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CHAPTER I

THE AREA OF INVESTIGATION AND THE PROBLEM

Introduction and Review of Literature

Interpersonal relationships, particularly those of a primary nature, have long been of concern to the behavioral scientist. A significant body of research suggests the importance of peer ties in influencing the behavior and attitudes of the members of a social system. For example, pressures toward conformity to group norms placed upon an individual by his close associates has been observed in such diverse contexts as the juvenile gang (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; Whyte, 1943) and the work place (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939; Whyte, 1956). Schofield (1964) witnesses the fact that friendship plays an important role in the psychological well-being of the individual. In addition, there is evidence that the recovery or the deterioration of patients in mental hospitals depends not only on planned therapeutic measures, but also upon the interpersonal relationships that develop spontaneously on the wards (Caudill, 1958; Caudill, et. al., 1952; Stanton and Schwartz, 1954). On the other hand, a lack of close ties with others has been suggested as being related to decreased effectiveness in a social system, heightened vulnerability to personality disorders and an increased degree of alienation from society.

Friendship seems to be a significant factor in opinion formation and in the flow of information (Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955). Friendship groups have been viewed as anchorage points for individual opinions, attitudes, habits and values (Shils, 1950; Shils and Janowitz, 1948; Steiner, 1954) acting both as agents of change and of resistance to change (Flacks, 1963).
While the close interpersonal ties that one maintains provide a source of personal stability and identity, shifts in interpersonal relationships may also serve as one important catalyst for individual growth and change (Jersild, 1946; Maslow, 1954). Recent studies on developmental processes among college students have focused upon friendships as one of the important agents of change and growth in the young adult. The research of Katz, et. al. (1967) suggests that interpersonal relationships are perhaps the most significant agents of change among college students. Sanford (1962) has discussed the role of peers in the "freeing of impulse", or achieving a greater openness to one's own experiences, a phenomenon he regards as a major goal of development in college-age youth. Relations with others are also considered by Sanford as important in the attainment of a relatively stable identity. Other investigations have shown that peer-group membership has significant influence upon students' attitudes, and that when students do change, the direction is toward the actual or perceived value and attitude positions held by their friends (Bushnell, 1962; Flacks, 1963; Newcomb, 1962; Newcomb, et. al., 1967; Pace, 1964; Warwick, 1963). It would appear that to understand processes of student development involves understanding the qualities and patterns of college friendships.

The Problem and Theory

There is extensive evidence indicating that patterns of interpersonal relationships vary among different social classes (Blum, 1964; Dotson, 1951; Lynd and Lynd, 1929), age groups (Williams, 1958), and racial and ethnic groups (Criswell, 1937; Loomis, 1943), and that ties with others vary according to additional factors such as sex (Armstrong, 1969; Lundberg and Dickson, 1952) and marital status (Babchuk, 1965; Babchuk and Bates, 1963). This
thesis explores the relation between interpersonal ties and yet another variable—that of vocational choice in a college population. It is proposed that vocational choice may be conceived as a decision affecting one's "way of life" (Super, 1957), carrying implications for many facets of living beyond the job aspect, including relationships with others. In this regard Anne Roe's theory of vocational choice provides a conceptual framework from which specific hypotheses will be derived for the purpose of investigating the interpersonal ties among different groups of college students, categorized according to their curriculum, or choice of vocation.

From Roe's early investigations (e.g., Roe, 1951a, 1951b, 1951c, 1951d, 1952, 1953) into the developmental backgrounds and personality characteristics of research scientists in various specialties grew her broad conception of a dichotomous work orientation of "toward persons—not toward persons", or, more specifically, interest in people versus interest in objects. She proposes that the two orientations presume a different organization of personality characteristics and that personality differences between person versus non-person oriented scientists are in part the result of different child-rearing practices.

In her research Roe (1957) found that social scientists, in contrast to natural scientists, reported intense and disturbing family relationships in childhood. This finding led her to hypothesize that stressful parent-child relationships were sources of later personality disturbances and of a concern with human relations that led the individuals into careers in the social sciences. For the natural scientist, early family life seems to have been characterized by detached, unemotional and vague relationships leading him on the one hand to abandon efforts at intimate human involvement, and, on the
other hand, to turn his attention to the more approachable and comprehensible world of impersonal things.

Generalizing from these findings, Roe formulated a dichotomous classification of occupations on the basis of orientation toward persons or toward non-persons. Those occupations that Roe saw as attracting non-person oriented people included Technology, Outdoor, and Natural Science occupations; those drawing people-oriented persons were Service, Business Contact, Social Science, General Cultural, and Arts and Entertainment.

In summary, Roe's theory contains two distinct but related aspects, which may be separately tested. Her most basic assumption is that there is a major personality difference between groups of people with different vocational orientations, and that this difference lies in the dimension of interest toward persons or not toward persons. The second aspect involves an explanatory formulation of the origins of person versus non-person orientation in the different childhood experiences of both groups. Research designed to test the second part of Roe's theory has generally failed to support her contention that early upbringing is systematically related to vocational choice. It is the first aspect of Roe's theory, however, that most directly pertains to the scope of this thesis and from which hypotheses were derived. The basis for expecting that different curricular groups of college students will vary in their interpersonal relationships lies in Roe's proposition that vocational groups can be dichotomized according to their orientation toward people. It should be pointed out that this proposition is not necessarily dependent upon the second proposition concerning origins of person orientation in childhood experiences. There is a significant body of research that indicates the importance of socialization during the adult years of an
individual's life in addition to the significance of childhood learning.

Research testing Roe's hypothesis of personality differences between people in the two types of occupations, though scarce, has tended to support her conception of a person versus non-person orientation. Utton (1962) found that Rs in several "people oriented" occupations were more altruistic (as measured by the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values social scale) than those in selected "non-person oriented" occupations. Levine (1963), using a 10-item questionnaire to measure a R's tendency toward human or nonhuman approaches to problem solving, found that people with a strong "human orientation" tend to be found in people oriented occupations. Patterning her research after that of Roe, Eiduson (1962) found social isolation common among men in the natural and physical sciences and among engineers. Her investigation, however, did not include a comparable sample of social scientists. Terman (1955) found that tests of occupational interests given to his Rs during their youth were rather good predictors of eventual choice of occupation and also corroborated Roe's and Eiduson's findings on the lack of sociability among the natural scientists.

Research carried out in a college setting, by Newcomb and Feldman (1969), indicates that engineering students tend to be less sociable than most other types of college students. The authors fail, however, to describe how sociability is measured. Goldschmid (1967), in his investigation of the relation between personality and choice of major, classified vocations along a science-humanities continuum and administered five personality tests to his Rs (the California Psychological Inventory, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Omnibus Personality Inventory, and Strong Vocational Interest Blank). He found that engineers, whom he placed
close to the science end of the continuum, tended to be reserved and retiring in a social setting, socially introverted, and not spontaneous. On the other hand, educators, representative of the humanities vocations, were imaginative in social situations, outspoken and gregarious, seeking social contacts and gaining satisfaction from them. Hansen (1960) reports that his sample of engineering seniors indicated a lack of interest in people, according to their profiles on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank and the Edwards Personal Preference Inventory.

The validity of Roe's studies of eminent scientists is dependent on the accuracy of the retrospective reports of the men about their parents' attitudes and behaviors toward them, the early influences on their preferences and interests, feelings about themselves and other people, and also on Roe's interpretations of her interview material. In addition, some of Roe's conclusions were based on judgments she made about the scientists on the basis of Rorschach and TAT protocols. Numerous validity and reliability problems exist in research based on projective tests. Other measures of degree of person orientation employed in the studies cited above, e.g., the AVL Study of Values, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the Omnibus Personality Inventory, and a measure of approaches to problem solving, also may be of questionable validity for measuring orientation toward or away from people. The present study measures degree of person orientation using reports of present social behavior. While not directly measuring actual behavior, which would seem to provide the most valid measure of person orientation, it is believed that these reports of ongoing behavior will provide a somewhat more valid measure than those used in previous research. Even though the basic design is cross-sectional in nature and utilizes the interview technique, the
present approach will avoid such problems as the questionable validity and reliability of projective tests as well as the frequently tenuous relationship between stated attitudes and actual behavior.

In summary, there is considerable evidence attesting to the importance of interpersonal relations in the formation and change of an individual's identity, behavior, values and attitudes. Furthermore, friendship ties appear to be an important factor in personal development during the college years. It seems logical to assume that differences in the extent or quality of interpersonal relations that are experienced by different groups of students would have implications for the growth and development of these students. If Roe's conception of vocational choice is correct, there should in fact be differences in interpersonal ties among different curricular groups of college students. The major focus of the present study is the exploration of this proposition. In this thesis, primary relationships are treated as a dependent variable, the independent variable being the individual's academic major. In the section below, a primary relationship is more specifically defined.

A Framework for the Study of Primary Relations

Interpersonal ties may be perceived as falling along a continuum of intimacy going from casual acquaintances to highly primary relationships. The concern of this study is with relationships that fall toward the more intimate end of the continuum. Bates and Babchuk's (1961) reformulation of the primary group and primary relationship will provide a framework for the present study's investigation of friendship and parent-student ties. They argue:
The existing literature on the primary group fails to make clear that bound up in the concept as it is traditionally used are two distinct dimensions, one social-psychological, the other sociological. Clarity of the term "primary group" has been obscured by incorporating into it the sociological dimension, which includes the elements of size, quantity of interaction between members, duration of interaction and homogeneity of members. These are sociological components in that none of them requires reference to psychological attributes, either of the members or the relations between members. The social-psychological dimension is critical and defines the concept. It includes two elements: member orientation toward other members in actual or potential activity, and the affective aspect of intermember orientation. (p. 185)

Perhaps what is most critical regarding this definition of a primary group is its focus upon the nature of the relationship between members. Indeed, it is the very nature of the relationship, according to Bates and Babchuk, that defines the concept. In this study a primary relationship is defined as one in which the participants are predisposed to enter into a wide range of activities and this predisposition is associated with a preponderance of positive affect. The relationships to be explored in the present study--i.e., friends and family, may be meaningfully defined as types of primary relationships. Organizational affiliation may be regarded as an important source of potential primary relationships.

**Interpersonal Involvement**

In this study the construct of interpersonal involvement will be employed as a means of testing for differences in behavioral styles between person oriented and non-person oriented individuals. This global phrase pertains to both quantity (number of primary ties with others) and quality (closeness) of one's relationships with other people. Both the quantity and quality of interpersonal relations must be considered in order to fully define the concept, since possessing many superficial ties with others is a state that has many different connotations than either the maintenance of
many close relationships, few close relationships, or few superficial bonds with others. It is assumed that individuals can be classified according to their adherence to one of the various patterns of interpersonal involvement described above and that these "types" of people will eventually be found to differ, across groups, on a number of other psycho-social variables such as ego-strength, family background, personal adjustment, etc. While such questions are beyond the scope of this thesis, the data reported here should have relevance for these questions. Little data along these lines has been reported in the literature; the present study represents an attempt to begin to fill the gap by relating interpersonal involvement to the variable of vocational choice.

Although it has been suggested that active involvement in one area, such as the family, tends to draw on the energy available for other types of close relationships, it has generally been found that frequent and intimate contact with one type of group is associated with involvement in other types of groups, and vice-versa. Therefore, it is assumed in the present study that interpersonal involvement is a univariate tendency ranging from few, superficial ties with others to many, close relationships.

Although the present study speaks of interpersonal involvement as a broad but factorially simple behavioral tendency, its actual measurement is broken down into several areas, each dealing with a segment of interpersonal relations. Thus, each respondent's (R's) interpersonal involvement is investigated in terms of 1) number of friendships, 2) closeness of friendships, 3) types of relationships with family members, and 4) number of organizations of which he is a member.

If interpersonal involvement is here correctly perceived, the types of
interaction which are characteristic of a R in one area will be positively related to interactions in other areas. Those Rs who are involved to a great extent in relations with others will have many friends, will belong to more organizations, will have maintained closer family ties, etc., than those Rs who either do not need or are not able to become interpersonally involved—those Rs who are "non-person oriented".

Hypotheses

The basic question raised in the present study is: are Rs committed to a non-person oriented occupation (according to Roe's scheme) more non-person oriented than Rs committed to a person oriented occupation. Engineering majors will here be regarded as Rs committed to a non-person oriented occupation; secondary education majors will be regarded as men committed to a person oriented occupation. Degree of person orientation is operationally defined in terms of reported interpersonal involvement. The basic question can be formulated in terms of a number of more specific hypotheses:

1. Engineering Rs will report fewer close friends than secondary education Rs.

This hypothesis pertains to the "quantity" aspect of interpersonal involvement in the friendship arena of primary relations. It is assumed that person oriented Rs will differ from non-person oriented Rs in quantity, or number of close ties with others. Hypothesis two is concerned with the "quality" aspect of friendship ties.

2. Engineering Rs will report less close relations with close friends than secondary education Rs.

Rs will be asked initially to give the first names or initials of those people they consider to be close friends, a procedure which will be more thoroughly outlined in Chapter II. It is important to note, in relation to
hypothesis two, that Rs will perform this task on the basis of their own, personal definition of a close friend. Thus, hypothesis two could be reformed to state that perhaps this idiosyncratic definition of closeness will differ between the two groups. Actual, or relative, closeness will be investigated via several factors derived from Bates and Babchuk's (1961) definition of a primary relationship which will be discussed in Chapter II. It is hypothesized that engineering Rs will in fact be less close to those people they regard as close friends than secondary education Rs.

3. Engineering Rs will report less involvement in their relationships with their families than secondary education Rs.

This hypothesis pertains to the quality of R's relationship with his family. In contrast to Roe's formulation of the family as primarily a past determinant of personality differences in the area of person orientation, this thesis is concerned with the family as a present source of primary relationships; it does not attempt to explore longitudinally the origins of a R's approach to primary relationships. Again, it is assumed that a R's style of interaction in relations with significant others will be generally similar in all areas of primary relationships.

4. Engineering Rs will report less participation in off- and on-campus organizations than secondary education Rs.

Hypothesis four pertains to the "quantity" aspect of interpersonal involvement. Organizational affiliation, while not necessarily primary in nature, may be important because of the potentially primary ties, particularly friendship relationships, which may result from such membership. It is contended that a person oriented individual will not only already have a greater number of close ties with others, but that he will also take greater
advantage of opportunities to form additional ties through membership in clubs and associations than will a non-person oriented individual.
CHAPTER II

SETTING AND METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The data in this thesis were obtained by means of a partially structured interview schedule administered to a purposive sample of 20 engineering majors and 20 secondary education majors. The Rs were enrolled in junior and senior engineering and education courses at Kansas State University (KSU) in the Spring of 1969. This chapter will deal with the characteristics of the sample, the interview schedule, concepts and indices used in the study, and the methods of analysis that were used.

The Sample

The study involved a relatively homogeneous sample of 40 Rs, half of whom were engineering majors and half education majors. Several phases were involved in the selection of the sample. Ultimately, each R met the seven criteria described below before he was included in the sample. Selecting the sample in this way made it possible to control for variables that had been demonstrated in previous research as being important in the selection of friends:

1) Vocational choice. Engineering majors are regarded as individuals committed to a non-person oriented occupation and secondary education majors as individuals committed to a person oriented occupation. A possible confounding factor is the fact that a variety of orientations is possible within one particular occupation. To control for this, Rs were chosen on the basis of the specific role they planned
to play in their future occupation. Thus, only those men committed to the "typical" engineer's role were studied. Men planning a career in sales engineering, for example, were not considered. By the "typical" engineering role is meant that of researcher or investigator, supervisor, problem-solver, designer. His main characteristics are thinking rather than acting, organizing and understanding rather than dominating or persuading. Likewise, only those men committed to the "typical" secondary teaching role were included in the sample, and Rs heading for a research role, for instance, were eliminated. The "typical" secondary teaching role is defined as that of a teacher or therapist. He tends to avoid situations where he might be required to engage in intellectual problem solving, research, or strictly abstract thinking.

2) **Sex.** Only males were used in the present study for two reasons: first because it may be assumed that sex is a likely confounding variable in that males and females have been found to exhibit different patterns of relations with others (e.g., see Armstrong, 1969; Lundberg and Dickson, 1952), and because most of the research carried out by Roe and by those testing Roe's theory has been based on male Rs.

3) **Academic classification.** Only juniors and seniors were used in order to control for commitment to stated occupational choice and to control for amount of time in college during which friendships could be formed.
4) Race. Minority group status is often associated with limited access to membership in certain organizations and participation in certain activities, a restriction that is directly related to the potential formation of friendships in such organizations. Therefore, only white Rs were used in the present study.

5) Hometown. Only Rs whose hometown was other than Manhattan, Kansas were included. The rationale for this approach is related to factors in the formation of friendships. It seems reasonable to assume that the various possibilities for forming and maintaining ties with others would be different for those Rs who remain in their hometown to attend college and for those who are relative strangers to the town. Furthermore, certain avenues, such as the dormitory, a fraternity or food centers, would be less accessible to Rs living at home with their parents. Finally, it was decided to control for this factor because degree of interaction with parents, another component of interpersonal involvement which was explored in the present study, would necessarily be affected by presence or absence of the parents in the R's daily environment.

6) Social class. Several studies (e.g., Blum, 1964; Dotson, 1951) have suggested differences both in quality and quantity of the primary relationships of white-collar as opposed to blue-collar persons. For this reason it was decided to control for social class by using only
white-collar Rs in the present sample. Duncan's Index of Occupations was used to classify the Rs into white-collar and blue-collar categories and to assign decile scores to each R on the basis of his father's occupation.

7) Marital status. It was felt that marriage affects the frequency and intimacy of relations with others in addition to having an influence on the possible channels open to the individual for the formation of ties with others. And since there is a general lack of studies of the primary group ties of the unmarried in the literature, only single individuals were included in the present study.

A biographical questionnaire was constructed in order to obtain information on the criteria described above. (A copy of the questionnaire is located in Appendix A). The questionnaire was administered to the male students in 21 upper-level engineering courses and 16 upper-level education courses. Approximately 483 completed forms were returned from engineers, comprising 84 per cent of the population (juniors and seniors enrolled in the college of engineering). Ninety per cent, or 117, of the upper-class men in secondary education returned completed forms.

The questionnaires were then analyzed, and those not meeting the sampling requirements were eliminated. A pool of 30 education Rs and 93 engineering Rs met all the sampling requirements. These profiles were numbered consecutively and a table of random numbers was used to select 20 interviewees from each group.

Each of the 40 persons was contacted by telephone. The objective of the study was described briefly, and their participation was solicited. Only two
of the original 40 students selected refused to participate.\textsuperscript{1} These were replaced by two additional names. The interviews, lasting about 45 minutes, were conducted in an office at the University Counseling Center. In addition, a questionnaire booklet was sent home with each R and all booklets were returned by the end of the semester. All Rs were interviewed within a two month period. The interviewer spent the first few minutes of each interview establishing rapport with the Rs, and she felt that this effort was successful, as evidenced by the number of Rs who remained after the end of the interview to discuss the research and by the 100 per cent return rate on the take-home questionnaires.

The Instrument

A partially structured interview schedule was used.\textsuperscript{2} (A copy of the schedule is located in Appendix B.) The schedule contained five sections, which are briefly described below.

Section One was used to obtain background information supplementing that requested on the preliminary biographical questionnaire. Questions dealt with R's place of residence during the school year, church affiliation and religious beliefs, political affiliation, membership in organizations, and part-time job information. This data was useful as a means of more fully describing the sample in addition to providing information pertinent to a

\textsuperscript{1}The refusals were made by one engineering major and one education major. A brief biographical sketch more fully describing the nature of the sample is located in Appendix C.

\textsuperscript{2}The schedule was patterned after an instrument employed by George R. Peters in his study of the primary relationships of college students. George R. Peters, "Primary Friendship in the College Community: A Study of the Associations of Male Students", Unpubl. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1968.
test of hypothesis four.

Section Two concerned the relative importance (to each R) of each of
nine selected problems and issues according to which caused him the greatest
worry and concern. Differences in the relative importance that individuals
attach to various concerns could influence the extent of confiding in friends
as well as what is confided, so a measure of the relative importance of dif-
ferent concerns was included to control for this variable.

Section Three asked each R to list the initials or first names of per-
sons he considered to be his very close friends. According to the procedure
outlined by Peters (1968), no limit was placed on the number of friends that
the R might cite, however, they were asked to exclude girl friends (or fian-
cees) and members of their immediate families from the category of very close
friends. Such associations were excluded from this section of the instrument
because it was felt that significant qualitative differences might exist
between a male's relationship with his friends and ties with his family or a
girl friend. However, Rs were permitted to list females as close friends.
It is important to note that information related to ties with family was
obtained in another section of the instrument.

The friends cited were divided into two categories--those friends that
were local and those that were nonlocal. Then each R was asked to indicate
which of the friends he had listed he considered to be his three closest
friends, and his two least close friends. A series of questions was then
asked about each of these five persons. Three questions pertained to the
formation of the friendship: specifically, Rs were asked when, where and how
each friend was met. This information was felt to be important to an inves-
tigation of differences between the two groups of Rs in general style of
establishing ties with others.

Three questions were related to the activity component of friendship. They dealt with leisure-time activities shared with friends.

Finally, 16 items which concerned various aspects of the affective dimension of close friendships were included. These items focused on the extent to which each R confided in his friends, felt free to borrow money from each friend, whether he felt at ease with each friend, the extent to which he exchanged home visits with friends, and the degree of spontaneity involved in each relationship.

The data obtained in section three were used to test hypotheses one and two--those related to extent and closeness, or quantity and quality, of ties with friends.

In Section Four the R was asked to rank-order his three closest friends in terms of felt degree of closeness and to indicate which of his two least close friends he felt to be the least close. This procedure was important in that it provided a basis for investigating degrees of each R's perceived "primariness", or closeness with his friends.

Section Five was contained in a questionnaire booklet sent home with each R. In this section, Rs answered a series of questions which dealt with their relations with parents. Information on frequency of interaction with parents was gathered in addition to data on confiding in parents. The quality of interactions with parents was assessed by 13 questions concerning kinds of things each R discussed with his parents. Finally, ten questions concerned each R's general attitude toward his home life. The data obtained in this section was used to test hypothesis three.

That the instrument provided valid and reliable measures is at least
partially assured by the fact that it has been pretested and used in research by Peters.

**Concepts and Indices Used in the Study**

Several concepts are employed throughout this thesis. In this section these concepts are defined more precisely.

**Friendship.** The general framework that was used in this study's investigation of friendship has already been described in Chapter I: Briefly, a primary friend is defined as one with whom the _R_ is predisposed to enter into a wide range of activities and whose predisposition to do so is associated with a preponderence of positive affect. Together, the activity and affect dimensions of friendship comprise an index of the closeness of a friendship. These measures will permit a test of hypothesis two to be made. Below, friendship is more specifically defined in operational terms.

To measure the activity component of primary friendships, a list of 18 activities frequently engaged in by college students was developed. (See Appendix B.) Each _R_ indicated which of the activities he had participated in with his friends. In addition, _Rs_ were encouraged to cite activities shared with friends but not included on the list.

Five independent measures of the affective dimension of friendship were employed. The first measure involved the sharing of intimate confidences. _Rs_ indicated whether they had ever talked to their friends about nine separate problems. (See Appendix B.)

The second measure involved whether or not _Rs_ felt free to borrow a large amount of money from their friends should they need to, and whether they had ever borrowed money from their friends.

The third measure concerned each _R_'s felt degree of freedom and ease in
his relationship with each friend. They were asked if they really felt free to let their hair down and just be themselves with each friend. The fourth measure related to the exchange of home visits among friends.

Finally, as the fifth measure of affect, Rs named their three closest friends and indicated which of these they considered their very closest friend. Each R was also asked to indicate which friend was his least close friend.

Closeness of family ties. The family relationship is regarded in this thesis as another type of primary relationship, involving both the activity and affective dimensions described above. This is not meant to imply, however, that there are no differences between one's ties with friends and bonds with family members. This thesis contends that any primary relationship contains activity (behavior) and affect (feeling) aspects and that the relationship can be analyzed according to the relative strength or weakness of these dimensions in relation to each other and in relation to the strength of activity and affect manifested in other primary relationships.

The measures of each R's closeness of relationship with his parents do not exactly parallel the indices of closeness with friends described above. However, measures of both affect and activity components were involved in deriving a conception of closeness of family ties. Measures of the affective dimension included degree of confiding in parents about nine important problems. Rs were asked to indicate in whom they would confide about these issues given the following choices: close friends; parents; professor; minister, counselor or advisor; or none of these. Rs were asked to indicate a first, second, and least choice, thus enabling us to ascertain where parents lie along a continuum of potential confidantes for different problems.
In addition, 12 questions were included that were concerned with assessing the quality of each R's interaction with his parents. Rs indicated how frequently they talked with their parents about 12 issues related to important things going on in the R's life, the parents' lives, and in the external world. A thirteenth item obtained each R's perception of how closely his and his parents' ideas agree. A third index of the affective dimension consisted of 10 items measuring the R's feelings about his family and home life.

The activity dimension of R's relationship with his parents was measured by six items that asked each R to indicate frequency of contact with parents in the form of letters, phone calls and home visits during the school year. These measures directly pertain to a test of hypothesis three.

**Participation in organizations.** A measure of R's participation in organizations may seem incongruent with the other measures of primary relationships discussed here. But it has been included in our definition of interpersonal involvement because organizational membership, while not necessarily primary in nature, may provide a context for the formation of primary ties. It is contended that a person oriented person will both have more close ties with others, and that he will also take advantage of opportunities to form additional ties through membership in clubs and associations than will a non-person oriented person.

Three questions were included in the interview to explore the extent of R's participation in organizations. The first question asked whether he belonged to any campus organizations. The second question pertained to intensity of involvement and active participation in the organization. Each R was asked whether he held any offices in his clubs and associations. Question three asked whether he belonged to any organizations off-campus. These
indices of extent of involvement in organizations were utilized in a test of hypothesis four.

Statistical Analysis

The sample was analytical rather than representational in nature (see Riley, 1963). The present study was concerned with two narrowly defined populations—students in engineering or in secondary education. Rs were matched on several variables that have been found to be related to friendship patterns and primary relations in order to increase the probability that differences between the two groups would be related to vocational choice.

The measures employed in the present study provide both nominal and ordinal data. Statistical treatment of nominal data utilized the Chi-Square test and the Phi Coefficient. Analyses of ordinal relationships were made by non-parametric tests of ordinal association, such as Kendall's rank order correlation coefficient (tau) and Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient (rho). The accepted level of significance was .05. Although null hypotheses were not explicitly stated, each test was considered, in effect, an evaluation of the hypothesis of no association.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

The objective of this study was to explore the primary relationships of college students. Anne Roe's theory of vocational choice provided a basis for expecting differences in interpersonal relations between students in different types of curricula (person oriented and non-person oriented). The concept of interpersonal involvement was developed as a means of measuring differences in primary relationships between a group of engineering (non-person oriented) students and education (person oriented) students. Four hypotheses related to different areas of interpersonal involvement were formulated in order to test for differences in reported person orientation between the two groups of students.

This chapter is divided into four sections. In the first section, descriptive data on friendship relations is presented. Data on number of friends and formation of friendships is included. The second section summarizes findings on the affective and activity dimensions of friendship. The third section focuses upon family relations. The final section deals with findings concerning organizational affiliation. Much of the data which is reported is used to test specific hypotheses. Where appropriate, the tests of each hypothesis are described and interpretations of the results of these tests are made.

Descriptive Data on Friendship

The 40 Rs cited a total of 373 friends. Of these, 148 were named by engineering Rs, and 225 by education Rs. The number of friends listed ranged
from a single close friend to as many as 23. On the average, 9.3 close friends, of whom 5.6 were local units and 3.7 nonlocal, were cited. A similar breakdown by major showed engineering majors naming an average of 7.4 friends; 5.1 local and 2.3 nonlocal units. The corresponding figures for education majors were 11.2 friends; 6.1 local and 5.1 nonlocal units. The number of friends cited by education Rs was more widely distributed than was true of engineering Rs. In no case did engineering Rs report more than 12 close friends. Seven of the 20 education Rs, however, reported 12 or more close friends.

From the 373 friends Rs were asked to indicate their three closest and two least close friends. The interviewer then proceeded to obtain additional data on these five individuals. If fewer than five close friends were listed, information was obtained on all friendships and R was asked to rank his friends according to his closeness to them. The data reported below refers only to the 185 friends who were cited as closest or least close by the 40 Rs.

These friends ranged in age from 19-55 years. Approximately 87 per cent of the 116 closest friends fell into the same age categories as the Rs (19-23 years) while slightly fewer (78 per cent) of the 69 least close units were the same age as the Rs. Engineering Rs were slightly more likely than education Rs to name as their closest friends individuals who were the same age (approximately 87 per cent of friends as compared with 85 per cent of friends, respectively). More of the engineering Rs' least close friends were older than the R.

It would seem logical to assume that the number of semesters a R has

---

1Seven Rs, four engineers and three educators, listed fewer than five friends.
spent at KSU would have a bearing on the number of friends he has made there. However, no apparent relationship was observed between number of semesters at KSU and number of friends, or between transfer status (whether or not the student is a transfer student) and number of friends named. Likewise, transfer status did not appear to be related to proportion of local as opposed to nonlocal friends that were cited. The data further showed that across all friendships a close friend was as likely to be local as nonlocal. However, there were differences between the two groups of Rs in proportion of local as opposed to nonlocal friends that were named. Regardless of whether or not they were transfer students, education majors were more likely to cite more nonlocal individuals as both closest and least close friends. Engineers listed more local friends in both categories. Further comparisons revealed no relationship between fraternity membership and number of friends or rural-urban status and number of friends named by the R.

Rs provided fairly detailed information on the formation of their closest and least close friendships. Data on how long the friend had been known, where the friend was met and how the friend was met were collected. Table 1 shows that approximately 68 per cent of the 116 closest friends had been known for 5 years or less. This five-year span corresponds closely to that period of time covering the high school and college experiences of the Rs, emphasizing the school setting as a crucial context for making friends. About 70 per cent of all least close friends knew each other for five years or less, and the remaining 30 per cent had known each other for 6-15 years. Education Rs reported having known their closest friends for a somewhat longer period of time than did the engineering Rs. Both groups had met most of their friends within the previous five years. This span of time, however,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time Known</th>
<th>Engineers' Friends</th>
<th></th>
<th>Educators' Friends</th>
<th></th>
<th>All Friends</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closest N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Least Close N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Closest N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>5 .09</td>
<td>7 .21</td>
<td>2 .035</td>
<td>1 .03</td>
<td>7 .06</td>
<td>8 .12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-two years</td>
<td>12 .21</td>
<td>6 .18</td>
<td>11 .18</td>
<td>4 .11</td>
<td>23 .20</td>
<td>10 .14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-three years</td>
<td>26 .46</td>
<td>10 .29</td>
<td>11 .18</td>
<td>9 .26</td>
<td>37 .32</td>
<td>19 .28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-five years</td>
<td>2 .04</td>
<td>2 .06</td>
<td>10 .17</td>
<td>9 .26</td>
<td>12 .10</td>
<td>11 .16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-seven years</td>
<td>4 .07</td>
<td>2 .06</td>
<td>9 .15</td>
<td>7 .20</td>
<td>13 .11</td>
<td>9 .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight-nine years</td>
<td>3 .055</td>
<td>1 .03</td>
<td>2 .03</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>5 .04</td>
<td>1 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten-twelve years</td>
<td>3 .055</td>
<td>3 .085</td>
<td>10 .17</td>
<td>1 .03</td>
<td>13 .11</td>
<td>4 .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen-fifteen years</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>3 .085</td>
<td>2 .035</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>2 .02</td>
<td>3 .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteen + years</td>
<td>1 .02</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>3 .05</td>
<td>4 .11</td>
<td>4 .04</td>
<td>4 .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>56 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>34 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>60 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>35 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>116 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>69 100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\bar{X} = 3.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 4.20 \text{ yr.} \quad 5.83 \text{ yr.} \quad 5.54 \text{ yr.} \quad 4.76 \text{ yr.} \quad 4.88 \text{ yr.} \\
\text{mdn = 3.00 yr.} \quad 3.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 5.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 5.00 \text{ yr.} \quad 4.00 \text{ yr.} \quad 4.00 \text{ yr.} \\
\text{mode = 2.50 yr.} \quad 2.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 1.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 2.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 2.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 2.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 2.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 4.50 \text{ yr.}
\]
included 80 per cent of the engineers' closest friends, but only 57 per cent of the closest friends cited by education Rs. Only 20 per cent of the engineers' closest friends had been known for 6 years or more, while education Rs reported having known 43 per cent of their closest friends longer than five years.

Table 1 indicates that in addition to having known closest friends longer, education majors had known least close friends for a longer period of time than had engineering majors. Thirty-four per cent of the educators' least close friends as compared with 26 per cent of the least close friends named by engineers had been known for more than five years.

The finding that engineers had known both their closest and least close friends for a shorter period of time than had educators corresponds with the finding that engineers tended to name primarily local friends (those that have been met largely in the university setting) in both closest and least close categories, while educators named primarily nonlocal friends.

A close examination of Table 1 reveals that friends indicated as least close by engineering Rs tended to have been known for a longer period of time than persons regarded as closest friends. Twenty-six per cent of the engineers' least close friends as compared with 20 per cent of the friends listed as closest by engineering Rs had been known for longer than five years. There was a tendency in the opposite direction in the case of education Rs, who had known 43 per cent of their closest friends for longer than five years, but had known only 34 per cent of their least close friends for that length of time.

When the data were analyzed according to whether the friend was local or nonlocal, regardless of his closeness to the R, it was found that 84 per cent
of the local friends had been known by the Rs for three years or less, while 73 per cent of the nonlocal friends had been known longer than three years (see Table 2). As one would expect, Rs for the most part had known their nonlocal friends for a longer period of time than their local friends. Education Rs reported having known both local and nonlocal friends for a longer period of time than did the engineering Rs. Ninety-three per cent of the engineers' local friends as compared with 67 per cent of the educators' local friends had been known for three years or less. The corresponding figures for nonlocal friendships were 35 per cent of the engineers' friends and 22 per cent of the friends listed by educators.

In order to analyze data on where friends were met, information obtained from the Rs in this regard was broken down into two categories--met friend at the university, and met friend in my hometown. The results are summarized in Table 3. As indicated in Table 3, approximately half of the 185 closest and least close friends were met at the university. However, there were differences with regard to contexts in which closest as opposed to least close friendships were formed. Across all Rs, closest friends were met primarily in the university setting, especially as a result of living in the same residence with the friend. The Rs' hometown provided the most frequent context for initiating least close friendships.

In addition, there were differences between engineering majors and education majors with regard to where friends were met. Engineering Rs were more likely than education Rs to form new friendships, both closest and least close, at the university. As Table 3 shows, approximately 65 per cent of the friends cited by engineers were met at the university as compared with 34 per cent named by educators. On the other hand, educators reported having met a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time Known</th>
<th>Engineers' Friends</th>
<th>Educators' Friends</th>
<th>All Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local N %</td>
<td>Nonlocal N %</td>
<td>Local N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>10 .17</td>
<td>2 .06</td>
<td>3 .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-two years</td>
<td>14 .24</td>
<td>4 .13</td>
<td>12 .32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-three years</td>
<td>31 .52</td>
<td>5 .16</td>
<td>10 .27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-five years</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>4 .13</td>
<td>8 .22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-seven years</td>
<td>1 .02</td>
<td>5 .16</td>
<td>1 .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight-nine years</td>
<td>2 .03</td>
<td>2 .07</td>
<td>1 .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten-twelve years</td>
<td>1 .02</td>
<td>5 .16</td>
<td>2 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen-fifteen years</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>3 .10</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteen + years</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>1 .03</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>59 100</td>
<td>31 100</td>
<td>37 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\bar{X} = 2.33 \text{ yr.} \quad 6.48 \text{ yr.} \quad 3.17 \text{ yr.} \quad 7.43 \text{ yr.} \quad 2.66 \text{ yr.} \quad 7.10 \text{ yr.} \\
\text{mdn} = 3.00 \text{ yr.} \quad 6.00 \text{ yr.} \quad 3.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 7.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 3.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 7.50 \text{ yr.} \\
\text{mode} = 2.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 2.50 \& \quad 1.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 6.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 2.50 \text{ yr.} \quad 6.50 \text{ yr.} \\
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where Met</th>
<th>Engineers' Friends</th>
<th>Educators' Friends</th>
<th>All Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closest N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Least Close N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT UNIVERSITY*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>5 .09</td>
<td>2 .05</td>
<td>7 .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>27 .48</td>
<td>11 .32</td>
<td>38 .42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party or social event</td>
<td>1 .02</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>1 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club or organization</td>
<td>5 .09</td>
<td>3 .09</td>
<td>8 .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>2 .04</td>
<td>3 .09</td>
<td>5 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMETOWN*</td>
<td>16 .28</td>
<td>15 .45</td>
<td>31 .35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>2 .04</td>
<td>2 .06</td>
<td>4 .045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high</td>
<td>4 .06</td>
<td>1 .03</td>
<td>5 .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade school</td>
<td>1 .02</td>
<td>5 .15</td>
<td>6 .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>2 .04</td>
<td>2 .06</td>
<td>4 .045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>2 .04</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>2 .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>5 .08</td>
<td>1 .03</td>
<td>6 .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club or organization</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>2 .06</td>
<td>2 .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Hometown&quot;</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>2 .06</td>
<td>2 .02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals                    | 56       | 34      | 90            | 60      | 35      | 95     | 116      | 69      | 185        |

*The N's and percentages cited in the two major categories (at university and hometown) include the subcategories listed.
greater proportion of their friends in various contexts at home (education Rs, 66 per cent and engineering Rs 35 per cent). This finding is consistent with the results reported above which indicated that education Rs tended to have known their friends longer than had engineering Rs, and that most of the educators' friends were nonlocal.

Apparently, the educators' friendships were more stable (long-lasting) than those of engineers, whose associations were primarily recently formed within the university setting. This finding seems to make sense in view of Roe's hypothesis. Persons who are genuinely interested in others perhaps form different kinds of relationships than non-person oriented individuals. Stability of a relationship is an important dimension along which the associations of different types of individuals may vary. Another dimension is closeness of a relationship, to be examined later in this thesis.

The university not only provided an important context in which new friendships were initiated, but also appeared to be a place where previously formed friendships, particularly those of education Rs, were maintained and continued. Approximately 16 per cent of the 96 local friends cited were persons originally met at home, the friendship continuing at the university. Table 4 clearly indicates that education Rs named more university friends whom were met at home than did engineering Rs (approximately 30 per cent and 7 per cent, respectively). Except for this difference, engineers and educators were similar in having formed the majority of their local friendships at the university and most of their nonlocal friendships in their hometown. The 11 nonlocal friends that were met at the university were all friends of transfer students whom had been met at the R's previous college.

Rs provided fairly extensive information on how each of their friends
TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO WHERE LOCAL VERSUS NONLOCAL FRIENDS WERE MET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where Met</th>
<th>Engineers' Friends</th>
<th>Educators' Friends</th>
<th>All Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local N %</td>
<td>Nonlocal N %</td>
<td>Total N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At university</td>
<td>55 93</td>
<td>4 13</td>
<td>59 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hometown</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>27 87</td>
<td>31 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>59 100</td>
<td>31 100</td>
<td>90 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were met. Responses were placed under one of the nine categories included in Table 5. Two of the ten categories—met through another friend and met spontaneously—accounted for approximately 56 per cent of the closest friends listed and about 61 per cent of the 69 least close friends named by all Rs. The rest of the friends were fairly evenly distributed over the remaining eight categories.

As Table 5 indicates, both engineering and education Rs tended to meet the majority of their friends in the two ways described above. However, there were differences between the two groups in this respect. Engineering Rs, for example were somewhat more likely than education Rs to report meeting friends spontaneously, and slightly less likely to meet friends through another friend.

To analyze in more detail how friends were met, nine of the categories were collapsed into three, as follows:

1. Friendships formed through personal contact or through introduction by a third intimate party.
   a. met friend through a family member
   b. met friend through another friend
   c. met friend by a third party with whom R was acquainted (e.g., boss at work)

2. Friendships formed through an organized gathering or because both are participating in an organization which brings them together.
   a. met friend in the classroom
   b. introduced at a party
   c. shared the same residence
   d. met friend in an organized group

3. Friendship formed in a purely spontaneous fashion
   a. met friend while playing
   b. spontaneous (e.g., R said we just started running around together)

An examination of Table 6 indicates that both engineers and educators had met

---

2 The "not available" category was eliminated in this analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Met</th>
<th>Engineers' Friends</th>
<th>Educators' Friends</th>
<th>All Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closest N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Least Close N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a family member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced by a friend</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced by a third party</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In class together</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a party together</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the same college residence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing together</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through belonging to the same organization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneously</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
most of their closest friends spontaneously, while least close friends were met primarily through the channel of personal contact. However, engineering Rs were slightly more likely than education Rs to have met both closest and least close friends spontaneously and slightly less likely to have been introduced to their friends through a third party. Generally, more of the Rs' closest friends were met in organized settings such as clubs and the classroom than were least close friends.

Table 7 shows that when local and nonlocal friendships were considered regardless of the closeness of the friendship, no major differences between the two were found in terms of how friends were met. There was a slight tendency for both local and nonlocal friends of education Rs to have been met primarily through personal contact. A spontaneous meeting of friends followed closely in frequency, and the smallest proportion of friendships were initiated as a result of participation in organized settings. Engineering Rs differed slightly from education Rs in their greater tendency to have formed nonlocal friendships spontaneously rather than through a third party.

In summary, when all friendships were analyzed according to the intimacy and proximity (local-nonlocal) of the relationship, it was found that factors in the formation of friendships were useful in distinguishing between engineers' and educators' ties with closest and least close friends, local and nonlocal friends. The educators originally met most of their friends in their hometown through a third intimate party. Although some of their hometown friendships were continued when both parties came to the university, most of the educators' friends were not present in the Rs' university environment. On the other hand, the engineer, as compared with the educator, had met his friends more recently and in a more spontaneous fashion. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Met</th>
<th>Engineers' Friends</th>
<th>Educators' Friends</th>
<th>All Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closest N %</td>
<td>Closest N %</td>
<td>Total N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Through personal contact or through introduction by a third intimate party</td>
<td>17 30</td>
<td>17 50</td>
<td>34 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Through an organized gathering or because of participation in a common organization</td>
<td>10 18</td>
<td>6 18</td>
<td>16 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In a spontaneous fashion</td>
<td>29 52</td>
<td>11 32</td>
<td>40 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>56 100</td>
<td>34 100</td>
<td>90 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Met</td>
<td>Engineers' Friends</td>
<td>Educators' Friends</td>
<td>All Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local N %</td>
<td>Nonlocal N %</td>
<td>Total N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Through personal contact or through introduction by a third intimate party</td>
<td>25 42</td>
<td>9 30</td>
<td>34 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Through an organized gathering or because of participation in a common organization</td>
<td>10 17</td>
<td>6 19</td>
<td>16 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In a spontaneous fashion</td>
<td>24 41</td>
<td>16 51</td>
<td>40 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>59 100</td>
<td>31 100</td>
<td>90 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
majority of the engineers' friends, moreover, were at the university (local).

The differences that were found between engineers and educators in their formation of friendship ties may be viewed in terms of Roe's theory. Two patterns emerge from the data: On the one hand, educators, as person oriented individuals, have formed more lasting relationships with persons in their hometown whom they have met largely as a result of a common bond with another friend; they are part of a close-knit, continuing web of friendships. On the other hand, engineers have more recently and somewhat more independently formed such close ties with others. Perhaps their relationships are more fleeting, more transient than those of educators.

Disregarding R's major, closest friendships differed from least close friendships in two major ways. The R was more likely to have formed his closest ties with other individuals at the university. In addition, the friendship was more frequently initiated spontaneously as compared with least close friendships.

The data described above on number of friends listed by R was important to a test of differences between engineers and educators with respect to interpersonal involvement. Hypothesis one was formulated in order to test for quantitative differences in extent of friendship ties. Hypothesis one stated that:

    Engineering Rs will report fewer close friends than Secondary Education Rs.

Hypothesis one was tested by counting the number of friends originally cited by each R when asked to list the first names or initials of those persons he regarded as close friends. As indicated earlier, the 40 Rs listed a total of 373 friends. Engineering Rs cited 148 friends, or an average of 7.4 units, 5.1 of whom were local and 2.3 nonlocal. Education Rs listed 225 friends, or
an average of 11.2. Of the 11.2 friends, 6.1 were local and 5.1 nonlocal.

Chi Square was used as the statistical test of significance, and the contingency coefficient was computed as a measure of the strength of association between academic major and number of friends. The data on number of friends listed by all 40 Rs was dichotomized at the median number of friends. Number of friends above the median were labeled "many" and those below the median were "few". Table 8 reveals that significantly more engineers than educators listed few friends. Thus, it appears that Hypothesis one was confirmed by the present data.

| TABLE 8 |
| DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGINEERS AND EDUCATORS WITH RESPECT TO NUMBER OF FRIENDS LISTED |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rs who listed few friends*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs who listed many friends**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 5.01; p \leq .05 \]
\[ d.f = 1^{**} \]
\[ \phi = .354 \]

* Rs that listed fewer friends than the median number of friends named by the total sample.

** Rs that listed more friends than the median number of friends.

*** d.f = 1 in all comparisons in this thesis.
In order to determine whether the apparent relationship between academic major and number of friends was a spurious one, controls were introduced for several variables that seemed critical to the variable of number of friends. The first control, number of semesters at KSU, was introduced because of the almost obvious relationship between amount of time spent at the university and accumulation of friends there. It was found that in spite of the fact that engineering Rs had been at KSU slightly longer than education Rs, they listed fewer friends. \(^3\) It is interesting to note, however, that engineering Rs named proportionately more local friends than did education Rs. The same logic was used in controlling for transfer status of the R. Again, the relationship between major and number of friends remained, regardless of whether or not the R was a transfer student. Since there is reason to believe that the primary ties of urban individuals may differ in several respects from those of persons with a rural background, it was decided to control for this variable. Both rural and urban engineers, however, listed fewer friends than rural and urban educators.

Finally, additional variables that are in this study regarded as components of interpersonal involvement were introduced as controls. It seemed reasonable to assume that variables such as organizational affiliation, fraternity membership and relationship with parents may be related to number of friends. Perhaps a R that is active in a fraternity, for example, is more likely than his unaffiliated counterpart to have many friends, regardless of whether he is an engineer or educator. It was found that none of these variables—fraternity membership, organizational affiliation, frequency of

\(^3\)See Appendix C for a biographical sketch of the Rs.
interaction with parents, feelings about parents, or quality of relationship with parents—caused the original relationship between R's major and number of friends to disappear. It appears that indeed, academic major is significantly related to number of friends named by a R.

**Affect and Activity in Friendship**

Earlier a primary friend was defined as one with whom the R is predisposed to enter into a wide range of activities and his predisposition to do so is associated with a preponderance of positive affect. The activity and affect dimensions each were used as indices of the closeness of a friendship in order to test for differences between engineers and educators in the closeness they maintained with friends. Hypothesis 2 stated that:

Engineering Rs will report less close relations with close friends than Secondary Education Rs.

The activity and affective dimensions of friendship were measured separately and will be considered separately in the discussion below. A final section will be concerned with the relation between activity and affect in friendship.

**Activities and friendship.** To obtain information on the sharing of activities with friends, Rs were given a sheet of paper on which were listed 18 different activities. They were asked to indicate which of the activities they had engaged in with each of their three closest and two least close friends. The responses provided by Rs formed a Guttman scale (C.R. = .86). Thus, rather than having to evaluate each item separately, it was possible to

---

4Response patterns falling between .85 and .90 Guttman calls quasi-scales. If a sufficient number of items are included in the scale and a fairly even distribution of scale types is achieved, one may reasonably assume that the scale is approaching unidimensionality (in Guttman's sense) and the scale is usable.
work with "activity scores" which were derived from the pattern of responses given to the entire set of activity items. Moreover, each friendship was assigned an activity score and could be placed on a scale relative to all other friendships.\(^5\)

When the 18 activities were ranked according to the frequency with which \(R_s\) engaged in that activity, a highly significant association (Rho = .96) was observed between the rankings of engineers' activities and rankings of educators' activities. It seems reasonable to conclude from these data that the activity items included in the schedule were meaningfully related to the kinds of things friends do together.

The activity scores for all friendships were analyzed both in terms of \(R\)'s academic major and degrees of intimacy of the friendship. Measures of central tendency for all of these categories of friends were computed and are summarized in Table 9. It is important to note that the activity scores should be interpreted inversely; that is, a low numerical score indicates a high activity score. An examination of the mean scores indicates that both engineers and educators reported engaging in more activities with closest friends than with least close friends. To statistically compare less intimate and most intimate friends by number of activities shared with \(R_s\), the two categories of friends were divided into those friends who fell below and above the median activity score for the entire sample of friends.

Differences were observed between shared activities with closest and least close friends. The differences, however, were statistically

---

\(^5\)The referent for activity scores was the dyad (\(R\) and each of his friends). The scale score achieved by each friendship was assigned as the activity score for that friendship.
TABLE 9
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGINEERS AND EDUCATORS ACCORDING TO AVERAGE ACTIVITIES SCORES OBTAINED IN MOST INTIMATE VERSUS LESS INTIMATE FRIENDSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th></th>
<th>All Rs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 6.75$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 7.12$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 6.94$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>$mdn = 5.00$</td>
<td>$mdn = 7.00$</td>
<td>$mdn = 6.00$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$mode = 3.00$</td>
<td>$mode = 7.00$</td>
<td>$mode = 1.00$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 10.94$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 8.86$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 9.88$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$mdn = 12.00$</td>
<td>$mdn = 9.00$</td>
<td>$mdn = 10.00$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$mode = 13.00$</td>
<td>$mode = 7.00$</td>
<td>$mode = 7.00$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All friendships</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 8.43$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 7.82$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 8.11$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$mdn = 7.00$</td>
<td>$mdn = 7.00$</td>
<td>$mdn = 10.00$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$mode = 3.00$</td>
<td>$mode = 7.00$</td>
<td>$mode = 7.00$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

significant only for the entire sample and for the sample of engineers' friends (see Tables 10-10B). Although there was a tendency in the predicted direction for the educators' friends, the difference was not a significant one. Thus, both engineering majors and education majors exhibited a propensity to engage in many activities with closest friends and few activities with least close friends. However, the difference achieved statistical significance only for engineering Rs, who were more likely than education Rs to engage in more activities with closest and fewer activities with least close friends. The activity dimension didn't seem to be as critical an element in defining closeness of the educators' friendships.

Of greater relevance for hypothesis 2 were differences between engineers and educators in sharing activities with friends regardless of the degree of

---

6A different level of analysis, by R, revealed that Rs who engaged in many activities with closest friends also tended to engage in many activities with least close friends.
### TABLE 10

DIFFERENCES REPORTED BY ENGINEERING RS WITH RESPECT TO SHARED ACTIVITIES WITH CLOSEST VERSUS LEAST CLOSE FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineers' Friendships</th>
<th>Closest</th>
<th>Least Close</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R and his friends engage in many activities</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and his friends engage in few activities**</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 14.369; p < .001$

$\phi = .3995$

### TABLE 10A

DIFFERENCES REPORTED BY EDUCATION RS WITH RESPECT TO SHARED ACTIVITIES WITH CLOSEST VERSUS LEAST CLOSE FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educators' Friendships</th>
<th>Closest</th>
<th>Least Close</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R and his friends engage in many activities</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and his friends engage in few activities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 2.039; \text{N.S.}$

$\phi = .1465$

*Many activities is defined as an activities score above the median activities score for the entire sample.*

**Few activities is defined as an activities score below the median activities score for the entire sample.*
TABLE 10B
DIFFERENCES REPORTED BY ALL RS WITH RESPECT TO SHARED ACTIVITIES
WITH CLOSEST VERSUS LEAST CLOSE FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Friendships</th>
<th>Closest</th>
<th>Least Close</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R and his friends engage in many activities</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and his friends engage in few activities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 13.456; p < .001$
$\phi = .2697$

intimacy of the friendship. The mean activity scores for both groups (see Table 9) indicate that educators tended to engage in more activities with friends than did engineers. To analyze the difference statistically, the friends of the two groups were divided at the median activity score for the entire sample of friends. A Chi Square, summarized in Table 11, failed to show a significant difference between engineers and educators in sharing activities with friends.

The findings reported above reinforce the initial assumption that the activity dimension of primary relationships is an important element in defining such ties. The activity score seemed to distinguish between degrees of primariness (closest-least close) of friendship relationships, although with less sensitivity for educators as opposed to engineers. However, these data fail to support hypothesis 2.
### TABLE 11
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGINEERS AND EDUCATORS WITH RESPECT TO DEGREE OF SHARING ACTIVITIES WITH FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendships in which many activities were shared</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships in which few activities were shared</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 0.039; \text{ N.S.}$  
$\phi = 0.015$

**Affect in friendship.** The second component for measuring closeness of the primary friendship concerned affective ties between persons. It was assumed that there would be differences between engineers and educators in the affective dimension of their ties with friends.

Four types of affect measures were employed. The Rs were asked:

1. To indicate whether or not they had ever confided in their friends about:
   a. embarrassing experiences on dates
   b. problems with parents
   c. troubles that members of the family are in
   d. difficulties with school work
   e. serious financial difficulties
   f. personal problems
   g. sexual experiences
   h. ideas and plans for marriage
   i. goals and plans for the future
2. If they would be willing and, in fact, actually had borrowed money from their friends
3. If they "felt free to let their hair down and just be themselves" with their friends
4. If they had exchanged home visits with friends.

The data obtained from these items are presented, in order, in the following sections.
Confiding and friendship. The responses provided by the Rs to each of the nine confiding items formed a Guttman scale (C.R. = .88). The scale score achieved by each friendship was assigned as the confiding score for that friendship. Means and medians were derived from the confiding scores for the various categories of friendships (by academic major of the R and by degree of intimacy of the friendship). These data are summarized in Table 12.

### TABLE 12

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGINEERS AND EDUCATORS ACCORDING TO AVERAGE CONFIDING SCORES OBTAINED IN INTIMATE VERSUS LESS INTIMATE FRIENDSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>All Rs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.18$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 2.89$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.03$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mdn = 3.00</td>
<td>mdn = 2.00</td>
<td>mdn = 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mode = 1.00</td>
<td>mode = 1.00</td>
<td>mode = 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.91$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.94$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4.92$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mdn = 5.00</td>
<td>mdn = 5.00</td>
<td>mdn = 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mode = 5.00</td>
<td>mode = 6.00</td>
<td>mode = 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All friendships</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.87$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.71$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 3.79$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mdn = 4.00</td>
<td>mdn = 4.00</td>
<td>mdn = 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mode = 1.00</td>
<td>mode = 1.00</td>
<td>mode = 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with activity scores, a low numerical score indicates a high confiding score. An examination of Table 12 shows that both engineers and educators confided in closest friends to a greater extent than they confided in least close friends. This relationship was tested statistically by the Chi Square. The median confiding score for the entire sample of friends was used to

---

7A R by R analysis indicated that Rs who confide highly in closest friends also tend to confide highly in least close associates.
divide both closest and least close friendships into high and low confiding categories. The differences, as shown in Tables 13-13B, were statistically significant both across and within both groups of Rs. This finding tends to support the validity of the nine confiding items for measuring degree of primariness of a relationship.

Although degree of confiding in friends significantly distinguished between close and least close ties across all friendships, no significant differences were observed between engineers and educators in their tendency to confide in friends (see Table 14). Table 12, however, reveals that education Rs were slightly more likely than engineering Rs to confide more in closest friends and less in least close friends. The data again failed to support hypothesis 2.

The nine confiding items were analyzed in an additional way. The findings reported above indicate the significance of shared confidences in friendship. Is there, however, a relationship between the relative importance (as perceived by the R) placed upon the various concerns included in the list of confiding items, and the degree to which these items are predictive of affective ties? To obtain an indicator of relative importance the Rs were asked to rank the nine items in terms of which would cause them the greatest worry and concern. Separate overall rankings by importance of the nine items were then obtained for all Rs, engineering Rs and education Rs, by summing the ranks provided by Rs for each item. Also the items were ranked by decreasing affective significance using the final order of items as indicated in the confiding scales. These data are found in Table 15.

This procedure allowed tests of association to be made between the relative importance placed on an item and its discriminatory power as an
### TABLE 13
DIFFERENCES REPORTED BY ENGINEERING RS WITH RESPECT TO CONFIDING IN CLOSEST VERSUS LEAST CLOSE FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineers' Friendships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships in which there was a high degree of confiding*</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships in which there was a lesser degree of confiding**</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 8.402; \ p < .01 \]
\[ \phi = .305 \]

### TABLE 13A
DIFFERENCES REPORTED BY EDUCATION RS WITH RESPECT TO CONFIDING IN CLOSEST VERSUS LEAST CLOSE FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Educators' Friendships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships in which there was a high degree of confiding</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships in which there was a lesser degree of confiding**</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 13.223; \ p < .001 \]
\[ \phi = .373 \]

*Rs who obtained a confiding score above the median score for the entire sample were classified as high confiders.

**Rs who obtained a confiding score below the median score for the entire sample were classified as low confiders.
### TABLE 13B
Differences reported by all rs with respect to confiding in closest versus least close friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Friendships</th>
<th>Closest</th>
<th>Least Close</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendships in which there was a high degree of confiding</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships in which there was a lesser degree of confiding</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 21.415; p < .001$

$\phi = .340$

### TABLE 14
Differences between engineers and educators with respect to degree of confiding in friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendships in which there was a high degree of confiding</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships in which there was a lesser degree of confiding</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .189; \text{N.S.}$

$\phi = .032$
indicator of affect, both between and within groups of Rs. Also it became possible to examine the relationship between engineers' and educators' responses to the importance and to the affect items. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation test (Rho) was used as the measure of association. The correlation coefficients obtained are found at the bottom of Table 15.

There appeared to be a consistent and significant association both between engineers' and educators' responses to the affect items and between their rankings of the items by importance. However, no relationship was observed between the efficiency of the items as indicators of affect and the relative importance placed on them by Rs. For education Rs the correlation between confiding and importance was positive but small (Rho = .20); for engineering Rs, a negative association was observed (Rho = -.07). The ranking by importance by all Rs correlated with the ranking of items by affect at .11. A logical interpretation of these data would be that affect and relative importance are separate dimensions which may vary independently of one another. One concern (e.g., troubles that members of the family are in) may be confided only to closest friends, while another (e.g., goals and plans for the future) may be discussed with many people regardless of the intimacy of the relationship and apparently regardless of the R's major. Nonetheless, both may be regarded as very important by the R.

**Other measures of affect.** The remaining measures of affect were analyzed separately. The results of the analyses are found in Appendix D. As with activity and confiding, most of these items tended to discriminate between closest and least close friends. Both engineering Rs and education Rs were likely to report feeling free to borrow money ($\chi^2 = 4.01, p < .05$, $\phi = .211$ and $\chi^2 = 5.05, p < .05$, $\phi = .230$ respectively) and to behave
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Importance Rank</th>
<th>Confiding Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Embarrassing experiences on dates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Problems with parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Troubles that members of the family are in</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Difficulties with school work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Serious financial difficulties</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sexual experiences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ideas and plans for marriage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Goals and plans for the future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total importance x Engineers' importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total importance x Educators' importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers' importance x Educators' importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total confiding x Engineers' confiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total confiding x Educators' confiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers' confiding x Educators' confiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total importance x Total confiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers' importance x Engineers' confiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators' importance x Educators' confiding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 or less.
spontaneously ($\chi^2 = 12.22$, $p < .001$, $\phi = .368$ and $\chi^2 = 3.94$, $p < .05$, $\phi = .204$ respectively) more frequently with closest friends than with least close friends. Only engineering Rs, however, reported actually having borrowed money more from closest friends than from least close associates ($\chi^2 = 5.47$, $p < .02$, $\phi = .305$ and $\chi^2 = 2.40$, n.s., $\phi = .255$ respectively). Both groups of Rs reported exchange of home visits with their friends regardless of the intimacy of the friendship. It appears that of the three additional affect items only two--borrowing money and behaving freely--successfully measured degree of primariness in friendship.

The data were then analyzed to test for engineer-educator differences in the three additional affect items. Chi Square tests revealed a significant difference between the groups of Rs only on the variable concerning exchange of home visits (see Table 16). Education Rs were more likely than engineering Rs to have taken their friends home for a visit regardless of the

<p>| TABLE 16 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGINEERS AND EDUCATORS ACCORDING TO EXCHANGE OF HOME VISITS WITH FRIENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R has taken friend home for a visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R has not taken friend home for a visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 4.138; p < .05$
$\phi = .208$

*This data was obtained for local friends only.
intimacy of their relationship with the friend. This result seems to be
directly related to the finding that educators listed more nonlocal, hometown,
friends both as closest and least close, while the majority of engineers' 
friends were local.

These findings, along with the results reported above, lend little sup-
port to the hypothesis of differences between engineers and educators in
degree of closeness with friends. The relationships that engineering Rs had 
with their friends appeared much the same as those of education Rs. If one 
accepts Roe's theory, however, differences would be expected between the 
closeness of the ties of non-person oriented as opposed to person oriented 
individuals. The results reported above would seem to raise some question 
about the validity of Roe's theory.

Affect and activity in friendship. In order to partially validate the 
initial assumption utilized in this thesis that affect and activity are 
related defining components of primary relationships, it was decided to test 
for actual degree of association between the two aspects. Moreover, in view 
of the present study's conception of closeness in friendship that includes 
both activity and affect as highly related indices, it was deemed essential 
to verify this assumption. Separately, both affect and activity successfully 
get at degree of intimacy of friendship ties, but are the two correlated with 
one another? The confiding scores assigned to each friendship were used as 
the measure of affect, and the activity scores assigned to each friendship 
completed the basic data needed to test for degree of association between 
affect and activity. The Kendall's tau coefficient (.288, p < .001), com-
puted across all friendships was statistically significant far beyond the .05 
level stipulated in Chapter II.
The data seem to validate the assumptions made in this thesis regarding the relation of affect and activity to primary friendship. Together, they constitute a valid and useful index of the intimacy of friendship ties.

One of the most basic constructs used in this study is that of interpersonal involvement discussed in Chapter I. It was suggested that the concept includes both a quantitative and a qualitative dimension, and that these are positively related. It was assumed that a high degree of interpersonal involvement would manifest itself in both the quantitative and qualitative spheres. For example, an individual with many friends would also maintain closer ties with friends. The data reported to this point provide a basis for beginning to examine the validity of the present conception of interpersonal involvement. There were clear differences between engineers and educators in number of friends (the quantitative aspect). However, both groups of Rs were similar in the kinds of ties they maintained with those persons they regarded as close associates.

Interpersonal involvement, though, may be viewed as essentially an individualistic, idiosyncratic style, and group trends could be obscuring individual differences. In order to analyze the concept in greater depth, all Rs were divided into four groups—those who confided to a high degree in their closest friend and who also had many friends; those who confided to a lesser degree in their closest friend and had many friends; Rs who had few friends and a high degree of confiding in their closest friend; and finally Rs who listed few friends and reported a low degree of confiding in closest friends.

---

8 The median scores from the entire sample for confiding and for number of friends were used as the basis for dividing Rs into high and low confiding categories and into groups with many and few friends.
A 2 x 2 Chi Square was used as a statistical test of significance. The results of this analysis are summarized in Tables 17-17B. Briefly, no association between confiding (affect) and number of friends was found. A R who confided highly in his closest friend was as likely to name many friends as he was likely to name few friends; the same tendency can be observed for those few Rs who confided to a lesser degree in their closest friend.

A similar breakdown along the activity dimension of friendship indicated no relation between number of friends named by the R and the degree to which he engaged in activities with his closest friend. These data are presented in Tables 18-18B.

In this thesis, affect and activity both provide an index of closeness, or the qualitative aspect of interpersonal involvement, and number of friends represents the quantitative dimension of friendship. The comparisons reported above between affect and number of friends and activity and number of friends seem to bring into question the present conception of interpersonal involvement wherein the qualitative and quantitative aspects of primary ties are related.

In addition, R by R analyses, as reported above in footnotes 5 and 6, indicated that regardless of the R's major, individuals who confided to a high degree in closest friends tended to also confide to a high degree in less close friends. Likewise, both engineers and educators who engaged in many activities with closest friends engaged in many activities with less close associates. These findings raise some additional questions about the concept of the primary relationship used in this study. When the data were analyzed in the way described above, the activity and affect dimensions did not distinguish between most intimate and less intimate relationships.
### TABLE 17
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEGREE OF CONFIDING IN CLOSEST FRIEND AND NUMBER OF FRIENDS CITED BY ENGINEERING Rs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rs who named many friends</th>
<th>Rs who named few friends</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rs who confided highly in closest friend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs who confided to a lesser extent in closest friend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

corr $\chi^2 = .130$; N.S.  
$\phi = -.242$

### TABLE 17A
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEGREE OF CONFIDING IN CLOSEST FRIEND AND NUMBER OF FRIENDS CITED BY EDUCATION Rs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rs who named many friends</th>
<th>Rs who named few friends</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rs who confided highly in closest friend</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs who confided to a lesser extent in closest friend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

corr $\chi^2 = .208$; N.S.  
$\phi = .102$
### TABLE 17B

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEGREE OF CONFOIDING IN CLOSEST FRIEND AND NUMBER OF FRIENDS CITED BY ALL RS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rs who confided</th>
<th>Rs who named many friends</th>
<th>Rs who named few friends</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>highly in closest friend</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to a lesser extent in closest friend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

corr $\chi^2 = .673$; N.S.

$\phi = .130$

### TABLE 18

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXTENT OF ENGAGING IN ACTIVITIES WITH CLOSEST FRIEND AND NUMBER OF FRIENDS CITED BY ENGINEERING RS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rs who engaged</th>
<th>Rs who named many friends</th>
<th>Rs who named few friends</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in many activities with closest friend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in few activities with closest friend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

corr $\chi^2 = .00$; N.S.

$\phi = -.126$
### TABLE 18A

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXTENT OF ENGAGING IN ACTIVITIES WITH CLOSEST FRIEND AND NUMBER OF FRIENDS CITED BY EDUCATION RS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Rs who named many friends</th>
<th>Rs who named few friends</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rs who engaged in many activities with closest friend</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs who engaged in few activities with closest friend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

corr $\chi^2 = .009$; N.S.  
$\phi = .134$

### TABLE 18B

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXTENT OF ENGAGING IN ACTIVITIES WITH CLOSEST FRIEND AND NUMBER OF FRIENDS CITED BY ALL RS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Rs</th>
<th>Rs who named many friends</th>
<th>Rs who named few friends</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rs who engaged in many activities with closest friend</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs who engaged in few activities with closest friend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

corr $\chi^2 = .077$; N.S.  
$\phi = -.011$
However, the definition of a primary relationship given in Chapter II suggests that the intimacy of a relationship can be assessed according to the degree that confidences and activities are shared in that relationship.

The finding that in both groups of Rs there were high confiders and low confiders, active and less active individuals, raises some question about the validity of Roe's classification of individuals into occupational types. It is probably true that in any single occupation there is room for many different types of individuals, and that the kinds of relationships one forms with others is more a matter of individual dynamic than of occupational aspiration.

Family Relationships

A student's relationship with his family is regarded in this thesis as another type of primary relationship. The nature of this relationship is examined here again using affective and activity ties as indicators of a primary relationship. The data gathered was employed in testing Hypothesis 3:

Engineering Rs will report less involvement in their relationships with their families than Secondary Education Rs.

The activity and affect components of family ties were measured separately. Findings regarding each measure will be reported in the sections below. The final section will summarize the results concerning family ties and their implications for Hypothesis 3.

Activity and the Family. The activity dimension of a R's relationship with his parents was measured differently than was the activity aspect of his friendship ties. Rs were asked to indicate how frequently they contacted parents in the form of letters, phone calls and home visits during the school year. Seven response alternatives were provided ranging from "once a week or more" to "never". Rs were also asked to report how frequently their parents
contacted them in each of the three ways indicated above. The six items used
to measure frequency of family interaction produced three indices which were
derived as follows:

1. Responses to each of the three R-to-parent items for
each R were summed and assigned as a R-to-parent
interaction score.
2. Responses to each of the three parent-to-R items for
each R were summed and assigned as a parent-to-R
interaction score.
3. All six items were summed for each R and assigned as
a total frequency of interaction score.

The scale was constructed in such a way that a low numerical score indicated
a high interaction score. For example, for the total interaction score, a R
who marked the first alternative (once a week or more) for each item, thus
indicating a high frequency of interaction with parents, would obtain a score
of six, the lowest numerical score possible.

A Chi Square analysis\(^9\) revealed that the R-to-parent interaction score
and the parent-to-R interaction score were significantly related \( (\chi^2 = 4.91;\)
p < .05). Thus, there was a low incidence of one-way communication between
Rs and their parents. Since the two scores were related and apparently both
were measuring the extent of interaction between R and his parents, it was
decided to use the total family interaction score in the analyses which
follow.

Rs were divided at the median total interaction frequency score, which
was 25, into groups with high and low interaction scores. A Chi Square test
(see Table 19) revealed no differences between engineers and educators in
their frequency of communication with parents. This finding would suggest

\(^9\) The median R-to-parent and parent-to-R interaction scores for the
entire sample were used to divide Rs into high and low categories on each of
these variables.
that Hypothesis 3 is untenable in its prediction of differences in the family
ties of engineering Rs and education Rs.

**TABLE 19**

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGINEERS AND EDUCATORS IN
FREQUENCY OF INTERACTION WITH PARENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High interaction frequency*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Interaction frequency**</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .00; \text{ N.S.} \]
\[ \phi = .00 \]

* A high frequency of interaction was defined as a score above the median
frequency of interaction for the entire sample.

** A low frequency of interaction was defined as a score below the median
frequency of interaction for the entire sample.

The interpersonal involvement concept discussed in Chapter II and above
suggested additional comparisons which might cast further light upon Hypoth-
esis 3. First, it was decided to examine the association between the activ-
ity component of family relations and the activity dimension of friendship
ties. It seemed reasonable to assume that the activity component of primary
relationships would be manifested in similar ways in the types of primary
ties studied in this thesis. Thus, a R who scored high on the activity com-
ponent of friendship ties would also score high on the activity aspect of
family relationships. All Rs were divided at the median activity score with
closest friend for the entire sample into groups engaging in many activities
and in few activities with closest friend. Likewise, the median total interaction score with parents was used as a basis for placing Rs into high and low categories of interaction frequency. Chi Square indicated no relation between the two measures (corr. \( \chi^2 = .045, \) N.S., \( \phi = .022 \)). Rs who interacted frequently with parents were as likely to share many activities with friends as few activities. Apparently the activity dimension of different types of primary ties are not related.

A similar analysis was carried out in order to test for a relation between interaction frequency with parents and number of friends. Again, it was assumed that Rs who were active in their relationships with parents would also be active in the area of friendship by having made many friends. The median number of friends for the entire sample was used to divide Rs into groups with many and with few friends. Although there was a tendency for Rs that named many friends to also report a high frequency of interaction with parents and for Rs who listed few friends to report low frequency of interaction, the differences were not statistically significant (\( \chi^2 = 3.00, \) N.S., \( \phi = .274 \)).

It was reported earlier that the quantitative (number) and qualitative (closeness) aspects of friendship were unrelated. In addition, results of the comparisons described above show that a measure of the closeness of a friendship relationship (activity) was unrelated to a similar measure of the closeness of a family relationship. The reader is reminded that the activity dimension of friendship ties was measured in a different way than was activity in the family relationship. Perhaps the two measures aren't really comparable, but the more likely implication of the above results may be that activity, as one measure of the closeness of a relationship, varies across
types of primary ties. The additional finding that closeness (activity) of family relationships has little to do with the quantitative aspect (number) of friendship argues against a conception of interpersonal involvement wherein the qualitative (closeness) aspect is related to the quantitative (number) aspect within the same relationship or to the qualitative aspect of another type of primary tie.

_Affect in the family._ Three separate measures of the affective dimension of family ties were included in the schedule. The results concerning each of these measures are reported in the following sections.

_Confiding in parents._ Rs were asked in whom they would confide about nine problems and concerns. The response alternatives were as follows: close friends; parents; professor; minister, counselor or adviser; or none of these. Rs were asked to indicate a first, second, and least choice, thus enabling us to ascertain where parents lie along a continuum of potential confidantes for different problems.

The frequency with which Rs indicated each of the five alternatives as first choice was calculated, and the number of times each was named as last, or least choice was also computed. Second choices were not analyzed. These data are tabulated in Table 20. Generally, Rs indicated close friends as the persons in whom they would most likely confide about their concerns. However, in most cases, parents were next most frequently confided in as first choice, and they were named as the most frequently used confidante for concerns related to troubles that members of the family are in, and for financial difficulties. This latter finding seems logical in view of the partial

---

10 These nine items are listed above under "Affect in Friendship."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>First-choice Targets of Confiding</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineers' Responses</td>
<td>Educators' Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Plans for marriage</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal goals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Embarrassing experiences on dates</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Problems with parents</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Financial difficulties</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal problems</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Troubles that a member of the family is in</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Difficulties with school work</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sexual experiences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals*</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>Last-choice Targets of Confiding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineers' Responses</td>
<td>Educators' Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Plans for marriage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Embarrassing experiences on dates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Problems with parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Financial difficulties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Troubles that a member of the family is in</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Difficulties with school work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sexual experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentages listed under each column indicate the proportion of first (or least) choices that went to that response alternative.
financial dependency of most students upon their parents. It is interesting, but not surprising, to note that in no case did a R indicate that he would be most likely to talk with his parents about his sexual experiences. Only one R indicated that he would be most likely to talk with his parents about embarrassing experiences on dates.

Educators reported that they tended to regard parents as a first-choice confidante more frequently than did engineers (34% of the educators' first choices were parents as compared with 26% of the engineers' first choices). These data would seem to partially support Hypothesis 3.

Engineers and educators were alike in their tendency to confide in professors as a "last resort". It is interesting that even when the R's hypothetical concern was with difficulties in school work, over half of the sample named "professor" as the person in whom they would be least likely to confide. Ministers, counselors and advisers, along with "none of these" accounted for the majority of the remaining last choices. Engineering Rs seemed less likely than education Rs to confide in a minister, counselor or adviser, while more education Rs utilized the final, "none of these" category.

Quality of interaction with parents. A second measure of the affective component of a R's relationship with his family involved asking each R to indicate how frequently he talked with his parents about 12 issues related to important things happening to him, to his parents, and in the external world. For each item (see Appendix B for a list of the items used) R was to indicate whether he talked with his parents about each topic (1) Very often, (2) Occasionally, (3) Rarely, or (4) Never. Responses to all twelve items were summed in order to derive a score for each R. The scores could range from 12 (indicating a high quality of interaction) to 48 (indicating a low quality of
interaction). The scores actually ranged from 15 to 48. This numerical score constituted a measure of the quality of each R's interaction with parents. A thirteenth item obtained the R's perception of how closely his and his parents' ideas agree.

Rs were divided at the median quality of interaction score for the entire sample (mdn = 23) into groups with high and low quality scores. The Chi Square (see Table 21) revealed no statistically significant differences between engineers and educators in the quality of their interactions with parents. Again, the data failed to lend support to Hypothesis 3.

**TABLE 21**

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGINEERS AND EDUCATORS WITH RESPECT TO QUALITY OF INTERACTION WITH PARENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rs who engaged in a high quality of interaction with parents *</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs who engaged in a low quality of interaction with parents **</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .439; \text{ N.S.} \]
\[ \phi = -.105 \]

* A high quality of interaction was defined as a score above the median quality of interaction for the entire sample.

** A low quality of interaction was defined as a score below the median quality of interaction for the entire sample.
The reader is reminded that the friendship data reported above revealed a significant association between affect and activity in friendship. The data obtained in the family section of the schedule provide an opportunity to make a similar analysis of the relationship between affect and activity in family ties. The quality of interaction scores obtained by each R were used as the measure of affect, and the frequency of interaction scores as the index of activity. The median scores for the entire sample on each of the two variables was used as a basis for dividing Rs into groups with high and low quality of interaction scores and into high and low frequency of interaction categories. Chi Square indicated that a R who interacted frequently with his parents was as likely to engage in a low quality of interaction with them as a high quality of interaction. Likewise, among the Rs who interacted less frequently with their parents, as many indicated a low quality of interaction as a high quality of interaction ($\chi^2 = .897$, N.S., $\phi = .150$).

Thus, it appears that the measure of affect employed in this thesis is unrelated to the activity component of family relationships. While the definition of primary ties utilized in this study was partially validated in the finding that affect and activity dimensions of friendship ties are related, the results reported above may indicate that the present model of primary relationships is not applicable to the family relationship. On the other hand, our measure of activity in the family relationship may make interaction with parents appear spuriously high just because it's difficult not to interact with one's parents at least occasionally through phone calls and letters. In addition, visits home during vacations, for example, are essentially a "given" in the family relationship regardless of the closeness of that relationship. Because of the nature of one's relationship with his
parents, which is in some respects an established, a priori sort of bond, there may be less freedom of choice for the R in determining the dimensions of that relationship as compared with his ties with close friends.

Additional comparisons were made in order to further clarify the interrelationships among various aspects of the different types of primary ties. Given the conception of interpersonal involvement used in this thesis, it seemed reasonable to assume that the quality of the R's discussions with his parents could be related to his degree of confiding in friends. Engineering majors and education majors were divided into groups of low and high quality interaction with parents using the median quality of interaction score for the entire sample. Likewise, the median score for confiding in one's closest friend was used to categorize Rs into high and low confiding groups. A Chi Square indicated that for educators, there was a significant relation between quality of interaction with parents and degree of confiding in closest friend (corr. $\chi^2 = 4.70, p < .05, \phi = .612$). Education Rs who maintained a high quality of interaction with parents were more likely to confide to a greater extent in their closest friend than were the educators who engaged in low quality interaction with parents. Although the results tended in the same direction for engineering Rs, the relationship was not statistically significant (corr. $\chi^2 = .298, \text{N.S., } \phi = .030$).

These data lend some support to the notion that corresponding aspects of primary relationships are associated across different types of relationships. Thus, the above results indicate that a measure of the affective component of friendship (confiding in one's closest friend) tended to be related to a measure of the affective dimension (quality of interaction) of family ties. On the other hand, however, activity measures of friendship and family ties
were not related. To this point the data has failed to consistently support a systematic relationship between the quantitative (number) aspect of one type of primary tie and the qualitative (closeness) aspect of that relationship. Further, the data has indicated that qualitative components of different types of primary relationships are unrelated. Thus, measures of the closeness (qualitative aspect) of friendship ties have been found to be related neither to the number of friends listed (quantitative aspect) nor to the closeness of family relationships.

A second analysis derived from the interpersonal involvement concept compared number of friends with the R's quality of interaction with parents. Rs were again divided at the median scores for the entire sample on the variables of quality of interaction with parents and number of friends listed into high and low quality interaction groups and into categories naming many and few friends. Chi Square revealed no association between number of friends and quality of interaction with parents ($\chi^2 = 1.709$, N.S., $\phi = .207$).

An additional item requested the R to indicate how closely his and his parents ideas agree. The following choices were provided:

1. Our ideas are generally in complete agreement.
2. My parents and I agree on most things.
3. While my parents and I disagree on a number of things, we tend to agree more than disagree.
4. While my parents and I tend to agree on a number of things, we tend to disagree more than agree.
5. My parents and I tend to disagree on most things.
6. Our ideas are generally in complete disagreement.

The responses to this item were dichotomized on the basis of face validity rather than at the median response for the entire sample. Alternatives 1 through 3 indicate varying degrees of agreement with parents; alternatives 4 through 6 indicate corresponding degrees of disagreement. Rs that indicated
one of the first three alternatives were placed in the "agree" category while Rs choosing one of the last three alternatives were categorized as disagreeing with their parents. A Chi Square analysis, as Table 22 indicates, revealed differences in the direction predicted by Hypothesis 3. Slightly

TABLE 22

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGINEERS AND EDUCATORS WITH RESPECT TO R'S PERCEIVED DEGREE OF AGREEMENT WITH PARENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rs whose ideas agree with the parents'</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs whose ideas disagree with the parents'</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 1.66; \text{N.S.}$

$\phi = .204$

fewer engineering Rs than education Rs indicated agreement with parents. However, the difference was not statistically significant.

In order to analyze the relationships between the degree of agreement item and other measures concerned with family ties, the following comparisons were made. First, it seemed reasonable to assume that the R's perceived agreement with his parents' ideas could affect the quality of his interaction with them. Or in fact the converse may be true—that the R's quality of interaction with his parents could determine his perception of agreement with their ideas. To make this test, Rs were placed into groups of agreers and disagreers and were dichotomized at the median quality of interaction score
into high and low categories. A 2 x 2 Chi Square revealed no relation between quality of interaction and degree of agreement ($\chi^2 = .897$, N.S., $\phi = .150$).

A similar analysis showed no significant association between perceived degree of agreement and frequency of interaction with parents ($\chi^2 = 2.406$, N.S., $\phi = -.245$). However, there was a tendency for those Rs who perceived a high degree of agreement to engage in a low frequency of interaction with parents. Perhaps a lesser amount of interaction with one's parents allows for more misperception of the parents' attitudes on the Rs' part.

**Feelings about parents.** The final index of the affective component of family relationships involved each R's general attitudes and feelings toward his family. In response to 10 statements concerning feelings toward his family and home life (see Appendix B for a list of items) a R could indicate varying degrees of agreement, from "agree strongly" or "completely agree" to "disagree strongly". Responses were added in such a way that a low numerical score indicated primarily negative feelings toward the parents and a high score revealed more positive feelings.

To test for engineer-educator differences in feelings toward parents, both groups of Rs were dichotomized at the median score for the entire sample (mdn = 32) into groups indicating high and low feelings for parents. A Chi Square analysis revealed a significant difference between engineers and educators in the direction predicted by Hypothesis 3. As Table 23 shows, engineering Rs were more likely than education Rs to indicate less positive feelings about parents. This finding lends some support to Hypothesis 3. In view of the findings discussed above that do not support Hypothesis 3, however, we must conclude that the bulk of the present data fail to confirm
engineer-educator differences in family involvement.

TABLE 23
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGINEERS AND EDUCATORS WITH RESPECT TO FEELINGS ABOUT PARENTS AND HOME LIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rs scoring above the median in feelings for parents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs scoring below the median in feelings for parents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.912; \ p < .05 \]
\[ \phi = .350 \]

Although the index of feelings toward parents was not significantly associated with any of the additional measures of family ties, there were tendencies in the expected direction in the comparisons which were made (see Table 24 for a summary of these findings). A Chi Square analysis, dividing Rs into high and low groups according to feelings toward parents and quality of interaction with parents,\(^{11}\) showed that Rs who indicated a high quality of interaction with their parents were more likely to also indicate positive feelings toward them and that Rs who engaged in a low quality of interaction were less likely to indicate positive feelings toward their parents.

Chi Square also revealed that Rs who perceived a high degree of agreement between their parents' ideas and their own tended to indicate more

\(^{11}\) As in similar analyses reported above, the median scores were used to dichotomize Rs on both variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>All Rs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feelings toward parents x quality of interaction with parents</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = .102$</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = .448$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 1.199$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\phi = .190$</td>
<td>$\phi = .257$</td>
<td>$\phi = .173$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings toward parents x degree of agreement with parents</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = .238$</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = 2.051$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 2.823$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\phi = 0.00$</td>
<td>$\phi = .455$</td>
<td>$\phi = .266$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings toward parents x frequency of interaction with parents</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = 1.20$</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = 0.036$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 0.818$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\phi = .356$</td>
<td>$\phi = 0.043$</td>
<td>$\phi = 0.143$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings toward parents x degree of confiding in closest friend</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = .298$</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = 1.662$</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = 2.312$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\phi = -.275$</td>
<td>$\phi = 0.419$</td>
<td>$\phi = 0.306$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings toward parents x extent of engaging in activities with closest friend</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = .102$</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = .167$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = .233$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\phi = .190$</td>
<td>$\phi = .023$</td>
<td>$\phi = .076$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings toward parents x organization score</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = 3.580$</td>
<td>corr. $\chi^2 = 0.002$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 0.382$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\phi = .534$</td>
<td>$\phi = 0.121$</td>
<td>$\phi = 0.098$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
positive feeling toward their parents than those Rs who perceived disagreement.

There was no systematic relation between interaction frequency with parents and feelings toward parents. Again, the association between affect and activity that was found in friendship did not manifest itself in the family relationship.

Further analyses indicated that the variable of feelings toward parents was not related in a systematic way to any of the additional measures of interpersonal involvement with the exception of number of friends listed by the R. As Table 25 shows, across all 40 Rs, those who named many friends

| TABLE 25 |
| RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEELINGS TOWARD PARENTS AND NUMBER OF FRIENDS CITED |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                 | Rs scoring above the median in feelings toward parents | Rs scoring below the median in feelings toward parents | Total |
| Rs who listed many friends      | 12              | 5               | 17              |
| Rs who listed few friends       | 7               | 16              | 23              |
| Totals                          | 19              | 21              | 40              |

\[ \chi^2 = 4.812; p < .05 \]
\[ \phi = .397 \]

were significantly more likely to have indicated positive feelings toward their parents. On the other hand, Rs who listed few friends also revealed less positive feelings toward their parents. Thus the variable of feelings
toward parents was the single index of the family relationship that distin-
guished between engineers and educators and the only measure of family ties
that was systematically related in the predicted direction to a component of
friendship (number of friends listed). This finding lends some support to
the notion that an individual's relationships in one area of primary ties
will be related to the kinds of relationships he forms in another area of
primary ties.

**Summary of findings on the family relationship.** One measure of the
activity dimension and three measures of the affective dimension were
included in the schedule. It was hypothesized earlier that engineer-educator
differences would be found along both dimensions of primary ties.

Statistical analyses, however, did not tend to support this hypothesis.
Frequency of interaction with parents, as a measure of the activity compo-
nent, failed to distinguish between engineering Rs and education Rs. A
tendency was found for frequency of interaction with parents to be related in
a positive direction to number of friends listed by a R. Additional expected
associations between frequency of interaction with parents and other indices
used in this study were not found. For example, given the conception of
interpersonal involvement employed in this study, it was expected that the
activity component of family ties would be related to the activity component
of friendship. As reported above, however, this was not the case.

Greater differences between engineering Rs and education Rs were found
along the affective dimension. For the most part, however, these differences
could be accounted for by chance alone. Education Rs were more likely than
engineering Rs to indicate parents as the ones in whom they would be most
likely to confide about nine problems. The data also revealed a tendency for
educators to perceive greater agreement between their parents' ideas and their own and for engineers to perceive greater disagreement. There were no differences between engineers and educators in the quality of interaction they maintained with parents.

The only result that reached statistical significance was the difference that was found between engineers and educators in the feelings they indicated toward their parents and home life: Education Rs were more likely than engineering Rs to indicate positive feelings and less likely to indicate negative feelings. This variable of feelings toward parents was the only index of the family relationship that was significantly related to a measure of the friendship relationship (number of friends listed). It was found that Rs who indicated positive feelings toward parents were more likely to name many friends than Rs who indicated negative feelings toward parents. Roe might interpret this data as lending some support to her notion of a causal association between type of family relationship and later person orientation: Rs who held positive feelings and attitudes toward parents and home life named more close friends than Rs who felt less positively. Whether or not this finding is the result of a causal relationship cannot be determined using the present data.

At any rate, the bulk of the data failed to support the hypothesis of differences between engineers and educators in their family relationships. Thus, little support was found for Roe's theory, regardless of whether the family relationship is viewed primarily as a causal agent, as Roe suggests, or as one source of primary ties among many, as in the framework of this study.

The data reported earlier reveal that the present measures of affect in
the family were neither related to one another nor to the activity dimension of family ties. This finding raised some question about the applicability of the present conception of the nature of primary ties to the family relationship. Another problem that must be recognized in view of the above data, however, is the perhaps questionable validity of the indices used in this study for measuring the affective and activity dimensions of family ties.

The unsystematic associations among the various components of family and friendship relationships lend little support to a conception of interpersonal involvement wherein qualitative (closeness) aspects are related either to quantitative aspects within the same type of primary relationship or to qualitative aspects in a different type of primary relationship.

Thus, the concept of interpersonal involvement that was derived in order to operationalize Roe's concept of person orientation is brought into question. The findings seem to suggest that interpersonal involvement is neither as pervasive nor as factorially simple as the concept was defined earlier in this thesis. On the other hand, the problems raised in this study demonstrate the difficulty of attempting to measure Roe's broadly defined construct of person orientation.

Organizational Membership

It was argued earlier that affiliation with an organization cannot be regarded as a primary relationship in the same sense that friendship or family ties are primary relationships. However, membership in voluntary organizations may provide a framework within which close ties with others are initiated and maintained. On this assumption, an investigation of organizational memberships of engineers and educators was included in the present study, and Hypothesis 4 was formulated in order to test for differences
between educators and engineers on this variable:

Engineering Rs will report less participation in off-campus and on-campus organizations than Secondary Education Rs.

Information was obtained from each R concerning (1) number of on-campus organizations to which he belonged (2) number of offices held in these organizations, and (3) number of off-campus organizations to which he belonged. For each on- or off-campus organization of which the R was a member, he was given 1 point; for each office he held he was given 2 points.\(^\text{12}\) Summed, these points comprised a total "organization score" for each R.

Eighty-five per cent of the 40 Rs belonged to at least one campus organization; one R belonged to as many as seven. The average number of memberships listed was 2.2, the median number was 2. Most Rs (80 per cent) listed from one to three campus organizations. More engineers than educators (90 per cent and 80 per cent, respectively) belonged to campus organizations. The number of such memberships listed by engineers ranged from none to seven; organizations listed by educators ranged from none to five.

Seventeen Rs, or 42 per cent of all R, held an office in the organization of which they were a member on campus. This figure included 55 per cent of the engineering Rs but only 30 per cent of the education Rs. The highest number of offices held was three--by an engineering R. Most office-holding Rs, both engineers and educators, held only one such position.

Only 28 per cent of the sample reported belonging to off-campus organizations. Slightly more engineers than educators indicated membership in

\(^\text{12}\) More points were given to a R who held office because it was felt that such officership indicated not only greater commitment to the organization but greater intensity of involvement.
off-campus associations (30 per cent as compared with 25 per cent, respectively). The highest number of such organizational memberships was two. Half of the engineers who listed off-campus organizational memberships named one organization; and half listed two. On the other hand, all of the educators who were affiliated with such off-campus organizations listed only one.

The descriptive data reported above do not support Hypothesis 4. Indeed, the tendency is in the direction opposite of that predicted. Instead of listing fewer organizations, engineers listed more. In addition, engineers appeared to be more involved, through positions of leadership, in the organizations of which they were a part. In order to test statistically for differences between engineers and educators in organizational affiliation, Rs were divided at the median organization score for the entire sample into groups of high and low participants. Chi Square analysis, summarized in Table 26, revealed no significant difference between engineers and educators with regard to organizational membership.

**TABLE 26**

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGINEERS AND EDUCATORS WITH RESPECT TO ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rs scoring above the median organization score</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs scoring below the median organization score</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.50; \text{ N.S.} \]

\[ \phi = -.250 \]
It seemed reasonable to assume that a R's degree of participation in organizations could be related to other variables explored in this thesis. For example, a R who places himself in contact with many people by participating in several organizations would seem more likely to have more friends than the R who does not have this additional channel for initiating friendships. In addition, the "joining" and "doing" aspects of participation in organizations would seem to be reflected in other behaviors such as joining a fraternity, engaging in many activities with one's closest friend, or maintaining a high frequency of interaction with parents. As indicated in Table 27, however, none of these variables were significantly related to extent of participation in organizations.

In exploring the relationship between organizational affiliation and an additional measure used in this study it was discovered that for engineering Rs, feelings about family tended to be related to their participation in organizations. On this basis, organizational participation was examined for engineers and educators holding feelings about parents constant. It was found that when only those Rs who held positive feelings toward parents were considered, there were significant differences between engineers and educators in their organization scores (corr. $\chi^2 = 5.35$, p < .05, $\phi = .644$). Engineering Rs revealed greater participation in organizations than did education Rs.

The above findings on engineer-educator differences in organizational affiliation, which indicate tendencies opposite those predicted, would seem to argue against Roe's hypothesis of differences in person orientation between men in the different types of vocational fields. Another likely implication, however, is that a report of membership in organizations may not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>All Rs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational membership x number of friends cited</td>
<td>corr. ( \chi^2 = .277 ), N.S.</td>
<td>corr. ( \chi^2 = 1.018 ), N.S.</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = .474 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational membership x fraternity membership</td>
<td>corr. ( \chi^2 = .277 )</td>
<td>corr. ( \chi^2 = .659 )</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = .835 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational membership x sharing activities with closest friend</td>
<td>corr. ( \chi^2 = .009 )</td>
<td>corr. ( \chi^2 = .002 )</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = .013 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational membership x frequency of interaction with parents</td>
<td>corr. ( \chi^2 = .078 )</td>
<td>corr. ( \chi^2 = .082 )</td>
<td>( \chi^2 = .066 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be as valid a measure of person orientation as other indices used in this study appear to be. Perhaps the variable of organizational affiliation does not properly belong to the construct of interpersonal involvement as defined earlier. A more appropriate model for investigating organizational membership, in terms of the framework of the present study, was discovered too late to be incorporated into the research instrument. Parsons (1951) and Gordon and Babchuk (1959) employ the instrumental-expressive differentiation in classifying associational memberships. An individual may be motivated to join the instrumental association because he values the goals which the group represents. The instrumental group represents a means to the end of achieving organizational or personal goals. The basis for joining an expressive group rests in the gratifications to be achieved through interpersonal relationships with other members, which represents an end in itself. In this study no attempt was made to investigate the nature of the groups listed by R’s nor their reasons for joining. While engineering R’s listed more memberships in organizations, the groups named may have been more instrumental than those listed by education R’s, who may have attained more interpersonal involvement and satisfaction in their associations.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Review of the Study

This thesis explores aspects of the primary relationships of relatively young, male college students. It views a primary relationship as one in which persons are predisposed to enter into a wide range of activities with one another, and their predisposition to do so is associated with a predominance of positive affect. Anne Roe's theory of vocational choice provides a basis for expecting differences in interpersonal relations between students in different types of curricula (person oriented and non-person oriented). The concept of interpersonal involvement is utilized as a means of measuring differences in primary relationships between a group of engineering (non-person oriented) students and education (person oriented) students.

In this study particular attention is given to:

a. a description of conditions leading to the formation of friendships--i.e., when, where and how they were formed, and differences between engineers and educators in this respect;

b. an examination of differences between engineers and educators with regard to number of close friends cited;

c. an investigation of differences between engineers and educators in the closeness of their relationships with friends and with parents;

d. an examination of differences in organizational participation of engineers and educators.

The study involved a relatively homogeneous sample of 40 Rs, half of whom were engineering majors and half education majors, who were enrolled in upper-level engineering and education classes at Kansas State University in
the Fall semester of 1968. 1 A pre-tested, partially structured interview
schedule was used to gather data. Information was obtained from Rs in the
form of self-reports and responses to items intended to measure particular
aspects of friendship and family relations.

In the schedule, Rs were asked to initial the names of persons regarded
as very close friends. The data on number of friends each R listed was used
to test a hypothesis concerning differences between engineers and educators
in the quantitative aspect of friendship ties. Rs provided fairly extensive
information for each friendship cited. Rs indicated when, where, and how
each friend was met. This information on how long friends had known one
another, the contexts in which the friendship was initiated, and how each
friend was met was used to describe the circumstances leading to the forma-
tion of close friendships. This data was also used in an examination of dif-
ferences between engineering Rs and education Rs with respect to style of
establishing relationships with peers.

A substantial portion of the schedule elicited responses bearing on the
remaining variables of major concern to the present study: closeness of ties
with friends, closeness of parent-student relationships, and organizational
affiliation. More specifically, closeness of friendship was measured in
terms of affective ties between friends and activities shared with friends.
Measures of the affective ties between friends were derived from R's
responses to items involving sharing confidences with friends, borrowing
money from them, feeling free to behave without constraint when with them,

1 All 40 Rs were males, white, and unmarried, were full-time students of
either junior or senior standing, were from white-collar families, were
between the ages of 19-23, and came from a residence located outside the city
of Manhattan, Kansas.
exchanging home visits with them, and selecting from among close friends those who are closest friends and those who are least close. Rs also indicated from a list of leisure time activities those in which they had participated with their friends. From these responses, indices of shared activities were derived. These data were used in testing a hypothesis which focused upon differences in closeness of friendship ties of engineers as compared with those of educators. The data were also useful in exploring the function of affect and activity in differentiating among friends with respect to degrees of intimacy.

Additional indices were used for measuring affect and activity in R's relationship with his parents in order to test a hypothesis concerned with differences between engineering Rs and education Rs in the closeness of their family ties. Indices of the affective aspect of R's relationship with his parents included a measure of quality of interactions with parents, comprised of 12 questions concerning kinds of things R discussed with his parents. A thirteenth item obtained each R's perception of how closely his and his parents' ideas agree. In addition, a measure of degree of confiding in parents about nine important problems was included. A third index of the affective dimension consisted of 10 items measuring the R's feelings about his family and home life.

The activity dimension of R's relationship with his parents was measured by items that asked each R to indicate the frequency of interaction between he and his parents.

Finally, information was obtained on each R's extent of participation in on- and off-campus organizations. These data were used in testing a hypothesis concerning differences between engineers' and educators' involvement in
organizations. Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed in analyzing the data. The tests of statistical significance which were used were selected because they were appropriate for the nominal and ordinal data provided by our measures.

Summary of the Findings

A total of 373 friends were cited by the 40 Rs. On the average, 9.3 close friends, of whom 5.6 were local units and 3.7 non-local, were named. The friends, like the Rs, tended to be relatively young, white males. The proportion of friends\(^2\) that were students at KSU was about the same as the proportion of friends that were not present in the university setting (non-local), across all Rs. The data suggested that the university setting provided an important context both for the initiation of new friendships and the maintenance of previously formed friendships. Over half of all closest friendships were initiated at the university, and one-sixth of the local friends cited were persons originally met at home, the friendship continuing at the university. Rs reported meeting their least close friends most frequently through another friend and their closest friends were met spontaneously. On the average, the closest and least close friends had been known for from four to five years.

In addition to these general trends, a number of differences between engineers and educators in friendship ties were observed. Educators cited a greater number of friends than engineers. These friends were slightly less likely to be students at the university, less likely to have been formed at

\(^2\)From this point onward, we are speaking of the 116 closest and 69 least close friends named.
the university, and more likely to have been formed in the home community than were friends named by engineering Rs. The university setting generally appeared to be a less frequent context for finding and making close friends among education Rs than among engineering Rs. Educators were more likely than engineers to form intimate (and apparently lasting) friendships with persons met in the hometown setting. In addition, the data suggested that educators were more likely to have met their friends through the channel of personal contact. Engineering majors reported having met their friends more frequently as a result of a spontaneous acquaintance. Finally, education Rs reported having known their close friends for a longer period of time than their engineering peers, and educators cited a greater number of older persons as close friends.

Hypothesis 1 was formulated in order to test for quantitative differences in the friendships of engineers as compared with educators. Hypothesis 1 predicted that engineers would report fewer close friends than educators. Specific data to test this hypothesis was gathered by counting the number of friends originally cited by each R when asked to list the first names or initials of those persons he regarded as close friends. Hypothesis 1 was supported by the data.

A second hypothesis was formulated in order to test for differences between engineering majors and education majors in closeness of ties with friends. Hypothesis 2 predicted that engineers would report less close relations with close friends than educators. Closeness of a friendship was measured in terms of the strength of affect and the extent to which activities were shared in the relationship. Neither of the two major comparisons made offered significant support for Hypothesis 2. Educators were slightly less
likely to share activities with friends but slightly more likely to confide in friends than engineers. Neither of these differences, however, were statistically significant. A significant and positive association was observed between the intimacy of a friendship and the degree to which confiding occurred in that relationship. Likewise, Rs were significantly more likely to engage in many activities with closest friends than with least close associates.

A slightly different analysis of the confiding items made it possible to examine the relationship between the discriminatory power of each item as an indicator of affect and the relative importance placed upon it by Rs. Two tendencies emerged from this analysis. First, there appeared to be a consistent and significant association between engineers' and educators' responses to the items as indicators of affect as well as their rankings of the items by importance. Second, there appeared to be no relationship between the efficiency of the items as indicators of affect and the relative importance placed on them by Rs. These findings were interpreted to mean that affect and importance are separate dimensions which may vary independently of one another.

Three additional comparisons between academic major and indices of affect in friendship indicated that while measures of closeness could successfully distinguish between degrees of intimacy of a relationship, no significant differences between engineers and educators were revealed. Hypothesis 2 was not supported by the data. It was concluded that the types of relationships that engineers maintained with their close friends were very similar to the close friendships of educators.

Further analysis of the above data revealed a significant association
between indices of affect and of activity. Rs who shared many activities with a friend were more likely to confide highly in that friend than in a friend with whom he shared few activities. This finding reinforced the initial assumption utilized in this thesis that affect and activity are related defining components of primary relationships. However, neither component of the qualitative (closeness) aspect of friendship was related to the quantitative (number) aspect, contrary to our prediction under the interpersonal involvement construct used in this thesis.

Questions were raised as a result of a different level of analysis, by individual R rather than across Rs. When the data were analyzed in this way, it was found that regardless of a R's major or his felt intimacy with the friend involved, Rs could be identified as high confiders or low confiders, active and less active individuals. These data raised some question about the concept of the primary relationship used in this study. In addition, the validity of Roe's classification of individuals into occupational types was questioned.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that engineering Rs would report less involvement in their relationships with their families than education Rs. Measures of both the affect and activity dimensions were again used in testing this hypothesis. Only one of the four comparisons made, however, reached statistical significance. Frequency of interaction with parents, as a measure of the activity component of family ties, did not distinguish between engineers and educators. Of the indices of affect in the family, only one--i.e., feelings toward parents and home life--significantly distinguished between engineers and educators in the direction predicted by Hypothesis 3. No differences were found between engineers and educators on the other indicators of
affect: confiding in parents, quality of interaction with parents and perceived degree of agreement with parents. Thus, the major portion of the data on parent-student relationships did not support Hypothesis 3.

Comparisons similar to those carried out with the data on friendship were made in order to investigate the relationship between affect and activity in family ties. It was found that activity and affect were related in no systematic manner, perhaps indicating that the present model of primary relationships is not applicable to the family relationship. The question of the validity of the indices used in this study for measuring the affective and activity components of family ties was also raised.

The unsystematic associations among the various indices of family and friendship relationships gave little support to a conception of interpersonal involvement wherein qualitative (closeness) aspects are related either to quantitative aspects within the same type of primary relationship or to qualitative aspects in a different type of primary relationship. The conception of interpersonal involvement used in this study was questioned and the difficulty of operationalizing Roe's person orientation construct was discussed.

In Hypothesis 4 the relationship between academic major and organizational affiliation was examined. Although affiliation with an organization cannot be regarded as a primary relationship in the same sense that friendship or family ties are primary relationships, it was argued that membership in voluntary organizations may provide a framework within which close ties with others are initiated and maintained. On this assumption, an investigation of organizational memberships of engineers and educators was included in this study. Hypothesis 4 predicted that engineering majors would report less
participation in off-campus and on-campus organizations than education majors. The data did not support Hypothesis 4. It was found that engineers, instead of listing fewer organizations, listed more. In addition, engineers appeared to be more involved, through position of leadership, in the organizations of which they were a part. The relationship between R's degree of participation in organizations and other variables used in this thesis was explored, but none of the comparisons reached statistical significance. The validity of organizational affiliation as a measure of person orientation was questioned, and a more appropriate model for investigating organizational membership under the framework of this study was discussed.

Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research

The major portion of the data gathered in this study failed to verify the hypotheses derived from Roe's theory of vocational choice. Only Hypothesis 1, in its prediction that engineering Rs would list fewer friends than education Rs, was clearly supported by the data. Engineers listed fewer friends than educators, but the types of relationships they maintained with friends and family were similar to those of educators. These findings pose an interpretive dilemma in terms of Roe's theory. Earlier, (see Chapter II) the concept of interpersonal involvement was defined as containing a quantitative and qualitative aspect. It was argued that engineers, as non-person oriented individuals (according to Roe's scheme) would be less interpersonally involved, both quantitatively and qualitatively, than educators, or person oriented individuals. The two groups differed in the predicted direction only on the quantitative aspect, however. Thus, if person orientation had been defined in terms of sheer number of ties with friends, for example,
Roe's hypothesis would be verified. On the other hand, if person orientation had been defined strictly in terms of the quality of relationships an individual maintained, the present data would not support Roe's proposition. This thesis measured person orientation in both ways, and obtained conflicting results. This raises questions both for Roe's theory and for the means used in this thesis to measure Roe's concept of person orientation.

In view of the above results, which partially support Roe and partially contradict her proposition, the data suggest that Roe's theory merits further investigation. Previous studies designed to test Roe's theory relied primarily upon projective techniques and other personality measures, while the present investigation used reports of present social behavior. Further investigations utilizing direct observation of behavior perhaps combined with personality and attitudinal indices would be worthwhile.

On the other hand, an alternative explanation for the finding that education Rs listed more friends than engineering Rs may be found in Pace and Stern's (1958) concept of environmental press. This concept relates to the measurement of the means whereby the environment shapes and molds the behavior of the individuals who live within it. The greater emphasis in education courses, as compared with engineering courses, upon human relationships and understanding may have caused the educators to become more sensitive to and concerned with the importance of interpersonal ties. Perhaps when asked to cite their close friends, the educators' concept of a "well-adjusted" person prompted them to list many names, while engineers may have felt less need to demonstrate "interpersonal success". The extent to which an "occupational characteristic" is a function of the types of individuals drawn to that field as compared with the molding effect an occupational (or educational)
environment has upon those individuals is an issue that Roe does not consider. The question merits further study of a longitudinal nature. In the paragraphs below, implications and suggested research related to additional concepts used in this thesis are discussed.

It appears that the concept interpersonal involvement, which was derived in order to operationalize Roe's notion of person orientation, is neither as pervasive nor as factorially simple as the concept was defined earlier in this thesis. The qualitative (closeness) aspect of friendship ties was related neither to the quantitative aspect (number of friends) nor to qualitative aspects of the family relationship, another type of primary relationship. It must be recognized, however, that because this study used similar but not identical indices to measure the closeness of friendship and the closeness of family ties, the data that was obtained may have been confounded. It would be worthwhile to further pursue the question of whether or not patterns of interpersonal involvement can be identified. Other indices could be explored as well as additional sources of interpersonal relationships such as siblings, dating partners, and faculty members.

Focusing upon the affective and activity bonds between friends proved to be a fruitful way of conceptualizing and studying friendship. R's statements about what they do, what they say and how they act with their friends permit reasonably accurate predictions to be made about the intimacy of friendships. Closest friends were significantly differentiated from less intimate friends in terms of expressions of positive affect; shared activities also tended to distinguish closest from least close associates. The present inquiry replicates the work of Babchuk and Bates (1963) in its finding that the affect component of primary friendships was of greatest significance in getting at
the relative primariness of the relationship between persons. The activity component, they report, was a less sensitive indicator of the primariness of the relationship between persons.

The Babchuk and Bates model of primary relationships was less effective as a means for investigating the parent-student relationship.

The effectiveness of the model was further questioned when a $R$-by-$R$ level of analysis revealed that individuals who confided to a high degree in closest friends also tended to confide highly in their less close associates. Likewise, individuals who engaged in many activities with closest friends also shared many activities with persons they regarded as least close. Thus, the present data indicated that individuals could be identified according to the degree to which they tended to confide in others, regardless of the $R$'s academic major or the intimacy of the friendship involved. Likewise, active and less active individuals could be identified. These data suggest that idiosyncratic personality variables may be a more potent predictor of the extent to which an individual confides in others and shares activities with others than the primariness, or intimacy of a friendship, as the Bates and Babchuk model suggests. However, the personality factor and the situational variable of the intimacy of the relationship are most likely interrelated. An interesting direction to take in further research would be to investigate the characteristics of low confiders versus high confiders, and of active versus less active individuals.

An examination of bases of interpersonal attraction has become a prominent trend in social psychological research in recent years. A basic question in this research concerns determinants of choice. Frequently, attempts at answering this question emphasize the importance of similarities between
persons as a determinant of attraction (e.g., see Newcomb, 1956). While the present study does not deal with the issue of similarities among friendship choices, it would be valuable to obtain further demographic data, for example, on the friends of both engineers and educators. These data would permit more of an in-depth investigation into the sources and characteristics of students' relationships with peers. For instance, do engineers form close ties primarily with other engineering majors, while educators draw their friendships from a wider range of individuals?

The answer to this question, for example, would seem to be relevant to an examination of how students' values and attitudes are changed through relationships with their peers. If the engineering student formed most of his close ties with fellow engineers, the environmental press toward the value system (or systems) of engineers would be strengthened. On the other hand, if the educator was exposed to a broader range of values through his friends in many different fields, the environmental press toward the values of an educator would not be as homogeneous.

Related to the above discussion is the finding reported earlier that engineers' closest friends tended to be individuals met at the university, while educators named primarily non-local, or hometown friends as being closest. In terms of the research indicating the importance to development of college peers, these data could be used as a basis for predicting that the college experience, intensified by new friendships with fellow students, would have a greater impact on engineers than upon educators. Educators, to a greater extent than engineers, maintained ties with their hometown through

---

3. This argument assumes that such value systems exist and can be identified.
their friends there, and, presumably, thus maintained an investment in former values and attitudes.

The data gathered in this thesis has practical implications in addition to the theoretical implications discussed above. The differences that were found between engineering students and education students add to the data on characteristics of individuals that enter different types of occupations that is of potential use to the counselor who is assisting a student in vocational decision-making.

Likewise, information on the characteristics of students in various curriculums is vital to an understanding of the growth that occurs in these individuals during their college years. It is felt that this thesis has added to the growing body of literature on characteristics of various types of college students. The practical application of such knowledge toward creating conditions to enhance growth involves a value judgment that cannot be supported by the kind of data gathered in this study. Longitudinal data are needed that pertain to the question of what kinds of conditions promote the greatest growth and fullest realization of potential in different types of individuals. Indeed, the issue of what kinds of growth are to be most highly valued and facilitated in the university community is a crucial one. Is a high degree of interpersonal involvement, for example, to be highly valued for all students; and if so, should steps be taken by the university to promote the development of close ties among students and to create a predominance of "person orientation".
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APPENDIX A

BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Name_________________________ Age____ Race - White Negro Other
(circle correct answer)

Marital status - Single Married Divorced
(circle correct answer)

Academic classification this semester - Fr. So. Jr. Sr. Grad.

Will you be a full-time student at KSU (taking 12 or more hours) this sem.?__

Manhattan address_________________________ What is your
Manhattan phone_________________________ hometown?

How much schooling does your father have? Please check the correct answer:

- Elementary school only
- 7th thru 9th grades
- High school but less than
  a high school diploma
- High school diploma
- Some college (including jr. college) but less than a bachelor's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- One or two years of graduate or professional study (M.S., M.B.A., etc.)
- Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D)
- Doctor of Medicine or doctor of Dental Surgery
- Other (specify)

What is your father's main occupation?______________________________

What does he do on this job--please be specific (e.g., does he own, employed, etc.)______________________________

What are your vocational plans?______________________________

Which of the following alternatives describes the main role you expect to play in your future vocation? (For example, if you want to be a physicist and work primarily as a researcher, you would mark "1". If you want to be a physician who specializes in private practice, you would mark "5". An engineering major who plans to become a sales engineer should mark "4". A teacher who plans to become a principal should mark "3". An art major who plans to become a professional artist should mark "5", etc.) You may check more than one role if appropriate.
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1. Researcher or investigator
2. Teacher or therapist
3. Administrator or supervisor
4. Promoter or salesman of services or products
5. Practitioner, performer, or producer of services or products
6. None of the above
7. Don't know or undecided
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Read to Respondent:

The form for this interview has been prepared as part of a research project carried on here in the Counseling Center. The purpose of this research is to study how friendships are formed by students like yourself. Most of the questions are concerned with how and when you became acquainted with persons who are your close friends. While the questions deal with your very good friends, you will see that they do not ask for information which is either embarrassing or hard to give. We won't know who your friends are. Your answers, of course, will be considered confidential.

We are interested in the general problem of friendship and not in specific persons. The value of this research depends upon getting frank and complete answers to the questions. Your frankness in answering the questions is very important.
APPENDIX B

FRIENDSHIP SCHEDULE

Section I

1. What is your age
   _____ 1. 18 years or younger
   _____ 2. 19-20
   _____ 3. 21-22
   _____ 4. 23-25
   _____ 5. over 25 years

2. Are you a transfer student
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No

3. Number of semesters at K-State

4. What is your class standing
   _____ 1. Freshman
   _____ 2. Sophomore
   _____ 3. Junior
   _____ 4. Senior
   _____ 5. Other (specify)

5. What is your intended or declared major

6. Have you always been in Engineering (Or Secondary Education).
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No

   If no - what else have you majored in

7. What is your hometown
   City_________________________ State_________________________
Section I

8. During the school year where do you live

   ____ 1. With my parents
   ____ 2. With my spouse
   ____ 3. Dormitory
   ____ 4. Fraternity or sorority house
   ____ 5. Off-campus apartment
   ____ 6. Off-campus rooming house
   ____ 7. Co-op house
   ____ 8. With a private family (not your own home, not rooming house)
   ____ 9. Trailer
   ____10. Other (specify)

9. What is your father's main occupation--be specific--exactly what does he do on this job (e.g., does he own, employed, etc.)

10. How much schooling does your father have

   ____ 1. Elementary school only
   ____ 2. 7th thru 9th grades
   ____ 3. High school but less than a high school diploma
   ____ 4. Graduate of high school but no college
   ____ 5. College but less than a bachelors degree
   ____ 6. A B.A. or B.S.
   ____ 7. One or two years of graduate or professional study--C.M.A., M.B.A., etc.
   ____ 8. Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
   ____ 9. Doctor of Medicine or doctor of Dental Surgery (M.D., D.D.S.)
   ____10. Other (specify)

11. What is your family's religious background

   ____ 1. Both parents protestant--specify which affiliation
   ____ 2. Both parents Catholic
   ____ 3. Both parents Jewish
   ____ 4. Mixed (specify)

12. With what church do you most closely identify yourself

13. Do you personally feel that you need to believe in some form of religious faith or personal philosophy

   ____ 1. Yes
   ____ 2. No
   ____ 3. Don't know
Section I

14. Do you feel that you have an adequate religious faith or personal philosophy as a guide to your conduct
   ____ 1. No, I don't have
   ____ 2. Yes, I do have
   ____ 3. I don't know

15. How often do you attend religious services
   ____ 1. About once a week or more
   ____ 2. About twice a month
   ____ 3. About once a month
   ____ 4. Mainly on important holidays
   ____ 5. Never, or almost never

16. In what ways has your evaluation of religion changed, if at all, since you came to college
   ____ 1. I personally value religion more
   ____ 2. I personally value religion less
   ____ 3. I have not changed my evaluation

17. Which of the following statements of faith most closely describes your idea about the Diety? (Hand card to Respondent)
   ____ 1. I believe in a Divine God, Creator of the Universe, who knows my innermost thoughts and feelings and to whom one day I shall be accountable
   ____ 2. I believe in a power greater than myself, which some people call God and some people call Nature
   ____ 3. I believe in the worth of humanity, but not in a God or in a Supreme Being
   ____ 4. I believe in natural law, and that the so-called universal mysteries are ultimately knowable according to scientific method
   ____ 5. I am not sure what I believe
   ____ 6. I'm an atheist
   ____ 7. Other (specify)

18. Do you consider yourself a Republican, a Democrat or an Independent in most political matters
   ____ 1. Republican
   ____ 2. Democrat
   ____ 3. Independent
   ____ 4. Other (specify)
Section I

19. How does your father usually vote

1. Republican
   2. Democrat
   3. Independent
   4. Other (specify)

20. Are you a member of a fraternity or sorority on campus

1. Yes
   2. No

21. If no, are you now a pledge

1. Yes
   2. No

22. If no, do you intend to pledge

1. Yes
   2. No

23. Do you belong to an organization here on campus

1. Yes
   2. No

If yes, specify which organizations:

24. Do you hold any offices in these organizations

1. Yes
   2. No

Specify:

25. Do you belong to any organizations off campus or at home

1. Yes
   2. No

If yes, specify which organizations:
Section I

26. Do you have a job during the academic year

_____ Yes
     1. I work less than 15 hours a week
     2. I work 15-24 hours a week
     3. 25-34 hours a week
     4. 35 or more hours a week

_____ No
     5. But seeking a job for school year
     6. Not seeking a job for school year

27. Do you depend more upon your earnings or your own savings to put yourself through school or more upon the support of your parents

_____ 1. I depend more upon my own earnings or savings
     2. I depend more upon the support of my parents
     3. I depend about equally upon both

28. How are you financing your education


NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Instruct respondent to proceed to Section II given by questionnaire. Hand respondent the Questionnaire I Booklet
Section II

It is possible that what are considered to be important problems and concerns by some persons may be less important for others. Look over the following list of statements. Which of these would cause you the greatest worry and concern. Indicate the item which would concern you the most by placing a "1" in the space provided on the left of that item. Now look for the item that seems of second greatest concern to you and write a "2" to the left of it. Rank the entire set of nine items in this way. If you feel that two items are of equal concern to you use the same number for both. For example, if you feel that serious financial difficulties and problems with your parents are of equal concern to you and are of greater concern than the other seven items, give each a "1".

_____ a. Embarrassing things that have happened to you on dates
_____ b. Problems which you have with your parents
_____ c. Trouble that members of your family are in
_____ d. Serious financial difficulties that you have
_____ e. Personal problems that make you worried and afraid
_____ f. Your sexual experiences
_____ g. Your ideas and plans about marriage
_____ h. Your personal goals and plans for the future
_____ i. Difficulties you are having with school work
Section III

On this sheet of paper will you list the initials or first name of the persons you consider to be your very good friends:
SCHEDULE FOR LOCAL FRIENDSHIPS

Section III

A. Background Information for Each Friend:
   1. What is ( ) age

   2. What is ( ) sex

B. Information on the Formation of the Friendship:
   1. When did you first become acquainted with ( )
      (NOTE: date for each person)

   2. Where did you first meet ( )
      (probe for specific contexts)

   3. How did you first meet ( )
      (probe for how the friendship was initiated--who was responsible for introducing the friend)

C. Information on Activities Shared with Friends:
   1. (Hand list of activities to R) From the following list, could you tell me
      the kinds of things you do when you get together with ( )
      (Ask R to give the numbers)
Section III

1. Play cards
2. Play games (other than cards)
3. Attend sports events
4. Attend movies
5. Attend concerts
6. Listen to music
7. Go to dances
8. Attend church
9. Go bowling
10. Watch TV
11. Dine at a restaurant
12. Go to parties
13. Participate in sports activities (e.g., handball, tennis, basketball, football, etc.)
14. Engage in conversation
15. Vacation with
16. Study together
17. Participate in clubs or organizations with each other
18. Attend convocations, university or public meetings together
Section III

Ask R to give the numbers associated with the activities: record these numbers.

Ask R if there are other activities he shares with ( ) which are not included on the list. Record these, if any.

2. Are there certain kinds of activities that you feel persons are likely to engage in only with their very close friends and not just casual acquaintances?

3. If any different than list, ask R if he has participated with ( )

D. Information on Confiding in Friends: (Yes = +, No = 0)

1. Have you ever talked to ( ) about embarrassing things that have happened to you on dates. If no, would you feel free to

2. Have you ever talked to ( ) about problems you have with your parents. If no, would you feel free to
Section III

3. Have you ever talked to ( ) about troubles that members of your family are in. If no, would you feel free to

4. Have you ever talked to ( ) about difficulties you are having with your school work. If no, would you feel free to

5. Have you ever talked to ( ) about serious financial difficulties you have. If no, would you feel free to

6. Have you ever talked to ( ) about personal problems that make you worried and afraid. If no, would you feel free to

7. Have you ever talked to ( ) about sexual experiences that you have had. If no, would you feel free to

8. Have you ever talked to ( ) about your ideas & plans for marriage. If no, would you feel free to
Section III

9. Have you ever talked to ( ) about your personal goals and plans for the future. If no, would you feel free to

10. (A) in an emergency situation would you feel free to borrow a large sum of money from ( ) if he had it to lend: (B) have you ever borrowed money from ( )

11. Do you feel free to really let your hair down and just be yourself with ( )

12. Have you ever been to ( )'s home for a visit

13. Have you ever taken ( ) to your home for a visit

14. Would you be willing to take ( ) to your home for a visit

15. Are you or ( ) more likely to suggest getting together

16. Have you ever done things with ( ) on the spur of the moment
SCHEDULE FOR NON-LOCAL FRIENDSHIPS

Section III

A. **Background Information for Each Friend:**

1. What is ( ) age

2. What is ( ) sex

B. **Information on the Formation of the Friendship:**

1. When did you first become acquainted with ( )
   (NOTE: date for each person)

2. Where did you first meet ( ) (probe for specific contexts)

3. How did you first meet ( ) (probe for how the friendship was initiated--who was responsible for introducing the friend)

C. **Information on Activities Shared with Friends:**

1. From the following list could you tell me the kinds of things you used to do when you got together with ( )
Section III

2. Are there certain kinds of activities that you feel persons are likely to engage in only with their very close friends and not just casual acquaintances

3. If any different than list, ask R if he has participated with ( )

D. Information on Confiding in Friends:

1. Have you ever talked to ( ) about embarrassing things that have happened to you on dates

2. Have you ever talked to ( ) about problems you have with your parents

3. Have you ever talked to ( ) about troubles that members of your family are in

4. Have you ever talked to ( ) about difficulties that you are having with your school work
Section III

5. Have you ever talked to ( ) about serious financial difficulties that you have

6. Have you ever talked to ( ) about personal problems that make you worried and afraid

7. Have you ever talked to ( ) about sexual experiences you have had

8. Have you ever talked to ( ) about your ideas and plans for marriage

9. Have you ever talked to ( ) about your personal goals and plans for the future

10. In an emergency situation would you have felt free to borrow a large sum of money from ( )

11. Do you feel free to really let your hair down with ( ) and just be yourself

12. Have you ever been to ( )'s home for a visit
Section III

13. Have you ever taken ( ) home with you for a visit

14. Would you be willing to take ( ) to your home for a visit

15. Are you or ( ) more likely to suggest getting together

16. Have you ever done anything with ( ) on the spur of the moment
Section IV

From all of the persons you have cited as very good friends which would you consider to be closer to you than the others:

a. List in rank order--preferable 3 closest friends:

b. Of those friends who are "closer" to you who would you consider to be your very closest friend(s):

c. Which of the persons you have listed would you consider to be least close:
FAMILY SECTION

Section V

A. During the School Year:

1. About how frequently do you call home?
   
   a. Once a week or more
   b. Once every 1-2 weeks
   c. Once every 3-4 weeks
   d. Once a month
   e. Once every couple of months
   f. Once a semester
   g. Only in emergencies

2. About how frequently do you write home?

   a. Once a week or more
   b. Once every 1-2 weeks
   c. Once every 3-4 weeks
   d. Once a month
   e. Once every couple of months
   f. Once a semester
   g. Never

3. How frequently do you visit home?

   a. Once a week or more
   b. Once every 1-2 weeks
   c. Once every 3-4 weeks
   d. Once a month
   e. Once every couple of months
   f. A couple of times or less during the semester
   g. Only during vacations
   h. Never

4. How frequently do your parents call you?

   a. Once a week or more
   b. Once every 1-2 weeks
   c. Once every 3-4 weeks
   d. Once a month
   e. Once every couple of months
   f. Once a semester
   g. Only in emergencies
Section V

5. How frequently do your parents write you?
   ___ a. Once a week or more
   ___ b. Once every 1-2 weeks
   ___ c. Once every 3-4 weeks
   ___ d. Once a month
   ___ e. Once every couple of months
   ___ f. Once a semester
   ___ g. Only in emergencies

6. How frequently do your parents visit you?
   ___ a. Once a week or more
   ___ b. Once every 1-2 weeks
   ___ c. Once every 3-4 weeks
   ___ d. Once a month
   ___ e. Once every couple of months
   ___ f. A couple of times or less during the semester
   ___ g. Only during vacations
   ___ h. Never

B. Part 1: Now we would like to ask you some questions about who you talk to when you are worried or bothered by different things. Below are listed a series of problems and concerns which sometimes bother college students. IF YOU WERE TO HAVE such a problem, to whom would you be most likely to go to talk over the problem.

   Place a 1 by the response which would be your first choice.

1. Your ideas and plans for marriage
   ___ a. Close friends
   ___ b. Parents
   ___ c. Professor
   ___ d. Minister, counselor, advisor
   ___ e. None of the above

2. Your personal goals and plans for the future
   ___ a. Close friends
   ___ b. Parents
   ___ c. Professor
   ___ d. Minister, counselor, advisor
   ___ e. None of the above
Section V

3. Embarrassing things that have happened to you on dates
   a. Close friends
   b. Parents
   c. Professor
   d. Minister, counselor, advisor
   e. None of the above

4. Problems which you have with your parents
   a. Close friends
   b. Parents
   c. Professor
   d. Minister, counselor, advisor
   e. None of the above

5. Serious financial difficulties that you have
   a. Close friends
   b. Parents
   c. Professor
   d. Minister, counselor, advisor
   e. None of the above

6. Personal problems that make you worried and afraid
   a. Close friends
   b. Parents
   c. Professor
   d. Minister, counselor, advisor
   e. None of the above

7. Troubles that members of your family are in
   a. Close friends
   b. Parents
   c. Professor
   d. Minister, counselor, advisor
   e. None of the above

8. Difficulties you are having with your school work
   a. Close friends
   b. Parents
   c. Professor
   d. Minister, counselor, advisor
   e. None of the above
Section V

9. Your sexual experiences

   ___ a. Close friends
   ___ b. Parents
   ___ c. Professor
   ___ d. Minister, counselor, advisor
   ___ e. None of the above

Part 2: Will you now go back over the list of problems and concerns again, this time marking a "2" beside the person you would be next most likely to talk to if bothered by such a problem. (If a "1" is placed by "None of the above" on a question, please skip that question.)

Part 3: Finally, will you mark a "3" beside the person to whom you would be least likely to go if bothered by such a problem.

C. The following statements deal with some of the kinds of things that students and their parents may talk to one another about. Will you mark the response which most accurately describes how frequently you talk with your parents about such matters.

How frequently do you talk with your parents . . . .

1. About intellectual matters such as world affairs, current events, social problems, etc.

   ___ a. Very often
   ___ b. Occasionally
   ___ c. Rarely
   ___ d. Never

2. About your feelings, experiences, and ideas regarding your life

   ___ a. Very often
   ___ b. Occasionally
   ___ c. Rarely
   ___ d. Never

3. About the feelings, experiences and ideas concerning life that your parents have

   ___ a. Very often
   ___ b. Occasionally
   ___ c. Rarely
   ___ d. Never
Section V

4. About where you are heading in life

   a. Very often
   b. Occasionally
   c. Rarely
   d. Never
APPENDIX C

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE SAMPLE

The sample was composed of 20 juniors (11 educators and 9 engineers) and 20 seniors (9 educators and 11 engineers). Their ages ranged from 19-23 years with comparable distributions for both engineers and educators. Most of the Rs were from urban areas in the midwest, primarily from Kansas. Five engineers and three educators were from rural areas. Rs had been attending Kansas State University for an average of 5.25 semesters. There was a tendency for engineers to have been attending KSU longer than educators (5.40 and 4.65 semesters respectively). Seven engineers and 9 educators were transfer students from junior colleges and smaller universities. Only two engineers but seven educators had been previously enrolled in a different major. This may be at least partially explained by the University requirement that engineering students declare their field of specialization within engineering by the end of their freshman year; educators are not required to declare a field of study until their junior or senior year. Engineers, then, tend to begin their college careers in the College of Engineering and to remain there. Educators, on the other hand, come to their field through more diverse channels, from humanities to physical sciences.

Five of the seven fields of engineering were represented by the sample of 20 engineers--Mechanical (5), Chemical (2), Industrial (5), Nuclear (3), and Civil Engineering (5).¹ Six of the nine areas of concentration within Secondary Education were represented--Social Science (5), Science and Math (3),

¹There were no Rs from either Electrical or Agricultural Engineering.
Language (2), Physical Education (9), and Agriculture (1).²

In the entire sample of 40 Rs, there were ten fraternity members, five from both engineering and education. The remaining 30 were not affiliated with a fraternity. Nine of the engineers indicated that their residence during the college year was on campus (dormitory, fraternity, scholarship house). The remaining 11 engineers lived in off-campus apartments, rooming houses, or mobile homes. Fourteen educators lived in on-campus housing and 6 lived off-campus.

The above information was obtained in order to further specify sample parameters. On most of these variables the engineering sample and education sample are comparable. In each case about half of the Rs are juniors and half seniors, between the ages of 19 and 23. The Rs are primarily urban youth from Kansas that have been attending KSU for about 5 semesters. There was a tendency, however, for the engineering Rs to have been attending KSU longer than had education Rs. This is evidenced by the difference in number of semesters at KSU and also by the smaller number of engineers that were transfer students.

The engineering students tended to have begun their college careers in the KSU College of Engineering and to have remained there. The education Rs were more likely to have entered this area after having had experience in another college and in a different field of study. This was discussed in terms of the different requirements of the respective colleges. What may also be implied, however, is that there are differences between engineers and educators in professional identity and commitment. Some ramifications of

²None of the Rs were from Art, Business, or Speech.
this possibility were discussed in Chapter IV.

In both samples there was broad representation of the fields of specialization within engineering and education. There were no differences between engineers and educators in fraternity membership. However, there was a tendency for most of the engineering Rs to live in off-campus housing during the college year and for most of the educators to live on campus.
APPENDIX D

DATA TABLES FOR FINDINGS SUMMARIZED IN CHAPTER THREE

ADDITIONAL MEASURES OF AFFECT IN FRIENDSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTIMACY OF FRIENDSHIP X FELT FREEDOM OF ENGINEERS TO BORROW MONEY</th>
<th>R feels free to borrow money</th>
<th>R doesn't feel free to borrow money</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 4.01; p < .05$

$\phi = .211$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTIMACY OF FRIENDSHIP X FELT FREEDOM OF EDUCATORS TO BORROW MONEY</th>
<th>R feels free to borrow money</th>
<th>R doesn't feel free to borrow money</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 5.05; p < .05$

$\phi = .230$
### Intimacy of Friendship X Felt Freedom of Engineers to Be Themselves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R feels free to be himself</th>
<th>R doesn't feel free to be himself</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 12.22; p < .001 \]
\[ \phi = .368 \]

### Intimacy of Friendship X Felt Freedom of Educators to Be Themselves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R feels free to be himself</th>
<th>R doesn't feel free to be himself</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.94; p < .05 \]
\[ \phi = .204 \]

### Intimacy of Friendship X Having Borrowed Money (Engineers)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R had borrowed money</th>
<th>R hadn't borrowed money</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 5.42; p < .02 \]
\[ \phi = .305 \]

*Data reported here apply to local friends only.*
### Intimacy of Friendship X Having Borrowed Money (Educators)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R had borrowed money</th>
<th>R hadn't borrowed money</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.40; \text{N.S.} \]
\[ \phi = .255 \]

*Data reported here apply to local friends only.*

### Intimacy of Friendship X Having Been to the Friend's Home (Engineers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R has been to the friend's home</th>
<th>R hasn't been to the friend's home</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.15; \text{N.S.} \]

### Intimacy of Friendship X Having Been to the Friend's Home (Educators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R has been to the friend's home</th>
<th>R hasn't been to the friend's home</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .06; \text{N.S.} \]
### INTIMACY OF FRIENDSHIP X HAVING TAKEN THE FRIEND HOME (ENGINEERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R has taken the friend home</th>
<th>R hasn't taken the friend home</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 0; \text{ N.S.} \)

### INTIMACY OF FRIENDSHIP X HAVING TAKEN THE FRIEND HOME (EDUCATORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R has taken the friend home</th>
<th>R hasn't taken the friend home</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friendships</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least close friendships</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = .01; \text{ N.S.} \)
### R-TO-PARENT INTERACTION FREQUENCY X PARENT-TO-R
INTERACTION FREQUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R interacts frequently with parents</th>
<th>R interacts less frequently with parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents interact frequently with R</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents interact less frequently with R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.91; \ p < .05 \]

### PARENTAL INTERACTION FREQUENCY X DEGREE OF ENGAGING IN ACTIVITIES WITH CLOSEST FRIEND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R engages in many activities with closest friend</th>
<th>R engages in few activities with closest friend</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R interacts frequently with parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R interacts less frequently with parents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

corr. \[ \chi^2 = .045; \text{N.S.} \]

\[ \phi = .022 \]
### QUALITY OF INTERACTION X DEGREE OF CONFIDING IN CLOSEST FRIEND (ENGINEERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R engages in a high quality of interaction with parents</th>
<th>R engages in a low quality of interaction with parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R confides to a high degree in closest friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R confides to a low degree in closest friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

corr. \( \chi^2 = .298 \); N.S.

\( \phi = .030 \)

### QUALITY OF INTERACTION X DEGREE OF CONFIDING IN CLOSEST FRIEND (EDUCATORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R engages in a high quality of interaction with parents</th>
<th>R engages in a low quality of interaction with parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R confides to a high degree in closest friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R confides to a low degree in closest friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

corr. \( \chi^2 = 4.70 \); \( p < .05 \)

\( \phi = .612 \)
### PARENTAL INTERACTION FREQUENCY X NUMBER OF FRIENDS CITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R interacts frequently with parents</th>
<th>R interacts less frequently with parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R named many friends</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R named few friends</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 3.00; \text{N.S.}\\
\phi = .274$

### PARENTAL INTERACTION FREQUENCY X QUALITY OF INTERACTION WITH PARENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R interacts frequently with parents</th>
<th>R interacts less frequently with parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R engages in a high quality of interaction with parents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R engages in a low quality of interaction with parents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .897; \text{N.S.}\\
\phi = .150$
### QUALITY OF INTERACTION WITH PARENTS X NUMBER OF FRIENDS CITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R engages in a high quality of interaction with parents</th>
<th>R engages in a low quality of interaction with parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R cited many friends</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R cited few friends</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.709; \text{ N.S.} \]
\[ \phi = .207 \]

### QUALITY OF INTERACTION WITH PARENTS X DEGREE OF AGREEMENT WITH PARENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R indicates a high degree of agreement with parents</th>
<th>R indicates a low degree of agreement with parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R engages in a high quality of interaction with parents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R engages in a low quality of interaction with parents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .897; \text{ N.S.} \]
\[ \phi = .150 \]
### DEGREE OF AGREEMENT WITH PARENTS X FREQUENCY OF INTERACTION WITH PARENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R indicates a high degree of agreement with parents</th>
<th>R indicates a low degree of agreement with parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R interacts frequently with parents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R interacts less frequently with parents</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.406; \text{N.S.} \]

\[ \phi = -.245 \]

### FEELINGS TOWARD PARENTS X ORGANIZATION SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rs who indicated a predominance of positive feelings toward parents</th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>All Rs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rs who scored above the median organization score</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs who scored below the median organization score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

corr. \[ \chi^2 = 5.35; p < .05 \]

\[ \phi = .644 \]
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This thesis investigates aspects of the primary relationships of male college students. It views a primary relationship as one in which persons are predisposed to enter into a wide range of activities with one another, and their predisposition to do so is associated with a predominance of positive affect. Anne Roe's notion of person orientation as it relates to vocational choice provides a basis for expecting differences in interpersonal relations between students in different types of curricula. The concept of interpersonal involvement is utilized as a means of measuring differences in primary relationships between a group of engineering (non-person oriented) students and education (person oriented) students. Particular attention is given to describing the conditions leading to friendship formation, examining number of close friends listed, investigating the closeness of friendships and of parent-student ties, and exploring organizational participation. Hypotheses were derived pertaining to expected differences between engineers and educators with respect to these variables.

The data come from interviews administered to a relatively homogeneous sample of 40 respondents, half of whom are engineering majors and half education majors enrolled in upper-level engineering and education classes at Kansas State University in the Fall of 1968.

The evidence shows that engineers tend to cite fewer friends than educators. These friends are more likely to be students at the University, or to have been met at the University than friends of educators. Educators are more likely than engineers to form intimate friendships with persons met in the hometown setting. Educators report having met friends through the channel of personal contact; engineers more frequently meet friends spontaneously. On the average, educators have known their friends longer than engineers.
The data show that as intimacy in a friendship increases so does the number of activities shared with friends. Likewise, affective ties of various kinds are stronger in friendships identified as highly intimate. A positive relationship obtains between affective and activity ties with friends. However, no differences exist in the closeness of friendships maintained by engineers and educators.

A $R$ by $R$ analysis raises questions for the present model of primary relationships and for Roe's theory. The data reveal that regardless of a $R$'s major or the intimacy of the friendship involved, $Rs$ can be identified as high or low confidants, active and less active individuals.

The major portion of the parent-student relationship data reveal no differences between engineers' and educators' closeness with parents. Frequency of interaction with parents, as a measure of activity in family ties, does not distinguish between engineers and educators. Of the indices of affect in the family--i.e., feelings toward parents, confiding in parents, quality of interaction and degree of agreement with parents--only the variable of feelings toward parents significantly distinguishes between the two groups. It seems that the concept of primary relationships used in this thesis is less effective for investigating parent-student relationships than for examining friendships.

The unsystematic associations among the various indices of family and friendship relationships give little support to a conception of interpersonal involvement wherein qualitative aspects are related to quantitative aspects within the same type of relationship or to qualitative aspects in a different type of primary relationship.

The evidence indicates that engineers reveal greater participation in
organizations than do educators. No associations obtain between organizational affiliation and additional aspects of interpersonal involvement.

The major portion of the present data fail to verify hypotheses derived from Roe's theory of vocational choice. However, because the results partially support Roe, it is suggested that her theory merits further study. These data add to the literature on characteristics of college students of use to counselors and educational planners.