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Introduction

Interpersonal, peer relationship research can be found in a variety of settings and under numerous headings. As such, there are several disciplines with prior and on-going investigations of this complex area of behavior. However, a component of interpersonal, peer research—the various attitudes concerning friends and friendships—is comparatively recent. Prior to the last decade, points concerning friends and friendships were primarily discussed in the Aristotlian terms of virtue, pleasure, and utility (Aristotle, 1962).

The disciplines of developmental psychology and educational research have both contributed to the emerging body of knowledge with regard to children and interpersonal, peer relationships. However, in keeping with the tenets of Maslowian (1979) theory, much of the introductory developments in children's interpersonal, peer relationship research has sought to delineate aspects of healthy, non-handicapped children's social behaviors with regard to these categories (Reisman & Shorr, 1978; Selman & Selman, 1979; Bigelow, 1975). Granted learning disabled children do possess average intelligence, do spend most of their time in the regular classroom, and most do exhibit average behaviors, but they still cannot be categorized as non-handicapped; and little research has delved into the interpersonal, peer relationship, or friendship factors of learning disabled children. Although, in the
literature, in the classroom, and in the home educators and parents have noted varying degrees of social, interactive behaviors that are inappropriate within the learning disabled population (Learner, 1985). Bryan's initial research (1974a, 1974b) concluded that a sub-population of learning disabled children existed who displayed inappropriate, non-verbal behaviors in social situations resulting in rejection by peers and observers alike. Unfortunately, childhood rejection by peers and adults poses such a long term psycho-social problem, (Schaffer, 1981) that efforts to reduce its impact on children merits consideration by educators. The knowledge of the learning disabled population's perception of friends and friendship could benefit teachers. The friendship perimeters of learning disabled children would appear to be useful as knowing a student's possible feelings concerning a subject often dictates appropriate, successful teacher remediation procedures. Hence, the present investigation proposed that learning disabled and non-learning disabled children are more dissimilar in their feelings about friends and friendship than they are alike. To measure the proposed likenesses and differences, a survey was constructed and given to 215 5th and 6th grade children spread through a local school district.

Hypothesis

\[ H_0 \quad \text{There exists no statistically significant difference} \]
\[ \text{between the elementary learning disabled student's} \]
\[ \text{perception concerning friends and friendship and the} \]
non-learning disabled student's perception concerning friends and friendship as measured by their responses on the Friendship Questionnaire.

$H_1$ There exists a statistically significant difference between the elementary learning disabled student's perception concerning friends and friendship and the non-learning disabled student's perception concerning friends and friendship as measured by their responses on the Friendship Questionnaire.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

Learning disabled persons (LD): Person adjudged as meeting the federal/state guidelines by an interdisciplinary team, thus displaying average or better intelligence. Exhibit discrepancy between achievement and ability that cannot be attributed to physical handicapping conditions or environment resulting in "disorders of listening, thinking, talking, reading, writing, spelling, or arithmetic" (Haring, 1983, p. 174).

However, for the purposes of this study additional criteria were employed. Volunteers for the sample population of learning disabled needed to spend no more than one hour in the Resource Room for tutoring, needed to be no
less than 10, nor more than 12 years old, and needed to score minimum of 90 on at least one section of the WISC R or equivalent.

Non-learning disabled persons (NLD): Persons not adjudged as needing special education services who are neither gifted nor remedial prospects, who are also grade level in all subject areas for the school year 1984-85.

Although, for this study further requirements were implemented. Prospective sample participants also needed to spend no time in the Resource Room, nor in the gifted programs, needed to be no less than 10 nor more than 12 years old.

Non-grade level persons: Persons not adjudged as needing special education services who are neither gifted nor remedial prospects, who are not grade level in all subject areas for the school year 1984-85.

Resource Specialist Program (RSP): California program whereby learning disabled children receive tutorial assistance in areas defined by the interdisciplinary Individual Education Program team, under 50% of the school day. Generally, LD/RSP time periods are limited to 60 minutes a day three to five days a week.

**Summary**

The first chapter sought to familiarize and introduce components of this project including the theoretical foundations,
the context, and the need for this study.

Hence, historical and research information concerning interpersonal and friend relationships were briefly presented. From this context, the need for information concerning learning disabled children's friendships emerged providing the hypothesis which stated learning disabled children are dissimilar from non-learning disabled children in their perception of friends and friendships. To facilitate fuller understanding of the literature review to follow, this chapter concluded with definitions of terms likely to be found therein as well as in the remainder of the project report.
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Review of the Literature

The review of the literature contains background statements concerning the major contributors to the children's social behavior body of knowledge, educational research of social behaviors of learning disabled and non-learning disabled children, psychological research of childhood rejection, and psychological research of friends and friendship. However, as this present research is functioning as a starting point for delineation of learning disabled friendship factors, the literature review emphasizes learning disabled children's deviant social behaviors and theoretical constructs of non-learning disabled adults and children concerning friend and friendship.

Background Comments

Fortunately, a fair amount of agreement exists between the two major sources of information concerning children's social behavior, psychology and education. From a theoretical standpoint these disciplines support the developmental stance with regard to a variety of behavior items including personality growth, psychometrics, peer relations and friendships. Accepted psychological theory has supplied observational and clinical data that supports the contradiction of the adult personality as a steady state. Rather, the concept of continuing personality development and change through life has become increasingly
accepted (Erikson, 1963; Sullivan, 1953; Maslow, 1971; Piaget, 1967). On the other hand, educators in general and special educators in particular, have tended to utilize and to depend upon the developmental aspects of Piagetian (1967) personality theory for effective instructional sequences and methods. Special education has also used a variety of psychological indices, including social maturity scales and intelligence measures, when seeking insights to maximize individual special education programs (Doll, 1969; Weschler, 1974). Unfortunately, the handicapping conditions of many children often results in uneven change and development that extends into adulthood, thus affecting social behavior (Bryan, 1974a, 1974b; Falard & Haubrich, 1981; Kronick, 1981).

Moreover, from a social scientist research position, personality variables have largely been ignored in favor of research into more visible phenomena, such as learning rates/methods (Skinner, 1968) or covert oral behaviors and auditory hallucination (McGuigan, 1966). And, although developmental psychology has traditionally focused on children, the popular psychoanalytic view of the mother/child relationship generating enough intensity to preclude non-familial impact on young children has tended to reduce studies of children's relationships since the 1930's (Lewis & Rosenbaum, 1979). Luckily, the last ten years has seen real gains in interpersonal, peer research of adults as well as of children. Two
interpersonal/friendship premises often explored by researchers are interrelated: friendship expectancy evolution due to age (Reisman & Shorr, 1978) and the developmental stage construct advocated by Bigelow (1977), Bigelow and LaGaipa (1975) and Mannarino (1979). One area neglected by the spate of current psychological research into friendships has been the personal perspective. There has been an unfortunate lack of emphasis on self-report research of how individuals may feel about the various factors of friendship among adults or children (Tesch, 1981).

On the other hand, with the passage of 92-142 (Education For All Handicapped Children Act, 1975), educational research has exploded with investigations on several fronts including social interaction research among children with handicapping conditions (Haring, 1983; Gearheart & Litton, 1979). These investigations into the social interaction, peer relationships of children with handicapping conditions has resulted in data that delineates deviant social/interactive behaviors among children who are categorized as learning disabled (Bryan, 1974a, 1974b; Bryan, T.; Pearl, Donahue, Bryan, J., & Pflaum, 1983; Bryan, Wheeler, Telcan, Hench, 1976; Heister, Wong, and Hunter, 1972; Deshler, Schumaker, & Lenz, 1984). Although there are educational theorists who do not support the concept that social behavior—or the lack of acceptable social behavior—can affect the academic behavior of the learning disabled student (Goodman & Mann, 1976), many educators have produced research results that indicate a strong
inverse relationship between social adjustment and academic success (Learner, Evans & Meyer, 1977; Falard & Haubrich, 1981). In fact, Falard and Haubrich (1981) while discussing a vocational education program for learning disabled adolescents, draw the conclusion that if a learning problem appears "chronic and persistent" one needs to consider that a social problem may also be "persistent" in the same manner (1981, p. 123).

**Learning Disabled Social Behaviors**

The rejected, socially inept student concept may have sprung from Clement's (1966) original research review which hinted that the learning disabled child may have social problems. The symptoms he initially discussed with regard to social imperception of learning disabled children included restlessness, excitability, low ability to delay gratification, little ability to tolerate frustration and an inadequate or inappropriate social and emotional expression. These behaviors in the school age child are reminiscent of the pre-school age behaviors; they would also tend to hamper good social interactions with peers or adults. Supportive of this line of reasoning, Learner (1981) cites researcher Myklebust (1967), Kronick (1978), and Bryan and Bryan (1978) as endorsing the socially handicapped sub-category of learning disabled children. These average to bright children have been shown to have deficits in social perception that are thought to be based in neurological dysfunctions (Myklebust, 1967; Wender, 1971; Nall, 1971). Wender's (1971) research, furthermore
substantiated the age inappropriate, poor social perception concept of the learning disabled child as Wender employed the term immature "King Kongs" when he described the personality attributes of this type of learning disabled student. Additionally, Nall (1971) while discussing various learning disabled children's social problems, described a 12 year old intermediate student that she predicted would not get along with age mates in high school. This prediction was based upon the student's poor social skills and inadequate/inaccurate social perceptions.

Nall's (1971, p. 71) description stated:

She read well. She did math well. She wrote well. She just could not get along with others. She was too impulsive. What she thought, she said. She scratched where it itched. She went where she happened to look. When she finally was academically ready to enter high school, she could not be sent. She would not have lasted a day.

Pursuing the concept of arrested social development, Kronick (1981) posits that social processes develop in a manner similar to cognitive development and are thus subject to developmental delay. Kronick further proposes that social awareness makes specific demands including adequate input/feedback before confirmation of predicted results, and necessary behavior modification prior to generalization. Learning disabled children may not properly make these psychological adjustments. Thus, these socially inept children, according to Kronick, may not be capable of determining
procedures to initiate or maintain contact with desired other persons.

Social imperception research of learning disabled children in the last decade has seen Tanis Bryan (1974a) and James Bryan (1979) work alone, together, as well as with several other researchers to gain further information about the learning disabled child's social desirability. Beginning with T. Bryan's independent (1974a and 1974b) efforts right up to 1983's collaborative study, both Bryans have sought to delineate differing social interactive behaviors between learning disabled and non-learning disabled children.

Tanis Bryan's (1974a) observational investigation sought to measure task orientation and social behavior of learning disabled and non-learning disabled elementary aged children in a school room situation. Bryan used the Interaction Process Analysis to measure and code children's interaction over a five month period. Bryan's findings suggest that learning disabled children attend to academic endeavors significantly less than non-learning disabled students. Furthermore, the data suggests that the learning disabled student's peer/adult interactions were significantly dissimilar from the non-learning children's interactions with adults and with other children.

Tanis Bryan (1974b) used sociometric measures to identify children's choice of classmates as friends, neighbors, and those deserving of a party invitation. This measure also evaluates the
converse, negative connotations of these situations (Moreno, 1960). Additionally this investigation used the Guess Who Techniques (Garry, 1963) which seeks to elicit responses to questions such as "Who finds it hard to sit still in class." The results revealed that learning disabled children were considered significantly less desirable, attractive and more rejected by classmates than the non-learning disabled children.

Bryan (1967) again used observation techniques while working with Wheeler, Falcon, and Hench. This study determined that learning disabled children are ignored more often by teachers and peers, that they more frequently utter competitive/combative statements which are devoid of consideration for others. Further, this population of learning disabled children also receives less positive reinforcement and more negative teacher attention than non-learning disabled or socially competent children. Corroboration for this line of research has been obtained by Heibert, Wong, and Hunter (1982) as their research, gained from teacher reports and systematic observation of elementary school students, suggests that untimely remarks or behaviors are associated with learning disabled, socially incompetent children. These behaviors result in little positive attention and regard from peers and teachers for the learning disabled child.

James Bryan and Perlmutter (1979) sought to delineate adults' first impressions of learning disabled children. They used a video tape of children in a lab setting permitting randomly
selected college rater/observers to rate social desirability of the children. The raters determined the learning disabled children to be less desirable socially than the non-learning disabled children.

James Bryan and Sherman (1981) extended this line of research. The video tape that "blind observers" saw, but not heard, consisted of an adult female interviewing learning disabled and non-learning disabled children. Hostility and little adaptability was attributed to the learning disabled children by raters, who were themselves mothers. These raters based their rejection of the learning disabled student on non-verbal behaviors.

Tanis Bryan's current research was written with colleagues Peral, Donahue, Bryan J., and Pflaum in 1983. This material forms the basis of a review for the Chicago Institute for the Study of Learning Disabilities concerning their goals on behalf of learning disabled children's communication, reading, attribution, and immediate impression on others research. Bryan et al (1983) cites reports that show learning disabled children with socialimperception to have difficulty making friends. It is the latter factor that will be addressed here. Bryan et al (1983) proposes that without school related, club, or other planned activities, non-school time periods are especially problematical and lonesome for this population. These learning disabled children do not have anything to do, nowhere to go, and sadly, no one to do it with.
Learning disabled, socially incompetent children have significantly different social behavior that is not only easily observable by independent raters, but these same behaviors inhibit establishment, due to peculiar speech patterns and conduct, of adequate bonding with family members. Thus, these learning disabled, socially inept children do not acquire proper parental support and gratification.

Janet Learner (1985) sums up many aspects of learning disabled, socially incompetent children by noting that these students are likely to be disliked and to be rejected due to their unusual social characteristics. Unfortunately, rejected children tend to be poor candidates for sound mental health as adults.

**Childhood Rejection**

Research into the effects of childhood rejection can found in several disciplines including the social psychology and the sociometric literature. In his social development text, Shaffer (1981) reports that the rejected, though not neglected child, often requires the services of mental health professionals as an adult. Citing Roff (1961, 1963, 1974) and Roff, Sells and Garden (1972), Shaffer reports on their consistent findings which state that poor interpersonal or poor relationships prior to adulthood—acceptance by few and rejected by many—to be a valid precursor to "delinquency, sexual deviations, neurosis, and psychosis" (1981, p. 569). These studies were later corroborated by Cowen, Pederson, Bakegan, Izzo, and Frost (1973). Cowen and
her colleagues collected information on third grade children's ability, achievement, teacher ratings, grades, and "peer nominations for positive and negative roles in a school play" (Schaffer, 1981, p. 569). The subject population was then followed through into adulthood to see if these individuals sought treatment for emotional maladjustment. The results indicate that the single most powerful predictor of adult emotional disturbance to be childhood peer rejection as measured by the negative peer nomination for the school play.

**Peer Friendship**

Paramount among the many underlying threads that unite lifelong growth and change would seem to be an individual's social/interpersonal attitudes concerning friends and friendships. Sadly, as Kronick (1981) and Bryan et al (1983) imply, learning disabled, socially inept children do not form and maintain desired peer relationships/friendships due to their faulty grasp of social situations. Thus, much of the recent developmental research, which largely ignored the learning disabled population, would appear to offer theoretical guideposts, rather than absolute benchmarks for socially incompetent students. Hence, despite two of the prominent research studies, Reisman & Shorr (1978) and Bigelow (1975; 1977), use of methods unsuitable for use with learning disabled children, these investigations do provide a much needed data base.

Reisman and Shorr's (1978) study of friendships expectations
among several age groups provided support for the stage theory of friendship advocated by earlier researchers/theorists (Erikson, 1969; Piaget, 1970; Sullivan, 1953). Their study used an open-ended interview method with 330 subjects aged seven to sixty-five. The subjects were asked to write what they expected of their friends. Reisman and Shorr's results indicate that age affects the number of best friends claimed/named. Further, the study found that there was a decrease in expected pleasure and excitement from friends and an increase in expecting friends to be useful with advancing age.

Further research in this area has found support for the stage quality of friendship. LaGaipa and Bigelow (1975) and Bigelow (1977) investigated the developmental aspect of what children expect from their friendships. Both studies gained their data from school children's, ages six through thirteen, essays in which they were asked to define the characteristics of their best friends. While the essay method would appear to hamper the younger child, both of these studies did yield significant data as both disclosed that a desire for common activities, loyalty, and intimacy increased with age. These results would appear to support Reisman and Shorr's (1978) data of valuing usefulness with increasing age.

How and why friendships work has also been explored by psychological researchers. Gronlund's (1959) observational research on friendships is credited with providing the impetus for
Selman and Selman's (1979) study into the developmental nature of children's understanding of friendships and the children's reasoning of what and why friendships work. Utilizing the interview method with over 250 children, Selman and Selman asked each age group the same set of questions to obtain an age group's expectations of friendships. While providing dissimilar reasons for the expectations, the results supply insights into children's expectations, as well as lend support for the construct of developmental differences between children and adults with regard to friendships expectations. For example, when discussing relative closeness, older children were interested in intimacy while younger children were interested in getting friends to do what they wanted them to do in a self-serving manner.

As a result of the converging psychological and educational research concerning the importance of social/interpersonal relationships to life-long mental health (Shaffer, 1981), and the learning capabilities of the learning disabled child (Falard & Haubrich, 1981), the self reported data advocated by Tesch (1981) concerning friends and friendships could be of value. Due to the relationship between learning disabled children and rejection (Deshler & Lenz, Schumaker, 1983), the results of childhood rejection (Shaffer, 1981), and the assumption that peer rejected learning disabled children would have fewer friends, it would seem prudent to delineate possible differences between learning disabled and non-learning disabled children's perceptions of
friendships. Armed with this input perhaps adequate curriculum change could be initiated for the learning disabled, socially inept student. Curriculum alterations could facilitate adequate personal growth, educational mainstreaming, and aid for future personality development by reducing the learning disabled child's social ineptness during the elementary school years.
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Methods

This study investigated the opinions and feelings of "chumship" (Sullivan, 1957; Mannarino, 1979) aged learning disabled and non-learning disabled children concerning friends and friendship. Two hundred-fifteen 5th and 6th grade children were surveyed. From this original subject pool, children were matched for sex, age, race, number of siblings, and number of family moves resulting in 68 matched pairs of children. Each question was analyzed using chi square incorporating the procedures used by Burton (1981, p. 101) to determine "goodness of fit of an observed distribution of outcomes to an expected distribution, thus generating tabular displays of frequency distributions" for each item on the Friendship Questionnaire.

Instrumentation and Procedures

The Friendship Questionnaire (See Appendix A) consists of component materials from three other friendship devices. Sullivan's (1953) original "chum list", and Mannarino's 1976 "chum check sheet" (See Appendix D) formed the basis for questions 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, and 17. The remainder of the questions were derived from Parlee's (1978) survey of adult friendships (See Appendix E) and this researcher's unpublished initial modifications of Parlee's survey (See Appendix B and C).

A pilot survey instrument was developed and presented to a panel, consisting of two special education faculty members, two
parents of learning disabled elementary aged children, one elementary principal, three classroom teachers, two district administrators, and two RSP teachers. The pilot instrument was then administered to a group of 15 non-grade level elementary students. Following the analysis of the results as well as a review of the administrating procedures it was then revised and reviewed by the panel. A second pilot group of 12 non-grade level elementary students completed the revised survey. Upon review by the panel, a final form of the instrument was developed and administered to 215 elementary school children. Administration of the research instrument was completed during a two week time period in January 1985 to 25 groups of students varying in size from four to thirty-three.

**Survey Procedures and Directions**

All prospective subjects were verbally informed of the nature and intended use of the collected information. Additionally, the subjects were informed that their possible participation was voluntary. The learning disabled (LD) students were administrated the questionnaire during their daily RSP time period. The non-learning disabled (NLD) students were given the survey in their home rooms. In both cases, the subject's teacher was present and served as an aide to the survey administrator.

Subjects were told that the survey information concerned personal opinions, that there were no right or wrong answers, and that these personal opinions and feelings were of importance.
Subjects were asked not to share answers. However, if for some reason the subject could not or did not choose to respond to a question, they were told to go to the next question. Further, the subjects were informed that the entire questionnaire would be read aloud to them. Their task was to answer as best they could. They were advised that the questions would be accompanied by examples to help them understand the questions. Subjects were reminded to raise their hands for question clarification rather than to whisper to their neighbors. Subjects were assured that participation in the study would not affect their schoolwork. Furthermore, the subjects were told that following the completion of the investigation, they would be notified of the overall outcomes.

To omit non-grade level subjects from the subject pool, classroom teachers were requested to hand out the survey which was color coded for grade level/non-grade level.

The survey instrument was placed on each student's desk face down. The demographic information was explained orally and the subjects were instructed to turn their questionnaire over and complete that portion of the survey. Introductory information was then read to the students before proceeding to question number one "a". Throughout the administration period subjects were reminded that their names were not to be put on the paper, that there were no right/wrong answers, that the study wanted their opinions concerning friends, and that they were to raise their hands if
they had a question concerning their task.

Question twenty was a brief answer essay type question, thus it required different directions. The students were simply asked to spell and write as best they could; they were encouraged to think and answer carefully, and to not worry about grammar and spelling as this was not for their teacher, but for the researchers.

The subjects consisted of 68 5th and 6th grade male and female learning disabled (LD) elementary school students and 68 5th and 6th grade male and female non-learning disabled (NLD) elementary school students. There were 40 male pairs and 28 female pairs distributed as follows: 28 6th grade and 40 5th grade student pairs with an age range of 10 to 12 years of age with an average age of 10.50; there were 78 white, 34 Mexican American, 18 Black, 4 Asian, and 2 American Indian respondents. All subjects were students in the same school district and all subjects attended schools designated as ethnically balanced by the local district. The number of students was randomly determined by asking for volunteers at representative school sites for the NLD students.

The learning disabled students were defined in the following manners:

1. Labeled LD by the interdisciplinary team;
2. Students needed to spend no more than one hour daily in a RSP setting;
3. Students could be no less than 10 years old, nor more than 12 years old;

4. A minimum score of 90 on at least one section of the WISC R within the last year (or equivalent).

The non-learning disabled (NLD) students were defined in the following manners:

1. Grade level in all subject areas during the 1984-85 school year as determined by district test, or by mastering grade level materials in all subject areas in the school;

2. As many NLD students are not administrated the WISC R, intelligence scores were not available, it was assumed to be in the 90-120 range as the students were grade level and not remedial/gifted;

3. Students needed to spend no time in remedial/gifted classes;

4. Students could be not less than 10 years old, nor more than 12 years old.

Data Analysis

The obtained data was chi square analyzed to determine if a significant difference between the two independent variables—learning disabled and non-learning disabled—and the several dependent categories—the survey questions—existed. Thus contingency tables were generated for questions 1 through 19 to determine if the observed frequencies were significantly different
from the expected frequencies between the learning disabled and then non-learning disabled populations with regard to the survey questions. An alpha of .05 was used to reveal no significant differences between the frequencies and the populations. To place the findings in a meaningful order, the data from the contingency tables were summarized into tabular form and are included in the following section of this report as are tabular presentations of the percentage of student responses.

Chi Square analysis was not applied to question #20 as this was an uncoded essay type question. The information gathered from this question is discussed in Chapter 4.

**Summary**

Methods, procedures, instrumentation and data analysis were researched and developed to elicit personal responses from learning disabled and non-learning disabled upper elementary aged children with regard to friends and friendships.

Methods and procedures are loosely based on a modification of those used by Bryan (1976) and Mannarino (1976) while instrumentation parallels Sullivan (1953), Mannarino (1976), and Parlee (1978), as well as a self report friendship questionnaire developed by this researcher. Survey procedures however, were solely based upon this researcher and the panel's recommendations as well as developments that surfaced during piloting.
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Results and Discussion

This investigation sought to probe the feelings and opinions of learning disabled and non-learning disabled upper elementary aged children with regard to friends and friendships. The volunteer population for the study was obtained from students enrolled in approximately half of the Resource Specialist Program facilities for elementary students and in four elementary schools in a local district. Sixty-eight matched pairs of children were used to generate the data.

Comments concerning the failure to reject the null hypotheses will be presented in this section. The chi square data analysis of the children's responses and the description of the findings from the Friendship Questionnaire will also be discussed, as well as the limitations of the study. Finally, suggestions will be made regarding additional research needs, and classroom curriculum implications revealed in this study will be presented.

Analysis and Description of the Findings

An analysis of the results reveal a failure to reject the null hypotheses. There were no significant statistical differences between learning disabled and non-learning disabled children's opinions and feelings with regard to friends and friendship as measured by the Friendship Questionnaire.

Although, the learning and non-learning disabled children did not respond identically to questions la and lb (la, number of
close friends and lb, number of school friends), there still was not enough discrepancy between their responses to constitute significance (la: \(X^2 = 4.489\) and lb: \(X^2 = .125\), \(p < .05\)). It is, however, worthwhile to note that the raw data itself appears different in several respects (See Tables la/1b & Tables 2c/2b). Four of the learning disabled children (2.5%) indicated they had no close friends while all of the non-learning disabled children felt they had at least one close friend as evidenced by their responses to question la. This is further demonstrated by the 62% of the non-learning disabled population selected response "b" (one to five close friends) while only 40% of the learning disabled population chose this response (See Table 1b).

Both the learning disabled and the non-learning disabled children indicated they had similar numbers of school friends (question lb) for overall non-significance (\(X^2 = .0125\), \(p < .05\), see Table 2a), and both populations felt they might not have at least one school type friend as each population contributed to the total of three students for this marginal number. Furthermore, similar student responses resulted in several congruent percentages for the answers (See Table 2b). For example item "c" garnered 20% and 21% of the learning disabled and non-learning disabled answers, item "d" received 18% and 23%, while answer "e" received 40% and 45% of the responses from the learning and non-learning disabled students. Dissimilar answer "b" received 21% of the learning disabled student responses and 11% of the
### Table 1a

Chi Square Analysis of Question 1a:

How many "close friends" do you feel that you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) none</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 1-5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 6-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 11-15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) more than 15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 4.489, \ p < .05, \ X^2 = 4.489, \ p > .50 \] \( df = 4 \)
Table 1b
Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 1a:
How many "close friends" do you feel that you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) none</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 1-5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 6-10</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 11-15</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) more than 15</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2a
Chi Square Analysis of Question 1b:
How many "school friends" do you feel that you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) none</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 1-5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 6-10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 11-15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) more than 15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X2 = .125, p. < .05  df = 4
Table 2b
Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 1b:
How many "school friends" do you feel that you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) none</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 1-5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 6-10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 11-15</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) more than 15</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
non-learning disabled student responses.

Both sample populations felt they have friends they do not see often (Question 2: Are there people that you remain friends with even though you do not see them often?). The raw scores are identical for both populations. Thus the analysis resulted in an insignificant $X^2 = .4092, p.<.05$ (See Table 3a). For both samples 86% of the respondents answered "yes", and 14% answered "no" to the question (See Table 3b).

Perception of when they first got to know their "best close friend" (Question 3: At what age did you first get to know your "best close friend?") are also very similar ($X^2 = .643, p.<.05$). Learning disabled children felt they got to know their special person at an early age as a majority (30) indicated age of meeting as 3 to 5 years old (See Table 4a). Just under a majority (40%) of the non-learning disabled sample felt they met their "best" friend at the ages of 7, 8 or 9 years old (See Table 4b).

Question number 4 was broken into four sub-parts. The student subjects were asked to rank friendship attribute items in each sub-section in order of preference. Items they deemed as most important received scores of 1, second most important scores of 2, and third and fourth most important scores of 3 and 4, respectively. Thus, low scores indicate high value and high scores indicate low value of the qualities treasured by the students in their friends. Significance was not obtained ($X = .5143, p.<.05$, see Table 5a) in set "a" as intelligence was valued
Table 3a

Chi Square Analysis of Question 2:
Do you feel that you can remain friends with someone even though you may not see them often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = .40922, p. <.05  df = 1
Table 3b
Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 2:
Do you feel that you can remain friends with someone even though you may not see them often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4a

Chi Square Analysis of Question 3:
At what age did you first get to know your "best close friend"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-6 years old</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years old</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years old</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 0.0643, p < 0.05 \quad df = 2 \]
Table 4b
Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 3:
At what age did you first get to know your "best close friend"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) 3-6 years old</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 7-9 years old</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 10-12 years old</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in friends equally by the learning and non-learning disabled samples (LD = raw score 122/NLD = raw score 114). For complete raw scores see Table 5a. Both samples also found the qualities of "same moral values" and same "goals/interests" to be important in friendships. Neither population felt physical appearance to be a friendship determiner. Although the learning disabled population's raw score was high, (LD raw score = 160) the non-learning disabled score was even higher (NLD raw score = 229 implying even more disdain for this quality in a friendship (See Table 5a).

In set "b" statistical significance was nearly achieved at the .05 level (X² = 7.554 vs. 7.82 for significance, see Table 5a). The factors with the most raw scores discrepancy were loyalty and gender. They were cast in another contingency table. The results of further analysis indicate non-significance difference at the .05 level of probability (X² = 2.889).

The children's responses to set "c" were not statistically different (X² = .7385, p. > .05, see Table 5a). However, there are slight raw score differences which can be noted. Both samples tended to order the attributes similarly, but they did not support their ranking with the same robust numbers. For first choice non-learning disabled children tended to value truthfulness more than learning disabled children (raw score 133 vs. 103) and devalue age and secret keeping ability (third and fourth choices) with humor their second choice. The learning disabled responses
Table 5a

Chi Square Analysis of Question 4:

Put each of the following friendship qualities in order of their importance to you by using numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4. Number one equals the first most important item, number 2 equals the second most important item, number 3 equals the third most important item, and number 4 equals the least most important item to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Disabled Scores</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled Scores</th>
<th>X2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intelligence</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same moral values</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same goals/interests</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good looking</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set &quot;b&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyal</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing to make</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time for me</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same sports abilities</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as me</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same sex as myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled Scores</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled Scores</th>
<th>X2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set &quot;c&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humor</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>X2 = .7385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about my age</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>p. &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truthfulness</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keeper of secrets</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>df = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set &quot;d&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same home life</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>X2 = .0732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same race ethnic</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>p. &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a cheerful person</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fell in the same order. However, learning disabled students did tend to place more value on humor and secret keeping ability as evidenced by their smaller raw scores (See Table 5a).

Set "d" found the non-learning and the learning disabled students both highly valuing cheerfulness in their friends. Neither population perceived racial/ethnic background as important to a friendship as they did a similar home life ($X^2 = .07$, p. < .05). Cheerfulness in friends received a raw score of 91 from the learning disabled and a raw score of 78 from the non-learning disabled students, while racial/ethnic background similarities received a raw score of 161 and 148 from the learning disabled and the non-learning disabled students (See Table 5a).

Item number five (How often do you feel you get to do things with your "best" friend?) revealed no significant differences between the populations at the .05 level of probability; however, the populations were opposite with regard to amount of time spent with friends as the analysis computed to zero (See Table 6a).

An analysis of percentages (See Figure 6b) revealed that 13.5% of the learning disabled children and 28% of the non-learning disabled children felt they did things with their friends about half the time; 20% of the learning disabled vs. 11% of the non-learning disabled felt their friends control the amount of time spent doing things together; 21% of the learning disabled vs 9% of the non-learning disabled children felt they did not do things with their friends very often.
Table 6a

Chi Square Analysis of Question 5:
If you have a "very best friend", how often do you do things together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) most of the time</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) about $\frac{1}{2}$ of the time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) only if my friend wants to</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) not very often</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 0$
Figure 6b

Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 5:
If you have a "very best friend", how often do you do things together?
Question number six (Do you feel that you behave or act differently in the company of different friends?) sought the respondents' self evaluation of their behavior in the company of different friends. Although more learning disabled students felt they behaved different; generally both populations believed that "sometimes" they did behave differently with different individuals. There was not, however, a statistically significant difference between the two populations (X2 = .003, p.<.05, see Table 7a) in response to this item. Analysis of percentages (See Table 7b) revealed that 35% of the learning disabled felt they behaved differently with different friends. Answer "c" (sometimes behaves different) received 50% and 56% of the learning and non-learning disabled children's votes for their answer to this statement.

Question number seven (Would you tell your "best close friend" if you were going to die?) elicited information concerning the depth of intimacy and discussion employed by the respondents with their "best friends". Both raw scores and data analysis search reveal much agreement between the two population's responses to this question (X2 = .078, p.<.05, see Table 8a). From a percentage standpoint (See Table 8b), over 50% of both populations felt they would discuss their approaching death with a "best friend", and 30% of both populations felt they would discuss their approaching death with a "best friend", and 10% of both populations simply did not know whether they would discuss this
Table 7a

Chi Square Analysis of Question 6:
Do you feel that you behave or act differently in the company of different friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) sometimes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X2 = -0.003, p. < .05  df = 2
Table 7b

Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 6:
Do you feel that you behave or act differently in the company of different friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) sometimes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8a

Chi Square Analysis of Question 7:

Would you tell your "best close friend" if you were going to die?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I don't know</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .078, p < .05 \]  \[ df = 2 \]
Table 8b
Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 7:
Would you tell your "best close friend" if you were going to die?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I don't know</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subject with a "best friend".

Raw scores and percentages of question number eight (Does success in school often get in the way of having lots of friends?) indicated that both populations have similar perceptions of the side effects of success in school; thus, statistical significance was not found ($X^2 = .82$, $p<.05$, see Table 9a and Table 9b). Learning and non-learning disabled students did, however, respond differently to the yes/no portion of the question. Eighteen percent of the learning disabled students felt that success could get in the way of having lots of friends, while only 6% of the non-learning disabled students felt this way (See Table 9b). There was a seven point raw score spread between the learning and non-learning disabled students with regard to the negative response. Non-learning disabled children did not find it hard to be successful and to have friends as 46% said success had no influence on friendships. Thirty-four percent of the learning disabled sample held the same viewpoint. The raw scores and the percentages were nearly equal in both populations with regard to the "no difference" and the "sometimes" categories (See Table 9b).

The raw scores were similar enough for question number nine (Have you done any of the following things with friends?) to be analyzed by simply casting the total number of individual learning and non-learning disabled yes/no responses into a contingency table ($X^2 = .021$, $p<.05$, see Table 10a). A score of 884 was possible for either condition. But as the students were
Table 9a
Chi Square Analysis of Question 8:
Does success in school often get in the way of having lots of friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) does not make a difference</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) sometimes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .82, p. < .05 \quad df = 3$
Table 9b

Percentages of Paired Response to Question 8:

Does success in school often get in the way of having lots of friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) does not make</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a difference</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) sometimes</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10a

Chi Square Analysis of Question 9:
Have you done any of the following things with friends? Check yes or no (13 items total).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = .021, p. <.05  df = 12
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
instructed to delete questions that did not seem to apply to them, neither the "yes" nor the "no" condition achieved the maximum points. So similar were the children's patterns of responses, that average number of yes/no answers for each population were nearly the same (LD yes = 7.89, NLD yes = 7.97; LD no = 4.75; NLD no = 4.89, see Table 10b).

Chi square analysis resulted in non-significance (X2 = 2.09, p.<.05, see Table 11a) for question 10 (Would you tell your best "close friend" about something you were very proud about?). A majority—90% LD and 77% NLD—of the children responded "yes" to sharing information with "close friends" concerning success or pride (See Table 11b). However, for the negative responses 15% of the learning disabled answered "no", and 3% of the non-learning disabled children answered "no" to confiding in a close friend. A similar percentage of each population (9% and 8%) did not know whether they would confide in a friend or not confide in a friend.

Question eleven (Do you ever talk with your "close friend" about how special your friendship is?) did not achieve statistical significance (X2 = .46, p.<.05, see Table 12a). The yes/no responses were very similar in both populations as the learning disabled "yes" response was 47% of the population and the non-learning disabled "yes response was 45% of the population (See Table 12b). The "no" responses were 35% and 27% respectively.
Table 11a
Chi Square Analysis of Question 10:
Would you tell your best "close friend" about something that you were very proud about?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Don't know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X2 = 2.01, p.<.05  df = 2

*Category "c" was combined with category "b" for statistical purposes.
Table 11b
Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 10:
Would you tell your best "close friend" about something that you were very proud about?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>15% *(25%)</td>
<td>3% *(10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) don't know</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates the combined category percentages.
Table 12a
Chi Square Analysis of Question 11:
Do you ever talk with your "close friend" about how special your friendship is?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) sometimes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Χ² = .46, p. < .05  df = 2
Table 12b

Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 11:
Do you ever talk with your "close friend" about how special your friendship is?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) sometimes</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The "sometimes" category was used by roughly 12% more non-learning disabled respondents than learning disabled respondents.

Question twelve's content is the opposite of number 10, and it too sought to determine the amount of intimate discourse children may have with "best" friends by inquiring about the possibility of confiding in a friend about a failure. (Question #12: Would tell your best "close friend" about a failure you had in school?) Failure was defined in both an academic and a social manner for the students; so student responses may be reflective of this dual aspect of failure. In any case, statistical significance was not found (X² = .889, p.<.05, see Table 13a). The raw scores indicate that non-learning disabled students were slightly more likely to confide in best friends than were learning disabled children (60% vs. 43%, respectively, see Table 13b) while twice as many learning disabled children as non-learning disabled children replied they would not discuss a failure with a "close" friend (23% vs. 10%, respectively). Nearly an equal number of respondents felt they would confide in a friend about a failure, "only if they were asked" (15% vs. 18%, respectively).

Question number thirteen sought to determine differences between the two populations with regard to whom they would turn in a time of distress (At a time when very upset, who would you first turn to for advice and support?). For statistical purposes the 12 learning disabled students who claimed they would turn to no one, needed to be deleted from computations. Analysis yielded no
Table 13a
Chi Square Analysis of Question 12:
Would you tell your best "close friend" about a failure you had in school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) sometimes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) only if I were asked</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .889, \ p < .05 \quad df = 3 \]
Table 13b

Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 12:
Would you tell your best "close friend" about a failure you had in school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) sometimes</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) only if I were asked</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14a
Chi Square Analysis of Question 13:
At a time when you are very upset, who would you first turn to for support and advice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) family</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) friends</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) no one</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X2 = 1.01, p. < .05 df = 2
Table 14b
Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 13:
At a time when you are very upset, who would you first turn to for support and advice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) family</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) friends</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) school friends</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant differences ($X^2 = 1.01, p.<.05$, see Table 14a). It is interesting to note that not one non-learning disabled student felt competent enough to deal with stressful situations alone while 18% of the learning disabled population perceived themselves as able to handle stressful situations alone (See Table 14b).

Question number fourteen sought to delineate respondents' expectations of school friends, family members, and close friends. Analysis of total responses indicate little statistical differences between the two populations ($X^2 = .01502, p.<.05$, see Table 14a). However, with raw score numbers it is possible to determine that both populations expected family members to fulfill slightly more than half of the roles mentioned. The typical learning disabled and non-learning disabled responses are listed in Table 15b.

Besides gathering a few giggles, question fifteen's inquiry about friendship being a form of love (Do you think friendship is a kind of love?) achieved no statistical significance ($X^2 = 0$). From a percentage standpoint, just under half of the learning disabled perceived friendship as a form of love while just over half of the non-learning disabled students felt love and friendship were related (See Table 16b).

Question number sixteen also elicited a laugh (Would you tell your "best friend" that you love them?). Nearly equal raw scores resulted in little statistical difference between the populations with regard to this question ($X^2 = .224, p.<.05$, see Table 17a).
Table 15a
Chi Square Analysis of Question 14:
Please check which you would expect of your family, close friends, and school friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) family</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) close friends</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) school friends</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .01502, \ p < .05 \ \text{df} = 2 \]
Table 15b
Average Number of Response in Each Category for Question 14:
Please check which you would expect of your family, close friends, and school friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) family</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) close friends</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) school friends</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not sum to 100 as children were instructed to delete questions that did not seem to apply to them.*
Table 16a
Chi Square Analysis of Question 15:
Do you think friendship is a kind of love?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) don't know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) write in response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X2 = 0  df = 2

*For statistical purposes, cells with less than 5 were combined with another cell, eg. write ins were included with don't knows as they reflected that sort of answer.
Table 16b

Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 15:
Do you think friendship is a kind of love?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) don't know</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) write in response</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17a

Chi Square Analysis of Question 16:
Would you tell your best "close friend" that you love them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) don't know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) write in response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X_2 = .224, \ p < .05 \] df = 2

*For statistical purposes cells with less than 5 were included with appropriate other cell, eg. write in responses were reflective of "don't know" answers and were so included.*
Table 17b

Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 16:
Would you tell your best "close friend" that you love them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) don't know</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) write in response</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirty-five percent of the learning disabled and 30% of the non-learning disabled felt they could tell a "best" friend that they were loved while 45% of the learning disabled and 36% of the non-learning disabled felt they could not tell a "best" friend they were loved (See Table 17b). Approximately 22% of each population were unsure of their capabilities of telling a "best" friend that they were loved.

Questions number seventeen and eighteen were included to gain insights into beginnings and endings of friendships from these children (Question 17: Have you any friends that you used to dislike a lot?, Question 18: Do you now dislike someone who used to be your friend?). For statistical purposes it was necessary to delete five respondent generated answers from question 17. In any case, significance was not achieved (X² = 1.39, p.<.05, see Table 18a). The written responses varied from the two "I don't think it is any of your business", to the one "I can't remember", to the two responses that merely said, "I can't answer this." Question 18 concerning the disliking of someone who used to be your friend resulted in no statistical significance (X² = .1834, p.<.05; See Table 19a). There were no written responses for this question.

The raw scores were also very similar; although, four learning disabled students evidently did not feel competent or confident to answer this question as it was left blank. For each population just under half answered yes (47% and 45%) while the "no" response garnered 47% and 54% of the learning disabled and non-learning
Table 18a

Chi Square Analysis of Question 17:

Have you any friends that you used to dislike a lot?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) write in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 1.39, \ p < .05 \ df = 2$

*For statistical purposes cells with less than 5 were included with appropriate other cell, eg. write in responses were reflective of "no" answers and were so included.
Table 18b
Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 17:
Have you any friends that you used to dislike a lot?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) write in response</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19a
Chi Square Analysis of Question 18:
Do you now dislike someone who used to be your friend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) write in responses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .1834$, $p < .05$  df = 1
Table 19b

Percentages of Paired Responses to Question 18:

Do you now dislike someone who used to be your friend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) yes</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) no</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) write in</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
disabled student's votes with regard to currently disliking a
former friend (See Table 19b).

Question number 19 sought to gain information about the
child's perception of self as a friend to others. This question
was arranged similar to question four as students were required to
rank items of importance using numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4 in four
different sets (a, b, c, d). A perfect low raw score (68)
indicated that an item was first choice for each student in that
population; conversely, a perfect high raw score of 272 indicated
that the item was valued the least by the entire sample.
Significance was not obtained for set "a" (X² = .216, p.<.05, see
Table 20a). In set "a" both populations valued their intelligence
equally well, and both populations gave their good looks a bottom
score, indicating that physical appearance was not seen as a
component of their friendships. The non-learning disabled
population gave a much lower score, thus higher value to the
statement concerning truthfulness than did the learning disabled
population.

Sets "b", "c", and "d" were answered in a very similar manner
for each population. Statistical significance was not achieved
for these sets (X² = .225, .1984, and 7.779, p.<.05, respectively,
see Table 20a). However, set "d" nearly achieved statistical
significance at the .05 level of probability. A difference in the
raw scores of 10 or more points for each attribute contributed to
this factor. The learning disabled and the non-learning disabled
Table 20a

Chi Square Analysis of Question 19:
Put each of the following friendship qualities that you feel your friends see in you in order of their importance by using numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4. Number one equals the first most important item, number two equals the second most important, number 3 equals the third most important item, and number four indicates the least most important item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities</th>
<th>Learning Disabled Scores</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled Scores</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligence</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>X2 = .216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good looking</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>p. &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truthful</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keeper of secrets</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>df = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same home life</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>X2 = .225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same race/ethnic background</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>p. &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same goals/interests</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>df = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same moral values</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Disabled Scores</th>
<th>Non-Learning Disabled Scores</th>
<th>X2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humor</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>X2 = .1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same sports abilities</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>p. &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerful person</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyal</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>X2 = 7.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same age</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>p. &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same sex</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>df = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makes time for me</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
children apparently do not see themselves valued in the same manner for the same items. Both populations felt they were valued for their loyalty, even though the non-learning disabled supported this feeling with more points. "The same age" requirement received nearly similar scores (165 vs 170). So it may be assumed their feelings were similar with regard to age. Likewise, the ability to make time for friends was valued similarly as evidenced by the raw scores of 150 and 140. The value of same gender, while coming in as least important, still received a much lower learning disabled score (194) than did the non-learning disabled (208) score indicating that perhaps age of friends is less important for the learning disabled than for the non-learning disabled student. Summarizing question 19, it would seem that both learning disabled and non-learning disabled children see themselves valued for their cheerfulness, loyalty, intelligence, followed most by truthfulness, humor, sports ability, home similarities, their goals, morals, time for others, keeper of secrets, with age, race, and gender viewed as the least most important of the qualities listed.

Discussion of Results

The results of this project should be construed as inferential as there is no statistical significance with regard to difference between the populations interviewed. These findings conflict with much of T. Bryan's past (1974a, 1974b) and current research (Bryan et al, 1983) as well as Learner's (1985) citings.
However, these findings offer support for specific psychological constructs with regard to friendship development (Sullivan, 1953; Mannarino, 1976; Maslow, 1971). These results also imply support for the stage model of friendship (Selman & Selman, 1979; Gurucharri & Selman, 1983) as well as corroboration for Deshler and Schumaker's (1983) findings concerning the social behavior of learning disabled students.

Based on their previous research at the University of Kansas Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities with regard to social behaviors of learning disabled adolescents, Deshler and Schumaker (1983) propose that not all learning disabled students may be socially rejected or neglected. These adolescents, however, are often involved in far fewer extracurricular activities and are therefore at home with family instead of "out" with friends. From a remediation standpoint, Deshler and Schumaker (1983) posit the use of direct instruction to reduce inadequate social behaviors and suggest one to one teaching, small group teaching and written instruction with immediate feedback.

The results of this study support Sullivan's (1953) concept of the individual's development of a intense relationship outside of the family during the pre-adolescent age range. Sullivan's (1953) theory proposed that at around 10 years of age the center of the child's social life moves from the groups of peers as a whole to a special friend. This special friend is a partner in a very intense relationship, who according to Sullivan, becomes the
child's first realistic attachment outside of the family. Sullivan postulated that it is at this time that the child first begins to really think in terms of "we" instead of "I". Student responses to questions number 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16 (See Appendix A) tend to support the concept of emerging special friendship development outside of the family as these questions probe the child's perception of self in a relationship outside the family.

Mannarino's (1976) research sought to verify components of Sullivan's (1953) social development theory via utilizing several indices including the "chumship check list". Mannarino found the list to be a reliable and valid method of measuring the student's capability for communication and sensitivity to and with his/her friends. Both the learning disabled and the non-learning disabled populations tended to corroborate the concept of communication and sensitivity development at this age via their responses to questions 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 7 (See Appendix A), as each of these elicited student replies indicated sharing intimate information with a non-family member.

From another viewpoint, the findings of this study support Maslow's (1971) theory of self actualization. Maslow's (1971) theory postulated a hierarchical model rather than an age/stage development model of social and personality development. Hence, age is not seen as a factor for motivation or personality growth. Maslow (1971) proposed a hierarchy of needs that motivates all
persons begins with physiological and safety needs which are followed by belonging and love needs, self esteem and self actualization needs. Maslow simply stated that after the physical and safety needs of the individual have been met, the individual can become aware of and pursue the next higher level. The first totally psychological need on Maslow's scale is belonging and love need. Development of friendships, as evidenced by the number of claimed friends and by the type of intimacy advocated, would appear to be a method of obtaining these needs in children as well as adults (See Appendix A for questions 1a, 1b, 7, 10, 12 and 13).

Thus far this report has mentioned corroboration for three personality theories by revealing the intensity of children's friendship diads, by indicating the respondents' ability to thoughtfully communicate with a special friend, and by indicating the relationship between belonging needs and friendship. However, this study also substantiates the more specific social research of Selman and Selman (1979) and Gurucharri and Selman's (1983) investigations of friendship stages.

By dealing more distinctly with friendship among children and adults, Selman and Selman's (1979) original research proposed a five stage model of friendship. This model relied heavily on Piaget's (1963) successor, Lawrence Kohlberg's (1968) stage concept of morality and justice. Gurucharri and Selman's (1983) work expanded this model via a longitudinal study. This theoretical model posits the three to seven year old child as
having "difficulty distinguishing between a physical action...with the psychological intention behind the action" (1979, p. 71).

According to Piaget (1963) a child this age is bound by the preoperation stage and cannot see another's point of view. In the second stage—ages four to nine—individuals can see the other person's point of view, but they cannot fathom give and take. In this stage the child prefers all take, do it only my way, or no way at all relationships. Again this stage reflects the Piagetian (1963) transition stage from preoperations to concrete operations. The next stage—ages six to twelve—does involve reciprocal dealings, but only for benefit of self. If the child cannot see himself gaining something from the relationship, it will disintegrate. The nine to fifteen year old individual can "step outside the friendship and take a generalized third person perspective" on a situation (1979, p. 72). Selman and Selman (1979) refer to this as the "mutually shared relations" stage.

The adult stage may begin at age twelve. In this stage a relationship can be properly viewed as "complex" and "overlapping" (1979, p. 81). The children's answers in this study, especially the responses to question 20, indicate the respondents to be in either stage three or four which is consistent and appropriate according the longitudinal study and their chronological ages (Gurucharri and Selman, 1983).

Furthermore, the results of this investigation indicate that there are several areas that approached statistical significance.
These areas include question 1a (number of close friends), question four Set "b" and question 19 Set "d" (attributions of their friends and self attributions, respectively). While question 10, telling a friend about something you were very proud about, came in a poor fourth in order of significance. Question 1a addressed the student's perceived number of close friends ($X^2 = 4.48, p.<.05$, see Table 1a). From a raw score viewpoint, the number of close friends appears very different; statistical significance was missed by three points. Although there are a number of possible reasons for this non-significance, including imperception by both populations, most factors can be subsumed under sample limitations. Even so, it may still be reliably postulated that 70-80% of the time the learning disabled and non-learning disabled students do not perceive themselves as having the same number of close friends (Seigel, 1959).

The attributes of age, loyalty, and willingness to make time for friends appeared dissimilar in both the "I see it in my friends" and in the "my friends see it in me" conditions. Statistical significance was indeed very close ($X^2 = 7.38$ for question 4, Set "b"; $X^2 = 7.72$ for question 19, Set "d" vs 7.82 needed for significance in both cases, see Tables 5a and 20a). Thus, it may well be that 90% of the time these two populations differ with regard to the importance and value placed on age, loyalty, and willingness to make time for others in their friendships (Seigel, 1959).
Sharing of intimate prideful information with a close friend may be seen to be different between the two populations about 50% of the time ($X^2 = 2.09$ vs. $5.99$ at the .05 level, see Table 11a). Thus, fifty percent of the time chance would have these two populations differing, and fifty percent of the time a bonafide perceptual difference would exist with regard to dissimilar perceptions along this friendship dimension.

The item of interest, however, is the congruence between the two attribution lists across populations (question 4 and question 19, see Appendix A). There appears to be a substantial amount of agreement between what these children see in their friends as valuable attributes, and what they see in themselves as admirable qualities as friends. A comparison of the raw scores between question 4 and question 19 reveals cheerfulness as the most important item on both lists with loyalty and truthfulness as second and third most important factors; intelligence is listed as the fourth most important item. The attributes of sports ability, home life similarities, goals/interest and morals similarities, time for others, and keeper of secrets are arranged in approximately the same descending order while age, race, and gender are last for both populations (See Table 5a and 20a).

**Limiting Factors**

There are always limiting factors involved in gathering data from sample populations (McGuigan, 1969) for generalization to
entire populations. Prominent limiting factors considered for this project include representation, sample size, and instrumentation.

Every effort was made to obtain representative learning disabled and non-learning disabled pairs of volunteer elementary children to take the Friendship Questionnaire. There is no guarantee that this goal was achieved. Not all of the learning disabled children in the district meeting the eligibility requirements were involved in the subject pool. Non-representation of the learning disabled may also be viewed from a slightly different perspective. There is no evidence that the population of socially deviate learning disabled children exist in the target school district, partially due to problems relating to proper identification of learning disabled children. This later factor is frequently pointed out as a research problem. Furthermore, the non-learning disabled children were not screened to determine their social competence prior to their inclusion in the study's population of children.

Without positive representation, generalization to the rest of the learning disabled population and to the non-learning disabled population is in jeopardy. The results of this study can reliably apply to those volunteers involved with this study and possibly to the remainder of the District. The use of approximately half of the learning disabled population meeting the study's criteria in the District would tend to reduce the chance
of the small, socially inept learning disabled population peopling the rest of the District's learning disabled population. On the other hand, the junior high and the senior high school aged learning disabled population may include all of this District's socially incompetent, learning disabled students.

Sample size often precipitates non-significant findings that fail to reject the null hypothesis (McGuigan, 1969; Ellins, 1980). At first glance the 68 matched pairs obviated this problem. However, closer observation of cell breakdown reveals cells with less than 5. Tuckman (1980), Seigel (1956) and Ellins (1980) posit that chi square analysis with cells containing less than 5 may actually have too small of N, which may result in lost and misrepresented data. Both Tuckman (1980) and Seigel (1956) advise combining the low number with another cell for analysis. But in the case of a survey, misrepresentation may follow. Respondents to the survey had the choice of the alternate response, and they chose not to use that answer. The researcher who must move around data surely is not getting the valid results wanted. Again, inclusion of the total learning disabled population meeting the appropriate criteria may have eliminated this confounding factor.

Instrumentation may have also contributed to the disconfirmation of the hypothesis; hence it must be considered a possible limiting factor. The Friendship Questionnaire was not tested for validity or reliability prior to administration to the target population. Validity was somewhat assumed as the survey
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questions were derived from previously utilized check lists and surveys (Mannerino, 1976; Parlee, 1978, see Appendix D and E). From a reliability standpoint, the Friendship Questionnaire appeared to measure the same thing each time it was used in pilot studies. The Questionnaire was piloted thoroughly and the pilot responses match the general responses of the target populations. However, as mentioned validity and reliability were assumed. To support these two factors perhaps the participant’s subjectivity needs to have been controlled. The administration of an objective measure along with the subjective, self report measure could have added to the validity and reliability of the findings obtained from this study.

In summary, while sample size and instrumentation may be confounding factors, the most debilitating limitation in the present study would appear to be the lack of means to determine if the learning disabled, socially incompetent student even took the Friendship Questionnaire. As pointed out by numerous researchers (Learner, 1985; Bryan, 1974a; Clement, 1966) the socially inept, learning disabled student comprises a small sub-population imbedded within the learning disabled population. Thus, it is conceivable that this student did not volunteer, does not live in the district surveyed, or was among the learning disabled students who were not surveyed in this district.

Future Research

This investigation sought to delineate differences between
learning disabled and non-learning disabled children with regards to their feelings on friends and friendship. Unfortunately, disconfirmation of the null hypotheses was not obtained. However, insufficient statistical data should not eliminate further study in this area of behavior. It is well documented that the learning disabled and the non-learning disabled child are socially different (Bryan et al, 1983; Dashler and Schumaker, 1983). Hence, they may have many different friendship patterns. Future research in this area needs to include a large representative population for each category. Furthermore, perhaps a third category, the non-grade level, non-learning disabled, needs to be included for a reference comparison.

Future research needs to consider refining and validating the Friendship Questionnaire. Refinement might include assignment of values to the answers to allow ordinal analysis of the findings. Validation is needed to be assured that friendship perimeters are being measured by the survey instrument.

Additionally, the Friendship Questionnaire might be more reliable/valid if it were to correlate well with an objective measure given at the same approximate time. Reisman's (1983) SACRAL questionnaire might work well with the Friendship Questionnaire to further define friendship patterns in the learning disabled population as Reisman's instrument proports to measure friendliness itself. Another objective measure that might correlate well with survey methods would be Gurucharri and
Selman's (1983) dilemma assessments of interpersonal situations.

From a spectulatorly standpoint, perhaps the age of the population surveyed could be advanced. Eventhough an age change is not consistent with the literature on either friendship patterns, or on socially deviant learning disabled individuals; it would, however, be useful to document perimeters of learning disabled friendship patterns for more than one cohort. Furthermore, as Wender (1971) and Kronick (1981) both point out, the learning disabled population tends to exhibit immature behaviors in general; thus, the age/grade matching significant in this investigation may not have been the most appropriate variable to use in sample selection. Hence, future studies may want to rely on a different variable in sample selection.

Implications for the Classroom

While the results of this study indicate there are no statistical differences between learning disabled and non-learning disabled children, there are still dissimilarities between these populations of children with regard to friends and friendships, as evidenced by the raw scores. For example, the raw scores are noticeably dissimilar with regard to attributes of number of close friends claimed, importance of truthfulness, the desire to share information with a close friend, and the perception of self sufficiency when upset between the two populations. The raw score differences do have implications for educators.

The first item, number of close friends named, does speak to
teachers in particular. The learning disabled child may either have a deflated view of friends or the non-learning disabled child an inflated view. Teachers need to be cognizant of the existence of the small (2.5%) percentage of learning disabled children who feel they have no close friends. These children would certainly be at risk for social rejection. As a preventive measure, the teacher may wish to implement Learner's (1985) suggestions pertaining to direct teaching. The teacher could manipulate class seating arrangements, or assignments to prevent the possible social isolate from becoming a passive participant in classroom activities. Values clarification discussions could be initiated, followed up by bibliotherapy, or role playing to facilitate the non-learning disabled child's understanding of social isolation or rejection. Specific roles could be assigned for time periods—three days or a couple of weeks. In this manner, the learning disabled student could "practice" appropriate social behaviors and non-learning disabled students could cue/support proper social interactive behaviors. In a similar vein, the use of the Magic Circle (Bessell & Palomores, 1971) would also benefit self understanding and communication among circle members.

On another dimension, truthfulness was found not as valued by learning disabled students in others; nor did they see themselves as valued for truthfulness as did the non-learning disabled populations. For the teacher this implies that learning disabled children need modeling, examples and role playing to develop this
aspect of their personality. It may also mean that learning disabled children view truth differently than non-learning disabled children. Learning disabled children may have been reprimanded for too much truthfulness, such as unnecessary tattling, hurting feelings of others with untimely remarks, or rudeness, to value their perception of truthfulness. Hence, learning disabled children would benefit from the aforementioned direct, dramatic, and concrete methods of developing socially accepted truthfulness.

The other intriguing item that appears via this study is the number of learning disabled children who felt they were able to handle stressful situations by themselves. Are these children able to handle stress as they state? Or are these type answers reflective of minor pathology in evaluation of self capabilities? Or are the non-learning disabled students surveyed not mindful of their own strengths? Are these responses from the learning disabled students merely "macho" and mean nothing more than the typical learning disabled child's facility at conversation? A classroom teacher may need to deal with individual children, some of whom are in each proposed category. Value for the teacher comes from awareness that a child in the class holds these perceptions which may not be healthy for future growth and development of the child. Again, methods to address this possibly deviate response would be a class bibliotherapy project and role playing, adequate class discussion of stress, and where to go for
help in handling situations.

Summary

Probably the three most valuable items garnered from this study of interest for the classroom teacher are: 1) knowledge that the learning disabled and the non-learning disabled student are far more alike in their perspective of friends and friendships than they are different; 2) the availability of an instrument such as the Friendship Questionnaire to reveal easily tabulated information concerning children's perceptions of friends and friendships; and 3) concrete suggestions for the classroom teacher to remediate possible social incompetencies in children.

The first value, the likeness between the populations, is most evident in the congruent placement of the first and last three items on the attributes listed in questions four and nineteen. Further evidence of likenesses of the two groups surfaces in the essay responses to question 20 (How do you make or find friends) which elicited unexpected conformity including the similarity of the reporting pairs as well as the priority placed on friendliness by the children. All the children's responses fell into one of several categories whether learning disabled or non-learning disabled. The children felt friends were developed by going someplace (the park or mall or playground) and by asking the name of a child, inviting a child to play, or by asking someone to come home and visit. The essay responses revealed that the most frequently mentioned methods of initiating new
relationships were humor, politeness, and conversation. Children in both populations were willing to go out and seek friends using these methods. A 5th grade learning disabled girl provides a representative example when she states:

I be nice to them and I don't call them bad names like other friends. I find my friends at school. When I move into a new house, I go around the block. When I see a person I say 'hi' to them; then I ask what their name is and they tell me. Then we start playing and I say that I'll play with you tomorrow.

Her non-learning disabled partner countered with four suggestions in a similar vein make or find friends:

Just be myself and being polight.

Having a good atidude.

Helping if needed.

Don't be a snot or be stuck up.

The other major categories of answers included the very short reply, the sports minded reply, the sharing attitude respond, and the often used phrases method to reply to this question. Representative of the brief answer are the many pairs that merely wrote the word "Hi" to make or find new friends. This response was closely followed by the student pairs that responded with, "I say hello to them." Then there were the sports minded. These children had to explain how they would play various kinds of ball with new persons, right after they said, "Hi" to them. Sharing
was also mentioned as a factor in making and finding new friends. When telling or listing things to do for finding new friends many children noted they would share toys, trucks, balls, games, food, time and other friends. Several old phrases were written down about friends. For example, the most often cited phrases were, "Be a friend to have a friend" and "Kill them with kindness" as methods to develop new friends.

The second value gleaned from this study for educators would be the Questionnaire itself. The Friendship Questionnaire can be used to gain insight into students or to aid in values clarification for the students, or just to raise the topic for discussion. Furthermore, the Questionnaire could be valuable in working with emotionally disturbed children to elicit conversation as well as information. The Questionnaire is not difficult to administer for these purposes. This researcher found that children enjoyed having their opinions deemed valuable enough to take up class time. They willingly participated by giving thoughtful consideration to the questions as evidenced by the attentive atmosphere and quiet concentration during the administration of the Questionnaire.

The third value would be the teacher suggestions (Deshler and Schumaker, 1983; Learner, 1985) for direct teaching of the learning disabled, socially incompetent student to facilitate development of adequate social skills and social perceptions. As Learner (1985) suggests social competencies, self concept and
emotional attitudes may be developed in the child via various methods and materials. The direct teaching of social skills has been found to be very successful in a variety of settings (Learner, 1985; Deshler & Schumaker, 1983; Gearheart & Litton, 1979).

Conclusion

Although a statistical difference was not found between the two populations with regard to friends and friendship, this investigation did provide insights into learning disabled and non-learning disabled student's feelings, and opinions about friends. By prompting the development of the Friendship Questionnaire, which educators may find useful in the classroom, and by including possible methods of modifying behavior for specific student responses to the Questionnaire, implications for educators have been addressed. The theoretical context that the results do corroborate, the inclusion of weaknesses and remediation as well as future research directions sought to place this study in the proper prospective.

Some additional thoughts concerning the results of this study deal with the nature of significance. Future educational research needs to keep in mind the value of studies that do not confirm their hypothesis. The search for statistically significant differences can be viewed as limiting. Further learning can occur from each attempt to investigate the complex area of interpersonal relationships within the learning disabled population. If the
present research has served to stimulate interest, to shed light on children's behaviors, or to cause the reader to think, develop, or to implement future work aimed at illuminating the social needs of learning disabled children, then the study has achieved a valuable goal.
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APPENDIX A

FINAL STUDY EDITION OF FRIENDSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE
The questions on this survey are about your feelings on friends and friendships. Please feel free to write in your reply in the spaces provided when the printed ones do not fit your feelings.

Remember this is just a survey, and it is not going to be graded. So do not put your name on the paper. But please do write in your grade, sex, today's date, number of brothers or sisters living with you, and circle how many times you have moved and check your ethnic background.

1) We get to know many people we call friends in our lifetime, though we often notice a difference between "close friends" and "school friends":

How many "close friends" do you feel that you have?
   a)none b)one to five c)six to ten d)eleven to 15 e)more than 15

How many "school friends" do you feel that you have?
   a)none b)one to five c)six to ten d)eleven to 15 e)more than 15

2) Are there people that you remain friends with even though you do not see them often?
   a)yes b)no

3) At what age did you first get to know your "best close friend"?
   a)3 to 6 b)7 to 9 c)10 to 12

4) To put each of the following friendship qualities in order of their importance to you, please choose the most important item in Set A and circle it, then put a number 2 in front of the second most important, a number 3 in front of the third most important, and a number 4 in front of the forth most important item. Please repeat these directions for Set B, Set C, and Set D.

Set A intelligence
   __has the same moral values
   __has the same goals or interests
   __is good looking

Set B loyal
   __willing to make time for me
   __has about the same sports abilities as I do
   __is the same sex as myself

Set C Sense of humor
   __about my age
   __truthfulness
   __keeper of secrets

Set D has about the same home life as
   __I do
   __is the same racial or ethnic background as I am
   __is a cheerful person

5) If you have a "very-best friend" how often do you do things together?
   a)most of the time b)about ½ the time c)we only do things together if my friend wants to d)not very often

6) Do you ever feel that you behave or act differently in the company of different friends?
   a)yes b)no c)sometimes

7) Would you tell your best "close friend" if you were going to die?
   a)yes b)no c)don't know d)

8) Does success in school often get in the way of having lots of friends?
   a)yes b)no c)does not make a difference d)sometimes e)
9) Have you done any of the following things with friends recently? Check yes or no.

a) taken part in after school sports
   yes) no)
b) watched a sporting event together
   yes) no)
c) gone to dinner in a restaurant
   yes) no)
d) eaten a meal at a friend's house
   yes) no)
e) gone to a movie or concert
   yes) no)
f) had a fight or argument
   yes) no)
g) broke off a friendship
   yes) no)
h) started a new friendship
   yes) no)
i) spend the weekend at each other's house
   yes) no)
j) went to a club meeting with a friend
   yes) no)
k) went shopping with a friend
   yes) no)
l) had a friend ask me to do something for him/her
   yes) no)
m) asked a friend to do something for me
   yes) no)

10) Would you tell your best "close friend" about something that you were very proud about?

   a) yes b) no c) don't know d)

11) Do you ever talk with a "close friend" about how special your friendship is?

   a) yes b) no c) sometimes d)

12) Would you tell your best "close friend" about a failure you had in school?

   a) yes b) no c) sometimes d) only if I were asked

13) At a time when you are very upset who would you first turn to for support and advice?

   a) family b) friends c) no one

14) Please check which of the following you would expect of your family, which you would expect of a "close friend", and which you would expect of a "school friend".

Please "X" your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family Members</th>
<th>&quot;Close Friends&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;School Friends&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) take my side in a fight or argument with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) give me money when I ask for it, or need it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) share something of value or special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) tell me without my asking if he/she believed that I was making a mistake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) visit or call me if I were hurt or sick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) share special information or gossip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) tell me his or her most private thoughts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) risk hurting himself/herself to help me if I were in danger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) share something special to eat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15) Do you think friendship is a kind of love?

   a) yes b) no c) don't know d)

16) Would you tell your best "close friend" that you love them?

   a) yes b) no c) don't know d)

17) Have you any friends that you used to dislike a lot?

   a) yes b) no c)
18) Do you now dislike someone who used to be your friend?
a) yes  b) no  c)___

19) In general, what is there about you that makes your friends like you? Please put these friendship qualities in order of their importance. Choose the most important item in Set A and circle it, then put a number 2 in front of the second most important, a number 3 in front of the third most important, and a number 4 in front of the fourth most important item. Repeat these directions for Set B, Set C, and Set D.

I am Set A ___intelligent
___good looking
___truthful
___a keeper of secrets

I have the same Set B home life as my friends
___racial or ethnic background as my friends
___goals or interests as my friends
___moral values as my friends

I have a Set C ___sense of humor
___about the same sports
___abilities as my friends
___a cheerful personality

I am Set D ___loyal
___about the same age as my friends
___the same sex as my friends
___willing to make time for my friends

20) How do you make or find friends? Please answer in your own words. Spelling is not counted.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

ORIGINAL PILOT EDITION FRIENDSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE
This is a survey, and is NOT going to be graded. So, DO NOT put your name on it. But, please circle the grade that you are in and your sex and the top of this page. Additionally, write in the date in the space provided.

The questions in this survey are about your feelings on friends and friendships. Please feel free to write in your reply in the spaces provided when the printed ones do not fit your feelings.
1) We get to know many people we call friends in our life, though we often notice a difference between "close friends" and "school friends". How many "school friends" do you have?
   a) none  b) one to five  c) six to ten  d) eleven to 15  e) more than 15

2) How many people do you call your "close friends"?
   a) none  b) one to five  c) six to ten  d) eleven to 15  e) more than 15

4) Are there people that you remain friends with even though you do not see them often?
   a) yes  b) no

5) Where did your "close friends" often begin?
   a) school  b) neighbors  c) family  d) sports  e) clubs  f) other friends
   g) friends of my family  h) other_______

6) How long have you had your oldest "close friend"?
   a) since the beginning of this school year  b) since third grade  c) since kindergarten  d) other_______

7) How important is each of those qualities in a friend? PLEASE CHECK AS MANY AS YOU WANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not At All Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good looks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree with my ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp dresser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense of humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about my age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truthfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm and affectionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keeps secrets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing to make time for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has about the same abilities and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home life as I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) Are any of your "close friends" members of a racial group different from yours?
   a) yes  b) no

9) Are more of your close friends of the same sex as you, or of the opposite sex?
   a) yes  b) no  c) about \( \frac{1}{2} \) are boys and \( \frac{1}{2} \) are girls

10) Are your friendships with the people of the opposite sex different than your friendships with the people of your sex?
    a) yes  b) no  c) sometimes

If they are different, in what ways are the friendships you have with the opposite sex different from the friendships you have with the people of your sex? CIRCLE AS MANY AS YOU WANT
    a) we have more ideas and activities to share
    b) sometimes my same sex friends understand me better
    c) boys and girls cannot share some important activities
    d) sometimes my opposite sex friends understand me better
    e) society does not encourage boys and girls to be friends

11) If you have a very best friend, do you usually do things together?
    a) yes  b) about \( \frac{1}{2} \) the time  c) we only do things together if my friend really wants to
    d) no

12) In at least some cases do you feel that you behave or act differently in the company of different friends?
    a) yes  b) no  c) sometimes

13) Have you done any of the following things with friends since school started this year?

    PLEASE CHECK YES OR NO

    |           | YES | NO |
    |-------------------|
    | a) taken part in after school sports |
    | b) watched a sporting event |
    | c) gone to dinner in a restaurant |
    | d) had a meal at home with friends |
    | e) gone to a movie or concert |
    | f) asked your friend or friends to do something for you |
    | g) had a friend ask you to do something for him or her |
    | h) went shopping |
    | i) went to a club meeting that we both belong to |
    | j) spent the weekend at each other's home |
    | k) had a fight or argument |
14) Would you tell your best "close friend" if you were going to die?
   a) yes    b) no   c) don't know

15) Would you tell your best "close friend" about something that you are very proud about?
   a) yes    b) no   c) don't know

16) Would you tell you best "close friend" about a failure you had in school?
   a) yes    b) no   c) don't know   d) only if I were asked

17) Do you ever talk with a "close friend" about how special your friendship is?
   a) yes    b) no   c) sometimes

   If you do talk about it, do you talk about it with:
   a) same sex friends only   b) opposite sex friends only   c) friends of both sexes

18) I feel lonely:
   a) never   b) seldom   c) sometimes   d) often

23) At a time when you are very upset who would you first turn to for support and advice?
   a) family before friends   b) friends before family   c) prefer to handle it myself

24) Does success in school often lower your chances of having lots of friends?
   a) yes    b) no   c) does not make any difference   d) sometimes
25) HOW MUCH do you AGREE OR DISAGREE with each of the following statements?

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR REPLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Close Friend</th>
<th>School Friend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) people cannot be friends with their parents</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) people cannot be friends with their teacher</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) people cannot be friends with their step parents</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) parents cannot be friends with their children</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26) Please check which of the following you would expect of your family, which you would expect of "close friends" and which you would expect of "school friends":

CHECK ALL STATEMENTS THAT APPLY TO EACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Close Friend</th>
<th>School Friend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) take my side in fights or arguments with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) give me money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) share something special to eat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) tell me without my asking if he or she believed that I was making a mistake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) visit or call me if I was hurt or sick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) share special information or gossip about me if they heard anyone talking about me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) tell me his or her most private thoughts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) risk hurting himself or herself to help me if I were in danger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27) Do you think friendship is a kind of love?

a) yes  b) no  c) sometimes

If yes, would you tell your best "close friend" that you love them?

a) yes  b) no  c) don't know

29) Are you

a) Black  b) White  c) Oriental  d) Spanish  e) American Indian  f) Other

30) How many times have you moved in your life?

a) never  b) one  c) two  d) three  e) four  f) five or more times
APPENDIX C

SHORTENED SECOND EDITION FRIENDSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE
This questionnaire is part of a survey. It is not going to be graded. DO NOT put your name on the questionnaire. The questions on this questionnaire are about your feelings on friends and friendships. Please feel free to write in your reply if the printed answers do not fit your feelings.

1) We get to know many people we call "friends" in our life, though we often notice a difference between "close friends" and "school friends." How many "school friends" do you feel that you have?
   a) none  b) one to five  c) six to ten  d) eleven to 15  e) more than 15

2) How many "close friends" do you feel that you have?
   a) none  b) one to five  c) six to ten  d) eleven to 15  e) more than 15

3) Are any of your "close friends" members of a racial or ethnic group that is different than your own?
   a) yes  b) no  c)_____

4) Are your "close friends" the same or opposite sex as yourself?
   a) the same sex  b) the opposite sex as yourself?
   a) the same sex  b) the opposite sex  c) about ½ boys and ½ girls
   d)_____

5) How much do you agree with each of the following statements, Please circle your reply:
   a) people cannot be friends with their parents----agree / no opinion / disagree
   b) people cannot be friends with their teacher----agree / no opinion / disagree
   c) people cannot be friends with their step parents----agree / no opinion / disagree
   d) parents cannot be friends with their children----agree / no opinion / disagree
6) Do you feel that a "close friendship" is a kind of love?  
   a) yes  b) no  c) sometimes  d)__________________________

7) Are there people that you remain friends with even though you do not see them often?  
   a) yes  b) no  c) sometimes  d)__________________________

8) How important is each of these qualities in a friend? Please check as many as you want:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>a little important</th>
<th>not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) good looks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) agrees with my ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) good dresser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) sense of humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) about my age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) truthful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) loyal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) keeps secrets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) has about the same abilities as I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) has about the same home life as I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   l) comments:
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CHUMSHIP CHECKLIST
Chumship checklist

1. Play games in which you both take turns being the leader.
2. Walk to school together.
3. Help out when one of you gets behind in his work.
4. Talk about girls.
5. Share each other's games, bat and ball, etc.
6. Tell each other things you wouldn't tell anyone else.
7. 'Stick up' for each other if an older boy is picking on one of you.
8. Sit together on school bus.
9. Try to be on same side when choosing teams for football or baseball, even if he is not the best player.
10. Do 'fun' things together, such as going to the movies or ball games.
11. Tell each other if one of you has done something wrong.
12. Phone each other about school assignments.
13. Talk about what you want to be when you grow up.
14. Sleep over at each other's house.
15. Talk about your parents.
16. Find it hard to disagree with him on important things.
17. Go on a vacation or short trip with him and his family.

APPENDIX E
MARY PARLEE'S ORIGINAL ADULT SURVEY AS PUBLISHED
IN PSYCHOLOGY TODAY IN MARCH, 1979
complexity of the subject. It is simply very difficult to study such a phenomenon scientifically, and psychologists, like other scientists, cannot be blamed for addressing what look like easier problems first.

However, a number of psychologists who are doing research on related topics have begun to move toward studying friendship directly. In his textbook *Liking and Loving* (1973), psychologist Zick Rubin of Brandeis University reviewed his own and others' research on what attracts people to one another, a process that obviously plays a role in friendship. The researchers he discussed, however, were not directly concerned with finding out what that role is. But more recently, Rubin, psychologist Robert Selman of Harvard, and others have begun to study friendship itself—in children. Social psychologist Letitia Anne Peplau of UCLA is among those doing systematic research on loneliness, a topic that may eventually involve more researchers in the related study of friendship.

Recent work by sociologist Claude Fischer and his colleagues at Berkeley, as well as by others, has explored the way that social networks (of colleagues at work, neighbors, family) structure opportunities for friendship. That is, the way in which networks provide a circle of acquaintances, some of whom become friends, some of whom do not. The research has shown that social networks provide the individual with crucial psychological support in times of trouble or crisis, but it does not look directly at the psychological experiences and actions that intuitively seem to us to lie at the heart of friendship.

The present survey, developed by psychologist Mary Brown Parlee and other editors of *Psychology Today*, gives you the chance to tell us—and gives us the chance to learn—about your experiences with friends and your ideas on friendship. We will analyze your responses and report on the results in a later issue. Since a questionnaire necessarily limits the descriptions you can give and the ideas you can convey, we would welcome letters if you feel there are other issues that should be included in the report. For each question below, please circle only one answer, unless otherwise requested, skip any questions that do not apply to you. All replies should be completely anonymous.

Please put your answers on the reply form that follows the questionnaire, tear out, and mail by March 31, 1979 to:

Friendship Survey
Psychology Today
One Park Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10016

### PART I: YOU AND YOUR FRIENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many people do you consider to be close (as opposed to casual or work) friends?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. One to five</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Six to 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eleven to 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More than 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How many casual or work friends do you have?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. One to five</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Six to 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eleven to 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More than 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you find it difficult to decide how many of your friends are close friends?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there people you remain friends with even though you don't see each other for long periods of time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If so, how do you keep in touch? (Circle as many as apply)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Regular reunions once or twice a year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Through mutual friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. We don't keep in touch but we're still friends when we do see each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5  Where did most of your close friendships begin? (Circle as many as apply.)
1 Childhood (through high school)
2 College graduate or professional school
3 Work
4 Neighbors
5 Spous
6 Clubs organizations
7 Friends of friends
8 Friends of family
9 Other

6  How old is your longest close friendship?
1 Less than one year old
2 Two to five years old
3 Six to ten years old
4 Eleven to 20 years old
5 More than 20 years old

7  How important to you is each of these qualities in a friend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Intelligence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Physical attractiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Similar political views</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Supportiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E About my age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Similar educational background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Sense of humor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Similar occupation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Similar income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Frankness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Warmth, affection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Shares leisure (noncultural)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Shares cultural interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Loyalty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Professional accomplishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Keeps confidences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Ability to help me professionally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Good conversationalist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Willingness to make time for me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Independence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Social conscience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Abilities and background different from mine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8  I don't have enough time right now to see my friends as often as I would like
1 Agree
2 Disagree

9  Are any of your close friends members of a racial group other than your own?
1 Yes
2 No

10 Are most of your friends of your own ethnic and or religious background?
1 Yes
2 No

11 Do you have close friends who are homosexual?
1 Yes, female friends
2 Yes, male friends
3 Yes, both male and female friends
4 No

12 Are more of your close friends of the same sex as you or the opposite sex?
1 My sex
2 Opposite sex
3 About half are men and half are women

13 Do you think your friendships with people of the opposite sex are different from your friendships with people of the same sex?
1 Yes
2 No

14 In couples that you know, are you usually close friends with both partners or just one partner?
1 Both partners
2 One partner
3 Does not apply

15 If you are friends with just one partner do you see him or her separately or with his or her partner?
1 Yes
2 No

16 Are you friends with just one partner do you see him or her separately or with his or her partner?
1 Yes
2 No

17 In couples that you know are you usually close friends with both partners or just one partner?
1 Yes
2 No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you done the following with friends in the past month?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Participated in sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Watched a sporting event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Gone to dinner in a restaurant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Had a meal at home or at your friend's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Had sexual intercourse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Gone to a movie, play, or concert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Gone drinking together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Asked your friend (or friends) to do something for you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Had a friend ask you to do something for him or her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Smoked pot together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Had an intimate talk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Done something with your children together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Gone shopping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Gone to a meeting of an organization you both (or all) belong to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Conducted a business transaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Taken a vacation together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Quarreled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you ever talk with a close friend about the qualities of the friendship?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you do, do you discuss it with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Same-sex friends only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Opposite-sex friends only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Friends of both sexes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you sometimes talk with any of your friends about sexual activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes, in general terms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yes, in detail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With whom do you usually spend Thanksgiving?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Both friends and family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I spend it alone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It varies from year to year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that many of your friendships are not completely reciprocal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you any friend now whom you used to dislike intensely?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel lonely?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you any friend now whom you used to dislike intensely?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which if any of the following has led to a friendship's cooling off or ending?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. A friend borrowed money from me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. I borrowed money from a friend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. We took a vacation together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. My friend became involved with (or married) someone I didn't like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. One of us became markedly more successful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. One of us had a child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. One of us got married</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. My friend got divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. I got divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. One of us moved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. One of us became much richer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. We discovered that we had very different views on issues that are important to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. I felt that my friend betrayed me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In an emotional crisis to whom would you first turn for support and advice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Family before friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Friends before family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional counselors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prefer to go it alone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it important to you that your family and friends get to know one another?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I wouldn't want them to know one another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. You can fall in love at first sight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. You can form friendships at first sight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Friendships end more gradually than love affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. You have to know someone a long time before you can be sure he or she is your friend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the qualities of your lover or spouse lead you to seek him or her out as a friend?
1. Yes
2. No
3. I don't have a lover or a spouse right now

Do you ever talk with your spouse or lover about the relationship?
1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Often

I feel more confident when I am with a close friend than when I am with my spouse or lover.
1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Don't know

Have any of your ongoing friendships turned into sexual relationships?
1. Yes
2. No

How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

A. People cannot be friends with their parents
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

B. People cannot be friends with their boss or employees
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

C. People cannot be friends with their former spouses or lovers
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

D. People cannot be friends with their children
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

E. People cannot be friends with someone with whom they are romantically involved
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

Professional success often reduces opportunities for friendship
1. Generally agree
2. Generally disagree
3. Professional success has no effect on friendship

How would you describe the relative importance of work and of friends in your life now, as compared with five years ago?
1. Then, I cared more about my friends and less about my work.
2. Then, I cared more about my work and less about my friends.
3. Then, I cared more about both.
4. Then, work and friends were less important to me than they are now.
5. The importance of work and of friends in my life has not changed.
6. I can't remember how important work and/or friends were then.

In the past five years, have you become
1. Very successful in your work.
2. Moderately successful in your work.
3. No change.
4. Had setbacks in your work.

Please indicate which of the following you would expect of your family, which you would expect of close friends, and which you would expect of casual friends. Circle all that apply to each of the three groups.

A. Take my side in disputes with others
B. Lend me up to $10 in an emergency
C. Lend me what to him or her would be a substantial amount of money in an emergency
D. Advise me unasked, if he or she believes I am making a mistake
E. Make room for me in his or her house in an emergency
F. Visit me in the hospital if I were ill
G. Accept me as I am, flaws and all
H. Share privileged information or gossip about me if he or she hears any
I. Tell me his or her most intimate feelings
J. Introduce me to those of his or her close friends I don't already know
K. Make time in a busy schedule to stay in touch
L. Risk personal safety to help me if I were in danger

Would you lie in a divorce court to help a close friend?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Only a little lie

Do you think your closest friend ought to help you commit suicide if you wanted to and were too feeble to do it yourself?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. I am opposed to suicide

Do you think friendship is a form of love?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

If yes, would you tell your closest friend that you love them?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Professional success is a form of love?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

If yes, would you treat your closest friends the way you love them?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure
4. Too strong

Opinion: On a separate sheet of paper describe one of your closest friendships explaining why it is important to you. Add any other comments you want to make.

PART II: BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

What is your age?
1. Under 18
2. 18 to 24
3. 25 to 34
4. 35 to 44
5. 45 to 54
6. Over 55

What is your sex?
1. Female
2. Male

What is your sexual orientation?
1. Heterosexual
2. Homosexual
3. Bisexual