshmen, Hays and Oxley (1986) found that despite the presence of supportive behaviours and increasing intimacy with newfound friends, interpersonal conflict also increased over time, which in turn was associated with poor psychological adjustment. These authors noted that the presence of an intimate social network should not be assumed to proffer only positive benefits, but that it can in itself constitute a source of stress. Such conflict is increasingly being acknowledged as a component of personal relationships which must be taken into account (e.g. Hirsch, 1979; Hobfoll & London, 1986; Pagel, Erdly, & Becker, 1987; Rook, 1984). Certainly, researchers in the area of children's friendship have already taken this important variable into consideration (e.g. Adler & Furman, 1988; Bukowski, Boivin, & Hoza, 1994; Furman & Buhrmester, 1985). In the present study, it was predicted that interpersonal conflict might load separately from the positively valenced global friendship factor expected to emerge for best friendships.

It should be noted that associations between social support and adjustment, even when statistically significant, have tended to be low in an absolute sense (e.g. Ganster, Fusilier, & Mayes, 1986; Holahan & Moos, 1981; Wallston et al., 1983). These findings may be due to a number of factors. For instance, social support is only one of several possible determinants which can influence adjustment to daily or major life stressors. Other mediating variables might include properties of the individual's home and work environments, physical health (when not directly affected by the stressor), the degree to which

social roles can be maintained in the face of negative events, and coping style.

Another problem in the social support literature which may reduce significant findings is the lack of consistency in support measures used and in their degrees of comprehensiveness. There has been a range in the literature from using simple measures of pure tangible aid (e.g. Paykel et al., 1980, found that husbands' help with housework mediated depression in postpartum women), to complex inventories of supportive activities, such as the Arizona Social Support Interview Schedule (ASSIS; Barrera, 1981) and the Inventory of Socially Supported Behaviors (ISSB; Barrera, Sandler, & Ramsay, 1981). Further, in the majority of these studies, the sources of support (e.g. family vs. friends vs. colleagues) were not specified. Since differential results have sometimes been obtained depending on the source being assessed (e.g. Ganster, Fusilier, & Mayes, 1986; Kaniasty & Norris, 1993), the failure to account for such distinctions might conceal the more significant effects of one or more specific support resource classes.

Finally, the relatively low correlations between support and adjustment may be linked to the failure of scientists to go beyond relatively limited conceptions of support and examine the effects of interpersonal relationships in their entirety on adaptation. That is, people have the potential to benefit from more than three or four specific dimensions of a relationship or social network. It may be that if social support were defined more broadly in terms of complete relationships, as proposed in the current study, it would be found to have a

greater impact on both physical and psychological well-being. One point of interest in the present study was to determine whether in using a broad model of personal relationships, the correlations between support and adjustment would be of higher magnitude. If the reason for such low correlations in prior research was in fact the use of fairly narrow conceptualizations of social relationships, then the associations in the present study should be higher. If, on the other hand, current correlations were found to be consistent with those in earlier work, an alternate explanation must be responsible.

Despite the diversity in conceptualization and measurement, most findings are supportive of a link between social support and positive adaptation, including reduced depressive symptomatology.

Sex Differences in The Relationship Between Social Support and Adjustment

Few studies have included information on sex differences in the relationship between social support and adjustment. Those studies in which data were presented, however, imply that such differences likely do exist, and that this issue should be taken into consideration when studying the effects of support on adjustment. The limited data available suggest that apart from very close, intimate relationships, men may be less likely than women to seek out, accept and benefit from social support. Billings and Moos (1981) noted that the predictive value of both quantitative and qualitative support for depressive and somatic symptomatology was less robust among men than among women.

However, in a study of patients suffering from a nonbipolar major depression, Waring and Patton (1984) found that the inverse correlation between marital intimacy and depression was much stronger for men than for women. These few findings offer very preliminary support for the hypothesis that women are able to obtain and benefit from support provided by the social network in general, but that men are reluctant to request or accept support outside of specific, intimate relationships.

In this vein, men may be particularly dependent on their spousal relationships for support. As noted in the friendship literature, men have been shown to prefer women as best friends and confidants (Helgeson, Shaver, & Dyer, 1987; Rose, 1985; Rubin, 1985), and find women warmer and more empathic than men (Gibbs, Auerbach, & Fox, 1980). This hypothesis is strengthened by one finding in the social support literature indicating that whereas women mentioned their husbands least often as confidants, men named their wives most often (Lowenthal & Haven, 1968). It may be that because women are socialized to be strong providers of emotional support and intimacy, both men and women seek female partners as confidants. Alternately, or perhaps in addition, if women have more sources of support available to them and are more willing to accept that support, men may have a greater need for their female partners' provisions than women have for what their spouses can provide. Thus, the following hypotheses were made for the present study: First, women are more likely than men to benefit from support generally (although men

should still benefit), and second, men should benefit more than women from having an intimate heterosexual relationship.

Research on Friendship and Adjustment

Given the quantity and consistency of findings linking social support and adjustment, the absence of comparable research on friendship and adaptation is a surprising omission. Little is known about the impact of a good friendship on adjustment, particularly vis-a-vis daily hassles or major life events. Nevertheless, some studies have examined the specific connection between intimate relationships and adjustment. Although these studies are usually subsumed under the heading of social support, perhaps because of the operating paradigm (i.e. the buffering hypothesis), what is actually being assessed appears to be the value of one or more specific components of friendship. As such, it should be possible to draw some conclusions about the association between friendship and adjustment.

Some studies examined the effects of Weiss' (1974) relationship provisions on well-being. Of these provisions, which include attachment, social integration, reliable alliance, guidance, reassurance of worth and the opportunity for nurturance, only attachment and reassurance of worth were found to reduce stress in divorced mothers (Kurdek, 1988). The most well-adjusted women in Kurdek's study were those who seemed to be receiving esteem support in the context of an intimate relationship. Kraus et al. (1993) found three of Weiss'

social provisions--attachment, social integration and reassurance of worth--to be associated with reduced levels of loneliness in college students. Finally, in a study of healthy individuals coping with their spouses' cancer, all of Weiss' provisions were positively correlated with improved immunosuppressive functioning (Baron et al., 1990).

Most inquiries into the relationship between intimacy and well-being have demonstrated a positive correlation. For example, Cohen, Sherrod and Clark (1986) noted that relationships providing companionship, self-esteem and the opportunity for intimate self-disclosure moderated feelings of stress and depression in college students. Miller and Lefcourt (1983) found that individuals lacking an intimate romantic relationship were prone to higher levels of emotional disturbance than those with such a relationship, particularly when many negative or few positive life events had occurred. Similar results were found for patients suffering from a major unipolar depression (Waring & Patton, 1984) and from traumatic losses associated with old age (Lowenthal and Haven, 1968).

Self-disclosure is a critical component of close relationships (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Monsour, 1992), often studied in isolation, which has been linked with both mental and physical adaptation. For instance, Pennebaker and Hoover (1986) found that individuals who revealed a traumatic event in their lives (e.g. sexual molestation) were less likely than those who did not confide to take over-the-counter medications, receive medical attention, and experience

physiological symptoms and diseases. Similar results were obtained by
Pennebaker and O'Heeron (1984) for disclosing and nondisclosing spouses of
suicide and fatal accident victims. Veroff and Brender (1987) found that infertile
men and women who disclosed to others their feelings and problems were less
depressed, happier, more satisfied with life and reported higher quality marital
relations than persons who tended not to confide, although they failed to obtain
an association between confiding and physical health or symptoms. It should be
noted that in this literature, confiding is often interpreted as a coping strategy
(e.g. cognitive restructuring and reappraisal of meaning), rather than as a social
process per se. However, the concept of self-disclosure implies both the
presence of a close relationship and the possibility of eliciting various types of
support (e.g emotional support or advice in response to one's confidences); as
such, it warrants inclusion as a relationship component.

The Complementarity of Friendship and Social Support

Despite the considerable overlap between the theoretical components of
friendship and social support, these two research areas have remained quite
distinct. However, there are methodological as well as conceptual advantages
to integrating the areas of friendship and social support. For instance, a major
problem in the social support literature has been the tendency to study this
phenomenon in a vacuum, rather than within an interpersonal context. As noted
by Burhke and Fuqua (1987), support researchers have generally failed to look

44

at the individual relationships comprising one's social network; that is, little or no

information is sought regarding the various relationships from which people

obtain support. A subject may be asked if he or she has people in whom to

confide, with whom to do activities, who are emotionally supportive and so on,

but the specific qualities and provisions (e.g. ego support, affective quality and

security) of each relationship are not examined. By the same token, it is seldom

determined whether the various support functions are supplied by the same

person or by different people, and whether this distinction has implications for

adjustment.

From the opposite end of the spectrum, friendship researchers often study

isolated dimensions of particular friendships, but fail to look at these dimensions

in combination or to consider the larger social context in which such

relationships take place. There is seldom consideration of the potential additive

effects of multiple friendships or the relative benefits of belonging to specific

types of networks. Finally, with few exceptions (e.g. Bukowski & Newcomb,

1987), friendship researchers have largely ignored the vital aspect of social

relations addressed in the social support literature--how relationship factors can

influence adjustment. The stressors people experience and how they cope, so

integral to the social support literature, have yet to be adequately explored in

relation to the provisions and benefits of friendship.

The integration of these two research areas, friendship and social

support, would greatly enhance current understanding of the nature and

mechanisms of social relations. A consolidation of this type would also promote new directions in research into the precise relationships between various aspects of social functioning and adaptation.

An Integrative Model of Social Support and Friendship

The social world can be described as a set of relationships comprising friends, family members, colleagues, acquaintances and so on, with a specific pattern of structural features. These structural features include how many members of various types are included in the network; how often and at whose bidding contact is made; the proximity of network members to the individual; the extent to which network members know each other, and the nature of the individual's participation in groups or organizations.

Delving more deeply into the mechanisms of the social world, it is then possible to examine the functional properties of the network as a whole, of distinct relationship types (e.g. friends; neighbours; colleagues), and of specific relationships (e.g. John versus Mary). The literature on functional social support usually assesses what is perceived or obtained from all possible sources (the social world), or from one or more resource classes (e.g. support from friends; support from colleagues and family members). Research on friendship, including much of the work on intimacy and self-disclosure, addresses a particular resource class (i.e. friends), whether to describe the properties of friendship or, less frequently, to make links between friends and adjustment.

46

Specific relationships are sometimes examined, as when one's best friend is named and information about this affiliation requested.

The specific links between social support and friendship can be elucidated within this general context. Friendships--like other relationships and like the network as a whole--can be characterized by certain properties, some of which may be particularly supportive in the face of daily or major life stressors. For example, a relationship can be described as being affect-laden, stimulating, esteem-building and so on, but when one member is undergoing a stressor-- whether a major life event or daily hassle--the significant other may also provide instrumental help, guidance and/or emotional support. Friendship can thus be seen as a normative structure within which supportive transactions occur. Subjective appraisals can be made about the adequacy or quality of any relational component, including but not limited to support functions.

Structural features, then, describe the outward "appearance" or organization of the social network. Friendship is one important relationship type within the network, which can be characterized by various components (e.g. self-enhancement, companionship, trust, affection) and social support comprises an assistance-related cluster of such components (e.g. instrumental aid, advice, emotional support, esteem support) that can occur in any or all of the relationships in question, including friendships. It should be noted that the relative amounts of the various dimensions possible within relationships should vary among those relationships; to illustrate, with respect to young adults,

parents might provide more advice, affection and material aid and less companionship and confiding, whereas best friends might be high in companionship, stimulation, confiding and self-affirmation but lower in affection and material aid. Less central figures might afford specific benefits only, but might not be providers of other components at all (e.g. a "tennis buddy" might provide companionship and stimulation, perhaps even esteem support if tennis playing was important to the individual's self-image, but not much in the way of other functional aspects of friendship or support).

Finally, subjective appraisals are the qualitative judgments which can apply to all relationship dimensions. "Perceived support" is the operational term used in most research endeavours, although based on the current model, this term could be extended to encompass the perceived amount or value of all possible relationship dimensions. Using this model, alternative terminologies which circumvent the specific notion of support should be used, such as the more general "perceived resources" or "perceived benefits".

The respective research on friendship and social support, summarized earlier, reflect a somewhat artificial distinction between friendship as a relatively stable construct and social support as a more assistance-related phenomenon. According to the current model, social support functions constitute a subset of friendship behaviours. When researchers examine the relationship between social support and adjustment without considering the effects of the larger construct of friendship (or other "whole" relationships), important information is

being lost. For instance, there is much to be learned about the potential impact on adjustment of the sense of safety and security provided by a close friendship; the simple knowledge that one is loved and valued within a relationship; or the stimulation a friend can provide which serves to promote personal growth and development. One important goal of the present study was to look at the combined effects of social network and friendship dimensions, including support, on adjustment in college students. As noted earlier, it might be expected that these relationships would be stronger than those found in the past using just social support or just singular dimensions of friendship. A second goal was to see if these relationships would appear different for men and for women. It has already been hypothesized that the association between personal relationships and adjustment would be greater for women than for men, although men are expected to benefit more from having a heterosexual relationship.

The Present Study

The model of the social world on which this study was based attempts to integrate previously postulated, general dimensions of friendship and other relationships (e.g. companionship, affection, security, stimulation) with more specifically support-related functions (e.g. instrumental aid, advice, emotional and esteem support), as well as the structural features of a social network (network size, density, social integration, network involvement). A primary goal of this study was to examine the relative impact of the full range of relationship

49

components, including social support, on psychological and physical well-being in adults. Sex differences in these processes as well as in individual relationship properties were also examined. Finally, this study explored the role of friendship in the face of daily hassles; although much is known about the relationship between social support and hassles, similar information has not been amassed regarding hassles and friendship.

The sample chosen for this study was undergraduate university students. College students can be seen to exist in a relatively challenging transition phase between adolescence and adulthood, during which time various tasks must be confronted and conquered (Berman & Sperling, 1991; Levinson, 1977). Such tasks may include separating from one's family of origin, developing meaningful heterosexual relationships, and choosing a career path at a time when intense competition and high unemployment cannot be avoided. Further, as noted earlier, although students may be at less risk for major negative life events, they are likely to experience a variety of daily hassles such as roommate trouble, substandard living conditions, conflicts with professors, heavy workloads, financial strains and the pains of dating. Thus, university students may represent a particularly vulnerable population; the present study sought to understand social factors contributing to adjustment in this group of young adults.

The components of interest in this study were derived from the work of Wright (1978; 1984; 1985), other key theorists (e.g. Sullivan, 1953; Weiss,

50

1974), and the social support literature, incorporated into an expanded version of Wright's Acquaintance Description Form (see Methodology section for details). Because of an interest in how these two previously unassimilated sets of components fit together and since there was likely to be a high degree of intercorrelation among the subscales (e.g. Kraus et al., 1993), exploratory factor analyses were conducted separately for the best friend and network subscales. Using the factors that emerged, the unique contribution of each toward predicting well-being (depression, self-esteem, quality of life and physical symptoms) was assessed. A questionnaire on daily hassles was also completed. The relationships of hassles and friendship/support to adjustment, as well as possible interactions between them, were studied.

The key hypotheses of this investigation have been mentioned throughout the text and can be summarized as follows. One set of predictions dealt with the nature of interpersonal relationships and included:

1) Friendship and social support are related constructs and the components of each were expected to combine via factor analysis to create meaningful relationship factors. Although the nature and number of factors underlying the data set could not be predicted a priori, it was hypothesized that for best friendships, as in previous research, a factor reflecting global favourability or friendship rewards would emerge. It was also hypothesized that trust might form a factor, either alone or in combination with other dimensions, reflecting the necessary preconditions for relationship formation and

development. Similarly, maintenance difficulty (interpersonal conflict) was expected to load separately from the global friendship rewards factor. Network subscales were expected to vary along the structural/functional dimensions.

2) With respect to both best friendships and networks, the social support subscales (utility value, advice, emotional support, esteem support) would be expected to load separately from the remaining relationship factors (e.g. companionship, security, confiding, satisfaction) if in fact these two sets are conceptually distinct.

3) All network members were expected to emerge as potential providers of the full range of relationship components. Nevertheless, it was predicted that best/close friends, family members and romantic partners (where relevant) would rank highly as resource providers.

The second set of key hypotheses concerned the associations between interpersonal relationships, hassles and adaptation:

4) As noted earlier, a greater number of resources would normally be available from a social network than from an individual relationship. As such, network factors were expected to come out more often than best friend factors as significant contributors to adjustment. Further, with respect to the portion of this sample with romantic partners, a high-quality romantic relationship was expected to be predictive of adjustment, particularly for men.

5) Evidence was expected to support the main effects hypothesis (a direct relationship between the quality of personal relationships and adjustment,

irrespective of the level of daily hassles), due to the extensive conceptualization and operationalization of friendship/ support used in this study.

6) Hassles were expected to be a significant predictor of adjustment in both men and women.

Finally, a set of hypotheses was proposed regarding sex differences in the nature and function of personal relationships:

7) Consistent with previous research, it was predicted that women's best same-sex friendships would be described as being higher in the intimacy/ emotional variables (e.g. affection, emotional support and confiding), whereas men's relationships would be characterized by greater degrees of companionship (voluntary interdependence), stimulation value and instrumental concerns (advice, utility value). Since women are thought to be more selective and demanding in choosing their close friendships, they were also expected to rate their best friends as being higher in person-qua-person than men. Further, it was predicted that women would be more satisfied than men with their best friends and networks.

8) Consistent with the few data available on this issue, women were expected to benefit from social support/friendship more than men. However, men were expected to benefit more than women from having a high-quality intimate relationship (i.e. girlfriend or boyfriend), beyond the effects of friendship/social support. The benefits being assessed in this study included lower rates of depression and physical symptoms, and higher degrees of

reported self-esteem and quality of life.

Method

Subjects

The final sample consisted of 242 university students, 142 women and 100 men, recruited from McGill and Concordia Universities. The sample was restricted to full-time students between the ages of 18 and 28. The mean age for women was 21.24 years (SD=2.17), while for men the mean age was 21.43 years (SD=2.35). The sample was distributed evenly across years in school except for a slight underrepresentation of fourth-year students. The distribution was 70 first-year students (29%), 72 second-year students (30%), 69 third-year students (29%) and 24 fourth-year students (10%).

Demographic characteristics of the sample are described in Table 3. Approximately two-thirds of the sample were Caucasian, while one-third was classified as non-white. Religious affiliation in order of representativeness in the sample was Catholic, "Other", Protestant and Jewish. Relatively few students were actually living with a romantic partner (10.1% of women, 4.2% of men), although approximately half the sample reported having a boyfriend or girlfriend (77 women, 54%; 47 men, 47%). The mean level of education in this sample was two years of university, and mean family income was estimated for both sexes to fall within the middle-class socioeconomic range. It should be noted

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

	Male	Female
Age	21.43 (2.35)	21.24 (2.17)
Years of Education	15.65 (5.18)	15.44 (2.57)
Family Income (000s)	54.35 (42.91)	60.78 (69.41)
Current Religion		
Protestant	18.8% (16)	21.4% (28)
Catholic	37.6% (32)	40.5% (53)
Jewish	17.6% (15)	9.8% (13)
Other	27.5% (36)	25.9% (22)
Ethnicity		
White	86.9% (73)	87.1% (115)
Nonwhite	13.1% (11)	12.9% (17)
Relationship Status		
Single	95.8% (91)	89.9% (124)
Living with Partner	4.2% (4)	10.1% (14)

Note. Values in the first three rows of the table represent means with standard deviations in parentheses. Values in the remainder of the table represent percentage of the sample and actual ns. The ns may not add up to the full N for the sample due to missing data on some variables.

* Missing data on age occur for three men and five women.

that no significant gender differences were obtained on any of the demographic

variables and there were no significant differences between demographic

categories (e.g. race, level of education) on the key measures of this study.

Instruments

The questionnaire battery, which can be found in Appendix A, was

comprised of the following measures:

Friendship and Social Support Measures

Acquaintance Description Form. (ADF; Wright, 1984; 1985): This self-

report questionnaire, described in detail earlier, assesses the extent to which

individuals' designated target person (e.g. friend) fulfills various relationship

functions (e.g. "Doing things with my friend seems to bring out my more

important traits and characteristics."). Although there are measures more

commonly chosen to assess social support and/or specific relationship functions

(e.g. self-disclosure), the ADF is unique in the breadth of dimensions included

and has a format which is easily modifiable to incorporate further dimensions. It

has been used on several occasions by Wright and his colleagues (e.g. Duck &

Wright, 1993; Wright, 1985; Wright & Scanlon, 1991) as well as other

researchers (e.g. Lea, 1989), and has been shown to have high reliability and

validity. In the present study, all items were scored on a seven-point Likert-type

scale, where 1 represented **not at all true** and 7 represented **completely true**.

Higher scores indicate greater amounts of the dimension in question.   For

the present purposes, the eight relevant friendship subscales in Wright's (1985) ADF were used.[5] These subscales included: a) Voluntary Interdependence (4 items, $\propto$ =.61); Person-Qua-Person (4 items, $\propto$ =.72); c) Utility Value (5 items, $\propto$ =.76); d) Ego Support Value (4 items, $\propto$ =.67); e) Stimulation Value (5 items, $\propto$ =.69); f) Self-Affirmation Value (5 items, $\propto$ =.85); g) Security Value (5 items, $\propto$ =.63), and h) Maintenance Difficulty (4 items, $\propto$ =.63)[6]. Five subscales were then added to the measure based on existing research and theory in friendship and social support. These subscales, which were studied in pilot work prior to this investigation, included: j) Emotional Support (5 items, $\propto$ =.75); k) Confiding (Self-Disclosure) (3 items, $\propto$ =.85); l) Advice (Information/Appraisal Support) (4 items, $\propto$ =.80); m) Affection (6 items, $\propto$ =.85), and n) Relationship Satisfaction (4 items, $\propto$ =.70). It should be noted that for the present purposes, esteem support can be considered to be a composite of the ego support and self-affirmation subscales.

The ADF was completed first for a closest same-sex friend and then, for the social network as a whole. In the latter version, the voluntary interdependence, person-qua-person and maintenance difficulty scales were omitted, and four scales specifically designed to assess structural factors were

---

[5]These subscales and their psychometric properties have been described in detail above.

[6]Based on results of internal reliability studies in pilot work and in the present study, items have occasionally been dropped which were found to reduce the integrity of the subscale in question.

included. These subscales, based on social support research and tested for internal reliability in a pilot study, consisted of Network Involvement (i.e. size and frequency of contact) (3 items, $\propto$ =.70), Density (4 items, $\propto$ =.87), Social Integration (4 items, $\propto$ =.68) and Network Size (mean number of network members nominated). Cronbach's alphas for the network ADF subscales were as follows: Utility Value - 5 items, $\propto$ =.85; Stimulation Value - 5 items, $\propto$ =.84; Self-Affirmation Value - 5 items, $\propto$ =.91; Ego Support Value - 5 items, $\propto$ =.84; Security Value - 4 items, $\propto$ =.75; Emotional Support - 5 items, $\propto$ =.92; Advice - 4 items, $\propto$ =.85; Affection - 6 items, $\propto$ =.78; Confiding - 5 items, $\propto$ =.84; Network Satisfaction - 4 items, $\propto$ =.83. The actual items for each best friend and network subscale can be found in Appendix B. It should be noted that although a small number of the subscales were found to have only moderate internal consistency (coefficients between .61 and .69), they were retained for use in this study based on their theoretical relevance and their frequent use in prior research studies, including a pilot study conducted earlier on, where adequate internal reliability and construct validity were demonstrated.

Two questionnaires were designed for the purposes of this study, in order to elicit information about the qualitative and quantitative nature of individuals' best friends and social networks. The Friendship History Form sought information about the history and background of respondents' best friendships, such as the duration of and frequency of contact in the friendship, as well as demographic information about each partner in the dyad. The Social Provisions

58

Scale, developed based on existing measures in the social support literature (e.g. Fiore et al., 1986; Schaefer, Coyne, & Lazarus, 1981; Stokes, 1983), was designed in order to elicit information about the makeup (i.e. members) and "actual" provisions of people's social networks. Subjects were asked to list the names or initials of up to 20 significant members of their social network, including the type of relationship with each individual (e.g. Lisa - best friend; John - brother). In order to determine which network members were the primary and subsidiary providers of each relationship function, and to test Weiss' (1974) hypothesis regarding the match between relationship provisions and providers, a list of 11 functions (e.g. material aid; affection; advice) was presented, and individuals were asked to indicate which members of their network fulfill each function in descending order of importance. It should be noted that no validity data are currently available for the friendship/support measures.

Intimacy Measure

Miller Social Intimacy Scale. (MSIS; Miller & Lefcourt, 1983). This 17-item scale evaluates the level of intimacy currently experienced in a close relationship (i.e. close friend or spouse). The measure was used in the current study specifically to assess boyfriend/girlfriend relationships, so that the association between such relationships and adjustment could be ascertained. Each item is rated on a Likert-type scale; six of the items require a frequency response (e.g. "**How often** do you show him/her affection?") and 11 items

require a response reflecting intensity (e.g. **"How much** do you feel like being

encouraging and supportive to him/her when he/she is unhappy?"). Higher

scores reflect greater degrees of intimacy. Internal reliability for this measure

has been reported by the authors to range from .86 to .91, with a test-retest

reliability of .84 over a one-month interval and .96 over a two-month interval.

Data supporting construct, discriminant and convergent validity are also

available (Miller & Lefcourt, 1982). In the present study, internal reliability was

.87.

Well-Being Measures

Center for Epidemiological Studies - Depression Scale. (CES-D; Radloff,

1977). The CES-D is a 20-item measure of depressive symptomatology based

on previously validated scales (e.g. the MMPI depression scale), designed to

avoid the problem of overemphasizing somatic items. This measure was chosen

because of its wide use in stress research; to illustrate, it has been found to

correlate highly and inversely with social support (e.g. Cohen, Sherrod, & Clark,

1986; Goodenow, Reisine, & Grady, 1990; Hays, Turner, & Coates, 1992) and

life regrets (Lecci, Okun, & Karoly, 1994), and has distinguished between

bereaved individuals and controls (Lehman, Wortman, & Williams, 1987) and

between mothers with chronic parenting stress and controls (Quittner,

Glueckauf, & Jackson, 1990). Items (e.g. "I felt depressed"; "I enjoyed life") refer

to people's experiences during the last two weeks, and are scored 0 to 3 **(rarely**

or never, some or a little of the time, moderately/ occasionally, most or all of the time). Higher scores reflect greater depression. Radloff reported high levels of internal consistency, test-retest reliability and validity, and noted that correlations between the CES-D and age, social class and gender were minimal. The CES-D, despite having a greater emphasis on depressed mood than on the full range of clinical signs of depression, has been found to correlate highly with the Beck Depression Inventory (r=.87, Wong & Whitaker, 1993). Internal reliabilities have been reported as ranging from .83 to .95 (e.g. Cozzarelli, 1993; Hays, Turner, & Coates, 1992; Hobfoll & Lieberman, 1987; Schulz & Decker, 1985; Tompkins, Schulz, & Rau, 1988); Cronbach's alpha in the present study was .90.

Self-Esteem Scale. (Rosenberg, 1965): This scale measures global personal evaluations of the self and consists of 10 statements (e.g. "I have some positive traits"; "I often feel like a failure") scored on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from **strongly agree** to **strongly disagree**. The lower the overall score, the greater the level of self-esteem. This scale was chosen for use in the present study because it is a well-validated measure with high internal consistency and test-retest reliability (e.g. Dinh, Sarason, & Sarason, 1994; Hobfoll & Lieberman, 1987; Kernis et al., 1993; Rosenberg, 1965; Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994). In addition, scores on the Rosenberg have been found to be relatively independent of stressful life events (Hobfoll & Lieberman, 1987; Pearlin et al., 1981). Internal reliability was .82 in this study.

61

Quality of Life Scale. (Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976). The Quality of Life Scale consists of 10 semantic differentials (e.g. "discouraging/ hopeful", "boring/ interesting") which reflect how individuals feel about their life at present. Respondents indicate on a seven-point rating scale where they fall along the continuum between markers (e.g. discouraging versus hopeful). Higher scores indicate lower quality of life ratings. This measure, used frequently in the psychological literature as a dependent variable, has been shown to correlate with high network support (Brenner, Norvell, & Limacher, 1989; Leslie & Grady, 1988), low interpersonal conflict (Brenner, Norvell, & Limacher, 1989), the presence of a romantic relationship (Henderson & Cunningham, 1993) and, for women but not men, seeking social support as a means for coping with distress (Stanton, 1987). Internal reliability for the Quality of Life Scale has been reported at .95 (Brenner, Norvell, & Limacher, 1989). In the present study, Cronbach's coefficient alpha was found to be .87.

Cohen-Hoberman Inventory of Physical Symptoms. (CHIPS; Cohen & Hoberman, 1983). This 35-item questionnaire evaluates general physical complaints (e.g. sleep problems, headache, stomach pain, asthma), with higher scores signifying higher levels of symptomatology. The authors found high internal reliability (.88) and demonstrated validity (predicted health facilities visits). Physical symptoms as measured by the CHIPS have been found to correlate inversely with social support (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1992), and to be unrelated to one's personal sense of optimism (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges,

62

1994). Internal reliability in the present study was found to be .89.

Life Events Measure

Daily Hassles Inventory. (Kanner et al., 1981). This 117-item inventory of

stressful events in everyday life has been used frequently in psychological

research, and has been found to correlate significantly with both psychological

and physical well-being (Compas et al., 1986; Cummins, 1988; DeLongis,

Folkman, & Lazarus, 1988; Holahan, Holahan, & Belk, 1984; Weinberger, Hiner,

& Tierney, 1987). High scores on the Hassles Inventory connote high levels of

daily hassles. Cronbach's alpha for the hassles measure in this study was .94.

The high test-retest reliability of the Hassles Inventory (an average r of .8 for

nine monthly scores), reported initially and in later studies (e.g. Cummins, 1988),

reflects not only the stability of the instrument but the chronicity (and likely, by

extension, the aversiveness) of the stressors measured. In order to adequately

assess the stress levels of college students, the short form of the Hassles

Inventory was used (as per DeLongis, Folkman, & Lazarus, 1988) and school-

related items from the Life Experiences Survey (Sarason, Johnson, & Siegel,

1978) and the College Students Life Events Scale (Sandler & Lakey, 1982) were

added. This procedure has been followed by other researchers in order to

accommodate the student population (e.g. Felsten & Wilcox, 1992; Weir & Okun,

1989). It should be noted that although personality variables (e.g. disposition,

psychopathology) can affect the reporting of certain life events or hassles

(Dohrenwend et al., 1984), several studies have failed to find or found only

limited evidence of personality variables moderating the relationships between

life stressors and adaptational outcome (e.g. Cooke & Rousseau, 1983;

Ganellen & Blaney, 1984; Kobasa, Maddi, & Courington, 1981; Lefcourt et al.,

1981; Zika & Chamberlain, 1987).

Social Desirability Measure

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964).

This measure is commonly used to assess the tendency to respond defensively,

i.e. with an awareness of the social valence associated with one's responses

(e.g. Joubert, 1991; Lakey, 1989; Lobel & Teiber, 1994; Shedler, Mayman, &

Manis, 1993; Spohn, 1993). Higher scores are suggestive of greater social

defensiveness. Evidence reveals that those who endorse items on the Marlowe-

Crowne are not dissembling but rather, believe they are responding truthfully

(Weinberger, 1990). Internal reliability has been reported at .77 (Lakey, 1989)

and was found to be .82 in the present study.

Procedure

With permission from various professors and the requisite officials at

McGill and Concordia Universities, undergraduate students were approached in

their classes to request their participation in the current study. The students

were informed that this study was designed to examine the nature of friendship

64

behaviour in adults. Participation entailed filling out a series of questionnaires assessing social and more general functioning, the completion of which would take approximately one hour. Interested students were given copies of the questionnaire package to complete at home and bring back to their class within the week. Each package contained a section to be filled out with name, address and phone number, which could be detached and submitted separately from the anonymous questionnaires when collected by the experimenter. Consistent with similar research projects, the response rate varied for men and women; 64% of women approached completed and returned their questionnaires, while only 37% of men did so.

In return for their cooperation, participating students became eligible to enter a raffle from which they had the opportunity to win $50 cash or a computer software package of comparable value. Those who expressed an immediate desire for information about the study, as indicated on the detachable identification form, were contacted by the experimenter shortly after participation. Others who showed interest in the outcome of the study were informed that they would be contacted by the experimenter for discussion of the general findings upon its conclusion.

Results

The results section is organized into four parts. The analyses in Section I describe the characteristics of respondents' social networks, including their best

65

same-sex friends. Sex differences in personal relationships were also examined.

The analyses in Section II address the ways in which dimensions of friendship and social support combine for networks and for best same-sex friends, by means of exploratory factor analyses. Using the factors that emerged, Section III then examines the relationships between friendship, support and various aspects of adjustment. The relationship between daily hassles and adjustment is also included in these hierarchical multiple regression analyses.

Finally, in Section IV, the role of a romantic relationship in predicting adjustment, above and beyond the effects of friendship/support, is explored using a series of hierarchical multiple regressions.

I. Properties of Friendships for Men and Women

A. Characteristics of Best Same-Sex Friendships

Some basic information was compiled regarding the parameters of best friendship for men and women. Ninety-five percent of the men (N=95) and 97% of the women (N=138) in this sample reported having a same-sex best friend. These best friends were similar to the respondents in terms of age, occupation, race and religion. For men, their best friend was someone they had known for an average of 7.87 years (SD = 6.0), whom they saw approximately twice per week (M = 103.75 contacts per year). Women knew their best friend an average

66

of 8.0 years (SD = 5.32), and got together two to three times per week (M = 127.04 contacts per year). These characteristics were not significantly different for men versus women. Table 4 presents an overview of where best friendships were acquired. For both men and women, most friends were made in school. Although some friends were newly acquired in university, a significant number of best friends dated back to high school and even elementary school.

B. Role Functions of Network Members

Overall, men and women described their social networks as similar in size; men listed an average of 15.24 network members, whereas women listed an average of 15.26 members. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was computed to compare the functions of best friends versus networks across sex. A significant multivariate effect of relationship type was obtained (Wilks = .35, $F(1,229) = 40.14$, $p < .001$). Despite the number of possible resources available to these students, best friends were reported to be better providers of most functions, including advice, emotional support, esteem support, confiding and trust, and people were more satisfied with their best friends than with their overall social networks. Only material aid and stimulation were equally available from best friends and networks, and networks provided more affection than best friends. The means, standard deviations and univariate F values for the best friend and network subscales can be found in Table 5.

In order to determine the specific roles of various network members in the

Table 4

<u>Best Friend Sources for Men and Women</u>

	Frequency	
Source	Men	Women
Elementary School	22% (22)	13% (19)
High School	24% (24)	24% (34)
University/Residence	16% (16)	28% (39)
Through Friends/Family	13% (13)	8% (12)
Neighbours	12% (12)	8% (12)
Sports/Leisure Activities	9% (9)	8% (12)
Work	3% (1)	5% (7)
Siblings	0% (0)	5% (7)

<u>Note:</u> Values in parentheses are the <u>n</u>s for each category.

Table 5

Univariate F-tests for Best Friend and Network Subscales:

F Values, Means and Standard Deviations (df = 1,229)

	Relationship Type		
Subscales	Best Friend	Network	Univariate F Value
Utility Value	5.50 (.10)	5.41(1.17)	1.07
Ego Support	5.66 (.93)	5.22(1.05)	27.42***
Self-Affirmation	5.56(1.04)	5.10(1.19)	29.89***
Stimulation Value	5.14 (.95)	4.99(1.16)	3.70
Security Value	5.86 (.87)	4.93(1.28)	106.88***
Emotional Support	6.10 (.83)	5.64(1.11)	36.29***
Advice	5.37 (.99)	5.10(1.08)	9.12**
Affection	4.65(1.21)	4.86(1.18)	7.00**
Confiding	5.96(1.13)	4.57(1.21)	249.06***
Satisfaction	6.13 (.91)	5.29(1.22)	96.62***

Note. Standard deviations are presented in parentheses.

** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

lives of this sample, each individual was asked to rank order his or her network members with respect to the extent to which each provided various relationship functions. The rankings of different network members were compared using the Friedman nonparametric test of ranks, separately for men and women and for those with and without a romantic relationship. For purposes of parsimony, only the five most important resource classes were included in this analysis since other resource classes (e.g. colleagues, supervisors, extended family members) were mentioned with much less frequency by the current sample.

i. Network role functions for subjects without partners.

For men without a romantic relationship, best and close friends were most often turned to for stimulation, companionship, self-affirmation and as confidants. Friends as well as parents were important sources of material aid, advice, ego support, trust (security value), emotional support and affection. Siblings[7] were consistently the least important provider of these men's needs. However, friends, parents and siblings were equally likely to be sources of conflict. These data can be found in Table 5.

Women without romantic partners were also likely to turn to their best friends, close friends and parents for most needs. The only two areas in which parents were less important resources than friends were as companions and confidants. Siblings again were the least important function providers but were

---

[7]At least one sibling was listed among network members for most subjects.

Table 6

The Importance of Network Resources in Rank Order:

Men Without Intimate Partners (N=53)

<div align="center">Rank Position</div>

Function	Best Fr.	Friend	Parent	Sibling	F(3,53)
Utility Value	2.70[a]	2.66	2.62	2.02[a]	9.91*
Stimulation Value	2.82[a]	3.05[b]	2.22[a,b]	1.92[a,b]	26.22***
Advice	2.78[a]	2.56	2.67[b]	1.99[a,b]	11.82**
Ego Support Value	2.87[a]	2.57	2.53	2.04[a]	11.26**
Self-Affirmation	2.87[a]	2.91[b]	2.11[a,b]	2.11[a,b]	19.05***
Security Value	2.89[a]	2.74[b]	2.40	1.98[a,b]	15.43**
Emotional Support	2.78[a]	2.59	2.56	2.07[a]	8.92*
Confiding	3.00[a]	2.74	2.17[a]	2.09[a]	18.42***
Affection	2.53	2.64	2.68	2.15	5.56
Voluntary Interdep.	3.12[a]	2.82[b]	2.03[a,b]	2.03[a,b]	29.75***
Maintenance Diff.	2.14	2.63	2.78	2.44	7.29

Note: For each row, ranks with superscripts indicate that the highest value in the row with a given superscript is significantly greater at p < .05 than other values in that row with the same superscript.

* p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

the greatest source of conflict along with parents. See Table 7 for these data.

ii. Network role functions for subjects with romantic partners.

The differences between men with and without a romantic partner were
found to be minimal (see Table 8 for rankings of the former). Best friends, close
friends and parents were still the primary sources of most functions for men with
partners. However, girlfriends were important sources of affection for these men
(although not significantly more so than friends and parents).

For women with a romantic relationship, boyfriends were equal to best
friends, close friends and parents as providers of many functions, including
material aid, stimulation, advice, ego support, trust and emotional support.
Boyfriends were equal to friends but more important than family members as
sources of self-affirmation, affection and companionship. Again, siblings were
the least important providers of all functions. These data are presented in Table
9.

Thus, contrary to Weiss' (1974) model, it can be seen that each network
resource category was mentioned as a potential provider of each of the
relationship functions, by at least some students. The data show that among the
first two or three nominees in each category, few significant statistical
differences emerged. Generally, best friends, close friends and parents were
counted on most to provide the various dimensions of friendship and support,
although parents were not the primary choices as companions and confidants.

72

Table 7

Importance of Network Resources in Rank Order:

Women Without Intimate Partners (N=43)

			Rank Position		
Function	Best Fr.	Friend	Parent	Sibling	F (3,43)
Utility Value	2.49	2.35	2.91	2.26	6.41
Stimulation Value	2.80	2.85^a	2.15^a	2.20	10.99**
Advice	2.74	2.47	2.56	2.23	3.50
Ego Support Value	2.78^a	2.59	2.64	1.99^a	9.49*
Self-Affirmation	2.88^a	2.74	2.33	2.05^a	11.43**
Security Value	2.76	2.52	2.48	2.24	3.40
Emotional Support	2.98^a	2.56	2.51	1.95^a	13.66***
Confiding	3.10^a	2.83^b	1.99^{a,b}	2.08^{a,b}	23.44***
Affection	2.40	2.26	1.95	2.40	7.41
Voluntary Interdep.	3.07^a	3.07^b	1.95^{a,b}	1.95^{a,b}	33.53***
Maintenance Diff.	2.06^{a,b}	2.43	2.94^a	2.57^{a,b}	10.33*

Note: For each row, ranks with superscripts indicate that the highest value in the row with a given superscript is significantly greater at $p < .05$ than other values in that row with the same superscript.

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

Table 8

The Importance of Network Resources in Rank Order:

Men With Intimate Partners (N=47)

			Rank Position			
Function	Best Fr.	Friend	Parent	Sibling	Partner	F (3,47)
Utility Value	3.63^a	3.20	2.88	2.35^a	2.94	7.20
Stimulation Value	3.55^a	3.82^b	$2.60^{a,b}$	$2.38^{a,b}$	2.65^b	11.64*
Advice	3.67^a	2.98	3.14	2.29^a	2.93	5.80
Ego Support Value	3.45^a	3.39^b	2.65	$2.38^{a,b}$	3.13	8.18
Self-Affirmation	3.74^a	3.53^b	$2.41^{a,b}$	$2.20^{a,b,c}$	3.11^c	15.84**
Security Value	3.84^a	3.31^b	2.72	$2.19^{a,b}$	2.94	3.82
Emotional Support	3.24	3.19	2.93	2.39	3.24	6.52
Confiding	3.51^a	3.46^b	2.61	$2.23^{a,b,c}$	3.19^c	22.00***
Affection	2.69	3.06	3.28	2.48^a	3.49^a	20.80***
Voluntary Inter.	3.71^a	3.55^b	$2.33^{a,b}$	$2.17^{a,b,c}$	3.23^c	25.30***
Maintenance Diff.	2.53	3.38	3.22	2.85	3.01	9.93*

Note: For each row, ranks with superscripts indicate that the highest value in the row with a given superscript is significantly greater at $p < .05$ than other values in that row with the same superscript.

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

74

Table 9

The Importance of Network Resources in Rank Order:

Women With Intimate Partners (N=77)

	Rank Position					
Function	Best Fr.	Friend	Parent	Sibling	Partner	F (3,43)
Utility Value	3.10	2.76	3.16	2.59	3.39	7.20
Stimulation Value	2.90	3.24	2.67	2.61^a	3.58^a	11.64*
Advice	3.23	2.72	3.17	2.66	3.23	5.80
Ego Support Value	3.17	2.72	2.89	2.72	3.51	8.18
Self-Affirmation	3.39	3.10	2.48^a	2.53^a	3.50^a	15.84**
Security Value	3.19	2.85	2.85	2.80	3.31	3.82
Emotional Support	3.16	2.76	2.93	2.70	3.44	6.52
Confiding	3.49^a	2.92	2.24^{a,b}	2.75	3.60^b	22.00***
Affection	2.66^a	2.43^a	3.28	2.83^a	3.80^a	20.80***
Voluntary Inter.	3.75^a	3.56	2.42^{a,b}	2.43^b	2.84^b	25.30***
Maintenance Diff.	2.56^a	3.13	3.52	3.07	2.73	9.93*

Note: For each row, ranks with superscripts indicate that the highest value in the row with a given superscript is significantly greater than other values in that row with the same superscript.

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

For women with romantic partners, those partners were also important providers of some functions. Generally, as noted by Berman & Sperling (1991) with respect to parental attachment, the data support the hypothesis that parents as well as friends play an important role in the lives of young adults.

C. Sex Differences in Personal Relationships

Analyses of sex differences on the relationship subscales were conducted to determine whether, as predicted, men and women showed discrepant patterns of friendship responses. That is, women were expected to rate their relationships as being higher in the expressive domain (e.g. affection, confiding, emotional support), whereas men were expected to report having relationships higher in instrumental qualities (e.g. stimulation, advice, companionship).

Multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) were performed on the subscales for both best friend (n = 138 women, 95 men) and network (n = 141 women, 99 men), respectively. Box's M test for multivariate homogeneity of variance was significant for the best friend scales, due primarily to the slight heterogeneity on the person-qua-person and security value subscales. However, given the sample size in this study, the F-test has been shown to be robust to this slight violation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). For the network subscales, Box's M test for multivariate homogeneity was not significant.

i. Best friend subscales.

Among the 13 best friend subscales, a significant multivariate effect of sex was obtained (Wilks = .75, $F(13, 219) = 5.72$, $p<.001$). Univariate F-tests showed significant effects for person-qua-person, ego support value, security value, emotional support, advice, confiding and satisfaction . As compared to men, women described their best friendships as higher in emotional support, trust and loyalty (security value), advice, the sharing of confidences and the provision of esteem. Women also regarded their best friends as more unique and special than did men (person-qua-person), and were more satisfied with their best friendships. The means, standard deviations and univariate F values for the best friend subscales can be found in Table 10.

ii. Network subscales.

A significant multivariate effect of sex was obtained for the network subscales (Wilks = .76, $F(12, 227) = 6.12$, $p<.001$). Univariate F-tests showed significant effects for confiding, affection, advice, emotional support, security value and satisfaction, all of which were rated higher in women's social networks. Confiding in particular was more characteristic of women's than men's social networks. Table 11 presents the means, standard deviations and univariate F values for the network subscales.

Table 10

<u>Univariate F-tests for Best Friend Subscales:</u>

<u>F Values, Means and Standard Deviations (df = 1,231)</u>

	Sex		
<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Univariate F Value</u>
Voluntary Interdep.	5.58(1.02)	5.44(1.12)	1.00
Person-Qua-Person	5.60(1.16)	6.13(0.83)	16.18***
Utility Value	5.33(1.00)	5.61(0.98)	4.79
Ego Support	5.38(0.98)	5.85(0.84)	14.87***
Self-Affirmation	5.41(0.97)	6.66(1.06)	3.24
Stimulation Value	5.06(0.97)	5.19(0.91)	1.20
Security Value	5.52(0.89)	6.10(0.73)	26.82***
Maintenance Difficulty	5.51(1.07)	5.67(1.11)	1.22
Emotional Support	5.80(0.90)	6.29(0.72)	20.76***
Advice	5.08(0.96)	5.56(0.96)	14.15***
Affection	4.45(1.23)	4.79(1.18)	4.58
Confiding	5.49(1.19)	6.26(0.96)	29.53***
Satisfaction	5.89(1.00)	6.78(0.82)	10.20**

<u>Note.</u> Standard deviations are presented in parentheses.

** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

Table 11

Univariate F-tests for Network Subscales:

F Values, Means and Standard Deviations (df = 1,229)

	Sex		
Subscales	Men	Women	Univariate F Value
Utility Value	5.23(1.23)	5.52(1.10)	3.67
Ego Support	5.04(1.02)	5.30(1.06)	3.67
Self-Affirmation	4.92(1.13)	5.22(1.22)	3.36
Stimulation Value	4.84(1.26)	5.05(1.07)	1.90
Security Value	4.62(1.29)	5.12(1.23)	9.25**
Emotional Support	5.41(1.09)	5.77(1.10)	6.50**
Advice	4.90(1.07)	5.21(1.10)	4.77*
Affection	4.62(1.22)	5.02(1.14)	7.47**
Confiding	3.99(0.99)	4.96(1.25)	44.82***
Satisfaction	5.91(0.98)	6.28(0.82)	9.48*
Density	4.70(1.40)	4.66(1.46)	.03
Network Involvement	5.01(1.46)	5.00(1.43)	.00
Social Integration	2.99(1.71)	2.95(1.87)	.03

Note. Standard deviations are presented in parentheses.

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

79

D. Summary of Data on Friendship Characteristics

The students in this sample generally reported large social networks in which best friends, close friends and parents were counted on most to meet their needs. The vast majority of men and women had a best same-sex friendship, often longstanding, involving contact at least twice per week. Despite reporting fairly large social networks, people perceived receiving more of most functions from their best friends than from those networks.

As hypothesized, the characteristics of men's and women's personal relationships differed in several ways. Although both sexes described their relationships as providing the same general functions, women were more satisfied than men with their best friendships and reported receiving more emotional support, ego support and advice. Women were also more trusting of their best friends, could confide in them more easily than could men, and described them as more unique or special. With respect to social networks as a whole, women trusted their networks more than did men, were more satisfied with them, could confide in members far more easily, and reported receiving more affection, emotional support and advice. It should be noted that contrary to prediction, men's relationships were not more likely to be characterized by instrumental concerns and companionship.

II. The Interrelationships Among Friendship and Social Support

In order to explore the ways in which dimensions of friendship and social

support are related, factor analyses were conducted separately for the 13 best friend subscales and the 14 network subscales, respectively. Since there was insufficient theoretical background to allow for a priori hypotheses about the nature and number of the specific scales underlying the proposed factors (Kline, 1991), the factor analyses in this study were of an exploratory rather than a confirmatory nature.

Several steps were taken to ensure that the variables being used in this study were appropriate for exploratory factor analysis. The zero-order correlation matrices among the best friend and network subscales (see Appendix C), indicated the presence of numerous significant correlations. Most of these correlations were below .75 for the best friend dimensions, although for the network subscales, several higher correlations emerged. Examination of Bartlett's test of sphericity (1737.82, $p < .001$) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin overall measure of sampling adequacy (.92) indicated that the correlation matrix among the best friend subscales was appropriate for exploratory factor analysis. For the network subscales, the correlation matrices were also shown to be appropriate according to Bartlett's test of sphericity (2375.24, $p < .001$) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin overall measure of sampling adequacy (.93). Further, the subject-to-variable ratios were acceptable in all analyses (19:1), and each subscale included in the exploratory factor analyses had reasonable to good internal reliability (.61 to .85). Appendix D presents the intercorrelation table among the factors obtained and the dependent variables.

81

A. Best Friend

A Varimax orthogonal rotation was used[8] producing two factors (see Table 12). As predicted, a factor representing global friendship rewards was obtained, termed "Friendship Strength, Support and Closeness", accounting for 51.7% of item variance with an eigenvalue of 6.72. As shown in Table 12, the variables loading on this factor included person-qua-person, voluntary interdependence, advice, stimulation, utility value, affection, confiding, self-affirmation and emotional support. Cronbach's alpha calculated for this factor was .90. Factor 2, termed "Fundamental Safety and Acceptance", accounted for 9.5% of item variance with an eigenvalue of 1.23. The subscales loading on this factor were maintenance difficulty, security value, satisfaction with the relationship and ego support value. Cronbach's coefficient alpha for this factor was .80. It is noteworthy that some subscales loaded on more than one factor, although for current purposes, subscales were assigned to the factor with higher loadings. For example, self-affirmation value and emotional support loaded most highly on "Friendship Strength, Support and Closeness", but had moderate cross-loadings on "Fundamental Safety and Acceptance". The opposite was found for ego support value. These results are not surprising given that the

---

[8]

Oblique rotation was initially selected because the factors tended to be intercorrelated ($r \sim .40$). However, since the orthogonal solution for this sample produced identical factors to that of the oblique and presented a better differentiation among variables, the orthogonal rotation was used.

Table 12

<u>Loadings for Best Friend Factors</u>

	<u>Factor 1</u> "Friendship Strength, Support and Closeness"	<u>Factor 2</u> "Fundamental Safety and Acceptance"
<u>Variables</u>		
Advice	**.75**	.23
Person-Qua-Person	**.74**	.28
Voluntary Interdep.	**.71**	.15
Affection	**.68**	.06
Stimulation Value	**.67**	.16
Emotional Support	**.67**	.43
Utility Support	**.66**	.35
Self-Affirmation Value	**.64**	.50
Confiding	**.66**	.43
Maintenance Diff.	.00	**.81**
Security Value	.21	**.75**
Satisfaction	.41	**.75**
Ego Support Value	.43	**.62**

relationship in question concerns a best friend; the qualities characterizing

such a close relationship would not be expected to be completely independent.

B. Network

With respect to social networks, a Varimax orthogonal rotation was again

used[9], revealing two factors (see Table 13) as generally predicted. Factor 1,

labelled "Functional Support" in accordance with the social support literature,

accounted for 53.1% of item variance with an eigenvalue of 7.44. Subscales

loading on this factor included self-affirmation value, emotional support, ego

support value, advice, utility value, confiding, security value, network

satisfaction, affection and stimulation value. Cronbach's coefficient alpha for

this factor was .94. Factor 2, termed "Structural Support" also as per the social

support literature, accounted for 10.8% of item variance with an eigenvalue of

1.52. As can be seen in Table 13, variables loading on this factor were network

involvement, density, network size and social integration. Cronbach's alpha for

this factor was .61. It should be noted that network involvement cross-loaded on

Functional Support, suggesting that although the amount of contact people have

with network members is a structural feature, it may also reflect what is offered

from the network in terms of availability.

---

[9]Orthogonal rotation was chosen because the interfactor correlation was reasonably low (.26). As in the case of the best friend analysis, the orthogonal and oblique rotations were found to be virtually identical.

Table 13

<u>Loadings for Network Factors</u>

	<u>Factor 1</u> "Functional Support"	<u>Factor 2</u> "Structural Support"
<u>Variables</u>		
Self-Affirmation	**.91**	.19
Ego Support	**.89**	.18
Emotional Support	**.89**	.18
Advice	**.86**	.19
Utility Support	**.82**	.15
Security Value	**.81**	-.15
Confiding	**.78**	.03
Satisfaction	**.78**	.17
Stimulation Value	**.71**	.37
Affection	**.66**	.18
Density	.29	**.70**
Network Size	.03	**.69**
Network Involvement	.47	**.63**
Social Integration	.01	**.54**

C. <u>Summary of Data on the Relationships Between Friendship and Support</u>

As predicted, dimensions of friendship and social support were not found to be distinct but rather, were found to combine conceptually. That is, the social support functions (instrumental aid, advice, emotional support and esteem support) did not load independently as potentially stress-buffering constructs but loaded along with other (non-support) dimensions (e.g. affection, trust, companionship, confiding) to describe what is generally available in a best same-sex friendship and in a social network. It should be remembered that while esteem support has been included here as a support dimension, it has also been postulated to be a more general dimension of personal relationships such as friendship.

III. <u>The Relationships Between Friendship, Support and Adjustment</u>

In order to examine the combined effects of friendship and social support on adjustment, and to investigate which of the relationship factors contribute to the prediction of adjustment, a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses was computed. The four relationship factors derived earlier were used as predictors[10] and the dependent variables were depression, self-esteem, quality of life and physical symptoms.

---

[10]The unit method was used to calculate factor scores as recommended by Cohen and Cohen (1983). In this method, each variable is standardized, multipled by -1 or 1 (depending on the sign of its loading) and then each variable contributing significantly to the dimension is summed to produce the factor score. Original variables are converted to standardized scores so that variables with larger standard deviations do not have greater weight in the calculation of the factor score.

Social desirability was entered as the first step in each regression equation to control for its possible effects on the data. Gender was then entered in the second step, followed by the best friend and network factors in the third block. Hassles was entered next, with the interactions between the social support/friendship factors and gender entered in the last block of each regression equation and examined for significance. It should be noted that the possibility of interactions between hassles and the relationship factors was examined initially. No significant interaction effects were found in any regression analyses, providing support for the main effects hypothesis as predicted. There were also no significant interaction effects obtained between gender and friendship/support; thus, this step was omitted from the regression tables to follow.

As noted earlier, all variables were examined for skewness and outliers prior to computing the regression analyses. Mild deviations from normality were observed and a few outliers detected. Outliers were brought to within three standard deviations of the mean. The subject to variable ratio was 16:1. The range of correlations among the independent variables ranged from .07 to .67.

A. Depression

The overall equation was found to be significant ($\underline{F}(11,216) = 17.09$, $\underline{p} <$ .001), showing that 46.5% ($\underline{\text{adjusted } R^2} = .43$) of the variance could be accounted for by the set of predictors. The significant variables were social

desirability, friendship/support and daily hassles (see Table 14). Men and

women who scored higher on social desirability and who experienced fewer daily

hassles reported lower levels of depression. With respect to the relationship

factors, a high degree of Fundamental Safety and Acceptance in one's best

friend relationship as well as a rewarding social network (Functional Support)

significantly predicted lower depressive symptomatology. No gender

differences in depression were obtained.

B. Self-Esteem

The overall equation for self-esteem was significant ($\underline{F}$(11,216) = 10.74, $\underline{p}$

< .001). Thirty-five percent (adjusted $\underline{R}^2$ = .32) of the variance could be

accounted for by the set of predictors. Social desirability and hassles were

significant predictors, with high desirability and low hassles predicting higher

self-esteem. The friendship/support block also added significantly to the

equation for self-esteem, with high levels of both Functional and Structural

Support predicting higher self-esteem. No gender differences in self-esteem

were obtained. These data can be found in Table 15.

C. Quality of Life

The overall equation for quality of life was found to be significant

($\underline{F}$(11,216) = 14.58, $\underline{p}$ < .001), showing that 43% (adjusted $\underline{R}^2$ = .42) of the

variance could be accounted for by the set of predictors (see Table 16).

Table 14

Summary Results for Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses - Depression

Predictor Variable	Beta	Correl.	Sr^2	t-Value
1. Social Desirability	-.36	-.36	.13	-5.78***
2. Gender	.02	.04	.00	.35
3. Friendship Strength,				
Support & Closeness	.13	-.15	.01	1.48
Fundamental Safety				
And Acceptance	-.22	-.24	.03	-2.66**
Functional Support	-.24	-.34	.04	-3.49***
Structural Support	-.09	-.22	.01	-1.32
R^2 change = .11, F change (6,221) = 7.65, p < .001				
3. Hassles	.50	.60	.21	9.24***

Note: The n for this analysis was 233.

** p<.01   *** p<.001

Table 15

<u>Summary Results for Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses - Self-Esteem</u>

Predictor Variable	Beta	Correl.	Sr^2	t-Value
1. Social Desirability	-.41	-.41	.17	-6.71***
2. Gender	-.32	.02	.00	-.00
3. Friendship Strength, Support, & Closeness	.11	-.12	.01	1.30
Fundamental Safety And Acceptance	-.12	-.17	.01	-1.49
Functional Support	-.27	-.38	.05	-4.04***
Structural Support	-.15	-.29	.02	-2.29*
R^2 change = .12, F change (6,221) = 9.32, $p < .001$				
3. Hassles	.25	.39	.05	4.19***

Note: The n for this analysis was 233.

* $p < .05$ *** $p < .001$

Table 16

Summary Results for Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses - Quality of Life

Predictor Variable	Beta	Correl.	Sr^2	t-Value
1. Social Desirability	-.35	-.35	.12	-5.58***
2. Gender	.03	.05	.00	.49
3. Friendship Strength,				
Support & Closeness	-.07	-.30	.00	-.95
Fundamental Safety				
And Acceptance	-.10	-.28	.00	-1.36
Functional Support	-.27	-.46	.05	-4.28***
Structural Support	-.22	-.39	.04	-3.54***

R^2 change = .22, F change (6,221) = 18.91, p<.001

Predictor Variable	Beta	Correl.	Sr^2	t-Value
4. Hassles	.29	.42	.07	5.20***

Note: The n used for this analysis was 233.

p<.001

Significant predictors were social desirability, hassles and both Functional and Structural Support. Individuals with higher scores on social desirability, lower levels of daily hassles and a large, involved, high-quality social network were more likely to report greater quality of life. Note that men and women were not found to be significantly different on this measure.

D. Physical Symptoms

The overall equation for physical symptoms was significant ($F(11,21) = 9.86$, $p < .001$), showing that 33.4% (adjusted $R^2 = .29$) of the variance could be accounted for by the set of predictors. Social desirability, hassles and friendship were the significant predictors, such that high social desirability, low daily hassles and a high-quality social network (Functional Support) were associated with fewer physical symptoms. In this analysis, gender also added significantly to the prediction of physical symptoms. Women reported somewhat higher levels than men of this variable. These data are presented in Table 17.

E. Summary of Data on Friendship, Support and Adjustment

The relationships between friendship, support and adjustment were significant for all aspects of adjustment. Contrary to prediction, the block of relationship factors significantly predicted depression, self-esteem, quality of life and physical symptoms equally for men and women. Network factors were more likely to predict to adjustment than the best friend factors, although

Table 17

Summary Results for Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses - Physical Symptoms

Predictor Variable	Beta	Correl.	Sr^2	t-Value
1. Social Desirability	-.28	-.28	.08	-4.44***
2. Gender	-.14	-.12	.02	-2.16*
3. Friendship Support, Strength & Closeness	.09	.03	.00	1.04
Fundamental Safety And Acceptance	-.01	-.00	.00	-.14
Functional Support	-.23	-.21	.04	-3.10**
Structural Support	.04	-.07	.00	.59

R^2 change = .04, F change (6,221) = 2.52, $p < .05$

4. Hassles	.47	.52	.19	7.95***

Note: The n used for this analysis was 233.

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

Fundamental Safety, Acceptance and Esteem was found to be a unique

significant predictor of reduced depressive symptomatology.

IV. Intimacy and Adjustment

In examining the relationships between friendship/support and

adjustment, it must be considered that for those with a romantic partner, there

might be a special benefit to having such a relationship. In this vein, a separate

set of analyses was conducted which looked at the association between

adjustment and intimacy (defined here as a high-quality romantic relationship)

above and beyond the effects of friendship/support. Multivariate analyses of

variance (MANOVAs) were first carried out, separately for men and for women,

comparing the adjustment of those with and without a romantic partner; no

differences were found. Using only those men and women with an intimate

relationship (77 women, 47 men), separate regression analyses were then

conducted to explore the role of these intimate relationships in adjustment.

Specifically, the relative contribution of intimacy to levels of depression, self-

esteem, quality of life and symptoms after controlling for friendship/support was

examined.

Given the relatively small size of this subsample and the specificity of the

research question, the daily hassles measure was eliminated from this set of

analyses. Subject to variable ratios in these analyses were thus close to 18:1.

In the hierarchical multiple regressions for friendship and intimacy, social

desirability was entered first to control for its potential effects, followed by gender in step two, the relationship factors in step three, and intimacy in the third step. Finally, the possibility of an interaction between gender and intimacy was examined in the last step. Since no interactions between friendship/support and gender were obtained in earlier analyses, this block was excluded from the current analyses. Further, since no interactions between gender and intimacy were obtained in the current analyses, this step was omitted from the discussion below. Note that only those dependent variables for which intimacy was found to be a significant predictor will be presented since the earlier steps of these regressions virtually replicate those reported earlier. Thus, only self-esteem and quality of life are covered below.

B. Self-Esteem.

The overall equation was significant for self-esteem ($F(8,111)$ = 6.88, p < .001), indicating that 33% of the variance was accounted for by the set of predictors. Individuals with higher scores on social desirability, Functional Support and those with higher-quality romantic relationships reported higher levels of self-esteem (see Table 18).

C. Quality of Life.

The overall equation for quality of life was significant ($F(8,111)$ = 10.89, p < .001), showing that 44% of the variance could be accounted for by the set of

95

Table 18

Summary Results for Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses

On Intimacy: Self-Esteem

Predictor Variable	Beta	Correl.	Sr^2	t-Value
1. Social Desirability	-.40	-.40	.16	-5.05***
2. Gender	-.08	.03	.00	-.87
3. Friendship Strength, Support & Closeness	.15	-.13	.01	1.25
Fundamental Safety And Acceptance	-.14	-.18	.01	-1.20
Functional Support	-.27	-.37	.05	-2.78**
Structural Support	-.15	-.32	.02	-1.60

R^2 change = .13, F change (6,113) = 5.13, p < .001

4. Intimacy	-.18	-.27	.02	-1.98*

Note: The n for this analysis was 124.

* p<.05   ** p<.01   *** p<.001

predictors. Along with high scores on social desirability and both Functional and Structural Support, having a high-quality romantic relationship was a significant predictor of greater quality of life for the students in this sample. See Table 19 for a summary of these data.

Discussion

A major theoretical goal of the present study was to examine grounds for a conceptual integration of two critical areas in interpersonal relations: friendship and social support. The results suggest that friendship and social support are not distinct constructs but, in fact, combine conceptually. As hypothesized, social support functions were found to constitute a subset of friendship behaviours. In fact, social support functions were virtually indistinguishable from other relationship dimensions, both in their patterns of interrelatedness and in their associations with various adjustment variables.

The Structure of Best Friendships and Social Networks

With respect to the network subscales, the factors which emerged from the exploratory factor analyses are consistent with the literature describing Structural Support (the external parameters of a network) and Functional Support (what is obtained from one's network). Friendship and social support provisions did not load separately but rather, combined to form the latter factor. That is, emotional support, material aid, esteem support and advice combined

Table 19

<u>Summary Results for Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses</u>

<u>On Intimacy: Quality of Life</u>

Predictor Variable	Beta	Correl.	Sr^2	t-Value
1. Social Desirability	-.42	-.42	.18	-3.37**
2. Gender	.01	.12	.00	.15
3. Friendship Strength,				
Support & Closeness	-.04	-.33	.00	-.37
Fundamental Safety				
And Acceptance	-.13	-.32	.01	-1.23
Functional Support	-.21	-.43	.03	-2.36*
Structural Support	-.23	-.43	.04	-2.65**
$\underline{R}^2$ change = .21, $\underline{F}$ change (6,111) = 9.47, $\underline{p} < .001$				
4. Intimacy	-.28	-.41	.06	-3.33***

Note: The $\underline{n}$ for this analysis was 124.

* $\underline{p}<.05$ ** $\underline{p}<.01$ *** $\underline{p}<.001$

with components such as affection, self-disclosure, trust and companionship to form a unified and vital description of what is provided from one's social network. The structural features which clustered together included the number of network members, frequency of interaction with one's network, group membership (e.g. clubs, religious affiliation) and interrelatedness of members. This latter collection of features can be said to represent the individual's sense of connectedness to or involvement in the social world.

With respect to the best friend factors, as predicted, a global friendship factor was obtained called "Friendship Strength, Support and Closeness". This factor can be said to represent the set of rewards inherent in a special close relationship, including support functions. A second, more evaluative factor emerged which might be seen to reflect the secure base necessary for a friendship to develop. This factor, labelled "Fundamental Safety and Acceptance", combined trust with ease of interaction, overall satisfaction in a close relationship and feeling valued and respected as a person. Interestingly, two subscales hypothesized to load separately from the global friendship factor—trust (security value) and ease of interaction (maintenance difficulty)—were found to combine in this second factor.

Of the two factors derived, Friendship Strength, Support and Closeness was the most salient, accounting for almost 51% of item variance. Clearly, the perceived quality of a friendship is based on the combined availability and/or calibre of a variety of relationship components, including companionship,

affection, confiding and emotional support. The second factor, Fundamental Safety and Acceptance, accounted for only 10% of item variance, but is suggestive of a set of possibly unconscious criteria individuals might have with respect to close relationships. That is, although individuals may be more aware of the actual provisions afforded by a relationship than what is underlying, it can be speculated that in order for any close relationship to develop, a minimum level of loyalty, trust and ease of interaction is required. This basic hypothesis has been suggested previously regarding trust (e.g. Monsour, 1992; Reis & Shaver, 1988; Wright, 1984), and certainly requires further investigation. However, this underlying sense of trust and ease (the "Fundamental Safety and Acceptance" factor) was found to predict lower depression in men and women, suggesting that having at least one close relationship with a solid foundation promotes psychological well-being. Future studies should attempt to replicate these data, examining further the ways in which having a trusted, satisfying friendship facilitates well-being. It might also be interesting to determine how the global set of friendship rewards varies according to fluctuations in Fundamental Safety and Acceptance through the course of a relationship, or vice versa (since the direction of the relationship has not yet been established). The relative importance of this factor to different groups of individuals (e.g. men versus women, people at different developmental stages) would also be an interesting focus of study. Research along these avenues could greatly expand current understanding of the nature and evolution of personal relationships.

It should be noted that the goal of the present study was to explore, for the first time, the relationships between multiple dimensions of friendship and social support. Since the available literature on adult friendship offered little in the way of guidance as to which dimensions might load together, and since only one relationship type (same-sex best friend) was being studied in the present study (along with social network as a whole), exploratory factor analysis was chosen as the most appropriate statistic. With the information obtained here, there is now an initial suggestion of how friendship and support combine and how the combined role of friendship and social support is related to adjustment. Future studies should attempt to replicate these findings with other relationship types (e.g. best opposite-sex friend, casual friend, parent, sibling, teacher), followed by confirmatory factor analyses based on the structures thereby obtained. Although the factors described here appear to have conceptual value, it remains to be seen whether they are applicable to all types of personal relationships. For example, it may be that the Fundamental Safety and Acceptance factor would only be observed in the context of particularly close relationships. The global friendship factor might also differ depending on the nature of the relationship in question; for example, dimensions more closely associated with feelings of intimacy, such as confiding and affection, might be less likely to load with functions such as companionship and stimulation in a more casual relationship. An examination of such issues would provide valuable information as to how people discriminate between relationships in their

network, and can then be extended to an investigation of how individual relationships are related to adjustment.

Although the factors obtained in this study were described in independent terms for purposes of greater clarity (using the orthogonal factor structures, which nevertheless virtually replicated the oblique analyses), some overlap among the factors was still obtained. With respect to the network subscales, although the correlation between the Functional and Structural Support factors was quite low, a cross-loading was obtained for network involvement. This finding makes sense given that the more an individual interacts with his or her network members, the more likely that individual is to benefit from the various rewards provided by the network. The overlap of certain best friend dimensions (e.g. self-affirmation, ego support) would also be expected, given that the qualities which characterize a close relationship are likely to be closely intertwined. It would be interesting to ascertain whether such overlap occurs in less intimate relationships, where a halo effect is not as likely to exist.

Despite their preliminary nature, the preceding data seem to suggest that the individual dimensions of friendship and social support appear less important than the ways in which they combine. Although many studies have examined single dimensions such as self-disclosure, emotional support or material aid as independent variables, the current data indicate that these distinctions are artificial and the emphasis on the importance of such particularities exaggerated. It may be that the larger the network under consideration, the less important the

102

distinction between friendship/support components becomes; in this study, two factors emerged for best friendships, whereas for social networks as a whole, all the nonstructural components clustered together into one large factor. Perhaps it is easier or more important to be specific in evaluating a single relationship as opposed to a set of relationships which may be quite varied in nature and provisions.

Overall, support was gained for the model proposed earlier in which social networks can be described in terms of how they are structured (e.g. the interconnectedness of members, frequency of interaction) and what benefits they offer (e.g. advice, affection, emotional support). Friendship can then be seen as a prototype for the various kinds of relationships in a social network, characterized by a set of functions or provisions including those which have traditionally been labelled "social support". Contrary to the proposed model, however, the "social support" relationship dimensions did not form a discrete subset of components which became protective in the face of stressful life events. Rather, the social support dimensions tended to combine with other relationship components to reflect the overall set of rewards and underlying trust/acceptance inherent in a best same-sex friendship. The mere presence of networks with many provisions--including not just emotional support, instrumental aid and advice, but also elements such as affection, companionship, trust and confiding--seemed to facilitate well-being, independent of life stressors.

The data in this study also indicated that contrary to Weiss' (1974)

proposal and as predicted, both friendship and support functions were shown to

be offered by any and all network members, rather than being limited to a direct

association between a given dimension (e.g. companionship) and a

corresponding network subgroup (e.g. peers). Nevertheless, the students in this

study tended to choose one or two resource classes (e.g. friends, parents) or

individuals (e.g. best friend, girl/boyfriend) as providers of most of their

socioemotional needs.

Gender Differences in the Nature of Friendship

A second principle goal of the present study was to examine gender

differences in the nature and processes of friendship and social support. The

results suggest that despite certain differences, the relationships of university-

age men and women are similar in many ways. With respect to what people get

from their relationships, female students reported receiving more of several

relationship components than did men. These differences followed the predicted

pattern often but not invariably. As expected, women received more emotional

support from, confided more in and were more trusting of their best friends and

network members than men. Women were also more satisfied with both their

best friendships and their social networks. Women reported more affectional

encounters with network members than did men. However, contrary to

expectation, men and women were equally affectionate with their best friends

104

and were equally likely to obtain material aid, stimulation and companionship from their best friends and network members. There were also no gender differences in the amount of esteem support afforded by network members, although women reported more ego support from their best friends than did men. Thus, as hypothesized and replicating earlier findings (Duck & Wright, 1993; Wright and Scanlon, 1991), men's relationships tended to be more limited than women's in the expressive domain, whereas women's relationships appeared rich in both expressive and instrumental qualities. These differences are particularly noteworthy given that the parameters of friendship (e.g. relationship duration, frequency of contact, number of network members) were not significantly different for the male and female samples. Nonetheless, it can be stated that the differences between men's and women's friendships are present but not extreme; Tiger's (1969) assertions that women are incapable of real friendship can finally be put to rest, and those who now characterize men's friendships in the same way (e.g. Rubin, 1985) are also not entirely correct. Best friends clearly form an important part of life for both men and women, and both genders reap many benefits from their relationships, although women do seem to get more and show more appreciation for what they receive (i.e. greater satisfaction).

Despite the sex differences described above, and contrary to prediction, men and women did not differ in the extent to which they benefitted from their personal relationships. For both genders, having a large, integrated social

105

network (Structural Support) predicted higher self-esteem and quality of life, while Functional Support was a significant predictor of every aspect of physical and emotional well-being. Finally, both men and women tended to be less depressed in the presence of a secure, satisfying relationship with a best friend (Fundamental Safety and Acceptance). Similar results were obtained with respect to having a romantic partner. Although depressive symptomatology and physical symptoms were not related to intimacy, having a high-quality romantic relationship predicted higher self-esteem and quality of life in both men and women. These data add to current knowledge on gender differences in social support and adjustment, particularly given the paucity of research conducted on this issue in the past. It appears that interpersonal relationships are equally likely to be associated with feelings of well-being in women as in men.

It should be noted that although the term "sex differences" has generally been used in this paper, primarily to indicate a grouping variable, the impiication is not that such differences when obtained are inherently attributable to gender per se. As noted by Wood (1993), observed "sex differences" are often due more to a relational perspective acquired via familial and cultural learning than to biologically, genetically and physiologically determined characteristics. Caution must be taken when attempting to understand and define the differential attitudes and functioning of men and women, particularly when dealing with a topic such as social relationships which are certainly determined in large part by socialization and acculturization.

The Relative Benefits of Network Versus Best Friend

Although direct examination of relative variance accounted for was not undertaken, the data in this study suggest that across gender, network factors are significantly more important to adjustment than what is available from a best friend relationship. Network quality consistently emerged as a significant unique predictor of well-being, while structural features of the network predicted high self-esteem and reported quality of life. In contrast, the only instance in which a best friend factor was predictive of adjustment was in the case of depression, where Fundamental Safety and Acceptance was the significant predictor. These findings are made more powerful by the fact that, as noted earlier, individuals actually perceived receiving more of most relationship dimensions in an absolute sense from their best friends than from network members. Although it is possible that the network and best friend factors interact in an as yet unknown way, thereby suppressing unique variance in the multiple regression analyses, it should be noted that the zero-order correlations between the network factors and adjustment were generally greater than those between the best friend factors and adjustment. Certainly, future research should examine more explicitly the independent and interactive effects of network and best friend factors on adaptation.

It thus appears that having a variety of social resources from whom one can reap benefits is more important than having just one good friendship, even when the perceived benefits of that friendship are greater than those perceived

as being available from the network as a whole. These findings might appear contrary to the findings of some authors (Bukowski & Newcomb, 1987; McGuire & Weisz, 1982) who propose that in the absence of a social network (i.e. for an unpopular child), having even one reciprocal best friend can positively affect well-being. However, in this sample of university students, the reciprocity of the best friendship was not assessed[11]. Further, most of the individuals in this sample reported the presence of fairly large, reasonably high-quality networks. It is possible that were these networks smaller and of poorer quality, the best friend factors would have been more strongly related to adjustment.

Intimacy

Since early adulthood is a time for developing heterosexual relationships (Maccoby, 1990; Sullivan, 1953), part of this study involved looking at what impact the quality of such relationships had on adjustment above and beyond the effects of the larger social network. As noted earlier, having a high-quality relationship with a romantic partner did add to the prediction of self-esteem and quality of life for both men and women. Although these findings must be interpreted with caution because of the relatively small sample size (approximately half the original sample), they are suggestive of the fact that

---

[11] A reciprocity subscale was included in the pilot study but internal reliability was too low to allow inclusion in the main study. Nevertheless, this scale would have reflected perceived reciprocity, not confirmed reciprocity.

romantic relationships are important to one's perceived quality of life in university, as well as to one's perceived self-image. A corollary of these findings is that an unfulfilling relationship may be worse than no relationship, since on average, individuals with and without intimate partners (without assessing relationship quality) had equivalent adjustment.

Friendship and Hassles

One consistent finding in this study, replicating others before it (e.g. Demakis & McAdams, 1994; Felsten & Wilcox, 1992; Kohn, Lafreniere, & Gurevich, 1991; Roos & Cohen, 1987; Zika & Chamberlain, 1987) was the direct, highly significant relationship between daily hassles and adaptation, particularly depression. As predicted, neither friendship nor social support dimensions were found to moderate the effects of daily hassles on adjustment (i.e. no interactions were obtained), providing support for the main effects hypothesis. These results are consistent with those found by other researchers using comprehensive measures of social support.

It should be pointed out that the predictive value of hassles to adjustment was generally greater than that of the friendship/support factors to adjustment. In fact, in some cases (i.e. for depression and physical symptoms), as observed in previous research (e.g. Ganster, Fusilier, & Mayes, 1986; Holahan & Moos, 1981; Wallston et al., 1983), associations between friendship/social support and well-being were low in an absolute sense despite being statistically significant.

109

On the other hand, the relationship factors added quite significantly to the prediction of self-esteem and quality of life. One of the hypotheses in this study predicted that looking at the effects of "complete" relationships might produce associations between such relationships and adjustment greater than those generally observed in the literature on social support alone. That is, previous studies on adjustment used a small set of relationship provisions—the social support dimensions—as predictor variables, resulting in the consistent but relatively low correlations noted above. It was hypothesized that the large set of relationship dimensions used in the current study might result in associations of greater magnitude. This hypothesis received partial support. It appears that for some aspects of adjustment, but perhaps not others, looking at personal relationships in a comprehensive way does explain more in terms of how these factors are related. Quality of life in particular was most likely to show strong associations with the current set of relationship variables.

Although enhancing understanding of the nature and role of interpersonal relationships has important theoretical or conceptual value, the data in this study suggest clinical implications as well. A network of personal relationships appears to offer significant benefits to the self-esteem and perceived quality of life of university students, with additional albeit lesser effects on depressive and physical symptoms. Conversely, daily hassles were found to detract significantly from all aspects of physical and emotional well-being. Thus, it might be advisable for stress researchers to approach future interventions from two

110

concurrent vantage points: seeking ways to improve the social networks of individuals, with the aim of reducing distress, while finding ways to directly reduce the various so ces of distress for students or increasing their means of coping with life stress.

Methodological Considerations

Interpretation of the findings in this study must take methodological constraints into consideration. First, the response rate for male students was quite low (37%) relative to that for women (64%). This finding seems to be consistent with other research in the area of friendship. Perhaps men are simply less interested in the topic; women approached by the experimenter did tend to express much more interest in talking about and trying to understand their relationships than did men. It is also possible that the men who participated in this study were somehow different from those who refused to participate. The participants may have been more interested in friendship, or may have had better relationships in general. Conversely, these men may have had relationships perceived as particularly unsatisfactory and chose to participate in the present study as a means of attempting to understand why. This last interpretation seems unlikely given that the male participants' scores on most relationship dimensions—albeit lower than women's in several cases—were still relatively high. Nevertheless, the full range of possibilities must be considered. Although it was not feasible to compare participants and nonparticipants in the

111

present study, future research might find a way to do so, in the hopes of understanding what factors serve to motivate men's interest in the area of friendship as well as the ways in which such factors might influence results.

A second methodological concern lies in the correlational nature of the data. It is impossible to know for certain the causal direction or basis of the correlations obtained. Nevertheless, the data on gender differences at least do not require longitudinal or prospective examination; correlational data are sufficient to help clarify the nature of differences between men's and women's friendships. The only caution here is that the present sample was asked about their same-sex best friends and not their opposite-sex best friends. This choice was made deliberately, to avoid the confound of sexual interest and involvement. However, it is possible that different results might be obtained if opposite-sex friendships were also considered. In this vein, some researchers have found gender differences in the ways that same- versus opposite-sex relationships are viewed (e.g. Banikotes, Neimeyer, & Lepkowsky, 1981; Bukowski, Nappi, & Hoza, 1987). Thus, further research might include an examination of same- and opposite-sex friends as well as intimate partners and family members.

An additional consideration is that the sample used for this study was taken from a population of presumably "normal" college students undergoing the standard stresses of college life. It remains to be seen whether the results would be generalizable to other populations experiencing other life stages or circumstances. Future research might attempt to replicate the relationship

factors derived from the present study and their effects on adjustment using diverse samples such as new parents, women at home full-time versus women working outside the home, people undergoing health or personal crises and parents whose children are leaving home. It would be interesting to determine whether the same sex differences and alternately, the lack thereof, noted here would emerge in other populations as well.

Finally, the fact that the data were self-report must be considered, particularly given the relatively high scores obtained for Social Desirability. Although the effects of having self-report data in the present study cannot actually be measured, these self-report data did not seem to result in a restricted range on the variables in question; even if there was some pressure to respond favourably, a reasonable range of variability was found throughout the data. There was variability among scores on the dependent variables as well as in the relationship subscales, and in fact, the sample scored fairly high on a measure which might easily be adjusted to reflect greater health--depression. Thus, it does not appear that the format of the inquiry unduly influenced the results of this study. Further, it should be noted that Lakey and Heller (1985) obtained Social Desirability scores similar to those in the present study[12], and in their sample, defensiveness was uncorrelated with reporting of negative life events. They also found no evidence for a response bias associated with social

---

[12]The mean for their sample, combining men and women, was 14.49. In the present study, the means for Social Desirability were 16.03 for women and 15.63 for men.

desirability, depression or physical symptoms. Even if personality style were to influence responding, as suggested by Lakey and Cassady (1990), several authors have found for example that it is precisely one's perceptions of support that best predict adjustment (e.g. Cohen et al., 1984; Ell & Haywood, 1984; Lakey & Cassady, 1990; Veroff & Brender, 1987; Wethington & Kessler, 1990). Symbolic interactionists have also suggested that an individual's perceptions of his or her relationships are the most valid reflection of the quality of those relationships (Bukowski, Hoza, & Boivin, 1994).

Nonetheless, it would be valuable to examine the hypotheses of this study further using a somewhat different methodology. For example, both partners in a friendship dyad might be asked to complete questionnaires on their relationship, or several members of the target sample's networks might be assessed. From another perspective, the relative contribution of various specific relationships to adjustment (e.g. best same-sex friend, best opposite-sex friend, intimate partner, parents) rather than just best friend versus network might provide greater knowledge as to the protective factors of social networks.

Summary and Conclusions

In conclusion, the major theoretical contribution of the present study is that it extends current knowledge about the nature and processes of personal relationships. This study has provided empirical support for viewing friendship and social support not as distinct constructs, but rather, as joint contributors to

114

the multidimensional phenomena of interpersonal relationships. Specifically, the social network has been shown to consist of many relationships, including best friendships, all of which have the potential to offer a broad range of beneficial and socially supportive functions. It is possible to benefit not just from instrumental support, emotional support and advice, but also from having companionship, affection, confidants, and so on. Although anyone in the social network can be a source of support, most people likely turn to a relatively fixed nucleus or subset of network members for much of what they need. In this sample, close friends, parents and romantic partners were the most common sources of valuable relationship provisions.

From a practical perspective, data from the present study suggest that network factors in particular can be protective for college students, although the presence of a trusted, satisfying best friendship was also associated with reduced levels of depression. Having a high-quality relationship with a boyfriend or girlfriend enhances self-esteem and quality of life, whereas daily hassles detract significantly from the well-being of young men and women. Clinical interventions should thus be directed first, toward reducing the stresses faced by men and women in their college years, and second, toward helping those with small, less than adequate social networks to develop fuller, more supportive sets of relationships.

Finally, the current study shed some light on the nature of sex differences in the interpersonal domain. Whereas both men and women described their

relationships in instrumental as well as expressive terms, women's relationships were richer in both domains. Women were also more satisfied than men with their best friends and social networks. Despite these differences, however, the process by which men and women seem to benefit from their personal relationships was found to be quite similar. That is, there were no sex differences in the ways in which the adjustment of men and women were predicted by friendship and social support.

Future research should examine further the mechanisms by which people benefit from their social networks. As noted earlier, it would be interesting to determine whether the factor structures derived in the present study and their relationships to adjustment would be replicated with other samples, particularly those in different developmental stages and in particular life event groups, perhaps using different network members as target providers. Further examination of what may be fundamental prerequisites of close friendship (in the present study, trust, ease of interaction, satisfaction and respect) would provide a greater understanding of how relationships develop. This avenue of research might be particularly informative with respect to men, who may be more reluctant than women to develop both romantic and non-romantic intimacy. It would also be useful to determine whether the same prerequisites exist for all relationship types, or whether best friends require a unique core of qualities. With ongoing research of this type, it will gradually become possible to build a more detailed model of an integral facet of human experience: the world of personal relations.

References

Adler, T., & Furman, W. (1988) A model for close relationships and relationship dysfunctions. In S.W. Duck (Ed.), Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research, and interventions (pp. 211-229). London: Wiley.

Affleck, G., Tennen, H., Urrows, S., & Higgins, P. (1994) Person and contextual features of daily stress reactivity: Individual differences in relations of undesirable daily events with mood disturbance and chronic pain intensity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66(2), 329-340.

Ainsworth, M.S. (1989) Attachments beyond infancy. American Psychologist, 44(4), 709-716.

Argyle, M., & Furnham, A. (1983) Sources of satisfaction and conflict in long-term relationships. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 481-493.

Altman, I., & Taylor, D.A. (1973) Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Andrews, G., Tennant, C., Hewson, D.M., & Vaillant, G.E. (1978) Life event stress, social support, coping style, and risk of psychological impairment. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 166(5), 307-316.

Aries, E.J., & Johnson, F.L. (1983) Close friendship in adulthood: Conversational content between same-sex friends. Sex Roles, 9(12), 1183-1196.

Aseltine, R.H. Jr., Gore, S., & Colten, M.E. (1994) Depression and the social developmental context of adolescence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67(2), 252-263.

Ashton, N.L. (1980) Exploratory investigation of perceptions of influences on best-friend relationships. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 50, 379-386.

Aspinwall, L.G., & Taylor, S.E. (1992) Modeling cognitive adaptation: A longitudinal investigation of the impact of individual differences and coping on college adjustment and performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63(6), 989-1003.

Bailey, R.C., Finney, P., & Helm, B. (1975) Self-concept support and friendship duration. Journal of Social Psychology, 96, 237-243.

Banikotes, P.G., Neimeyer, G.J., & Lepkowsky, C. (1981) Gender and sex role orientation effects on friendship choice. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7, 605-510.

Baron, R.S., Cutrona, C.E., Hicklin, D., Russell, D.W., & Lubaroff, D.M. (1990) Social support and immune function among spouses of cancer patients. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59(2), 344-352.

Barrera, M.Jr. (1981) Social support's role in the adjustment of pregnant adolescents: Assessment issues and findings. In B.H. Gottlieb (Ed.), Social networks and social support in community mental health. Beverly Hills: Sage. Pp. 69-96.

Barrera, M.Jr., Sandler, I.N., & Ramsay, T.B. (1981) Preliminary development of a scale of social support: Studies on college students. American Journal of Community Psychology, 9(4), 435-447.

Barth, R.J., & Kinder, B.N. (1988) A theoretical analysis of sex differences in

same-sex friendships. Sex Roles, 19(5-6), 349-363.

Bell, R.A., LeRoy, J.B., & Stephenson, J.J. (1982) Evaluating the mediating

effects of social supports upon life events and depression symptoms.

Journal of Community Psychology, 10, 325-340.

Berman, W.H., & Sperling, M.B. (1991) Parental attachment and emotional

distress in the transition to college. Journal of Youth and Adolescence,

20(4), 427-440.

Berndt, T.J., & Hoyle, S.G. (1985) Stability and change in childhood and

adolescent friendships. Developmental Psychology, 21(6), 1007-1015.

Berscheid, E., & Walster, E.H. (1978) Interpersonal Attraction. Reading, Mass.:

Addison-Wesley.

Bigelow, B.J. (1977) Children's friendship expectations: A cognitive

development study. Child Development, 48, 246-253.

Billings, A.G., & Moos, R.H. (1981) The role of coping resources in attenuating

the stress of life events. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4(2), 139-157.

Billings, A.G., & Moos, R.H. (1985) Life stressors and social resources affect

posttreatment outcomes among depressed patients. Journal of Abnormal

Psychology, 94(2), 140-153.

Black, H.K. (1974) Physical attractiveness and similarity of attitude in

interpersonal attraction. Psychological Reports, 35, 403-406.

Blankenstein, K.R., & Flett, G.L. (1992) Specificity in the assessment of daily

hassles: Hassles, locus of control, and adjustment in college students.

Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 24(3), 382-398.

Blau, P.M. (1964) Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.

Bowlby, J. (1969) Attachment and loss. Vol. 1. New York: Basic.

Brenner, G.F., Norvell, N.K., & Limacher, M. (1989) Supportive and problematic social interactions: A social network analysis. American Journal of Community Psychology, 17(6), 831-836.

Buhrke, R.A., & Fuqua, D.R. (1987) Sex differences in same- and cross-sex supportive relationships. Sex Roles, 17(5/6), 339-352.

Buhrmester, D., & Furman, W. (1986) The changing functions of friends in childhood: A neo-Sullivanian perspective. In V.J. Derlega & B.A. Winstead (Eds.), Friendship and social interaction (pp. 41-62). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Bukowski, W.M., Boivin, M., & Hoza, B. (1994) Measuring friendship quality during pre- and -early adolescence: The development and psychometric properties of the Friendship Qualities Scale. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11, 471-484.

Bukowski, W.M., Nappi, B.J., & Hoza, B. (1987) A test of Aristotle's model of friendship for young adults' same-sex and opposite-sex relationships. Journal of Social Psychology, 127(6), 595-603.

Bukowski, W.M., & Newcomb, A.F. (1987) Friendship quality and the "self" during early adolescence. Paper presented at the Society for Research in Child Development.

120

Burda, P.C. Jr., Vaux, A., & Schill, T. (1984) Social support resources: Variation across sex and sex role. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10(1), 119-126.

Burke, R.J., & Weir, T. (1978) Sex differences in adolescent life stress, social support, and well-being. Journal of Psychology, 98, 277-288.

Byrne, D. (1971) The attraction paradigm. New York: Academic.

Byrne, D., & Clore, G.L. (1970) A reinforcement model of evaluative responses. Personality: An International Journal, 1, 103-128.

Caldwell, M.A., & Peplau, L.A. (1982) Sex differences in same-sex friendship. Sex Roles, 8(7), 721-732.

Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., & Rodgers, W.L. (1976) The quality of American life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions. New York: Russell Sage.

Cassel, J. (1974) Psychosocial process and "stress": Theoretical formulation. International Journal of Health Services, 6, 471-482.

Cobb, S. (1976) Social support as a moderator of life stress. Psychosomatic Medicine 38(5), 300-314.

Cohen, L.H., McGowan, J., Fooskas, S., & Rose, S. (1984) Positive life events and social support and the relationship between life stress and psychological disorder. American Journal of Community Psychology, 12(5), 567-587.

Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983) Applied multiple regression/correlation analyses

121

for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum Assoc.

Cohen, S., & Hoberman, H.M. (1983) Positive events and social supports as buffers of life change stress. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 13, 99-125.

Cohen, S., & McKay, G. (1984) Social support, stress and the buffering hypothesis: A theoretical analysis. In A. Baum, S.E. Taylor and J.E. Singer (Eds.), Handbook of psychology and health IV: Social Psychological aspects of health. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum Assoc.

Cohen, S., Sherrod, D.R., & Clark, M.S. (1986) Social skills and the stress-protective role of social support. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50(5), 963-973.

Cohen, S., & Wills, T.A. (1985) Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 98(2), 310-357.

Collins, N.L., Dunkel-Schetter, C., Lobel, M., & Scrimshaw, S.C.M. (1993) Social support in pregnancy: Psychosocial correlates of birth outcomes and postpartum depression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65(6), 1243-1258.

Compas, B.E., Slavin, L.A., Wagner, B.M., & Vannatta, K. (1986) Relationship of life events and social support with psychological dysfunction among adolescents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 15(3), 205-221.

Cooke, R.A., & Rousseau, D.M. (1983) Relationship of life events and personal orientations to symptoms of strain. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,

446-458.

Cozzarelli, C. (1993) Personality and self-efficacy as predictors of coping with
abortion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65(6), 1224-
1236.

Craig, W. (1988) Type A behaviour and social support. Paper presented at the
Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Montreal.

Crnic, K.A., Greenberg, M.T., Ragozin, A.S., Robinson, N.M., & Basham, R.B.
(1983) Effects of stress and social support on mothers and premature and
full-term infants. Child Development, 54, 209-217.

Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D. (1964) The approval motive: Studies in evaluative
dependence. New York: Wiley.

Cummins, R.C. (1988) Perceptions of social support, receipt of supportive
behaviors, and locus of control as moderators of the effects of chronic
stress. American Journal of Community Psychology, 16(5), 685-700.

Cutrona, C. (1982) Transition to college: Loneliness and the process of social
adjustment. In L.A. Peplau and D. Perlman (Eds.), Loneliness: A
sourcebook of current theory, research, and therapy. New York: Wiley.

Cutrona, C.E. (1984) Social support in the transition to parenthood. Journal of
Abnormal Psychology, 93(4), 378-390.

Cutrona, C.E., Cole, V., Colangelo, N., Assouline, S.G., & Russell, D.W. (1994)
Perceived parental social support and academic achievement: An
attachment theory perspective. Journal of Personality and Social

Psychology, 66(2), 369-378.

Davidson, L.R., & Duberman, L. (1982) Friendship: Communication and

interactional patterns in same-sex dyads. Sex Roles, 8, 809-822.

Dean, A., & Lin, N. (1977) The stress-buffering role of social support. Journal of

Nervous and Mental Disease, 165(6), 403-417.

Delongis, A., Coyne, J.C., Dakof, G., Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R.S. (1982)

Relation of daily hassles, uplifts, and major life events to health status.

Health Psychology, 1, 119-136.

Delongis, A., Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R.S. (1988) The impact of daily stress on

health and mood: Psychological and social resources as mediators.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54(3), 486-489.

Demakis, G.J., & McAdams, D.P. (1994) Personality, social support and well-

being among first year college students. College Student Journal, 27(2),

235-243.

D'Ercole, A. (1988) Single mothers: Stress, coping, and social support. Journal

of Community Psychology, 16(1), 41-54.

Diaz, R.M., & Berndt, T.J. (1982) Children's knowledge of a best friend: Fact or

fancy? Developmental Psychology, 18(6), 787-794.

Dinh, K.T., Sarason, B.R., & Sarason, I.G. (1994) Parent-child relationships in

Vietnamese immigrant families. Journal of Family Psychology, 8(4), 471-

488.

Duck, S.W. (1973) Similarity and perceived similarity of personal constructs as

influences on friendship choice. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 12, 1-6.

Duck, S., & Wright, P.H. (1993) Reexamining gender differences in same-gender friendships: A close look at two kinds of data. Sex Roles, 28(11/12), 709-727.

Durkheim, E. (1951) Suicide. New York: Free Press.

Ell, K., & Haywood, L.J. (1984) Social support and recovery from myocardial infarction: A panel study. Journal of Social Service Research, 7(4), 1-19.

Felsten, G., & Wilcox, G. (1992) Influences of stress and situation-specific mastery beliefs and satisfaction with social support on well-being and academic performance. Psychological Reports, 70, 291-303.

Foa, U.G., & Foa, E.B. (1974) Societal structures of the mind. Springfield, Il: Charles C. Thomas.

Frazier, P.A., & Esterly, E. (1990) Correlates of relationship beliefs: Gender, relationship experience and relationship satisfaction. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7, 331-352.

Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1985) Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. Developmental Psychology, 21, 1016-1022.

Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1985) Children's perceptions of the quality of sibling relationships. Child Development, 51, 448-461.

Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1992) Age and sex differences in perceptions of

networks of personal relationships. Child Development, 63(1), 103-115.

Ganellen, R.J., & Blaney, P.H. (1984) Hardiness and social support as

moderators of the effects of life stress. Journal of Personality and Social

Psychology, 47, 156-163.

Ganster, D.C., Fusilier, M.R., & Mayes, B.T. (1986) Role of social support in the

experience of stress at work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(1), 102-

110.

Gibbs, M., Auerbach, D., & Fox, M. (1980) A comparison of male and female

same-sex friendships. International Journal of Women's Studies, 3(3),

261-272.

Gitter, A., & Black, H. (1976) Is self-disclosure self-revealing? Journal of

Counseling Psychology, 23(4), 327-332.

Goodenow, C., Reisine, S.T., & Grady, K.E. (1990) Quality of social support and

associated social and psychological functioning in women with

rheumatoid arthritis. Health Psychology, 9(3), 266-284.

Gore, S. (1978) The effect of social support in moderating the health

consequences of unemployment. Journal of Health and Social Behavior,

19, 157-165.

Gottlieb, B.H. (1985) Social networks and social support: An overview of

research, practice, and policy implications. Health Education Quarterly,

12(1), 5-22.

Graham-Bermann, S.A., Cutler, S.E., Litzenberger, B.W., & Schwartz, W.E.

(1994) Perceived conflict and violence in childhood sibling relationships and later emotional adjustment. Journal of Family Psychology, 8(1), 85-97.

Habif, V. (1982) Development of a scale to measure social support and its role as a moderator of life stress. Unpublished dissertation, University of Georgia.

Habif, V.L., & Lahey, B.B. (1980) Assessment of the life stress-depression-relationship: The use of social support as a moderator variable. Journal of Behavioral Assessment, 2, 167-173.

Hartup, W.W., & Sancilio, M.F. (1986) Children's friendships. In E. Schopler & G.B. Mesibov (Eds.), Social behavior in autism. New York: Plenum. Pp. 61-80.

Hatfield, E., & Traupmann, J. (1981) Intimate relationships: A perspective from equity theory. In S. Duck & R. Gilmour (Eds.), Peer relationships: (Vol. 1) Studying personal relationships. London: Academic Press.

Hays, R.B. (1984) The development and maintenance of friendship. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 1, 75-98.

Hays, R.B. (1985) A longitudinal study of friendship development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48(4), 909-924.

Hays, R.B., & Oxley, D. (1986) Social network development and functioning during a life transition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50(2), 305-313.

Hays, R.B., Turner, H., & Coates, T.J. (1992) Social support, AIDS-related symptoms, and depression among gay men. <u>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</u>, <u>60</u>(3), 463-469.

Helgesen, V.S., Shaver, P., & Dyer, M. (1987) Prototypes of intimacy and distance in same-sex and opposite-sex relationships. <u>Journal of Social and Personal Relationships</u>, <u>4</u>, 195-233.

Henderson, S., Byrne, D.G., Duncan-Jones, P., Scott, R., & Adcock, S. (1980) Social relationships, adversity and neurosis: A study of associations in a general population sample. <u>British Journal of Psychiatry</u>, <u>136</u>, 354-388.

Henderson, S.N., & Cunningham, J.D. (1993) Women's emotional dependence on men: Scale construction and test of Russianoff's hypothesis. <u>Sex Roles</u>, <u>28</u>(5/6), 317-334.

Hirsch, B.M. (1979) Psychological dimensions of social networks: A multimethod analysis. <u>American Journal of Community Psychology</u>, <u>7</u>(3), 263-277.

Hobfoll, S.E., & Lieberman, J.R. (1987) Personality and social resources in immediate and continued stress resistance among women. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, <u>52</u>(1), 18-26.

Hobfoll, S.E., & London, P. (1986) The relationship of self-concept and social support to emotional distress among women during war. <u>Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology</u>, <u>12</u>, 87-100.

Holahan, C.K., & Holahan, C.J. (1987) Life stress, hassles, and self-efficacy in aging: A replication and extension. <u>Journal of Applied Social</u>

Psychology, 17(6), 574-592.

Holahan, C.K., Holahan, C.J., & Belk, S.S. (1984) Adjustment in aging: The

roles of life stress, hassles, and self-efficacy. Health Psychology, 3(4),

315-328.

Holahan, C.J., & Moos, R.H. (1981) Social support and psychological distress:

A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 90(4), 365-370.

Homans, G.C. (1961) Social behavior: Its elementary forms. New York:

Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Inglis, A. (1988) Role conflict, social support and gender: Implications for

psychological health. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the

Canadian Psychological Association, Montreal.

Johnson, F.L., & Aries, E.J. (1983) Conversational patterns among same-sex

pairs of late-adolescent close friends. Journal of Genetic Psychology,

142, 225-238.

Jones, D.C. (1991) Friendship satisfaction and gender: An examination of sex

differences in contributors to friendship satisfaction. Journal of Social and

Personal Relationships, 8(2), 167-185.

Joubert, C.E. (1991) Self-esteem and social desirability in relation to college

students' retrospective perceptions of parental fairness and disciplinary

practices. Psychological Reports, 69(1), 115-120.

Kahn, R.L., & Antonucci, T.C. (1980) Convoys over the life course: Attachment,

roles, and social support. In P.B. Baltes & O. Brim (Eds.), Life-span

development and behavior (Vol. 3). Boston: Lexington Press.

Kaniasty, K., & Norris, F.H. (1993) A test of the social support deterioration

model in the context of natural disaster. Journal of Personality and Social

Psychology, 64(3), 395-408.

Kanner, A.D., Coyne, J.C., Schaeffer, C., & Lazarus, R.S. (1981) Comparison of

two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major

life events. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4(1), 1-39.

Kaplan, B.H., Cassel, J.C., & Gore, S. (1977) Social support and health.

Medical Care, 15(5), 47-58.

Kernis, M.H., Cornell, D.P., Sun, C.-R., Berry, A., & Harlow, T. (1993) There's

more to self-esteem than whether it is high or low: The importance of

stability of self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,

65(6), 1190-1204.

Kessler, R.C., & Essex, H. (1982) Marital status and depression: The

importance of coping resources. Social Forces, 61(2), 484-507.

Kline, R.B. (1991) Latent variable path analysis in clinical research: A beginner's

tour guide. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 47, 471-484.

Kobasa, S.C., Maddi, S.R., & Courington, S. (1981) Personality and constitution

as mediators in the stress-illness relationship. Journal of Health and

Social Behavior, 22, 368-378.

Kohn, P.M., Lafreniere, K., & Gurevich, M. (1991) Hassles, health, and

personality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61(3), 478-

482.

Kohut, H. (1984) How does analysis cure? Chicago: The University Press.

Kraus, L.A., Bazzini, D.B., Davis, M.H., Church, M., & Kirchman, C.M. (1993) Personal and social influences on loneliness: The mediating effect of social provisions. Social Psychology Quarterly, 56(1), 37-53.

Kurdek, L.A. (1988) Social support of divorced single mothers and their children. Journal of Divorce, 11(3/4), 167-188.

LaGaipa, J.J. (1977) Testing a multidimensional approach to friendship. In S. Duck (Ed.), Theory and practice in interpersonal attraction. New York: Academic Press.

Lakey, B. (1989) Personal and environmental antecedents of perceived social support developed at college. American Journal of Community Psychology, 17(4), 503- 513.

Lakey, B., & Cassady, P.B. (1990) Cognitive processes in perceived social support. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59(2), 337-343.

Lakey, B., & Heller, K. (1985) Response biases and the relation between negative life events and psychological symptoms. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49(6), 1662-1668.

Lea, M. (1989) Factors underlying friendship: An analysis of responses on the Acquaintance Description Form in relation to Wright's friendship model. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 6, 275-292.

Lecci, L., Okun, M.A., & Karoly, P. (1994) Life regrets and current goals as

predictors of psychological adjustment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66(4), 731-741.

Lefcourt, H.M., Miller, R.S., Ware, E.E., & Sherk, D. (1981) Locus of control as a modifier of the relationship between stressors and moods. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 357-369.

Lehman, D.R., Wortman, C.B., & Williams, A.F. (1987) Long-term effects of losing a spouse or child in a motor vehicle crash. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52(1), 218-234.

Lepore, S.J. (1992) Social conflict, social support, and psychological distress: Evidence of cross-domain buffering effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63(5), 857-867.

Leslie, L.A., & Grady, K. (1988) Social support for divorcing mothers: What seems to help? Journal of Divorce, 11(3/4), 147-165.

Levinson, D.J. (1977) Seasons of a man's life. New York: Ballantine.

Lewis, R.A. (1978) Emotional intimacy among men. Journal of Social Issues, 34(1), 108-121.

Lobel, T.E., & Teiber, A. (1994) Effects of self-esteem and need for approval on affective and cognitive reactions: Defensive and true self-esteem. Personality and Individual Differences, 16(2), 315-321.

Lott, A.J., & Lott, B.E. (1974) The role of reward in the formation of positive interpersonal attitudes. In T.L. Huston (Ed.), Foundations of interpersonal attraction (pp. 171-189). New York: Academic Press.

132

Lowenthal, M.F., & Haven, C. (1968) Interaction and adaptation: Intimacy as a critical variable. <u>American Sociological Review</u>, <u>33</u>(1), 20-30.

Maccoby, E.E. (1990) Gender and relationships: A developmental account. <u>American Psychologist</u>, <u>45</u>, 513-520.

McGuire, K., & Weisz, J. (1982) Social cognition and behavior correlates of preadolescent chumship. <u>Child Development</u>, <u>53</u>, 1478-1484.

Mead, M. (1934) <u>Mind, self, and society</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mehrabian, A. (1969) Some referents and measures of nonverbal behavior. <u>Behavior Research Methods and Instrumentation</u>, <u>1</u>, 203-207.

Miller, R.S., & Lefcourt, H.M. (1982) The assessment of social intimacy. <u>Journal of Personality Assessment</u>, <u>46</u>(5), 514-518.

Miller, R.S., & Lefcourt, H.M. (1983) Social intimacy: An important moderator of stressful life events. <u>American Journal of Community Psychology</u>, <u>11</u>(2), 127-139.

Mitchell, R.E., & Hodson, C.A. (1986) Coping and social support among battered women: An ecological perspective. In S.E. Hobfoll (Ed.), <u>Stress, social support, and women</u>. New York: Hemisphere Publishing.

Monroe, S.M. (1983) Social support and disorder: Toward an untangling of cause and effect. <u>American Journal of Community Psychology</u>, <u>11</u>(1), 81-97.

Monsour, M. (1992) Meanings of intimacy in cross- and same-sex friendships.

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 9, 277-295.

Morse, S.J. (1983) Requirements for love and friendship in Australia and Brazil. Australian Journal of Psychology, 35(3), 469-476.

Overholser, J.C., Norman, W.H., & Miller, I.W. (1987) Life stress and social supports in depressed inpatients. Paper presented at the 95th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New York.

Pagel, M., & Becker, J. (1987) Depressive thinking and depression: Relations with personality and social resources. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52(5), 1043-1052.

Pagel, M.D., Erdly, W.W., & Becker, J. (1987) Social networks: We get by with (and in spite of) a little help from out friends. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 793-804.

Parker, J.G., & Asher, S.R. (1993) Friendship and friendship quality in middle childhood: Links with peer group acceptance and feelings of loneliness and social dissatisfaction. Developmental Psychology, 29(4), 611-621.

Parsons, T. (1949) Age and sex in the social structure of the United States. In Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray (Eds.), Personality in nature, society and culture. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Paykel, E.S., Emms, E.M., Fletcher, J., & Rassaby, E. (1980) Life events and social support in puerperal depression. British Journal of Psychology, 339-346.

Pearlin, L.I., Menaghan, E.G., Lieberman, M.A., & Mullan, J.T. (1981) The

stress process. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 22, 337-356.

Pennebaker, J.W. (1985) Traumatic experience and psychosomatic disease:
Exploring the roles of behavioural obsession, and confiding. Canadian
Psychology, 26(2), 82-95.

Pennebaker, J.W., & Hoover, C.W. (1986) Inhibition and cognition: Toward an
understanding of trauma and disease. In R.J. Davidson, G.E. Schwartz, &
D. Shapiro (Eds.), Consciousness and self-regulation: Vol. 4. New York:
Plenum Press.

Pennebaker, J.W., & O'Heeron, R.C. (1984) Confiding in others and illness
rates among spouses of suicide and accidental-death victims. Journal of
Abnormal Psychology, 93(4), 473-476.

Pierce, G.R., Sarason, I.G., & Sarason, B.R. (1991) General and relationship-
based perceptions of social support: Are two constructs better than one?
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61(6), 1028-1039.

Pogrebin, L.C. (1987) Among friends: Who we like, why we like them, and what
we do with them. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Procidano, M.E., & Heller, K. (1983) Measures of perceived social support from
friends and from family: Three validation studies. American Journal of
Community Psychology, 11(1), 1-23.

Quittner, A.L., Glueckauf, R.L., & Jackson, D.N. (1990) Chronic parenting
stress: Moderating versus mediating effects of social support. Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 59(6), 1266-1278.

Radloff, L.S. (1977) The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. <u>Applied Psychological Measurement,</u> <u>1</u>(3), 385–401.

Reis, H.T., Senchak, M., & Solomon, B. (1985) Sex differences in the intimacy of social interaction: Further examination of potential explanations. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,</u> <u>48</u>(5), 1204-1217.

Reis, H.T., & Shaver, P. (1988) Intimacy as an interpersonal process. In S.W. Duck et al., (Eds.), <u>Handbook of personal relationships.</u> Chichester: Wiley.

Roberts, R.E.L., & Bengtson, V.L. (1993) Relationships with parents, self-esteem, and psychological well-being in young adulthood. <u>Social Psychology Quarterly,</u> <u>56</u>(4), 263-277.

Rook, K.S. (1984) The negative side of social interaction: Impact on psychological well-being. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,</u> <u>46</u>, 1097-1108.

Roos, P.E., & Cohen, L.H. (1987) Sex roles and social support as moderators of life stress adjustment. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,</u> <u>52</u>(3), 576-585.

Rose, S.M. (1985) Same- and cross-sex friendships and the psychology of homosociality. <u>Sex Roles,</u> <u>12</u>(1/2), 63-74.

Rosenberg, M. (1965) <u>Society and adolescent self-image.</u> Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press.

136

Rubin, L.B. (1985) Just friends: The role of friendship in our lives. New York: Harper & Row.

Russell, D., Cutrona, C., Rose, J., & Yurko, K. (1984) Social and emotional loneliness: An examination of Weiss's Typology of Loneliness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 1313-1321.

Russell, D., Peplau, L., & Cutrona, C. (1980) The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 472-480.

Sandler, I.M., & Lakey, B. (1982) Locus of control as a stress moderator: The role of control perception and social support. American Journal of Community Psychology, 10(1), 65-80.

Sarason, I.G., Johnson, J.H., & Siegel, J.M. (1978) Assessing the impact of life changes: Development of the Life Experiences Survey. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46(5), 937-946.

Scheier, M.F., & Carver, C.S. (1985) Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. Health Psychology, 4, 219-247.

Scheier, M.F., Carver, C.S., & Bridges, M.W. (1994) Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67(6), 1063-1078.

Schulz, R., & Decker, S. (1985) Long-term adjustment to physical disability:

The role of social support, perceived control, and self-blame. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48(5), 1162-1172.

Schwitzer, A.M., Robbins, S.B., & McGovern, T.V. (1993) Influences of goal instability and social support on college adjustment. Journal of College Student Development, 34, 21-25.

Seigel, S., & Castellan Jr, N.J. (1988) Nonparametric statistics for the Behavioral sciences, 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Shedler, J., Mayman, M., & Manis, M. (1993) The illusion of mental health. American Psychologist, 48, 1117-1131.

Siegel, J.M., & Kuykendall, D.H. (1990) Loss, widowhood, and psychological distress among the elderly. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58(5), 519-524.

Solomon, M.F. (1990) Self psychology and marital relationships. Paper presented at the Quebec Association of Marriage and Family Therapists, Montreal.

Spohn, R.B. (1993) Social desirability correlates for acceptance of rape myth. Psychological Reports, 73(3, Pt. 2), 1218.Stanton, A.L. (1987) Cognitive appraisal, coping, and adaptational outcome in infertility. Paper presented at the 95th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York.

Stokes, J. (1985) The relation of social network and individual difference variables to loneliness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48,

981-990.

Stokes, J., Fuehrer, A., & Childs, L. (1980) Gender differences in self-disclosure to various target persons. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27(2), 192-198.

Stokes, J., & Wilson, D.G. (1984) The Inventory of Socially Supportive Behaviors: Dimensionality, prediction, and gender differences. American Journal of Community Psychology, 12(1), 53-69.

Stryker, S. (1980) Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version. Palo Alto, Calif.: Benjamin/Cummings.

Sullivan, H.S. (1953) The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (1983) Using multivariate statistics. New York: Harper & Row.

Tesch, S.A., & Martin, R.R. (1983) Friendship concepts of young adults in two age groups. Journal of Psychology, 115, 7-12.

Thibault, J.W., & Kelly, H.H. (1959) The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley.

Thoits, P.A. (1982) Conceptual, methodological, and theoretical problems in studying social support as a buffer against life stress. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 23(June), 145-159.

Thoits, P.A. (1986) Social support as coping assistance. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54(4), 416-423.

Tiger, L. (1969) Men in groups. New York: Random House.

Tompkins, C.A., Schulz, R., & Rau, M.T. (1988) Post-stroke depression in primary support persons: Predicting those at risk. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56(4), 502-508.

Turner, R.J., Grindstaff, C.F., & Phillips, N. (1990) Social support and outcome in teenage pregnancy. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 31, 43-57.

Valentiner, D.P., Holahan, C.J., & Moos, R.H. (1994) Social support, appraisals of event controllability, and coping: An integrative model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66(6), 1094-1102.

Veiel, H.O.F. (1985) Dimensions of social support: A conceptual framework for research. Social Psychiatry, 20, 156-162.

Veroff, V.B., & Brender, W. (1987) The effects of prolonged infertility on couples' emotional, marital and sexual adjustment. Unpublished master's thesis, Concordia University, Montreal.

Vinokur, A.D., & van Ryn, M. (1993) Social support and undermining in close relationships: Their independent effects on the mental health of unemployed persons. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65(2), 350-359.

Wallston, B.S., Alagna, S.W., DeVellis, B.M., & DeVellis, R.F. (1983) Social support and physical health. Health Psychology, 2(4), 367-391.

Walster, E., Walster, G.W., & Berscheid, E. (1977) Equity: Theory and research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

140

Waring, E.M., & Patton, D. (1984) Marital intimacy and depression. British Journal of Psychiatry, 145, 641-644.

Waring, E.M., Tillman, M.P., Frelick, M.D., Russell, L., & Weisz, G. (1980) Concepts of intimacy in the general population. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 168, 471-474.

Weinberg, R.B., & Marlowe, H.A., Jr. (1983) Recognizing the social in psychosocial competence: The importance of social network interventions. Psycho-Social Rehabilitation Journal, 6(4), 25-34.

Weinberger, D. (1990) The construct validity of the repressive coping style. In J.L. Singer (Ed.), Repression and dissociation: Implications for personality theory, psychopathology, and health. (pp. 337-385). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weinberger, M., Hiner, S.L., & Tierney, W.M. (1987) In support of hassles as a measure of stress in predicting health outcomes. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 10(1), 19-31.

Weir, R.M., & Okun, M.A. (1989) Social support, positive college events, and college satisfaction: Evidence for boosting effects. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19(9), 758-771.

Weiss, R.S. (1974) The provisions of social relationships. In Z. Rubin (Ed.), Doing unto others. (pp. 17-26). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Wethington, E., & Kessler, R.C. (1986) Perceived support, received support, and adjustment to stressful life events. Journal of Health and Social

Behavior, 27(March), 78-89.

Wilcox, B.L. (1981) Social support, life stress, and psychological adjustment: A

test of the buffering hypothesis. American Journal of Community

Psychology, 9(4), 371-386.

Williams, D.G. (1985) Gender, masculinity-femininity, and emotional intimacy in

same-sex friendship. Sex Roles, 12(5/6), 587-600.

Williams, D.G., & Solano, C.H. (1983) The social reality of feeling lonely:

Friendship and reciprocation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,

9(2), 237-242.

Wong, J.L., & Whitaker, D.J. (1993) Depressive mood states and their cognitive

and personality correlates in college students: They improve over time.

Journal of Clinical Psychology, 49(5), 615-621.

Wong, M.H., & Csiksentmihalyi, M. (1991) Affiliation motivation and daily

experience: Some issues on gender differences. Journal of Personality

and Social Psychology, 60(1), 154-164.

Wood, J.T. (1993) Engendered relations: Interaction, caring, power, and

responsibility in intimacy. In S. Duck (Ed.), Understanding relationship

processes: Vol. 3, Social context and relationships. London: Sage.

Wright, P.H. (1978) Toward a theory of friendship based on a conception of self.

Human Communication Research, 4(3), 196-207.

Wright, P.H. (1982) Men's friendships, women's friendships and the alleged

inferiority of the latter. Sex Roles, 8(1), 1-20.

142

Wright, P.H. (1984) Self-referent motivation and the intrinsic quality of

    friendship. <u>Journal of Social and Personal Relationships</u>, <u>1</u>, 115-130.

Wright, P.H. (1985) The Acquaintance Description Form. In S. Duck & D.

    Perlman (Eds.), <u>Understanding personal relationships: An</u>

    <u>interdisciplinary approach</u> (pp. 39-62). London: Sage.

Wright, P.H. (1988) Interpreting research on gender differences in friendship: A

    case for moderation and a plea for caution. <u>Journal of Social and</u>

    <u>Personal Relationships</u>, <u>5</u>, 367-373.

Wright, P.H. (1989) Gender differences in adults' same-and cross-gender

    friendships. In R.G. Adams & R. Blieszner (Eds.), <u>Older adult friendship:</u>

    <u>Structure and process</u>. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wright, P.H., & Conneran, P.J. (1989) Measuring strain in personal

    relationships: A refinement. <u>Psychological Reports</u>, <u>64</u>, 1321-1322.

Wright, P.H., & Crawford, A.C. (1971) Agreement and friendship: A close look

    and some second thoughts. <u>Representative Research in Social</u>

    <u>Psychology</u>, <u>2</u>(2), 52-69.

Wright, P.H., & Keple, T.W. (1981) Friends and parents of a sample of high

    school juniors: An exploratory study of relationship intensity and

    interpersonal rewards. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, <u>43</u>, 559-570.

Wright, P.H., & Scanlon, M.B. (1991) Gender role orientations and friendship:

    Some attenuation, but gender differences abound. <u>Sex Roles</u>, <u>24</u>(9/10),

    551-566.

Zarski, J.J. (1984) Hassles and health: A replication. <u>Health Psychology</u>, <u>3</u>, 243-251.

Zika, S., & Chamberlain, K. (1987) Relation of hassles and personality to subjective well-being. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, <u>53</u>(1), 155-162.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Questionnaire Package

146

FRIENDSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE PACKAGE

This package contains several questionnaires dealing with your thoughts about your closest friend, your social network as a whole, and yourself. The package should take about an hour to complete, and it is completely anonymous – NO NAMES REQUIRED. If you decline to participate, you will not be penalized in any way in this class.

By agreeing to complete this package, you become eligible to win one of two **$50.00 CASH** prizes!

To confirm your entry in our raffle, simply return your questionnaire package to the researchers and return the completed slip below either with the questionnaires as is or in a separate envelope. Your name will be entered only if the eligibility slip is accompanied by a completed questionnaire package.

Please read all questionnaires carefully and complete them in full. If you wish to obtain information about the results of this study, check off the appropriate blank on your raffle slip, and a researcher will contact you upon completion of the project.

....

     I AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE FRIENDSHIP RESEARCH PROJECT, WHICH ENTAILS THE COMPLETION OF A QUESTIONNAIRE PACKAGE TAKING APPROXIMATELY ONE HOUR. MY ANSWERS WILL BE CONFIDENTIAL AND KNOWN ONLY TO THE RESEARCHER.

     BY VIRTUE OF MY PARTICIPATION, I HAVE BECOME ELIGIBLE FOR THE **$50.00** FRIENDSHIP RESEARCH RAFFLE. THE DRAWINGS WILL TAKE PLACE ONCE ALL QUESTIONNAIRES HAVE BEEN RETURNED.

NAME   _____

ADDRESS   _____

               _____

PHONE   _____

____ I AM INTERESTED IN FINDING OUT MORE ABOUT THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY. PLEASE CONTACT ME WHEN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT IS COMPLETED.

____ I HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY. PLEASE CONTACT ME IMMEDIATELY.

....

CLOSE FRIENDSHIP DESCRIPTION FORM

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out how you would describe your closest <u>same-sex</u> friend. Please read each statement carefully and then, thinking of your closest same-sex friend, indicate how true or untrue the statement is by <u>circling</u> the appropriate number on the scale next to it. The scales read as follows:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**
not at all true		somewhat true			completely true	

Please try to respond to all sentences. If some of the situations described have never come up in your relationship, try your best to <u>imagine</u> what things would be like if they did occur. If you feel you do not have a very close same-sex friend, please check here ___ and go on to the next form.

First name or initials of closest same-sex friend _____

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SCALE</u>
1) My friend can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about..........1	2 3 4 5 6 7
2) If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on my friend to be willing to loan it to me.......1	2 3 4 5 6 7
3) My friend makes it easy for me to express my most important personal qualities in my everyday life................1	2 3 4 5 6 7
4) My friend is encouraging and supportive when I am unhappy...1	2 3 4 5 6 7
5) My friend's way of dealing with people makes him/her rather difficult to get along with 1	2 3 4 5 6 7
6) If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skilful, I can count on my friend to notice it and appreciate my ability...1	2 3 4 5 6 7
7) When I do something for my friend, I need to know I'll get something in return...1	2 3 4 5 6 7
8) My friend is good at helping me solve problems..................1	2 3 4 5 6 7
9) I can converse freely and comfortably with my friend without worrying about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate or just silly............1	2 3 4 5 6 7
10) Sometimes my friend and I kid each other in an affectionate way...1	2 3 4 5 6 7
11) If I hadn't heard from my friend for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact her/him just for the sake of keeping in touch...............................1	2 3 4 5 6 7

SCALE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all		somewhat			completely	
true		true			true	

12) If my friend were to move away or "disappear" for some reason, I would really miss the special kind of companionship s(he) provides.............................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13) I feel comfortable confiding in my friend 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14) When we get together to work on a task or project, my friend can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems....................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15) If I were looking for a job, I could count on my friend to try his/her best to help me find one............................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16) My friend is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to express my true thoughts and feelings...........................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17) My relationship with my friend is very mutual; we do things for each other..1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18) I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with my friend from "falling apart"...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19) If I am in an embarrassing situation, I can count on my friend to do things that will make me feel as much at ease as possible...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20) It is important to me that my friend shows me affection....1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21) My friend sometimes says things that make my situation easier to understand...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22) My friend is the kind of person who likes to "put me down" or embarrass me with seemingly harmless little jokes or comments..1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23) I often keep very personal information to myself and do not share it with my friend.................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24) If my friend 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 my friend...................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25) My friend expresses so many personal qualities I like that I think of her/him as being "one of a kind", a truly unique person...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26) My friend gives me the moral support I need...................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27) My friend can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it weren't for him/her..1 2 3 4 5 6 7

SCALE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all true		somewhat true			completely true	

28) If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on my friend to help with errands or chores to make things as convenient for me as possible............1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29) My friend treats me in ways that encourage me to be my "true self"...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30) I feel quite affectionate toward my friend.........................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31) I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to my friend about topics that s(he) considers controversial or touchy...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32) If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on my friend to be happy and congratulatory about it............1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33) My friend sometimes helps me understand why I didn't do something well...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34) It seems as though my friend is rarely able to listen attentively to me when I need to talk about something....1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35) I feel free to reveal private or personal information about myself to my friend because s(he) is not the kind of person who would use such information to my disadvantage......1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36) If things were going badly for me my friend would support me...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37) If I had decided to leave town on a certain day for a leisurely trip or vacation and discovered that my friend was leaving for the same place a day later, I would seriously consider waiting a day in order to travel with him/her....................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

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 my friend...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39) I wish my friend was much different.................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

40) When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and options, my friend introduces viewpoints that help me see things in a new light.............1 2 3 4 5 6 7

41) My friend 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...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42) My friend is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to do the kinds of things I really want to do......................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

43) Sometimes when my friend smiles at me I know how much s(he) cares about me...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

150

SCALE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all		somewhat			completely	
true		true			true	

44) I have a hard time really understanding some of my friend's actions and comments...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

45) My friend would stand by me if someone was causing me trouble... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

46) If I have to defend any of my beliefs or convictions, my friend is the type of person who supports me, even if s(he) does not share those beliefs or convictions with me....... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

47) My friend sometimes gives me information about how to do something or suggests some action I should take...... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

48) When I am with my friend, 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......................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

49) I often feel that my friend doesn't really care about my welfare and concerns...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

50) When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with my friend to see if we can arrange to do things together...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

51) When my friend and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship I don't get from any of my other acquaintances..1 2 3 4 5 6 7

52) When I have a problem, I often confide in my friend.........1 2 3 4 5 6 7

53) I can count on my friend to be ready with really good suggestions when we are looking for some activity or project to engage in...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

54) If I were sick or hurt, I could count on my friend to do things that would make it easier to take.....................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

55) Doing things with my friend seems to bring out my more important traits and characteristics.....................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

56) I know my friend cares about me as much as I care about him/her..1 2 3 4 5 6 7

57) I can count on communication with my friend to break down when we try to discuss things that are touchy or controversial 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

58) My friend has a way of 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......................1 2 3 4 5 6 7

SCALE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all		somewhat			completely	
true		true			true	

59) Conversation with my friend usually stays on a casual
level and does not involve our personal feelings...............1 2 3 4 5 6 7

60) If I felt sad or upset my friend would try to cheer me up.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7

61) My friend is quick to point out anything s(he) sees as a
flaw in my character...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

62) My friend and I sometimes pat each other on the back or
roughhouse to show our affection for each other...............1 2 3 4 5 6 7

63) If I had just gotten off work or out of class and had some free
time, I would wait around and leave with my friend if (s)he
were leaving the same place an hour or so later...............1 2 3 4 5 6 7

64) My friend is the kind of person I would miss very much if
something happened to interfere with our
acquaintanceship...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

65) My friend and I talk more about our personal lives than
about everyday events...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

66) Sometimes my friend and I show our feelings for each
other through eye contact...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

67) I often talk to my friend about my feelings and problems...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

FRIENDSHIP HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

Please answer the following questions about yourself and the friend about whom you answered the above questionnaire (your closest same-sex friend).

1) How long have you and your friend known each other? _____
2) How did you and your friend meet? (e.g. circumstances, place)

_____

_____

_____

3) How frequently do you and your friend see each other socially?
   ___ per week / per month / per year (circle one)
4) What is your occupation? _____
5) Years of education completed? _____
6) Your age? _____
7) Your marital status? (single / married / separated / divorced / living with partner)

_____

Questions 8 to 10 and 15 to 17 are optional. Although complete information would be preferable and would help us in our research, you may leave out any item(s) if you would rather not respond.

8) Religious upbringing (Jewish/Catholic/Protestant/Other)? _____
9) Racial background (White/Black/Oriental/Other)? _____
10) Approximate income of your present household (i.e. yourself and mate or parents, as applicable)? _____

WITH REGARDS TO YOUR CLOSEST SAME-SEX FRIEND:

11) What is your friend's age? _____
12) Friend's occupation? _____
13) Years of education completed by friend? _____
14) Friend's marital status (singe / married / separated / divorced / living with partner)? _____
15) Friend's religious upbringing (Jewish / Catholic / Protestant / Other)? _____
16) Friend's racial background (White / Black / Oriental / Other)? _____
17) Approximate income of friend's present household (i.e. friend and mate or parents, as applicable)? _____

THE HASSLES SCALE

HASSLES are irritants - things that annoy or bother you; they can make you upset or angry. Some hassles occur on a fairly regular basis and others are relatively rare. Some have only a slight effect, others have a strong effect. This questionnaire lists things that can be hassles in day-to-day life.

Directions: Please think about how much of a hassle each item was for you in the last month. Please indicate on the rating scales next to each item how much of a hassle the item was by circling the appropriate number.

0 = None or not applicable
1 = Somewhat
2 = Quite a bit
3 = A great deal

		0	1	2	3
1.	Misplacing or losing things	0	1	2	3
2.	Troublesome neighbour(s) or roommate(s)	0	1	2	3
3.	Social obligations	0	1	2	3
4.	Inconsiderate smokers	0	1	2	3
5.	Troubling thoughts about your future	0	1	2	3
6.	Thoughts about death	0	1	2	3
7.	Health of a family member	0	1	2	3
8.	Not enough money for clothing	0	1	2	3
9.	Not enough money for housing	0	1	2	3
10.	Concerns about owing money	0	1	2	3
11.	Concerns about getting credit	0	1	2	3
12.	Concerns about money for emergencies	0	1	2	3
13.	Financial problems concerning school (in danger of not having sufficient money to continue)	0	1	2	3
14.	Someone owes you money	0	1	2	3
15.	Financial responsibility for someone who doesn't live with you	0	1	2	3
16.	Cutting down on electricity, water, etc.	0	1	2	3
17.	Smoking too much	0	1	2	3
18.	Use of alcohol	0	1	2	3
19.	Personal use of drugs	0	1	2	3
20.	Too many responsibilities	0	1	2	3
21.	Decisions about having children	0	1	2	3
22.	Non-family members living in your house	0	1	2	3
23.	Care for pet	0	1	2	3
24.	Planning and/or preparing meals	0	1	2	3
25.	Concerned about the meaning of life	0	1	2	3

HASSLES SCALE

0 = None or not applicable
1 = Somewhat
2 = Quite a bit
3 = A great deal

26.	Trouble relaxing.	0	1	2	3
27.	Trouble making decisions.	0	1	2	3
28.	Problems getting along with fellow students or workers.	0	1	2	3
29.	Customers or clients giving you a hard time.	0	1	2	3
30.	Problems with a professor.	0	1	2	3
31.	Failed an important exam.	0	1	2	3
32.	Academic probation.	0	1	2	3
33.	Laid-off or out of work.	0	1	2	3
34.	Don't like current duties at work or school.	0	1	2	3
35.	Don't like fellow students or workers.	0	1	2	3
36.	Not enough money for basic necessities.	0	1	2	3
37.	Not enough money for food.	0	1	2	3
38.	Too many interruptions.	0	1	2	3
39.	Unexpected company.	0	1	2	3
40.	Too much time on hands.	0	1	2	3
41.	Having to wait.	0	1	2	3
42.	Separation from family.	0	1	2	3
43.	Being lonely.	0	1	2	3
44.	Not enough money for health care.	0	1	2	3
45.	Fear of confrontation.	0	1	2	3
46.	Financial security.	0	1	2	3
47.	Silly practical mistakes.	0	1	2	3
48.	Inability to express yourself.	0	1	2	3
49.	Physical illness.	0	1	2	3
50.	Side effects of medication.	0	1	2	3
51.	Concerns about medical treatment.	0	1	2	3
52.	Physical appearance.	0	1	2	3
53.	Fear of rejection.	0	1	2	3
54.	Difficulties with getting pregnant.	0	1	2	3
55.	Sexual problems.	0	1	2	3
56.	Concerns about health in general.	0	1	2	3
57.	Not seeing enough people.	0	1	2	3
58.	Friends or relatives too far away.	0	1	2	3
59.	Wasting time.	0	1	2	3
60.	Auto maintenance.	0	1	2	3
61.	Filling out forms.	0	1	2	3

HASSLES SCALE

0 = None or not applicable
1 = Somewhat
2 = Quite a bit
3 = A great deal

62.	Concerns about accidents	0	1	2	3
63.	Problems with employees	0	1	2	3
64.	Problems on job due to being woman or man	0	1	2	3
65.	Dismissed from dormitory or other residence	0	1	2	3
66.	Joining a fraternity or sorority	0	1	2	3
67.	Being exploited	0	1	2	3
68.	Concerns about bodily functions	0	1	2	3
69.	Rising prices of common goods	0	1	2	3
70.	Not getting enough sleep or rest	0	1	2	3
71.	Problems with parents	0	1	2	3
72.	Problems with children	0	1	2	3
73.	Problems with your lover	0	1	2	3
74.	Difficulties seeing or hearing	0	1	2	3
75.	Overloaded with family responsibilities	0	1	2	3
76.	Too many things to do	0	1	2	3
77.	Unchallenging work	0	1	2	3
78.	Concerns about meeting high standards	0	1	2	3
79.	Financial dealings with friends or acquaintances	0	1	2	3
80.	Job or school dissatisfactions	0	1	2	3
81.	Worries about decisions to change jobs	0	1	2	3
82.	Trouble with reading, writing, or spelling abilities	0	1	2	3
83.	Too many meetings	0	1	2	3
84.	Changing a major	0	1	2	3
85.	Trouble with arithmetic skills	0	1	2	3
86.	Failing a course	0	1	2	3
87.	Dropping a course	0	1	2	3
88.	Concerns about weight	0	1	2	3
89.	Not enough time to do the things you need to	0	1	2	3
90.	Television	0	1	2	3
91.	Not enough personal energy	0	1	2	3
92.	Concerns about inner conflicts	0	1	2	3
93.	Feel conflicted over what to do	0	1	2	3
94.	Regrets over past decisions	0	1	2	3
95.	Menstrual (period) problems	0	1	2	3
96.	The weather	0	1	2	3
97.	Nightmares	0	1	2	3

HASSLES SCALE

0 = None or not applicable
1 = Somewhat
2 = Quite a bit
3 = A great deal

98.	Concerns about getting ahead.................................	0	1	2	3
99.	Hassles from boss or supervisor.................................	0	1	2	3
100.	Difficulties with friends.................................	0	1	2	3
101.	Not enough time for family.................................	0	1	2	3
102.	Transportation problems.................................	0	1	2	3
103.	Not enough money for transportation........................	0	1	2	3
104.	Not enough money for entertainment and recreation....	0	1	2	3
105.	Shopping.................................	0	1	2	3
106.	Prejudice and discrimination from others.....................	0	1	2	3
107.	Property, investments or taxes.................................	0	1	2	3
108.	Not enough time for entertainment and recreation.......	0	1	2	3
109.	Home maintenance.................................	0	1	2	3
110.	Concerns about news events.................................	0	1	2	3
111.	Crime.................................	0	1	2	3
112.	Traffic.................................	0	1	2	3
113.	Pollution.................................	0	1	2	3
114.	Concerns about job security.................................	0	1	2	3
115.	Financing children's education.................................	0	1	2	3
116.	Problems with child care arrangements........................	0	1	2	3
117.	Gossip.................................	0	1	2	3
118.	Legal problems.................................	0	1	2	3
119.	Beginning a new school experience at a higher academic level (college, grad school, etc.)...........................	0	1	2	3
120.	Applying to grad or professional schools.....................	0	1	2	3

MOOD INVENTORY

The following questions are about ways you might have felt or behaved during the past month. Please indicate on the rating scale next to each item how often DURING THE PAST MONTH you felt or behaved this way.

0=rarely/none of the time	1=some or a little of the time	2=moderately, occasionally	3=most or all the time

1. I was bothered by things that don't usually bother me....................... 0 1 2 3
2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor................................. 0 1 2 3
3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues, even with help from
   my family or friends.. 0 1 2 3
4. I felt that I was just as good as other people................................. 0 1 2 3
5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing........................ 0 1 2 3
6. I felt depressed... 0 1 2 3
7. I felt that everything I did was an effort... 0 1 2 3
8. I felt hopeful about the future.. 0 1 2 3
9. I thought my life had been a failure.. 0 1 2 3
10. I felt fearful.. 0 1 2 3
11. My sleep was restless... 0 1 2 3
12. I was happy.. 0 1 2 3
13. I talked less than usual... 0 1 2 3
14. I felt lonely.. 0 1 2 3
15. People were unfriendly.. 0 1 2 3
16. I enjoyed life.. 0 1 2 3
17. I had crying spells... 0 1 2 3
18. I felt sad.. 0 1 2 3
19. I felt that people disliked me.. 0 1 2 3
20. I could not get "going"... 0 1 2 3

Please circle your responses to each of the next five questions on a scale from **1 (none) to 5 (a great deal)**. Each question begins as follows:

What degree of control do you feel you have to...
1) ...achieve or obtain what is important to you?   0 1 2 3 5
2) ...make your interactions with others end up the
   way you expect them to?   0 1 2 3 5
3) ...cope successfully when stressed?   0 1 2 3 5
4) ...solve problems?   0 1 2 3 5
5) ...view the good things that happen to you as
   a result of your own actions?   0 1 2 3 5

SOCIAL NETWORK DESCRIPTION FORM

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out how you would describe your social network as a whole. Your social network can include your spouse, friends, family members, colleagues, neighbours and so on. Please read each statement carefully and then, thinking about your social network in general, indicate how true or untrue each statement is by circling the appropriate number on the scale next to it. The scales read as follows:

$$1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7$$

not at all	somewhat	completely
true	true	true

Please try to respond to all sentences. If some of the situations described do not apply to your social network, try your best to imagine what things would be like if they did occur.

ITEM	SCALE

1) The people in my social network can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2) If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on network members to be willing to loan it to me............0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3) The people in my network make it easy for me to express my most important personal qualities in my everyday life...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4) My network members are encouraging and supportive when I am unhappy..0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5) If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on my network members to notice it and appreciate my ability...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6) My network members give me the moral support I need..0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7) The people in my network are good at helping me solve problems...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8) I can converse freely and comfortably with network members without worrying about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate or just plain silly......................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9) Sometimes my network members and I kid each other in an affectionate way...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10) I feel comfortable confiding in members of my social network...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11) When we get together to work on a task or project, there are people in my network who can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems..........................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

SCALE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all true		somewhat true			completely true	

12) If I were looking for a job, I could count on members of my social network to try their best to help me find one......0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13) The people in my social network make it easy for me to express my true thoughts and feelings.........................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14) If I felt sad or upset the people in my social network would try to cheer me up.......................................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15) If I am in an embarrassing situation, I can count on the people in my network to do things that will make me feel as much at ease as possible.............................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16) It is important to me that others show me affection......0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17) The people in my network sometimes say things that make my situation easier to understand................................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18) There are people in my network who like to"put me down" or embarrass me with seemingly harmless little jokes or comments...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19) I often keep very personal information to myself and do not share it with my network members.........................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20) My relationships with network members are very satisfying..0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21) My network members can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it weren't for them...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22) If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, there are people I could count on to help with errands or chores to make things as convenient for me as possible........0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23) My network members treat me in ways that encourage me to be my "true self"..0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24) I feel quite affectionate toward the people in my social network..0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25) If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on network members to be happy and congratulatory about it...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26) Network members sometimes help me understand why I didn't do something well.......................................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27) I often feel that others don't really care about my welfare and concerns...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

SCALE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all true		somewhat true			completely true	

28) I am involved in at least cne social, political or religious organization...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29) I often go over to peoples' homes...............................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30) My network members and I know a lot of the same people...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31) It seems as though the people in my network are rarely able to listen attentively to me when I need to talk about something..0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32) I feel free to reveal private or personal information about myself to people in my network because I know they would not use such information to my disadvantage............0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33) If things were going badly for me my network members would support me...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34) I wish the people in my social network were much different...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35) When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and options, network members introduce viewpoints that help me see things in a new light...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36) The people in my network are willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects even if they are not directly involved...................................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37) The people in my network make it easy for me to do the kinds of things I really want to do...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38) Sometimes when close others smile at me I know how much they care about me...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39) If I have to defend any of my beliefs or convictions, my network members support me, even if they do not share those beliefs or convictions with me...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

40) I often get together with friends or relatives, either going out together or visiting in each other's homes...................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

41) Belonging to clubs may be nice for other people, but not for me..0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42) I am part of a group of people who often get together.0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

43) The people in my social network would stand by me if someone was causing me trouble..............................0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

44) My network members sometimes gives me information about how to do something or suggests some action I should take.....0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

161

SCALE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all true		somewhat true			completely true	

45) When I am with members of my social network, I feel free to "let my
guard down" completely because they avoid doing and saying things
that might make me look inadequate or inferior......... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

46) I sometimes feel dissatisfied with the quality of my
relationships.. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

47) When I have a problem, I often confide in members of my
social network... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

48) I can count on others to be ready with really good suggestions
when we are looking for some activity or project to engage
in... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

49) If I were sick or hurt, I could count on others to do things that
would make it easier to take....................................... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

50) Doing things with members of my network seems to bring out my more
important traits and characteristics............................. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

51) I rarely speak on the telephone with friends or
relatives.. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

52) I often attend religious services or group meetings.... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

53) Many of the people I know are also close with each
other.. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

54) My friends and I are part of a group of people who often
get together... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

55) The people in my social network make me feel like a really
worthwhile person, even when I do not seem to be very competent
or successful at my more important activities........ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

56) Conversation with network members usually stays on a casual
level and does not involve our personal feelings...0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

57) My network members are quick to point out anything they see as
a flaw in my character... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

58) The people in my network and I sometimes pat each other on
the back or roughhouse to show our affection for each
other.. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

59) My network members and I talk more about our personal lives
than about everyday events... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

60) Sometimes the people in my network and I show our feelings
for each other through eye contact............................ 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

61) I belong to several voluntary organizations (e.g. church groups,
clubs/lodges, parent groups)...................................... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

SCALE

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all true		somewhat true			completely true	

62) There are several people in my neighbourhood with whom
I am well enough acquainted that we stop and talk to
one another.. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

63) There are many people I could call if I felt like getting together
or doing something.. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

64) I often talk to network members about my feelings and
problems... 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

SELF-REGARD QUESTIONNAIRE

Using the scale below, choose a number from 1 to 4 which best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements. Circle this number on the scale next to each question.

1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = disagree
4 = strongly disagree

1) I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others..0 1 2 3
2) I feel that I have a number of good qualities.....................................0 1 2 3
3) All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure...............................0 1 2 3
4) I am able to do things as well as other people.................................0 1 2 3
5) I feel I do not have much to be proud of...0 1 2 3
6) I take a positive attitude toward myself..0 1 2 3
7) On the whole, I am satisfied with myself...0 1 2 3
8) I wish I could have more respect for myself......................................0 1 2 3
9) I certainly feel useless at times..0 1 2 3
10) At times I think I am no good at all..0 1 2 3

LIFE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Here are some words and phrases which may describe how you feel about your present life. For example, if you think your present life is very "boring", put an X in the box right next to the word "boring". If you think it is very "interesting", put an X in the box right next to the word "interesting". If you think it is somewhere in between, put an X where you think it belongs. Put an X in one box on every line.

BORING □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ INTERESTING
ENJOYABLE □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ MISERABLE
EASY □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ HARD
USELESS □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ WORTHWHILE
FRIENDLY □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ LONELY
FULL □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ EMPTY
DISCOURAGING □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ HOPEFUL
TIED DOWN □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ FREE
DISAPPOINTING □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ REWARDING
BRINGS OUT THE □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ DOESN'T GIVE ME
BEST IN ME   MUCH CHANCE

INTERPERSONAL INTIMACY SCALE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out how you would describe your relationship with your boyfriend/girlfriend or spouse. If you do not have a spouse or partner at present, please do not answer this questionnaire.

1) When you have leisure time, how often do you choose to spend it with your partner/spouse?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

2) How often do you keep very personal information to yourself and do not share it with your partner/spouse?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

3) How often do you show him or her affection?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

4) How often do you confide very personal information to him/her?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

5) How often are you able to understand his/her feelings?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

6) How often do you feel close to your partner/spouse?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

7) How much do you like to spend time alone with your partner/spouse?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

8) How much do you feel like being encouraging and supportive try our mate when he/she is unhappy?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

9) How close do you feel to him/her most of the time?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

10) How important is it to you to listen to his/her very personal disclosures?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

11) How satisfying is your relationship with your partner/spouse?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

12) How affectionate do you feel toward your partner/spouse?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

13) How important is it to you that he/she understands your feelings?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

14) How much damage is caused by a typical disagreement in your relationship with your partner/spouse?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
very rarely				sometimes				almost always	

166

15) How important is it to you that your mate be encouraging and supportive to you when you are unhappy?

```
1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10
very rarely        sometimes            almost always
```

16) How important is it to you that he/she show you affection?

```
1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10
very rarely        sometimes            almost always
```

17) How important is your relationship with your partner/spouse in your life?

```
1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10
very rarely        sometimes            almost always
```

SOCIAL PROVISIONS SCALE

This questionnaire asks about the people in your social network and what they do for you. For Part I, please list the names or initials of up to 20 people who are significant in your life at this time, whether you like them or not. This list can include anyone you feel is important, such as your spouse/partner, best friend, other close and casual friends, relatives, neighbours, supervisor(s) and colleagues. Beside each person's name or initials, please note his/her relationship to you (e.g. Jane - close friend). To avoid confusion, please put a * beside the name of the close friend you chose to write about in the first questionnaire.

Part I

_____   _____
_____   _____
_____   _____
_____   _____
_____   _____
_____   _____
_____   _____
_____   _____
_____   _____
_____   _____

Part II

Now, using the list above, we would like you to note which of these people can be counted on to provide or serve the functions specified below, in order of their importance. For example, if your closest friend Mary is the best provider of affection, followed by your spouse Leslie and your parents Jane and Harry, next to the item on affection you would write in "Mary/ Leslie/ Jane/ Harry." You can include as many or as few names as you like for each function. If you are unsure about the order in which to list people after the first one or two names, just make your best guess. Please read each item carefully.

1) Who in your network can be counted on to provide you with time, goods and/or help if you needed it?

2) Who in your network can be counted on to make you feel competent and worthwhile?

3) Who in your network can be counted on to provide you with interesting, stimulating new ideas?

4) Who in your network lets you express your "true self", the things
you really like about yourself?

5) Who in your network can be counted on to be loyal and trustworthy?

6) With whom in your network are you likely to experience friction or tension?

7) Who in your network can be counted on to provide emotional support
and comfort when you need it?

8) Who in your network can you openly and comfortably confide in?

9) Who in your network can you count on to provide you with affection?

10) Who in your network can be counted on to provide you with
companionship/spend time together?

11) Who in your network can be counted on to provide you with advice,
information or explanations if you needed it?

Part III

Referring back to the above items, we would now like you to rate how satisfied you
are with the degree to which others fulfill each function. Please rate your
satisfaction by circling the appropriate number on the scales below. The scales
range from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 7 (extremely satisfied).

How satisfied are you with the degree to which your network...

```
1)  offers time, goods and/or help.....................0 . 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
2)  makes you feel competent and worthwhile......0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
3)  provides interesting new ideas........................0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
4)  lets you express your "true self"....................0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
5)  is loyal and trustworthy..................................0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
6)  provides emotional support and comfort..........0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
7)  can be openly confided in...............................0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
8)  provides you with affection..............................0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
9)  provides you with companionship.....................0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
10) provides you with advice/information...............0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
```

INVENTORY OF HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

For each statement below, circle the number that best describes HOW MUCH THAT PROBLEM HAS BOTHERED OR DISTRESSED YOU DURING THE PAST TWO WEEKS, INCLUDING TODAY. Mark only one number for each item. 0 means that you have not been bothered by the problem at all, and 4 means that the problem has been an extreme bother.

1. Sleep problems (can't fall asleep, wake up in middle of night or early morning)..........0　1　2　3　4
2. Constant fatigue..........0　1　2　3　4
3. Back pain..........0　1　2　3　4
4. Weight change (gain or loss of 5 lbs. or more..........0　1　2　3　4
5. Constipation..........0　1　2　3　4
6. Dizziness..........0　1　2　3　4
7. Diarrhea..........0　1　2　3　4
8. Faintness..........0　1　2　3　4
9. Headache..........0　1　2　3　4
10. Migraine headache..........0　1　2　3　4
11. Nausea and/or vomiting..........0　1　2　3　4
12. Acid stomach or indigestion..........0　1　2　3　4
13. Stomach pain (e.g. cramps)..........0　1　2　3　4
14. Hot or cold spells..........0　1　2　3　4
15. Hands trembling..........0　1　2　3　4
16. Heart pounding or racing..........0　1　2　3　4
17. Poor appetite..........0　1　2　3　4
18. Shortness of breath when not exercising or working hard..........0　1　2　3　4
19. Numbness or tingling in parts of your body..........0　1　2　3　4
20. Felt weak all over..........0　1　2　3　4
21. Pains in heart or chest..........0　1　2　3　4
22. Feeling low in energy..........0　1　2　3　4
23. Stuffy head or nose..........0　1　2　3　4
24. Blurred vision..........0　1　2　3　4
25. Muscle tension or soreness..........0　1　2　3　4
26. Muscle cramps..........0　1　2　3　4
27. Severe aches and pains..........0　1　2　3　4
28. Menstrual problems..........0　1　2　3　4
29. Acne..........0　1　2　3　4
30. Bruises..........0　1　2　3　4
31. Pulled (strained) muscles..........0　1　2　3　4
32. Pulled (strained) ligaments..........0　1　2　3　4
33. Cold or cough..........0　1　2　3　4

34. Allergies (e.g. hay fever)...0   1   2   3   4
35. Asthma...0   1   2   3   4

PERSONAL REACTION INVENTORY

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is **true** or **false** as it pertains to you personally. Circle the correct response.

1) Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
    T F

2) I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.   T F

3) It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
    T F

4) I have never intensely disliked someone. T F

5) On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.   T F

6) I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. T F

7) I am always careful about my manner of dress. T F

8) My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
    T F

9) If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it. T F

10) On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. T F

11) I like to gossip at times.   T F

12) There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. T F

13) No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. T F

14) I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something. T F

15) There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. T F

16) I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.   T F

17) I always try to practice what I preach. T F

18) I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people. T F

19) I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget. T F

20) When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it. T F

21) I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.   T F

22) At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. T F

23) There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. T F

24) I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
    T F

25) I never resent being asked to return a favour. T F

26) I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. T F

27) I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. T F

28) There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. **T F**

29) I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off. **T F**

30) I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favours of me. **T F**

31) I have never felt that I was punished without cause. **T F**

32) I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved. **T F**

33) I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. **T F**

Appendix B

Best Friend and Network Subscales - Items

Best Friend Subscales

Voluntary Interdependence

1. If I hadn't heard from my friend for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact her/him just for the sake of keeping in touch.
2. If my friend 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 my friend.
3. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with my friend to see if we can arrange to do things together.
4. If I had just gotten off work or out of class and had some free time, I would wait around and leave with my friend if (s)he were leaving the same place an hour or so later.

Person-Qua-Person

1. If my friend were to move away or "disappear" for some reason, I would really miss the special kind of companionship s(he) provides.
2. My friend expresses so many personal qualities that I like that I think of her/him as being "one of a kind", a truly unique person.
3. When my friend and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship I don't get from any of my other acquaintances.
4. My friend is the kind of person I would miss very much if something happened to interfere with our acquaintanceship.

Utility Value

1. If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on my friend to be willing to loan it to me.
2. If I were looking for a job, I could count on my friend to try his/her best to help me find one.
3. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on my friend to help with errands or chores to make things as convenient for me as possible.
4. My friend 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.
5. If I were sick or hurt, I could count on my friend to do things that would make it easier to take.

Ego Support Value

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

175

2. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on my friend to be happy and congratulatory about it.
3. If I have to defend any of my beliefs or convictions, my friend is the type of person who supports me, even if (s)he does not share those beliefs or convictions with me.
4. My friend has a way of 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.

Stimulation Value

1. My friend can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.
2. When we get together to work on a task or project, my friend can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems.
3. My friend can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it weren't for him/her.
4. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, my friend introduces viewpoints that help me see things in a new light.
5. I can count on my friend to be ready with really good suggestions when we are looking for some activity or project to engage in.

Self-Affirmation Value

1. My friend makes it easy for me to express my most important personal qualities in my everyday life.
2. My friend is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to express my true thoughts and feelings.
3. My friend treats me in ways that encourage me to be my "true self".
4. My friend is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to do the kinds of things I really want to do.
5. Doing things with my friend seems to bring out my more important traits and characteristics.

Security Value

1. I can converse freely and comfortably with my friend without worrying about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate or just silly.
2. My friend is the kind of person who likes to "put me down" or embarrass me with seemingly harmless little jokes or comments.
3. I feel free to reveal private or personal information about myself to my friend

because(s)he is not the kind of person who would use such information to my disadvantage.
4. When I am with my friend, 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.
5. My friend is quick to point out anything (s)he sees as a flaw in my character.

Maintenance Difficulty

1. My friend's way of dealing with people makes him/her rather difficult to get along with.
2. I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to my friend about topics that (s)he considers controversial or touchy.
3. I have a hard time really understanding some of my friend's actions and comments.
4. I can count on communication with my friend to break down when we try to discuss things that are touchy or controversial.

Emotional Support

1. My friend is encouraging and supportive when I am unhappy.
2. My friend gives me the moral support I need.
3. If things were going badly for me my friend would support me.
4. My friend would stand by me if someone were causing me trouble.
5. If I felt sad or upset my friend would try to cheer me up.

Confiding

1. I feel comfortable confiding in my friend.
2. When I have a problem, I often confide in my friend.
3. Conversation with my friend usually stays on a casual level and does not involve our personal feelings.

Advice

1. My friend is good at helping me solve problems.
2. My friend sometimes says things that make my situation easier to understand.
3. My friend sometimes helps me understand why I didn't do something well.
4. My friend sometimes gives me information about how to do something or suggests some action I should take.

Affection

1. Sometimes my friend and I kid each other in an affectionate way.
2. It is important to me that my friend shows me affection.
3. I feel quite affectionate toward my friend.
4. Sometimes when my friend smiles at me I know how much (s)he cares about me.
5. My friend and I sometimes pat each other on the back or roughhouse to show our affection for each other.
6. Sometimes my friend and I show our feelings for each other through eye contact.

Relationship Satisfaction

1. My friend gives me the moral support I need.
2. My relationship with my friend is very satisfying.
3. I wish my friend was much different.
4. I often feel that my friend doesn't really care about my welfare and concerns.

Network Subscales

Utility Value

1. If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on network members to be willing to loan it to me.
2. If I were looking for a job, I could count on members of my social network to try their best to help me find one.
3. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, there are people I could count on to help with errands or chores to make things as convenient for me as possible.
4. The people in my network are willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects even if they are not directly involved.
5. If I were sick or hurt, I could count on others to do things that would make it easier to take.

Ego Support Value

1. If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on my network members to notice it and appreciate my ability.
2. If I am in an embarrassing situation, I can count on the people in my network to do things that will make me feel as much at ease as possible.

3. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on network members to be happy and congratulatory about it.
4. If I have to defend any of my beliefs or convictions, my network members support me, even if they do not share those beliefs or convictions with me.
5. The people in my social network make me feel like a really worth while person, even when I do not seem to be very competent or successful at my more important activities.

Stimulation Value

1. The people in my social network can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.
2. When we get together to work on a task or project, there are people in my network who can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems.
3. My network members can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it weren't for them.
4. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, network members introduce viewpoints that help me see things in a new light.
5. I can count on others to be ready with really good suggestions when we are looking for some activity or project to engage in.

Self-Affirmation Value

1. The people in my network make it easy for me to express my mos important personal qualities in my everyday life.
2. The people in my social network make it easy for me to express my true thoughts and feelings.
3. My network members treat me in ways that encourage me to be my "true self".
4. The people in my network make it easy for me to do the kinds of things I really want to do.
5. Doing things with network members seems to bring out my more important traits and characteristics.

Security Value

1. I can converse freely and comfortably with network members without worrying about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate or just plain silly.
2. There are people in my network who like to "put me down" or embarrass me with seemingly harmless little jokes or comments.
3. I feel free to reveal private or personal things about myself to people in my

network because I know they would not use such information to my disadvantage.

4. When I am with members of my social network, I feel free to "let my guard down" completely because they avoid doing and saying things that might make me look inadequate or inferior.

Emotional Support

1. My network members are encouraging and supportive when I am unhappy.
2. My network members give me the moral support I need.
3. If I felt sad or upset the people in my social network would try to cheer me up.
4. If things were going badly for me my network members would support me.
5. The people in my social network would stand by me if someone was causing me trouble.

Advice

1. The people in my network are good at helping me solve problems
2. The people in my network sometimes say things that make my situation easier to understand.
3. Network members sometimes help me understand why I didn't do something well.
4. My network members sometimes give me information about how to do something to suggest some action I should take.

Affection

1. Sometimes my network members and I kid each other in an affectionate way.
2. It is important to me that others show me affection.
3. I feel quite affectionate toward the people in my social network.
4. Sometimes when close others smile at me I know how much they care about me.
5. The people in my network and I sometimes pat each other on the back or roughhouse to show our affection for each other.
6. Sometimes the people in my network and I show our feelings for each other through eye contact.

Confiding

1. I feel comfortable confiding in members of my social network.
2. When I have a problem, I often confide in members of my social network.
3. Conversation with network members usually stays on a casual level and does not involve our personal feelings.
4. My network members and I talk more about our personal lives than about everyday events.

5. I often talk to network members about my feelings and problems.

Network Satisfaction

1. My relationships with network members are very satisfying.
2. I often feel that others don't really care about my welfare and concerns.
3. I wish the people in my social network were much different.
4. I sometimes feel dissatisfied with the quality of my relationships.

Density

1. My network members and I know a lot of the same people.
2. I am part of a group of people who often get together.
3. Many of the people I know are also close with each other.
4. My friends and I are part of a group of people who often get together.

Network Involvement

1. I often go over to peoples' homes.
2. I often get together with friends or relatives, either going out together or visiting in each other's homes.
3. There are many people I could call if I felt like getting together or doing something.

Social Integration

1. I am involved in at least one social, political or religious organization.
2. Belonging to clubs may be nice for other people, but not for me.
3. I often attend religious services or attend group meetings.
4. I belong to several voluntary organizations (e.g. church groups, clubs/lodges, parent groups).

Appendix C

Intercorrelations Among Relationship Subscales

Table C-1. Zero-Order Correlation Matrix for Best Friend Subscales: Men

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
VID (1)													
PQP (2)	.56**												
Utility Supp. (3)	.36**	.34**											
Ego Support (4)	.43**	.48**	.63**										
Stimulation (5)	.27**	.34**	.64**	.39**									
Self-Affirmation (6)	.52**	.53**	.71**	.78**	.55**								
Security Value (7)	.29**	.35**	.36**	.54**	.25*	.58**							
Maintenance Diff. (8)	.22*	.24*	.29**	.51**	.22*	.43**	.47**						
Emotional Supp. (9)	.53**	.58**	.66**	.65**	.46**	.74**	.35**	.30**					
Advice (10)	.32**	.45**	.47**	.47**	.59**	.59**	.23*	.20	.53**				
Affection (11)	.50**	.57**	.38**	.46**	.41**	.49**	.25*	.14	.54**	.46**			
Confiding (12)	.44**	.57**	.36**	.43**	.27**	.57**	.35**	.31**	.54**	.39**	.40**		
Satisfaction (13)	.44**	.53**	.57**	.64**	.38**	.72**	.44**	.51**	.74**	.40**	.32**	.46**	

* p < .05   ** p < .01

183

Table C-2. Zero-Order Correlation Matrix for Best Friend Subscales: Women

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
VID (1)													
PQP (2)	.57**												
Utility Supp (3)	.54**	.49**											
Ego Support (4)	.44**	.54**	.55**										
Stimulation (5)	.46**	.47**	.51**	.50**									
Self-Affirmation (6)	.52**	.64**	.55**	.63**	.55**								
Security Value (7)	.31**	.38**	.27**	.51**	.24**	.50**							
Maintenance Diff. (8)	.20*	.18*	.24**	.32**	.23**	.43**	.46**						
Emotional Supp. (9)	.47**	.63**	.61**	.60**	.49**	.74**	.45**	.32**					
Advice (10)	.51**	.61**	.60**	.59**	.60**	.59**	.31**	.22**	.56**				
Affection (11)	.47**	.49**	.28**	.29**	.29**	.38**	.23**	.22*	.23**	.33**			
Confiding (12)	.52**	.65**	.40**	.45**	.36**	.66**	.47**	.24**	.65**	.50**	.37**		
Satisfaction (13)	.31**	.46**	.48**	.59**	.38**	.65**	.51**	.55**	.71**	.46**	.24**	.56**	

* p < .05   ** p < .01

184

Table C-3. Zero-Order Correlation Matrix for Network Subscales: Men

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Utility Supp. (1)													
Ego Support (2)	.70**												
Stimulation (3)	.73**	.56**											
Self-Affirmation (4)	.72**	.80**	.69**										
Security Value (5)	.47**	.65**	.31**	.88**									
Emotional Supp. (6)	.73**	.83**	.60**	.85**	.59**								
Advice (7)	.72**	.77**	.72**	.80**	.57**	.77**							
Affection (8)	.56*	.66*	.43**	.54**	.47*	.53**	.63**						
Confiding (9)	.54**	.65**	.45**	.73**	.61**	.65**	.69**	.61**					
Satisfaction (10)	.54**	.67**	.56**	.73**	.56**	.69**	.61**	.50**	.66**				
Density (11)	.28**	.51**	.39**	.48**	.25*	.42**	.40**	.39**	.41**	.45**			
Network Involve. (12)	.47**	.48**	.50**	.57**	.36**	.53**	.52**	.43**	.55**	.52**	.62**		
Integration (13)	.04	.18	.09	.20	.03	.07	.19	.19	.20*	.14	.13	.18	
Network Size (14)	.17	.16	.25*	.21*	.00	.18	.12	.13	.02	.29**	.30**	.31**	.19

* p < .05
** p < .01

185

Table C-4. Zero-Order Correlation Matrix for Network Subscales: Women

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Utility Supp. (1)													
Ego Support (2)	.79**												
Stimulation (3)	.71**	.68**											
Self-Affirmation (4)	.77**	.84**	.75**										
Security Value (5)	.58**	.72**	.42**	.71**									
Emotional Supp. (6)	.78**	.87**	.68**	.82**	.69**								
Advice (7)	.75**	.77**	.79**	.79**	.54**	.77**							
Affection (8)	.47*	.58*	.51**	.55**	.45**	.58**	.50**						
Confiding (9)	.62**	.71**	.58**	.80**	.68**	.68**	.70**	.54**					
Satisfaction (10)	.64**	.72**	.51**	.69**	.67**	.70**	.60**	.40**	.61**				
Density (11)	.29**	.34**	.36**	.33**	.13	.36**	.30**	.27**	.24**	.23**			
Network Involve. (12)	.51**	.48**	.58**	.53**	.23**	.50**	.50**	.36**	.40**	.39**	.57**		
Integration (13)	.04	.13	.14	.08	-.04	.14	.11	.17	.01	.08	.26**	.12	
Network Size (14)	.05	.11	.17*	.08	-.05	.09	.06	.03	.05	.09*	.27**	.25**	.18*

* p < .05
** p < .01

186

Appendix D

Intercorrelations Among Factors and Dependent Variables

Table D-1. <u>Zero-Order Correlations Between Relationship Factors,</u>
<u>Dependent Variables and Other Predictors</u>

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Friendship Strength and Value (1)										
Basic Safety and Acceptance (2)	.61**									
Functional Support (3)	.27**	.16								
Structural Support (4)	.32**	.19*	.39**							
Depression (5)	-.12	-.24**	-.36**	-.24**						
Self-Esteem (6)	-.15	-.20*	-.40**	-.31**	.63**					
Quality of Life (7)	-.27**	-.24**	-.49**	-.39**	.70**	.59**				
Symptoms (8)	.14	.05	-.25**	-.02	.54**	.23**	.35**			
Daily Hassles (9)	.10	-.03	-.24**	-.05	.59**	.33**	.42**	.57**		
Social Desirability (10)	-.01	.09	.22*	.12	.44**	-.45**	-.35**	-.35**	-.37**	

* p<.05 ** p<.01

188