

**Close friends: Same- and cross-sex friendship formation using both
same- and cross-sex friendship formation factors**

by

Annick D. Boulet

**A Thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of**

Master of Arts

**Department of Psychology
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba**

© Annick D. Boulet, 2004

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION**

**Close friends: Same- and cross-sex friendship formation using both
same- and cross-sex friendship formation factors**

BY

Annick D. Boulet

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University of
Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirement of the degree
Of
MASTER OF ARTS**

Annick D. Boulet © 2004

Permission has been granted to the Library of the University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to University Microfilms Inc. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.

This reproduction or copy of this thesis has been made available by authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research, and may only be reproduced and copied as permitted by copyright laws or with express written authorization from the copyright owner.

Acknowledgements

First, and most importantly, I would like to thank God for having given me the qualities necessary to succeed at this task and to have carried me through it all. This experience has definitely shaped me into a person that I am proud of being and I am glad that he put me through this experience.

I would like to thank Dr. Marian Morry for her constant support, patience, and encouragement. I have stumbled many times in the past years and she was always there to offer help and kind words when most people would have become very frustrated. These few years have been a pinnacle period in my personal growth and she has been my greatest source of inspiration.

I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Beverly Fehr and Dr. Jason Brown for taking time out of their schedules to participate in this project. They were always very supportive and full of encouraging words.

I would like to thank Dr. André Samson. He was the first person to introduce me to psychology and is the reason why I fell in love with it in the first place. His love and enthusiasm for psychology, combined with excellent teaching skills, got hold of me and never let me go. He was a great source of inspiration, and provided me help that was crucial to my success.

I would like to thank my parents, Mary and Donald Boulet. They have been a constant source of support, financial and morally. They were the ones who instilled the values and goals that led me to this point. Without their influence in my life, I doubt that I would be have accomplished all that I have. They are a constant source

of inspiration, encouragement, and love, which have gotten me, and will get me through anything.

I would like to thank my siblings, Myriam, Jean-Daniel, and Josée, along with all of my friends, who have been a constant source of support. Their patience, love, and understanding have made this whole experience much easier that it would have been otherwise.

Abstract

Previous studies on same- and cross-sex friendship formation have examined these friendships with regards to separate formation factors. The present study examined same- and cross-sex friendship formation using both same- and cross-sex friendship formation factors. Evolutionary Theory and Social Learning Theory were used to examine this issue. Although cross-sex friendship formation factors had some impact on same- and cross-sex friendship formation, same-sex friendship formation factors proved to be the most important factors for both same- and cross-sex friendships. A MANOVA with follow-up tests indicated that the general order (with a few exceptions) of importance in friendship formation was: emotional access, companionship, situational, dyadic, individual, environmental, protection, and sexual access. Contrary to Evolutionary Theory, protection and sexual access, which are presumed to be the main reasons for cross-sex friendship formation, were always rated the least important factors for friendship formation. Emotional access and companionship were important for both men and women in friendship formation, which is evidence in support of social learning theory. Pearson correlations did not demonstrate that individuals involved in heterosexual romantic relationships had fewer friends than those who were not in romantic relationships. In addition, there were no differences based on romantic involvement in the number of same- or cross-sex friendships. In conclusion, previously categorized same-sex factors are really general friendship factors and future research should use these general factors for all friendship formation research.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....1

 Defining friendships.....2

 Types of friendships.....3

 Same-sex friendships.....4

 Cross-sex friendships.....7

 Defining cross-sex friendships.....7

 Cross-sex friendship research.....8

 Cross-sex friendships before adulthood.....9

 Friendship and the interference of romantic relationships.....10

 Same-sex friendships.....10

 Cross-sex friendships.....10

 Friendship formation.....11

 Same-sex friendship formation.....12

 Environmental factors.....12

 Individual factors.....13

 Situational factors.....13

 Dyadic factors.....14

 Summary of friendship formation factors.....14

 Cross-sex friendship formation.....14

 Five challenges to cross-sex friendships.....17

 Theories.....19

 Evolutionary theory.....19

Social learning theory.....	21
Both theories.....	23
Overview.....	24
Method.....	25
Participants.....	25
Procedure.....	26
Materials.....	26
Demographics.....	26
Friendship formation factors.....	27
Relationship status.....	28
Open-ended responses.....	29
Results.....	29
Preliminary analyses.....	29
Determining the presence of categories.....	29
Dealing with the issue of relevant / non-relevant.....	30
Friendship formation factors.....	32
Factor main effect.....	33
Participant sex by factor interaction.....	33
Friendship type by factor interaction.....	35
Friendship type by participant sex by factor interaction.....	36
Do men and women form cross-sex friendships for different reasons?.....	39
Are cross-sex friendship formation factors as important in same-sex friendships as in cross-sex friendships?.....	40

Are same-sex friendship formation factors as important in same-sex friendships as in cross-sex friendships?.....42

Relationship status and the number of friends.....43

 Difference between those who are in a romantic relationship and those who are not.....43

 Length of time in a romantic relationship and the number of friends.....44

 Length of time in a relationship and the number of same- and cross-sex friends.....45

Discussion.....46

 Friendship formation factors.....46

 Emotional access and companionship.....46

 Sexual access and protection.....49

 Comparing all friendship formation factors.....51

 Relationship status and the number of friends.....55

 Limitations.....58

 Future directions.....60

 Conclusion.....62

Footnote.....63

References.....64

Tables.....69

Appendices.....81

List of Tables

Table 1. Correlations between all friendship formation actors.....	69
Table 2. Means for all participants for each friendship formation factor.....	70
Table 3. Means for men and women for each friendship formation factor.....	71
Table 4. Means for same- and cross-sex friendships for each friendship formation factor.....	72
Table 5. Means for men and women within same- or cross-sex friendships for each friendship formation factor.....	73
Table 6. Means comparing men and women within same- and cross-sex friendships for cross-sex friendship formation factors	74
Table 7. Means comparing men and women within same- or cross-sex friendships for same-sex friendship formation factors.....	75
Table 8. Means comparing same- and cross-sex friendships for men and women for cross-sex friendship formation factors.....	76
Table 9. Means comparing same- and cross-sex friendships for men and women for same-sex friendship formation factors.....	77
Table 10. Mean number of friends for men and women in romantic relationships.....	78
Table 11. Correlations between length of time in a romantic relationship and the number of friends.....	79
Table 12. Correlations between length of time in a romantic relationship and the number of friends for men and women.....	80

Close friends: Same- and cross-sex friendship formation using both
same- and cross-sex friendship formation factors

Most people have at least one friend in their lifetime. If friends are so common, a logical question to ask is “How are friendships formed?” Researchers have examined this question on a variety of different levels. Most frequently, this issue has been studied by examining same-sex friendships. Although a variety of same-sex friendship formation factors have been explored, the majority of these factors are contained in four categories: environmental, individual, situational, and dyadic factors (Fehr, 1996).

In contrast, the study of friendship formation among cross-sex friendships has been neglected. Some researchers have proposed that individuals, mostly male, initiate cross-sex friendships to have access to sex (Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2001; Rose, 1985). Bleske-Rechek and Buss (2001) have also proposed that females initiate cross-sex friendships for protection. A select few have studied cross-sex friendship formation using same-sex friendship formation factors (e.g., Rose, 1985). However, there are problems with these studies. For example, participants in Rose’s (1985) study responded using open-ended rather than forced choice questions. This method could lead to omissions, in the sense that the participants may not have accessed all relevant factors. In addition, participants might have used stereotypes or lay theories to answer questions about relationships. Finally, there are studies that show that women’s same-sex friendships are more emotional and include more self-disclosure, whereas men’s same-sex friendships are more activity-based (Wright & Scalon, 1991;

Monsour, 1992; Duck & Wright, 1993; Brehm, 1992). These differences could lead to different reasons why men and women form cross-sex friendships.

My study will examine both same-sex and cross-sex friendship formation using same-sex and cross-sex formation factors while eliminating the problems in the previous studies. By using all factors, I can test if there is any validity to the sexual access and protection aspects in cross-sex friendship formation. I will also test if emotional and social factors are important to cross-sex friendship formation. For example, do men search for cross-sex friends for emotional closeness and self-disclosure? Do women search for cross-sex friends for companionship?

Defining friendships

If someone were to ask an individual if they know what a friend is, the answer would most probably be yes. However, if one would ask that person to define friendship, chances are that the individual would have greater difficulties. Friendship is a term that everyone knows but that no one can fully define. Fehr (1996) stated that "there are virtually as many definitions of friendship as there are social scientists studying the topic" (p.5). Depending on the area of the world, or the country you live in, different qualities are seen as important for friendship. For example, in the Eastern hemisphere, values like affection, trust, and loyalty are seen as salient whereas in the United States, expressive intimacy is particularly important (Winstead, Derlega, & Rose, 1997).

Defining friendship can be challenging. There are numerous variables to consider when constructing a definition. Some authors choose to include family members and romantic partners in their definition whereas others do not (Fehr, 1996).

Some researchers choose to focus on emotional aspects (i.e. love, understanding), physical aspects (i.e. proximity, time spent together), or a combination of both. Friendship can also be described in different ways such as acquaintances, casual friends, close friends, good friends, and best friends (Monsour, 2002). In this study, friendship will only be defined as non-familial and non-romantic. No additional information will be added to this definition (see Fehr, 1996 for a list of several definitions).

In addition to the definition of friendship, a distinction also needs to be made between the types of friendships that exist. Two types of friendship important for my research are same-sex and cross-sex friendships.

Types of friendships

Friendship in general has been the focus of a considerable number of studies. Most studies have concentrated on same-sex friendships. A same-sex friendship is a relationship where both individuals are of the same sex. This would constitute male-male and female-female friendships. Male-female friendships are referred to as opposite-sex, other-sex, cross-gender, or cross-sex. This type of friendship will be defined and explored later.

Research indicates that cross- and same-sex friendships are different (O'Meara, 1989, 1994; Afifi & Faulkner, 2000; Monsour, 2002) but research has also demonstrated that there are differences within same-sex friendships between female-female and male-male friendships (Wright & Scanlon, 1991; Monsour, 1992; Duck & Wright, 1993; Brehm, 1992; Caldwell & Peplau, 1982)

Same-sex friendships

Same-sex friendships have been the basis of friendship research since this area was first studied. Throughout the decades, a wide range of topics has been examined. For example, same-sex friendships have been studied with respect to formation, maintenance, termination, and sex-differences. My research examines friendship formation factors, therefore, only sex-differences potentially relevant to this stage will be discussed.

One topic that seems to captivate the interest of friendship researchers and of the lay community is sex differences in same-sex friendships. In other words, are male-male friendships much different than female-female friendships? A variety of sex-differences have been found. For example, women's friendships tend to be more expressive, emotional, intimate, richer, and include more self-disclosure than men's, whereas men's friendships tend to be more instrumental than women's friendships. In other words, men's friendships tend to be task, goal- and activity-oriented (Wright & Scalon, 1991; Monsour, 1992; Duck & Wright, 1993; Brehm, 1992). Moreover, when asked to choose from a list what they enjoy doing the most with their friends, women select "just talking" three times more than men do and men select engaging in activities twice as much as women do (Caldwell & Peplau, 1982).

The gender differences that exist between male-male friendships and female-female friendships have clearly been demonstrated in the literature but lately, scholars have questioned its magnitude (Fehr, 2000). Recent research points to the fact that both men and women look for more or less the same things from their same-sex friends. That is, these friendships are more similar than they are different. Rose

(1985) stated that intimacy, help, companionship, and acceptance were mentioned most often when young adults discussed important functions of same-sex friendships. In a study conducted by Helgeson, Shaver, and Dyer (1987), men and women equally described five dimensions as important in a same-sex friendship: feeling appreciative of the friend, expressing the appreciation, feeling happiness, talking, and sharing activities. In Monsour's (1992) study, both male and female undergraduate students indicated that self-disclosure was central to their definition of intimacy. Self-disclosure was followed by, in declining order, emotional expressiveness, support, physical contact, trust, and mutual activities. Together these studies indicate that there are numerous similarities between men's and women's views of same-sex friendships. "Thus, it is probably more accurate to conclude that both sexes value and define intimacy similarly in same-sex friendship, with differences being more a matter of degree than of substance" (Winstead et al., 1997, p. 120).

One difference that might exist between same-sex friendships of men and women is what is talked about within the friendship (Duck & Wright, 1993). In a study by Caldwell and Peplau (1982), individuals were asked to list what they talked about the most in their same-sex friendships. Women mentioned feelings and problems twice as much as the men did. Men, on the other hand, talked about sports, work, and vehicles. Martin (1997) transcribed several conversations of same-sex friends. He asked his participants to match the conversations with either male-male friends or female-female friends. The participants could identify the conversations by the topics discussed. Men mostly discussed women, sports, fighting, being trapped in relationships, bars, and drinking. Women's conversations dealt more with

relationships, men, clothes, problems with roommates, needs, and feelings. In summary, women talk about personal information, emotion, and relationships, whereas men talk about sports, work, and other non-personal topics (Duck & Wright, 1993; Caldwell & Peplau, 1982; Martin, 1997).

An important difference between same-sex friendships is that female ones tend to be more oriented towards emotional intimacy than male friendships (Dickens & Perlman, 1981). "A cultural norm of homophobia in the United States (i.e., fear of homosexuality or homosexuals) has been argued to have a significant impact on same-sex friendships, particularly men's" (Winstead, et al., 1997, p. 122).

Homophobia often dictates how two men will act with each other. They will generally be less physically affectionate with other men (i.e., hugging, putting arms around each other, and kissing) because they know that this behaviour goes against cultural norms (Derlega, Lewis, Harrison, Winstead, & Costanza, 1989). Several authors have also argued that homophobia restricts men from developing intimate friendships and produces barriers to emotional intimacy (Bank & Hansford, 2000; Winstead, et al., 1997; Derlega, Lewis, Harrison, Winstead, & Costanza, 1989; Lewis, 1978). This cultural norm could have a great effect on male same-sex friendships.

Homophobia is generally greater in men than in women (Winstead, et al., 1997), which cause men's friendships to be different from women's friendships. These differences in physical affection, emotional intimacy, closeness, and conversations could very well be a reason why men and women form cross-sex friendships. It is possible that men look to develop friendships with women because

they are looking for more emotional and physical closeness. Men might be looking for more self-disclosure, more intimacy, and more conversation about personal subjects. Women, on the other hand, might be looking to form friendships with men in order to have a friendship that requires less intimacy, less personal talk, and more of an activity-based friendship.

Hypothesis 1: Men and women will form cross-sex friendships for different reasons.

Hypothesis 1a: Men will form cross-sex friendships for emotional and self-disclosure more than women.

Hypothesis 1b: Women will form cross-sex friendships for companionship in activities more than men.

Cross-sex friendships

Defining cross-sex friendships. A cross-sex friend is where one individual is female and the other is male. A cross-sex friend could include brothers and sisters, mothers and sons, fathers and daughters, married couples or even dating couples. The same problem arises here that also exists when trying to define friendship in general. The dyads mentioned above are all worthy to be called friendship, however they can also all be classified under different terms as well. The first three dyads could be referred to as family members or family relations. The last two, married or dating, are defined as romantic relationships. For this reason, cross-sex friendships in this study will only refer to non-romantic, non-familial relations. More specifically, cross-sex friendships in this study will be based on Monsour's (2002) definition: "A voluntary, nonfamilial, nonromantic, relationship between a female and a male in which both individuals label their association as a friendship" (p. 26). The term non-

romantic might need a bit more clarification. It is obvious that individuals who are married or dating are deemed as romantic relationships. The problem begins with those who are technically not dating, in other words, they do not consider themselves as a couple.

One of O'Meara's (1989, 1994) five challenges for cross-sex friendships, which will be discussed in greater detail later on, is the concern for sexual attraction in the friendship. Most cross-sex friendships will defend their friendship and say that they are just friends (O'Meara's fourth challenge). The problem with defining cross-sex friendships as non-romantic is that the researcher does not know if there is more taking place in the friendship than is shared with others. One study found that 51% of the individuals from their college sample had had sex with a cross-sex friend (Afifi & Faulkner, 2000). These findings suggest that physical relations may exist between cross-sex friends, even if they are not romantically involved. For this reason, when defining cross-sex friendships as non-romantic, one cannot assume that there are no sexual undertones.

Cross-sex friendship research. Cross-sex friendships are a relatively new concept. They have only existed for about 100 years (Swain, 1992). Changes in our society, for example, having women in the work force, have made the existence of cross-sex friendships more prevalent in our society. As gender segregation disappears, men and women are learning how to be friends with each other. These friendships can be difficult to establish, and can pose different challenges than same-sex friendships (Winstead, et al., 1997). Because these friendships are relatively new, they have been

almost ignored in friendship research. Although these friendships are in their infancy, they continue to be more and more prevalent in our everyday lives (Monsour, 2002).

Cross-sex friendship research is lacking at every age level. Although this particular study will focus its attention on young adult cross-sex friendships, these friendships are influenced by earlier interactions. Cross-sex friendships in childhood and adolescence can have a great impact on adult cross-sex friendships (Monsour, 2002).

Cross-sex friendships before adulthood. The study of cross-sex friendship in childhood has been ignored to an even greater extent than in adulthood. These friendships are less frequent, and, therefore, less studied (Thorne, 1986). In childhood, most interactions between sexes are based upon gender and, therefore, those interactions also reinforce gender boundaries. For example, children's games reinforce gender differences, such as "boys catch the girls". Children are also often teased and made fun of if they play and spend time with the other sex (Winstead, et al., 1997).

Forming or failing to form cross-sex friendships in childhood can have an important impact on these type of friendships later on in life. Successfully forming cross-sex friendships in childhood often means that these individuals will form positive cross-sex friendships in later years. Early cross-sex friendships act like blueprints for further interactions (Monsour, 2002).

Adolescent cross-sex friendships are different than childhood ones. Cross-sex friendships are more accepted and having one increases an individual's status among same-sex peers. Adolescents mainly look for cross-sex friends who are sociable and

they expect less from these friendships than they do from same-sex friends (Winstead, et al., 1997).

Friendship and the interference of romantic relationships

Same-sex friendships

Friendship formation can be impacted by numerous variables, including an individual's relationship status (i.e., whether the individual is single, dating, married, and/or has children). An individual's relationship status has already been demonstrated to lead to friendship dissolution (Dickens & Perlman, 1981; Reisman, 1981; Johnson & Leslie, 1982). Romantic relationships pose a great threat to friendships. The more time you spend with your partner, the less time you spend with your friends (Fehr, 1996). When individuals marry, there is also a narrowing of friends as the marriage progresses (Reisman, 1981). Johnson and Leslie (1982) found that the average number of friends for occasional daters was 4.13 as opposed to married individuals who averaged 1.06. Friends can often take the back burner when other people or things take priority. For example, friends become less important to men than their families and careers (Reisman, 1981). Most often, marriage and having children constrain friendships (Dickens & Perlman, 1981).

Cross-sex friendships

It follows that romantic relations, marriages, and children also affect cross-sex friendships. In a study by Rose (1985), 53% of the married women and 67% of married men admitted to having at least one cross-sex friend. On the other hand, of the unmarried participants, all of the undergraduate students, all of the male graduate students, and 73% of the female graduate students mentioned that they had at least

one close cross-sex friend. Rose mentions that these individuals are single.

However, it is unclear whether some or all of the participants were involved in a dating relationship.

In summary, Rose demonstrated that the number of cross-sex friends decreases once married. Other studies have also shown that cross-sex friendships are rare when people are married (Booth, 1972; Chown, 1981) and that it is easier for men to make cross-sex friends when they are not married (Rawlins, 1992). It appears that getting married and having children affects all friendships, but they affect cross-sex friendships even more.

When it comes to friendship formation, it is obvious that romantic relationships, marriages, and children will halt this process to a certain extent. The present study will examine cross-sex friendship formation in young adults. For this reason, individuals who are married and / or have children will be excluded. The only factor of the three mentioned above that affect cross-sex friendship formation that is examined in this study will be involvement in a romantic relationship.

Hypothesis 2: Individuals involved in a heterosexual romantic relationship will have fewer same- and cross-sex friends than single individuals.

Hypothesis 2a: There will be a negative correlation between length of time in a relationship and number of same- and cross-sex friends.

Hypothesis 2b: The negative correlation will be larger for cross-sex friends than same-sex friends.

Friendship formation

Same-sex friendship formation

Have you ever wondered if you had chosen different life paths would you have the same friends? Answering this question could, at times, be very complex. Friendship formation is a combination of several different factors. Researchers have labelled these factors in a number of ways (e.g. Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2001; Rose, 1985; Blass & Schwarcz, 1982). However, Fehr (1996) classified these factors into four simple categories: environmental, individual, situational, and dyadic factors. Each of the different types of friendship formation factors can be placed into these four categories. For this reason, these four groups will be explained more thoroughly.

Environmental factors. Environmental factors are the first category in the classification of friendship formation factors. One important environmental aspect is the area of residence or residential proximity (Fehr, 1996). Many researchers have found that the closer two people live to one another, the more likely that they will become friends (Ebbesen, Kjos, & Konechi, 1976; Nahemow & Lawton, 1975). One study in particular found that the distance between university students' residences was inversely related to friendship formation (Hays, 1985). That is, the closer these students lived to one another, the more likely that they would become friends.

The workplace is another environmental factor that influences friendship formation. Individuals spend a great deal of their day at work. Therefore, the workplace is inevitably an important venue to make friends. One study conducted with approximately 1,000 men living in and around Detroit demonstrated that the largest percentage (26%) of their friendships were made at work (Fisher & Phillips, 1982).

Individual factors. This category deals with reasons for forming a friendship that lie directly within the individual. There are many reasons why a person becomes friends with one individual over another. One of these reasons is physical attractiveness. Research has demonstrated that physical appearance affects friendship formation in both same- and cross-sex friendships (Fehr, 1996). People are attracted to physically attractive others and would rather be friends with an attractive person than with one who is not attractive.

Social skills are another individual factor important in developing friendships. Fehr (1996) states that we are generally prone to become friends with someone who has good social skills. Social skills involve responsiveness to others. For example, Berg and Archer (1980) demonstrated that people high in responsiveness, that is people who are interested in what others are telling them, are generally liked more than individuals low in responsiveness. On the other hand, a shy person may have a lot of problems making friends because this person's social skills and responsiveness are lower than those of the average person (Fehr, 1996). Finally, we are most likely to become friends with someone who is similar to us. This includes demographic characteristics, social status, attitudes, and so on (Fehr, 1996).

Situational factors. In order for a friendship to form, the two people actually have to interact. For example, we are more likely to give attention to someone if there is a chance that we will see that person again (Fehr, 1996). Also, if two people meet a few times, their liking for each other is greater than if they meet just once (Fehr, 1996). Another possible situational factor for starting a friendship is the individual's availability. The two people need to be available for a new friendship. If

one or both people are too busy, it is likely that a friendship will not form (Fehr, 1996).

Dyadic factors. Finally, the last category of friendship formation is dyadic factors. One factor that affects our view of others is whether we think others like us. If we think that another person likes us, we will in turn like that person. Even more so, we will act in a way that will actually increase the other person's liking for us (Fehr, 1996). Another important dyadic factor is self-disclosure. Revealing personal information to a potential new friend is needed in order to form a friendship (Fehr, 1996).

Summary of friendship formation factors. The four categories that have been discussed seem to be independent from one another. Each has its own explanation as to how friendships develop. However, friendship formation is not simple to dissect. One cannot pinpoint exactly one reason why a specific friendship was formed. For this reason, Fehr (1996) indicates that all four categories, environmental, individual, situational, and dyadic converge when it comes to developing new friends.

Hypothesis 3: Same-sex friendship formation factors: (a) environmental, (b) individual, (c) situational, and (d) dyadic will be more important than cross-sex friendship formation factors (to be discussed below): (a) sexual access, (b) protection, (c) emotional intimacy, and (d) companionship for both same-and cross-sex friendships.

Cross-sex friendship formation

Friendship formation has been studied in great detail when it comes to same-sex friendships. Cross-sex friendships, on the other hand, have not received much

attention. In cross-sex friendship formation research it is assumed that there are very different reasons for same and cross-sex friendship formation. Bleske-Rechek and Buss (2001) propose that cross-sex friendship formation and maintenance are based on an evolutionary process. Women search for male friendships for protection and men search for female friendship for sex. The participants in Bleske-Rechek and Buss' study were asked to rate a number of pre-selected items to determine which factors were important in friendship initiation and selection. The results showed that men initiate a cross-sex friendship in order to "gain short-term sexual access to women" (Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2001, p. 1315). Women, on the other hand, form cross-sex friendships in order to gain physical protection. This study shows that cross-sex friendship "serves, in part, a long-term mate acquisition strategy" for both men and women (Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2001, p. 1315).

Bleske-Rechek and Buss' (2001) study focused on evolutionary factors that determine cross-sex friendship initiation. They did not compare cross-sex friendships with same-sex friendships and thus, it is impossible to determine if same- and cross-sex friendship formations differ. For example, Bleske-Rechek and Buss found that women searched for protection in men, but it is possible that women could also search for protection in other women. A study comparing same- and cross-sex friendships would tell us if their findings are limited to cross-sex friendships or if they can be extended to same-sex friendships as well. My study examines similarities and differences in friendship formation.

Another concept that has been studied in cross-sex research is the homosocial norm. "The homosocial norm refers to the seeking, enjoyment, and/or preference for

the company of the same sex that prevails societally” (Rose, 1985, p. 63). In our society, men are often seen as being the dominant sex, the sex with the most control and power. For this reason, men would be considered highly homosocial. They would have no need for women except for procreation. When we attach this concept to cross-sex friendship formation, it would follow that men engage in cross-sex friendships mainly for sexual reasons (Rose, 1985).

Rose (1985) examined same and cross-sex friendship development on the basis of the homosocial norm. Participants were asked, in a few open-ended questions, to explain formation and maintenance strategies used in same-sex and cross-sex friendships. Participant responses were classified into nine categories: “Proximity, Acceptance, Effort, Time, Communication, Common Interests, Affection, Sexual Attraction, and No Strategy” (Rose, 1985, p.66). The top three formation factors for cross-sex friendships were no formation strategy (33.5%), sexual attraction (30.4%), and time (16.1%). According to this study, sexual attraction is one of the biggest reasons why both men and women, initiate cross-sex friendships. As for same-sex friends, the top three formation factors were affection (27.3%), communication (25.4%), and acceptance (17.1%). Thus, the most important formation factors for same and cross-sex friendships were not the same. This study points to the fact that cross-sex and same-sex friendships may form for different reasons.

Although this study did demonstrate differences in same- and cross-sex friendship formation, there are a few problems with the research. Rose (1985) used open-ended questions, which could potentially lead to problems. The participants can

answer the questions however they want and may leave out or not access all factors that are relevant. Their responses are left for interpretation and human error can easily come into play when the researcher classifies answers in this manner. My study was conducted with scales providing forced choice answers. However, forced choice answers could prevent the participants from giving all their answers. For this reason, they were also given the opportunity to provide open-ended responses.

Hypothesis 4: Men will form cross-sex friendships for sex and women will form cross-sex friendships for protection.

Five challenges to cross-sex friendships. Cross-sex friendships can be difficult at times. O'Meara (1989) presented four challenges that occur at some point during a friendship between two individuals of opposite sex. First, the individuals need to deal with the emotional bond that exists between them. The love that exists between two cross-sex friends can be confusing and it may be difficult to distinguish between romantic or non-romantic love. This task, for many cross-sex friends, can be difficult.

The second challenge is the added concern of sexual attraction (O'Meara, 1989). Sexuality is a normal part of a romantic relationship but becomes an issue in cross-sex friendships. Some cross-sex friends accept the sexual dimension in the friendship and even invite sexuality into the friendship. As previously mentioned, Afifi and Faulkner (2000) found that 51% of their college sample had had sex with a cross-sex friend. The added sexual dimension in the friendship can add a pleasant aspect to the friendship but it can also cause problems. For this reason, many cross-sex friends make the decision not to involve sexuality in their friendship in order to

preserve the relationship. However, dealing with sexual attraction can be an on going concern in cross-sex friendships.

The third challenge that O'Meara (1989) presents is inequality and power. He states that men are often seen as dominant in our society. This can pose problems in cross-sex friendships because the two individuals must find a way to feel as though they are equal. Further, men and women may receive different benefits from friendships with the opposite sex. Men may obtain more emotional support from women whereas women may obtain status by association with men. This difference in benefits is an issue that must often be contended with in cross-sex friendships (O'Meara, 1989).

The fourth challenge described by O'Meara (1989) is public relationships. He states that cross-sex friends often have to deal with how they are viewed by others. The couple is often put in a position where they have to defend the status of their friendship. People in general find it difficult to accept that a man and a woman can be just friends. For this reason, cross-sex friends are often suspected of being secretly involved in a romantic relationship. If the dyad's audience does believe that they are not romantically involved, the audience might start to question if one or both of the friends are homosexual. This might scare off individuals from even forming a cross-sex friendship, especially if they are slightly homophobic.

A few years after O'Meara proposed his four challenges for cross-sex friends, he added a fifth, the opportunity challenge (O'Meara, 1994). This challenge involves, as he put it "the meeting phase of a cross-sex friendship" (p. 4). In other words, this fifth challenge deals with cross-sex friendship formation. He listed four factors that

are a minimum requirement for the initiation of cross-sex friendships. Two of his variables, proximity and facilitative patterns of time, are comparable to Fehr's (1996) categories of environmental and situational factors, respectively. The fact that O'Meara mentions two factors that are the same as same-sex factors suggests that there is similarity between same- and cross-sex friendship formation factors. His two other factors, however, are more related to cross-sex friendship formation. The first of these two is equality. He says that the couple needs to be of equal social status. The second factor is having a supportive normative structure, meaning that the two individuals can "comfortably negotiate cross-sex friendship" (O'Meara, 1994).

Theories

A number of theories can be used to understand same-sex and cross-sex friendship formation. In this study, I examined at evolutionary theory and social learning theory in the most detail. I tested their ability to predict friendship formation. Evolutionary theory predicts that cross-sex friendships are formed for sexual access and protection, which would lead to their survival. The theory also predicts that same-sex friendships are formed to help with survival by providing help in time of need. Based on social learning theory, one would predict that if cross-sex friendships are formed for sexual and protection, they are doing so because they are modeling other cross-sex friendships. The same is true for same-sex friendships, these friendships would be formed because they would be modeling other friendships that they have observed.

Evolutionary theory

Biological theories are based on the idea that each individual is governed by

his or her genes and hormones. When it comes to biologically-based theories on gender and relationships, evolutionary theory is the most influential current theory (Winstead et al., 1997). According to this theory, men and women are pre-programmed (within their genes) to behave differently.

Evolutionary theory has two foundations: sexual selection theory and parental investment theory (Winstead et al, 1997). Sexual selection, one of the theories that evolutionary theory is based on, states that same-sex individuals compete with one another for partners who are reproductively valuable. Sexual selection has a few clauses, including one which states that males and females search for different things in mate selection (Winstead et al., 1997). Parental investment theory, which is the second theory that evolutionary theory is based upon, is an elaboration of the preceding theory. According to this theory, women invest more time and energy in their offspring than men and have fewer opportunities to create offspring. The man can theoretically create a great number of offspring with one ejaculation, which is a small investment of time and energy (Trivers, 1972).

According to the sexual selection and parental investment theories, there are gender differences in partner preferences, mating strategies, and relationship behaviours. For example, women will look for men who make a lot of money, who have high social status, and are dominant so that they can provide for themselves and their offspring. Men, on the other hand, look for women who are physically attractive because they are seen as healthier, fertile, and better able to reproduce (Buss, 1989). Women are also seen as putting forth effort in enhancing their appearance to attract a heterosexual partner, whereas men display their resources in ways such as spending

money, or having a nice car (Buss, 1988). Finally, women show relationship-oriented behaviours because they need to be nurturing in order to take care of their limited number of offspring. Men have competitive behaviour because they need to compete with other men to get a physically attractive woman to produce their offspring (Winstead et al., 1997).

Evolutionary theory is less explicit when it comes to same-sex friendships. However, it is clear that friendships provide benefits that are key to reproduction and survival. Friends can offer food, lodging, and take care of us when we are in need, thereby increasing our chances for survival. Friends can also introduce us to potential mates, which are necessary for reproduction (Bleske & Buss, 2000). The theory also mentions that being involved in caring relationships is important because it increases our chances of survival (Bandura, 1977). This statement can be extended to same-sex friendships (which are definitely caring relationships) and affirm that these friendships increase our chances of survival.

Evolutionary theory, implanted within biological theory, discusses relationships from a genetic, hormonal view. There is no mention of learned behaviour; the behaviour is innate. Social learning theory, on the other hand, discusses aspects of learning in detail.

Social Learning Theory

Social learning theory has its origins in behaviourism, where reward and punishment play an important role in governing individuals' behaviour. Bandura distinguished his social learning theory from the strict behaviourist approach by including a cognitive aspect. Bandura (1977) stated that learning would be extremely

difficult if people had to rely only on their own experiences to know what to do. However, people do not rely only on themselves, they rely on others as well. While observing other people behave or react, the observer forms an idea of how he or she should behave or react in the same situation.

Bandura (1973) has also extensively applied his theory to the understanding of aggression. His way of understanding aggression can also be utilized to make sense of cross-sex friendships. In his view, there are parallels between aggression as seen on television and aggression in our daily lives. People watch aggressive behaviour in the news, television shows, movies, video games, and then model these behaviours in their every day lives.

Like aggression, social learning theory can help explain cross-sex friendship formation. People watch television shows where the main goal for cross-sex friendship formation is a romantic relationship. Many shows and movies demonstrate that cross-sex friendships generally always develop into a romantic relationship. The most common example is the movie "When Harry met Sally" in which a man and a woman argue about whether men and women can just be friends. This movie finally ends in a romantic relationship.

When applied to same-sex friendships, social learning theory would make the same predictions as for cross-sex friendships. In other words, women and men observe other same-sex friendships, and form their own, while modeling others. Women are more emotional with their friends because that is what they see other women doing. Men have activity-based friendships because that is what they see other men doing.

Both theories

Evolutionary theory and social learning theory explain friendship formation in different ways. Evolutionary theory uses the biological approach, whereas social learning theory uses a combination of behavioural and cognitive frameworks. These two theories can be used to explain friendship formation.

Some of the gender differences in relationship behaviours mentioned earlier are that women are emotional and have better self-disclosure, while men are better with companionship (shared activities). Evolutionary theory would explain this difference by stating that women are more nurturing because of their high investment in their offspring. Hence, women would be more emotional and have better self-disclosure. Men are said to be more competitive in order to find the perfect mate to reproduce their genes. This would relate to the idea of shared activities because men are often participating in events in which they compete with one another (whereas women work side by side with other women). On the other hand, social learning theory would explain these differences due to men and women observing other relationships, and, therefore acting in the appropriate way. Women are often viewed in the media as emotional individuals who love to self-disclose. On the other hand, men are portrayed as individuals who do not like to talk about emotions and would rather engage in some sort of activity. Men's reasons for initiating a cross-sex friendship according to social learning theory would be to have access to an emotional relationship open to self-disclosure, whereas women's reasons for initiating a cross-sex friendship would be to have a companion, someone with whom to do shared activities.

Overview

The majority of research on cross-sex friendship formation has been conducted using an evolutionary approach. The common formation factors include protection and sexual access (Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2001; Rose, 1985). In general, studies on cross-sex friendship formation try to demonstrate how cross-sex and same-sex formation factors are different. They also pursue this idea by trying to demonstrate how there are different friendship formation factors between men and women within a cross-sex friendship (Bleske-Rechek and Buss, 2001; Rose, 1985).

It is likely that evolutionary theory plays a role in cross-sex friendship formation. This theory states that there are definite gender differences in partner preference, mating strategies, and relationship behaviours. I hypothesize that the most important difference in cross-sex friendship formation is relationship behaviours, whereas differences for partner preference and mating strategies are much less important.

Evolutionary theory would also suggest that same- and cross-sex friendships form for different reasons. Same-sex friendships would form to ensure survival, but cross-sex friendships would form mainly for sexual access and protection. I will test whether same- and cross-sex friendships are formed for the same reasons. I will also test whether same-sex friendship formation factors apply to cross-sex friendship formation. I hypothesize that sexual access will come out as a factor in cross-sex friendships, but will be much less important than other factors such as similarity and proximity. To test these hypotheses, participants will be asked them to think of either a same-sex friend or a cross-sex friend while filling out the same questionnaire.

Method

Participants

Three hundred and twenty participants were recruited from Introductory Psychology courses at the University of Manitoba. They received course credit for their participation. Participants were required to answer the questionnaire while thinking of either a same-sex or cross-sex friend. Thirty-two participants were removed from the analyses for responding based on their dating partner. Seven participants were removed because they were married and 17 were removed due to non-heterosexual orientations. In total, 56 participants were removed from the data analyses, leaving 263 participants (115 men, 147 women).

One hundred and two participants answered the questionnaire about a cross-sex friend and 161 answered the questionnaire about a same-sex friend. Fifty-three women and 49 men answered while thinking of a cross-sex friendship, whereas 95 women and 66 men answered while thinking of a same-sex friendship. Participants were 19.51 years old (range 17-42 years). A t-test indicated that there was no gender differences in age, $t(260) = .27, p = .79$. Most participants (85.1%) were born in Canada. For those participants not born in Canada, the mean length of time they lived in Canada was 86.97 months. The majority (82.4%) stated English as their first language. A majority of participants (74.2%) stated their ethnicity as Caucasian. The average length of time the participants had been in their current friendship was 56.58 months (39.63 months if the friendship was cross-sex and 67.26 months if the friendship was same-sex, $t(254) = 4.67, p < .001$).

Procedure

Individuals participated in groups of approximately 30 and were required to fill out a questionnaire about themselves and a friend. Half of the participants were told to think of a same-sex friend while filling the questionnaire and the other half were told to think of a cross-sex friend (see Appendix A and B). In order to have an exact comparison of same- and cross-sex friendship formation factors, both groups filled out the same questionnaire.

Participants were first given oral instructions regarding the purpose of the study and what would be required of them. Participants were then asked to fill out a consent form. Next, they proceeded to fill out the questionnaire. Once they had completed the questionnaire, participants picked up a written feedback sheet and were thanked for their participation.

Materials

Demographics. The first point of concern was the participants' sexuality. If the participant was homosexual, bisexual, or even undecided, their responses could skew the results. The assumption when examining same-sex friendships is that there is no possibility for a romantic relationship to develop or even for romantic love emotions to get involved in the friendship. The opposite is true for cross-sex friendships. There is always a possibility that a romantic relationship develops or that romantic love emotions get involved in the friendship. This is why the two types of friendship are different and it is these differences that are under observation in this study. If the participants were not heterosexual, the guidelines of same- and cross-sex friendships would be reversed. For this reason, there was a small demographic

section that asked questions such as: (a) age, (b) ethnicity, (c) first language learned, (d) country of birth, (e) length of time in Canada if they were not born here, (f) how long they have been friends with the friend in question, (g) and finally, if they were heterosexual, gay or lesbian, bisexual, transgender, undecided, or other (see Appendix C and D). Participants who indicated anything but a heterosexual orientation were dropped from the study.

Friendship Formation Factors. Next, I examined the reasons why the participants initiated the friendship with the friend in question. This section began with: "While thinking of a same-sex (or cross-sex, depending on the condition) friend, how important were each of these items when you decided to initiate this friendship?" The participants were asked to rate these items on a scale from 0 (not important) to 6 (very important). They also had the option of indicating that the item was not relevant. Each item that was used to evaluate friendship formation was taken from several authors (Knapp & Harwood, 1977; Messman, Canary, & Hause, 2000; Hays, 1985; Aukett, Ritchie, & Mill, 1988; Bleske & Buss, 2000; Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2001). I also created several items to cover all areas in friendship formation literature (see Appendix F and G).

Three issues were tested in this section. The first concerned hypothesis #1. In other words, the question was whether males and females formed cross-sex friends for different reasons. Some items in this section were: (a) to talk about your emotions, (b) to discuss personal issues, and (c) to have someone to hang out with.

The second set of items addressed hypothesis #3, namely, do same-sex friendship formation factors also apply to cross-sex friendship formation? The items

that examined this issue targeted the four formation categories: environmental, individual, situational, and dyadic (see Appendix H). Some items for hypothesis #3 were: (a) because you had similar interests, (b) because you worked/went to school together, (c) because you started sharing personal stories, and (d) because you kept running into each other.

The final set of items examined Hypothesis #4, namely, sexual access and protection. Some items used to test this hypothesis were: (a) because you wanted access to sex, (b) because you wanted protection, and (c) to have insider information about the other sex. The items for hypothesis #1, #3, and #4 were presented randomly within this section.

Relationship Status. The third section of this questionnaire pertained to Hypothesis #2. This hypothesis states that single individuals will have more same- and cross-sex friends than individuals involved in romantic heterosexual relationships. In order to examine this issue, participants were asked to answer questions such as: (a) Are you in a romantic heterosexual relationship? (b) How long have you been in this relationship? (c) Are you married? (d) How many friends do you have? (e) How many of your friends are female? (f) How many of your friends are male? (g) What sex is your best friend (other than your romantic partner)? (h) How many of your cross-sex friends were your partners' friends before they were yours? and (i) Please list your friends first names below. This last question was included to reduce random responding to questions d, e, and f (see Appendix C, and D).

Open-ended Responses. The final section was a general statement asking participants to list any other reasons not mentioned in the questionnaire about why they became friends with this person (see appendix E).

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Before conducting the main analysis, it was important to (1) confirm that the predicted categories (sexual access, protection, individual, dyadic, environmental, situational, emotional access, companionship, and equality) showed internal reliability and (2) test whether there were differences in the factors participants noted as relevant or not relevant to the formation of their friendships.

Determining the presence of categories. The questionnaire was composed of 115 items that were used to capture the nine categories. For the main analyses, composite variables were created for each category by adding all the items that referred to a specific category and taking their mean. See Appendix H for a listing of the items within their category.

Cronbach alphas demonstrated a high level of reliability for each of the nine categories (sexual access: $\alpha = 0.94$, protection: $\alpha = 0.90$, individual: $\alpha = 0.81$, dyadic: $\alpha = 0.90$, environmental: $\alpha = 0.84$, situational: $\alpha = 0.78$, emotional access: $\alpha = 0.94$, and companionship: $\alpha = .86$) with the exception of equality ($\alpha = 0.56$)¹. Equality was added as an after thought because some cross-sex friendship literature mentioned that it was important. For example, it is one of O'Meara (1989)'s five challenges to cross-sex friendships. This category was not a main component of this study and because it demonstrated low reliability, no further analyses were conducted using this category.

In addition to the 115 pre-generated friendship formation items, participants were asked to free list other causes for their friendship formation. Altogether, participants listed an additional 195 items. For these open-ended responses, 143 items (73.3%) could be classified into one of the 115 closed-ended questions. For the remaining 52 items (26.6%), all but three could be placed into one of the nine categories (environmental, dyadic, situational, individual, emotional, companionship, sexual access, protection, and equality), although there were no specific closed-ended questions related to these items. Therefore, the questions and categories used in my study appear to capture the relevant aspects for why participants began their same-sex and cross-sex friendships.

Next, Pearson correlations were conducted on all eight friendship formation factors to determine if the factors were related one to another. All correlations were significant at the .001 level (see Table 1). With a total of 28 correlations to report, the majority (17) were below an r of 0.60. However, there were eight correlations with an r between 0.60 and 0.70, and there were three correlations with an r between 0.70 and .080. The highest correlation was between companionship and the dyadic factor, $r = .78$ and the lowest correlation was between emotional access and environment, $r = .17$. Although the factors were correlated with each other, they were judged independent enough to proceed with the main analyses.

Dealing With The Issue Of Relevant / Non-relevant. The items in the questionnaire that measured friendship formation were rated from 0 (non-important) to 6 (very important). Respondents also had the option to choose 7, which was marked as not relevant. Several analyses were conducted to determine if these

responses should be excluded. For those analyses, responses 1 to 6 were recoded as 1 (relevant) and 7 was recoded as 2 (not relevant). A 2 (Friendship Type: same- or cross-sex) X 2 (Sex of the participant: male or female) between subjects MANOVA on sexual access, protection, individual, dyadic, environmental, situational, emotional access, and companionship revealed few significant differences.

The MANOVA indicated a main effect for friendship type for the environmental, $F(1, 258) = 4.63, p < .05$, individual, $F(1, 258) = 50.53, p < .001$, companionship, $F(1, 258) = 10.29, p < .01$, and sexual access factors, $F(1, 258) = 10.29, p < .001$. Environmental factors seem to be less relevant in friendship formation for cross-sex friendships ($M = 1.26, SD = .24$) than for same-sex friendships ($M = 1.20, SD = .21$). Individual factors (same-sex $M = 1.18, SD = .16$; cross-sex $M = 1.05, SD = .10$), companionship (same-sex $M = 1.08, SD = .08$; cross-sex $M = 1.05, SD = .09$), and sexual access (same-sex $M = 1.68, SD = .37$; cross-sex $M = 1.28, SD = .28$) were less prevalent in same-sex friendship formation than in cross-sex friendship formation. Finally, with regard to the protection factor, there was a significant main effect for sex of the participant $F(1, 258) = 6.69, p < .05$, with men indicating protection as less relevant than women ($M = 1.20, SD = .23$ and $M = 1.15, SD = .18$, respectively). There was also a significant friendship type by sex of the participant interaction, $F(1, 258) = 5.55, p < .05$, in cross-sex friendships, protection was less relevant for men ($M = 1.22, SD = .25$) than for women ($M = 1.09, SD = .12$). There were no differences for same-sex friendships (women $M = 1.18, SD = .19$, men $M = 1.19, SD = .21$).

The preliminary analyses demonstrated that the categories were appropriate and covered all areas. The analyses also demonstrated that the differences in relevant/non-relevant are consistent with the type of friendship being formed. That is, same-sex factors were more relevant for same-sex than cross-sex friendship formation, and cross-sex factors were more relevant for cross-sex than same-sex friendship formation. Although there are differences in relevance, this does not answer the question of which factors are most important for friendship formation. This question was tested in the main analyses. Specifically, I tested (a) whether men and women have different reasons for initiating cross-sex friendships, (b) if same-sex friendship formation factors are more important than cross-sex friendship formation factors, and (c) which cross-sex friendship formation factors are more important for men and for women. I also compared the length of time that an individual spends in a relationship with their number of friends. The responses to the items that were circled as not relevant were excluded from the main analyses.

Friendship Formation Factors

The first analysis examined the third hypothesis, that same-sex friendship formation factors (environmental, individual, situational, and dyadic) would be more important than cross-sex friendship formation factors (sexual access, protection, emotional intimacy, and companionship) for both same-and cross-sex friendships. To examine this hypothesis, a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with sex of the participant (women, men) and friendship type (same-sex, cross-sex) as the between factors and the eight categories as the within-subject factors. An ANOVA indicated a significant factor main effect, $F(7, 226) = 173.22, p < .001$, a significant factor by

sex of the participant interaction, a factor by friendship type interaction, $F(7, 226) = 11.64, p < .001$, $F(7, 226) = 11.42, p < .001$, and a significant factor by sex of the participant by friendship type interaction, $F(7, 226) = 8.56, p < .001$.

Although not relevant to my hypothesis, there was a significant main effect for friendship type, $F(1, 232) = 4.36, p < .05$, cross-sex friendship had a higher mean than same-sex friendships ($M = 3.72$ and $M = 3.51$, respectively). There was also a significant main effect for sex of the participant, $F(1, 232) = 12.69, p < .001$, women had a higher mean than men ($M = 3.79$ and $M = 3.44$, respectively). Finally, there was a significant sex of the participant by friendship type interaction $F(1, 232) = 20.38, p < .001$.

Factor main effect. To examine the factor main effect, follow-up comparisons with a Bonferonni adjustment were conducted (see Table 2). These comparisons indicated that emotional access and companionship were the most important factors for friendship formation but did not differ from each other. This was followed by situational, dyadic, and individual factors. Although the situational factor was significantly different from the individual factor, the dyadic factor did not differ from the situational or the individual factors. Next, and significantly smaller than the individual factor, were protection and environment, which did not differ from each other. Finally, sexual access was the least important factor for friendship formation and differed significantly from all other factors.

Participant sex by factor interaction. A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted for each sex with friendship type as the between factor and the eight factors as the within factors. The multivariate F for the factors was significant for

both women, $F(7, 124) = 109.78, p < .001$, and for men, $F(7, 96) = 73.65, p < .001$. For women, follow-up comparisons with a Bonferonni adjustment indicated that emotional access was the most important reason for forming friendships, followed by companionship (see Table 3). Next came situational, individual, and dyadic factors, which did not differ from each other. These three factors were more important than protection, which was followed by environmental factors. Finally, sexual access was the least important factor in friendship formation for women. Contrary to hypothesis 3, the two most important reasons for forming friendships, emotional access and companionship, are both cross-sex friendship formation factors. Although not predicted, this does support previous literature, indicating that women initiate friendships for emotional closeness more than men. Three of the same-sex friendship formation factors (situational, individual and dyadic) were more important though than protection and sexual access, the remaining cross-sex friendship formation factors.

For men, companionship, situational, dyadic, emotional access, and individual were the most important factors in friendship formation (see Table 3). Although companionship was significantly higher than the dyadic factor, all the other factors did not differ significantly from each other. Next came the environmental factor and protection, which did not differ from one another. Finally, sexual access proved to be the less important factor in friendship formation for men. Supporting hypothesis 3, all same-sex friendship formation factors (with the exception of environmental) were more important than sexual access and protection (cross-sex friendship formation factors). Contrary to hypothesis 3 but consistent with the findings for women,

companionship, a cross-sex factor, was the most important friendship formation factor.

Friendship type by factor interaction. To examine the friendship type by factor interaction, a repeated measures ANOVA was for each friendship type, sex of the participant as the between factor, and the eight factors as the within factors. The multivariate F for the factors was significant for same-sex friendships, $F(7, 126) = 132.06, p < .001$, and for cross-sex friendships, $F(7, 94) = 62.63, p < .001$. For same-sex friendships, follow-up comparisons with a Bonferonni adjustment indicated that companionship, emotional access, situational, and dyadic were the most important factors for friendship formation (see Table 4). Companionship was significantly different than the situational factor and emotional access was significantly different than the dyadic factor. However, no differences were found between companionship and emotional access, emotional access and situational factors, or situational factors and dyadic factors. Next, and significantly lower than the previous four, was the individual factor. This was followed by the environmental factor and protection. Both factors were significantly smaller than the individual factor but did not differ from one another. Finally, sexual access was the least important factor in same-sex friendship formation. Companionship and emotional access are cross-sex friendship formation factors and their having the highest means does not support the third hypothesis. However, the next three factors are all same-sex factors and are higher than the remaining two cross-sex factors, supporting hypothesis three.

As for cross-sex friendship formation, emotional access, companionship, individual, situational, and dyadic were the most important for friendship formation

(see Table 4). Although emotional access was significantly higher than individual and companionship was significantly higher than situational, emotional access was not significantly different from companionship, companionship was not significantly different from individual, and finally, individual, situational, and dyadic are not significantly different from each other. These were followed by protection and environment, which are significantly smaller from the previous but did not differ from each other. Finally, sexual access was the least important factor in cross-sex friendship formation. Once again emotional access and companionship were the most important factors for friendship formation, which does not support the third hypothesis. However, three of the four same-sex factors were higher than protection and sexual access (cross-sex factors), which does support the third hypothesis.

Friendship type by participant sex by factor interaction. The last repeated measures ANOVA was conducted on friendship type (same-sex, cross-sex) and sex of the participant (female, male) with the eight factors as the dependant variables. The multivariate F for the factors was significant for women and men in same-sex friendships, $F(7, 72) = 96.68, p < .001$, and, $F(7, 48) = 57.15, p < .001$, respectively, and also for women and men in cross-sex friendships, $F(7, 46) = 32.43, p < .001$, and, $F(7, 42) = 32.43, p < .001$, respectively.

Follow-up comparisons with a Bonferonni adjustment indicated that for women in same-sex friendships, emotional access was the most important reason why they formed a friendship (see Table 5). The second most important factor was companionship, followed by situational, dyadic and individual factors, which did not differ from each other. Next was protection and environmental, which were

significantly lower than the previous three factors but did not differ from each other. The last, and least important factor, was sexual access. Once again, and opposite to hypothesis three, the cross-sex friendship formation factors of emotional access and companionship were more important than the same-sex friendship formation factors. Support for hypothesis three, though, is found in the next three same-sex factors, which are more important than protection and sexual access.

Companionship, situational, dyadic, emotional, environmental, and individual factors were the most important reasons why men formed same-sex friendships (see Table 5). Companionship was significantly higher than dyadic, and dyadic was significantly higher than environmental, but all other factors did not differ from each other. The next factor was protection, which was significantly lower than the other factors. Finally, men reported that sexual access was the least important reason for initiating a same-sex friendship. Contrary to hypothesis three, companionship, a cross-sex factor, was the most important reason why men formed same-sex friendship. Consistent with hypothesis three, though, protection and sexual access were the least important factors, falling behind the same-sex friendship factors.

In cross-sex friendships, women indicated that emotional access and companionship were the most important reason for friendship formation, but they did not differ from each other (see Table 5). This was followed by the situational, individual, dyadic and protection factors, which did not differ from one another. Next, and significantly smaller than protection, was the environmental factor. Finally, sexual access was the least important factor for women in cross-sex friendship formation, and differed significantly from all other factors. These results

support the third hypothesis. Three of the four same-sex factors (situational, individual, and dyadic) were significantly more important than two of the four cross-sex factors (protection and sexual access). Supporting the fourth hypothesis that women will form cross-sex friendships for protection, protection was significantly more important in cross-sex friendship formation for woman than sexual access.

For men in cross-sex friendships, emotional access, individual, companionship, situational, and dyadic factors were the most important reasons why they initiated the friendship (see Table 5). Although companionship was significantly different from dyadic, all other factors did not differ from each other. The remaining three factors, environmental, protection, and sexual access were significantly lower than the dyadic factor, but they did not differ from each other. There is support for the third hypothesis, similar to the results for women in cross-sex friendships, three of the four same-sex factors (situational, individual, and dyadic) were significantly more important than two of the four cross-sex factors (protection and sexual access). Finally, there was no support for the fourth hypothesis that men would form cross-sex friendships for sexual access. The mean for protection is higher than the one for sexual access, but they are not significantly different.

In summary, the results were basically the same for same- or cross-sex friendships. Emotional access and companionship were the most important reasons why men and women in both same- and cross-sex friendships formed friendships (with the exception that males in same-sex friendships). These results do not support the third hypothesis. However, support for the third hypothesis was found in that three same-sex friendship formation factors (situational, dyadic and individual) were

consistently more important than sexual access and protection (cross-sex friendship formation factors). In the same respect, protection and environment were also consistently in sixth and seventh place, leaving sexual access as the least important factor for any type of friendship.

Do men and women form cross-sex friendships for different reasons? The next analyses were conducted to test the first and fourth hypotheses. The first hypothesis stated that men would form cross-sex friendships for emotional access more than women, and that women would form cross-sex friendships for companionship more than men. The fourth hypothesis stated that men would form cross-sex friendships for sexual access and women for protection.

The file was split by friendship type to be able to compare the means of men and women within cross-sex friendships. T-tests were conducted with companionship, emotional access, sexual access, and protection as the dependent variables and with sex of the participant as the independent variable. For same-sex friendships, the means for men and women differed for three of the four comparisons, companionship, $t(159) = 5.96, p < .001$, emotional access, $t(159) = 11.05, p < .001$, and protection, $t(157) = 4.25, p < .001$. In each case, women rated the factor higher than did men (see Table 6) the means did not differ for sexual access, $t(132) = 1.77, p = .08$.

With regard to cross-sex friendships, the means for men and women did not differ for companionship, $t(100) = 1.07, p = .30$, and emotional access, $t(100) = .93, p = .36$ (see Table 6). These results do not support the first hypothesis. However, men expressed that sexual access was more important in forming cross-sex

friendships compared to women, $t(100) = 4.12, p < .001$; women expressed that protection was more important than men in forming cross-sex friendships compared to men, $t(100) = 2.95, p < .01$. These results support the fourth hypothesis.

In order to further examine the different reasons why men and women form friendships, the same analyses were performed using the same-sex friendship formation factors. The file was split by friendship type to be able to compare the means of men and women within same- and cross-sex friendships. T-tests were conducted with environmental, situational, dyadic, and individual as the dependent variables and with sex of the participant as the independent variable.

For same-sex friendships, the means for men and women differed for three of the four comparisons, situational, $t(159) = 4.12, p < .001$, dyadic, $t(159) = 4.37, p < .001$, and individual, $t(158) = 6.48, p < .001$. In each case, women rated the factor higher than did men (see Table 7) the means did not differ for the environmental factor, $t(159) = .18, p = .85$. With regard to cross-sex friendships, the means for men and women did not differ for any of the four factors, environmental, $t(100) = 1.67, p = .10$; situational, $t(100) = .27, p = .79$; dyadic, $t(100) = .63, p = .53$; and individual, $t(100) = 1.50, p = .14$.

Are cross-sex friendship formation factors as important in same-sex friendships as in cross-sex friendships? In order to further examine hypotheses one and three, the cross-sex friendship formation factors were compared in same-sex and cross-sex friendships for men and women. This analysis tested whether the cross-sex friendship formation factors were rated similarly in same- and cross-sex friendships. For this particular analysis, the file was split by sex of the participant. T-tests were

conducted with companionship, emotional access, sexual access, and protection as the dependent variables and with friendship type as the independent variable. The results demonstrated that some factors affect same- and cross-sex friendship formation equally (see Table 8).

For women, emotional access and companionship were more important in same-sex friendship formation than in cross-sex friendship formation, $t(146) = 4.78$, $p < .001$ and $t(146) = 3.55$, $p < .01$, respectively. The companionship component is further evidence against hypothesis 1 that women would use cross-sex friends for companionship. Although not testing this factor in comparison to men (see Table 6 for that comparison) the higher rating in same-sex, than cross-sex, friendships indicates this is an important factor in all of women's friendships. Sexual access and protection, however, were not significantly different in same- or cross-sex friendship formation, $t(130) = 1.55$, $p > .05$, and $t(145) = .95$, $p > .05$, respectively. The protection factor indicates that women use all friendships for protection. So, although noted earlier that supporting hypothesis 4, women used cross-sex friendships for protection more than men did, it appears that women use all relationships for protection.

For men, emotional access and sexual access were more important in cross-sex than same-sex friendship formation, $t(113) = 3.61$, $p < .001$, and $t(102) = 7.44$, $p < .001$, respectively. These two factors support hypothesis 1 and 4 by indicating that men rate these factors as more important to their cross-sex, than same-sex, friendship formation. Only hypothesis 4, sexual access, was supported earlier by a gender difference in cross-sex friendships (see Table 6). Companionship and protection were

equally important in same- and cross-sex friendship formation, $t(113) = -.63, p > .05$, and $t(112) = -1.19, p > .05$, respectively.

Are same-sex friendship formation factors as important in same-sex friendships as in cross-sex friendships? In order to further examine the different reasons why men and women form friendships, the same analyses were performed using the same-sex friendship formation factors. This analysis tested whether the same-sex friendship formation factors were rated similarly in same- and cross-sex friendships. For this particular analysis, the file was split by sex of the participant. T-tests were conducted with environmental, situational, dyadic, and individual as the dependent variables and with friendship type as the independent variable. The results demonstrated that some factors affect same- and cross-sex friendship formation equally (see Table 9).

For women, three of the four factors were more important in same-sex friendship formation than in cross-sex friendship formation, environmental, $t(146) = 2.21, p < .05$; situational, $t(146) = 2.89, p < .01$; and dyadic, $t(146) = 3.55, p > .01$. The individual factor was not significantly different for women between same- and cross-sex friendships, $t(146) = 1.53, p = .13$. For men, only the individual factor was more important in cross-sex than same-sex friendship formation, $t(112) = 5.80, p < .001$. The four other factors were not significantly different between same- and cross-sex friendships, environmental, $t(113) = .60, p = .55$; situational, $t(113) = 1.19, p = .24$; and dyadic, $t(113) = 1.19, p = .24$.

Relationship Status And The Number Of Friends

Hypothesis 2 included three components: First, it was predicted that individuals involved in a heterosexual romantic relationship would have fewer same- and cross-sex friends than single individuals. Second, it was hypothesized that there would be a negative correlation between length of time in a romantic relationship and the number of same- and cross-sex friends. Finally, I predicted that the negative correlation would be larger for cross-sex friends than same-sex friends.

Participants reported their number of friends in two different ways. First, they were asked to write down their total number of friends, their number of female friends and, finally, their number of male friends (reported number of friends). Second, they were asked to list all their friends. From this list, the total number of friends, the number of female and the number of male friends were compiled to create new totals (listed number of friends).

Difference between those who are in a romantic relationship and those who are not. The first test conducted to examine this hypothesis was a 2 (relationship status: dating, not dating) by 2 (sex of the participant: male, female) MANOVA on: (a) total number of reported friends, (b) total number of reported female friends, (c) total number of reported male friends, (d) total number of listed friends, (e) total number of listed female friends, and (f) total number of listed male friends. The MANOVA revealed a main effect for sex of the participant, $F(6, 228) = 28.43, p < .001$, but no main effect for relationship status, $F(6, 228) = 1.10, p > .05$, and no interaction between sex of the participant and relationship status, $F(6, 228) = .78, p > .05$. The main effect for sex of the participant indicated that women had a higher

mean number of friends than men for total reported female friends, and total listed female friends. The analysis also demonstrated that men had a higher mean number of friends than women for total reported male friends, and total listed male friends. The means for total listed friends and total reported friends were not significantly different for men and for women (see Table 10). The fact that there was no main effect for relationship status and no interaction between sex of the participant and relationship status does not support the first part of hypothesis 2. Individuals involved in a heterosexual romantic relationship did not have fewer same- and cross-sex friends than single individuals.

Length of time in a romantic relationship and the number of friends. To examine the length of time that the individuals had spent in a romantic relationship and their number of friends, Pearson correlations were conducted only for these individuals who reported being in a dating relationship ($n = 104$). All correlations had an expected negative direction because I predicted that the longer an individual was in a romantic relationship, the fewer friends this individual would have. For this reason, the correlations were examined using one-tailed significance levels. Four of the six correlations were significant. Participants had been in their relationship for an average of 20.50 months, ranging from 1 to 120 months.

There were negative correlations between length of time in a romantic relationship and (a) the number of reported friends ($r = -.20, p < .05$), (b) the number of reported female friends ($r = -.18, p < .05$), and (c) the number of reported male friends ($r = -.17, p < .05$). For the three correlations examining the number of friends listed, only the correlation between the length of time in a romantic relationship and

the number of listed friends ($r = -.19, p < .05$) was significant. The two other correlations, (a) length of time in a romantic relationship and number of listed female friends ($r = -.14, p > .09$), and (b) length of time in a romantic relationship and number of listed male friends ($r = -.14, p > .08$) were not significant. These results provide partial support for the second hypothesis.

Length of time in a relationship and the number of same- and cross-sex friends. The previous correlations did not discriminate between same- and cross-sex friends. For this reason, the file was split by sex of the participant and the same six correlations were conducted between length of time in a romantic relationship and (a) total number of reported friends, (b) number of reported female friends, (c) number of reported male friends, (d) total number of listed friends, (e) total number of listed female friends, and (f) total number of listed male friends. Once again, all correlations had an expected negative direction and were tested using one-tailed significance levels.

All six correlations were in the predicted direction for both women and men, but were not significant (see Table 11). Due to a small number of male participants ($n = 38$) involved in a romantic relationship, these correlations have low power.

To test the last part of hypothesis 2, a final set of correlations examined length of time in a romantic relationship and (a) total number of friends, (b) number of female friends, and (c) number of male friends, for both reported and listed friends. For women involved in a romantic relationship, none of the correlations was significant, although all were in the predicted direction. For men, two of the six correlations were significant. First, men involved in a romantic relationship showed a

negative correlation between their reported number of male friends and the length of time in a romantic relationship ($r = -.29, p < .05$). Second, men showed a negative correlation between their listed number of friends and the length of time they had been in a relationship ($r = -.24, p < .05$). This provides partial support for the second hypothesis. The remaining four correlations were in the predicted direction, but none of them was significant (see Table 12).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine same- and cross-sex friendship formation factors within same- and cross-sex friendships. More specifically, did men and women form cross-sex friendships for emotional access or companionship?, did men and women form cross-sex friendships for sexual access or protection?, and did men and women form cross- and same-sex friendships based on same- or cross-sex friendship formation factors? A second purpose of this study was to determine whether the length of time that individuals spent in a romantic relationship was correlated with their number of friends.

Friendship Formation Factors

Emotional access and companionship. I first examined the varying reasons why men and women became friends with the opposite sex. Studies examining men and women's same-sex friendships have exposed a now somewhat stereotypical view of the differences within their friendships. One of the most common facets of women's same-sex friendships is that they tend to be more expressive, emotional, intimate, richer, and include more self-disclosure than men's. On the other hand, men's friendships tend to be more instrumental than women's friendships. In other

words, men's friendships tend to be task, goal, and activity oriented (Wright & Scalon, 1991; Monsour, 1992; Duck & Wright, 1993; Brehm, 1992).

Men and women's friendships are therefore fairly different from one another on this level. These differences led to the assumption that men and women look to the other sex to fulfill an aspect of friendship that is missing from their own same-sex friendships. The supposition was that men would report that they searched for cross-sex friendships for emotional intimacy and women would report that their search was for companionship. The results did not support this hypothesis. The means for men and women were not significantly different with regard to emotional access and companionship. Although the means were not significantly different, women indicated that emotional access and companionship were both more important in cross-sex friendship formation than men. In addition, emotional access was more important than companionship for both men and women in cross-sex friendship formation.

The results indicated that for cross-sex friendships, emotional access and companionship were equally important to initiate friendships. Although previous research indicates that men and women have same-sex friendships for different reasons (Wright & Scalon, 1991; Monsour, 1992; Duck & Wright, 1993; Brehm, 1992), the current study indicates that men and women have cross-sex friendships for the same reasons. A possible explanation for the similarity in cross-sex friendship formation resides in the fact that I found differences for men and women in same-sex friendships. Women's same-sex friendships were focused on emotional access, whereas men's were focused on companionship. It is possible that both men and

women bring their same-sex friendship tendencies into their cross-sex friendships. In other words, women bring the emotional access component to the cross-sex friendship and men bring the companionship component. This way, both emotional access and companionship become equally important in cross-sex friendships for men and women.

For same-sex friendships, women expressed that both emotional access and companionship were more important in friendship formation than they were for men. The fact that emotional access was more important for women than for men in same-sex friendships supports past research. However, the fact that women also indicated that companionship was more important than men in same-sex friendships does not support past research. These results indicate that companionship is much more important for women than what the literature portrays. It is possible that through social learning, women have observed male friendships and have now included this aspect in their friendship. This offers some support for the social learning theory. Another possibility resides in the fact that cross-sex friendships are still relatively new types of friendships. As times goes on, women might have more male friends than was previously observed. Women might be learning to enjoy companionship from their male counterparts and implementing that aspect of friendship into their same-sex ones. Men, on the other hand, are not transposing the emotional access that they are learning from their cross-sex friendships possibly because homophobia is still influential in the male population (Bank & Hansford, 2000; Winstead, et al., 1997; Derlega, Lewis, Harrison, Winstead, & Costanza, 1989; Lewis, 1978).

Sexual access and protection. Cross-sex friendships are known to sometimes include a sexual component. Some individuals can manage this component and retain a cross-sex friendship. For others, their friendship will change into a romantic relationship (Afifi & Faulkner, 2000; O'Meara, 1989; Monsour, 2000). The question remains, do men and women form cross-sex friendships to have access to sex? A few studies have examined this question and have demonstrated that sexual access is a factor in cross-sex friendship formation (Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2001; Rose, 1985). The intent of the present study was to examine to what extent the sexual aspect is important in cross-sex friendship formation. This issue will also be discussed in further detail in the following section.

The results supported the fourth hypothesis in terms of the sexual component. Men reported that sexual access was more important in cross-sex friendship formation than did women. In addition to providing support for the fourth hypothesis, these results also support past research, which states that men form cross-sex friendships for sexual access (Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2001). Finally, these results support evolutionary theory, which states that men would like to plant their seed in as many women as possible to ensure their survival (Buss, 1989). It would seem that sexual access is a factor that holds greater importance for men than for women.

In terms of same-sex friendships, there were no differences between the means for men and women. This was expected because the sample size was limited to heterosexual individuals. Sexual access is similarly important (or similarly not important) for men and women in same-sex friendship formation.

The second aspect of the fourth hypothesis is protection. Bleske-Rechek and Buss (2001) found that in cross-sex friendships, women tend to form friendships with men for protection. The results demonstrated that protection was more important for women in cross-sex friendship formation than for men. These results support the fourth hypothesis, which stated that women would form cross-sex friendships for protection. Also, these results support Bleske-Rechek and Buss's (2001) findings that protection is significant for women in cross-sex friendship formation. Furthermore, these results support evolutionary theory, which states that women search for men for protection (Buss, 1989). The importance of protection in comparison with all other friendship formation factors will be discussed in the following section.

In terms of same-sex friendships, women also expressed that protection was more important for friendship formation than did men. Past research has not examined the importance of protection in same-sex friendships but has insinuated that this factor was only important in cross-sex friendship formation (Bleske-Rechek and Buss, 2001). The present study demonstrated that protection holds greater importance for women than men in friendship formation regardless of whether the friendship is a same- or cross-sex one. These results could also be said to support evolutionary theory. This theory states that women search for a man to provide protection for themselves and their offspring (Buss, 1989). Finding protection to ensure survival is crucial for women and it would be logical that they would also search for this protection from women. That way, women would have increased protection and therefore increase their chance of survival.

Comparing all friendship formation factors. Most researchers seem to study same- and cross-sex friendship formation factors separately, as though the two friendships were completely different. The current study presents several cross-sex friendship formation factors (emotional access, companionship, sexual access, and protection) as well as several same-sex friendship formation factors (environmental, individual, dyadic, and situational). The tendency in past studies has been to use same-sex friendship formation factors while examining same-sex friendships and to use cross-sex friendship formation factors while examining cross-sex friendships. The goal of the present study was to use all those factors with both same- and cross-sex friendships.

The results indicated that emotional access and companionship were the most important reasons why men and women formed same- and cross-sex friendships. Same-sex friendship literature indicates that women form same-sex friendships for emotional access and men form same-sex friendships for companionship (Wright & Scalon, 1991; Monsour, 1992; Duck & Wright, 1993; Brehm, 1992). This study examined those two factors in terms of their interaction in cross-sex friendships (men would form cross-sex friendships for emotional access and women would form cross-sex friendships for companionship). For this reason, they were termed cross-sex friendship formation factors. In hindsight, and in light of the results, it is fair to say that these factors are not cross-sex friendship formation factors but universal friendship formation factors.

The third hypothesis predicted that same-sex friendship formation factors would be more important than cross-sex friendship formation factors in both same-

and cross-sex friendship formation. The fact that emotional access and companionship were the most important factors is contrary to this hypothesis. However, as previously stated, these two factors may not have been given the proper terminology and could easily have been classified as same-sex friendship formation factors as well.

Further support for hypothesis three comes from the remaining factors. For both same- and cross-sex friendships and regardless of participant sex, in almost every case, three of the four same-sex friendship formation factors (situational, dyadic, and individual) were equally more important than the two cross-sex factors (protection and sexual access) in friendship formation. These findings contradict past research indicating that men and women formed cross-sex friendships for different reasons than same-sex friendships. My results demonstrate that the same-sex friendship formation factors are the most important formation factors for same-sex as well as for cross-sex friendships. This provides evidence that same- and cross-sex friendships are not so different. Friendships form for the same reasons, regardless of the type of friendship: same-sex or cross-sex. They are possibly modeling each other's relationships, which would support social learning theory.

The environmental factor did not yield the same results as the three other same-sex friendship formation factors. The third hypothesis stated that all four same-sex factors would be more important than the cross-sex factors. Participants in every type of friendship expressed that the environmental factor was the least important of the four same-sex factors. In fact, for some friendships, the environmental factor was rated similar to the protection factor. Furthermore, men in cross-sex friendships

declared that this factor was not significantly different from protection and sexual access.

These results are somewhat confusing because past research suggests that the environmental factor is important in same-sex friendship formation whereas my study indicates that it is not. These results do not support the third hypothesis. The participants in this study were asked to think of a friend that they had for at least six months. The average length of time that the individuals had been in their friendship was 56.58 months (range 3 to 360 months). It is possible that because most participants had been in their friendship for a few years, they disregarded the environment in which they met. In addition, the environmental factor might have been the first reason that the couple met but may not have been the most important reason that they became friends. Moreover, the environmental factor might seem like a superficial reason for friendship formation, while the three other factors might seem more meaningful. Finally, people probably are not very aware of the environmental influence on their behaviour. Additional research is required to examine this issue in greater detail. One possibility would be to run a longitudinal study tracking people's reasons for forming friendships over time.

The protection factor was not rated as important to friendship formation. In most cases, protection was considered the second least, or least, important reason why individuals formed friendships. However, for women in cross-sex friendships, protection was reported as being as important as the situational, the dyadic, and the individual factors. In general, this supports the third hypothesis because in three of the four types of friendships, same-sex factors were more important than protection.

For women in cross-sex friendships, although protection was as important as three same-sex factors, protection was not more important. Protection seems to be an important factor for women in cross-sex friendship formation, as was predicted by the fourth hypothesis. However, it is not one of the most important factors.

Finally, sexual access was deemed the least important reason why men and women formed same- and cross-sex friendships. This supports the third hypothesis. All same-sex factors were more important than this particular cross-sex factor for friendship formation (with the exception of men in cross-sex friendships where environmental, protection, and sexual access were equally the least important factors). These results contradict past research that reported cross-sex factors to be the most important reasons why cross-sex friendships are formed. In fact, this study actually demonstrates that they are the least important reasons. These results also provide evidence against evolutionary theory, which states that men search for women for sexual access. Finally, these results suggest that men and women form same- and cross-sex friendships for the pure desire of a friendship, rather than to fulfill sexual needs.

In summary, the results did not differ much between friendship type and sex of the participant. For men, women, same-sex friendships, and cross-sex friendships, companionship and emotional access are the most important reasons why individuals form friendships, with one exception, namely that the mean for emotional access was the fourth highest for men. The means for three of the same-sex friendship formation factors, (individual, dyadic, and situational) were consistently in third, fourth, and fifth place. Once again, the exception was men, whose mean for emotional access

took the fourth place. Protection and environment were consistently in either the sixth or seventh place, for men, women, same-sex friends, and cross-sex friends (with the exception that for women in cross-sex friendships, the protection factor was in second place with the situational, dyadic, and individual factors). Finally, sexual access was the least important reason why anyone initiated a friendship.

Relationship status and the number of friends.

Marriage, can be detrimental to the formation and maintenance of same- and cross-sex friendships, it even lead to friendship dissolutions (Dickens & Perlman, 1981; Reismen, 1981; Johnson & Leslie, 1982; Rose, 1985; Booth, 1972; Rawlins, 1992). Most studies have compared friendships between married and single individuals. For the second hypothesis, my study tried to replicate these results, comparing dating and single individuals. The results showed that individuals involved in a heterosexual romantic relationship did not have fewer same- and cross-sex friends than single individuals. This does not support the second hypothesis, nor does it reflect past literature on married couples. These results also do not reflect past literature that demonstrated that an individual's friendship network diminished as the length of the romantic relationship grew (Milardo, Johnson, & Husten, 1983). It would seem that although being in a marriage predicts a lower number of friends than unmarried individuals, being in a heterosexual romantic relationship does not predict a lower number of friends compared to individuals who are not in a relationship. It is possible that once a romantic relationship becomes permanent and official (a marriage), individuals dedicate more of their time to this relationship. These results could also be a reflection of the participants' age. The participants in this study were

younger than those in previous studies dealing with married individuals. Finally, the participants' life stage could also be a factor. In this study, all participants were students, whereas previous studies on married individuals were conducted with individuals in the workforce. Individuals in the workforce might have fewer opportunities to meet friends in general as opposed to university students. Also, because of gender segregation that still exists in some workplaces, individuals might have fewer opportunities to meet cross-sex friends.

The participants in this study reported a larger number of friends than previous studies. Johnson and Leslie (1982) found that the average number of friends for occasional daters was 4.13 as opposed to married individuals who averaged 1.06. In this study, the average number of friends for individuals involved in a romantic relationship was 11.26. Again, this may be a function of their life stage. Participants were first year university students who may be including both old high school friends and now university friends in their lists.

Men and women who were involved in a romantic relationship did not report a significantly different number of total friends (listed or reported). They did, however, report different numbers of male and female friends. Women and men both reported more same-sex than cross-sex friends. This pattern has appeared in past research. Same-sex friendships appear to be safer when involved in heterosexual romantic relationships because they do not pose a threat to the partner. Cross-sex friendships, on the other hand, can be the source of jealousy and discord. Individuals might chose not to be involved in cross-sex friendships in order to maintain peace in their romantic relationship.

The next prediction was that there would be a negative correlation between length of time in a romantic relationship and the number of same- and cross-sex friends. Participants had been in their relationship for an average of 20.50 months, ranging from 1 to 120 months. All the correlations were in the predicted direction, but few were significant. Same- and cross-sex friendships for women in heterosexual romantic relationships did not seem to decrease with the length of time that they spent in their relationship. Men, on the other hand, indicated that the longer they were in a heterosexual romantic relationship, the fewer the number of male friends and fewer the total number of listed friends. Being involved in a heterosexual romantic relationship seems to have a greater impact on men than on women.

The correlations offered partial support for the second hypothesis. Some friendships do seem to decrease according to the length of time that individuals spend in romantic relationships. I also predicted that the negative correlations would be larger for cross-sex friends than same-sex friends. This aspect of the second hypothesis was not supported. Although men's friendships in general decrease as their time in a relationship increases, it is their same-sex friends who decrease and not their cross-sex ones. This is surprising because the emotional involvement and sexual activity that can develop in cross-sex friends are much greater threats to the maintenance of a heterosexual romantic relationship than same-sex friends. A possible explanation for these results could be that the men are letting go of their friendships in general but taking on more of their girlfriend's same-sex friends. Future research should examine if this is the case. Overall, though, the results point

to the fact that men and women are not losing their cross-sex friendships when they are in heterosexual romantic relationships.

Limitations

This study was conducted with Introductory Psychology students as part of a course requirement. Because of this, the participants were all about the same age (mean age was 19.51, with a range of 17-42 years). Throughout their lifetime, individuals are faced with different issues, beliefs, or concerns. For example, a child, an adolescent, a parent, an elderly person, or a retired person all face different aspects of life such as school, work, marriage, or having a child. These factors could influence the number of friends individuals have and the opportunity to meet new people (Fehr, 1996). This study can therefore not be generalized past young adulthood. Second, these students are different than their age peers because they chose university instead of the work force. Such individuals could demonstrate large variations in terms of their social economic status, their life goals, their motivation, their intellect, their group of friends, and so on. Once again, one cannot generalize the results of this study to all young adults; the results can only be generalized to young adults in university. Another limitation due to the use of Introductory Psychology students is that I could not include married individuals or individuals with children. These two groups could have added more information to my study, especially the tests of the second hypothesis.

The intent of this study was to examine friendship formation. Although the questionnaire clearly indicated that the participants should respond while thinking: “why your friendship was formed”, these participants might have confused formation with maintenance. While friendship formation refers to the initial reasons why two

people become friends, friendship maintenance refers to the reasons why the friendship continues and further develops. Participants might have not understood the line that exists between forming a friendship and maintaining a friendship. This confusion could have led participants to answer about maintenance as opposed to formation. It is also possible that the participants had been in their friendship for so long that they were not able to accurately remember the reasons why their friendship was formed. In this study, participants had been in their same-sex friendship for an average of 67 months and in their cross-sex friendship for an average of 40 months. Previous studies examining friendship formation did not mention how long their friendships had been (Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2001; Rose, 1985). Future research should observe friendship formation with friendships that are just forming or that have been recently formed.

Including homosexual and bisexual individuals to this study could have added a greater dimension. Since homosexuals are attracted to the same-sex, hypotheses 1, 2, and 4 would have included same-sex friendships instead of cross-sex ones. It would have been interesting to find out their reasons for forming same- and cross-sex friendships. Bisexuals, on the other hand, are attracted to both men and women. For these participants, hypotheses 1, 2, and 4 would have included both same-sex friendships and cross-sex ones. It would be possible that these individuals always consider sexual access as a factor when forming a friendship. Unfortunately, the percentage of homosexual and bisexual individuals in a university setting is rather small compared to the heterosexual university population. Barrett (1980) found that only 16.5% of the male and 7% of the female university population reported having

participated in homosexual activities. Many individuals are also probably not comfortable declaring their sexuality, even if it is confidential. Some participants might therefore indicate that they are heterosexual when in fact they are homosexual or bisexual.

Finally, although the eight friendship formation factors were shown to have high reliability within each factor, they also were highly correlated to each other. Some relation between the factors was expected because some of the factors touch upon similar issues. For example, both individual and sexual access deal with physical attractiveness, and both dyadic and emotional access deal with self-disclosure. The fact that these factors were highly correlated could have affected the validity of the results. However, friendship formation factors do interact with each other when a friendship is being formed (Fehr, 1996) so it is hard to say if the factors can really be completely separate.

Future directions

There are a few directions in which this research could be further pursued. First, repeating this study with homosexual and bisexual individuals as well as heterosexual individuals could give greater insight into same- and cross-sex friendship formation. A few differences would be expected. For example would be that homosexuals should indicate that they search for sexual access in same-sex friendships more than cross-sex ones and bisexuals should indicate that they search for sexual access in both same- and cross-sex friendships. This would pose a serious threat to the integrity of evolutionary theory. This theory presumes that individuals mate in order to ensure the survival of their genes. It would be possible to explain

homosexuality and bisexuality in terms of protection according to this theory (men and women can offer protection). However, it is impossible to explain why these two groups would engage in sexual activity since this action would not lead to the survival or their genes. However, despite the apparent difficulty to explain homosexuality with the evolutionary theory, many have been able to explain this sexual activity according to this theory (see De-Block & Adriaens, 2004; Berman, 2003).

Although a few differences would probably arise when comparing friendship formation between heterosexuals, bisexuals, and homosexuals, the main and most important reasons for friendship formation should be the same. This would be further proof that same-sex friendship formation factors are in fact general friendship formation factors. In addition, this study could show even more that the present study, that men and women form same- and cross-sex friendships for the same reasons.

One could also compare same- and cross-sex friendship maintenance and dissolution strategies to see if they differ or are similar. Past research on cross-sex friendships indicate that the sexual dimension plays an important part in maintenance and dissolution (Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2001; Messman, Canary, & Hause, 2000). As same- and cross-sex friendship formation seem to be much more similar than different, this may also be the case for maintenance and dissolution strategies.

This study should also be repeated with a restriction on the length of the friendships. A study on friendship formation should look at friendships that are shorter. A future study could restrict the participants to think of a friend that they have had for three to six months. This constraint might increase the chances of the

participants remembering more precisely the reasons why they formed their friendship. Another possibility, as mentioned earlier, would be to run a longitudinal study tracking people's reasons for forming friendships. Yet another possibility would be to ask the participants to imagine being at the very beginning of a new friendship and to think what formation strategies would be important.

Finally, although men and women in dating or marriage relationships report having new and established cross-sex friends, many of these friends could have been friends with their significant other first. This would show that dating and / or married individuals have even fewer new and established friendships that they have made on their own than what is presently thought.

Conclusion

This study has shown that contrary to past research, which separated friendship formation factors between friendship types, same-sex friendship formation factors are actually the most important reasons for individuals to form friendships, no matter what the friendship type. Same-sex friendship formation factors (including emotional access and companionship, which were formerly termed cross-sex factors) should not be gender specific but should be described as general friendship formation factors. The general order (with a few exceptions) of importance in friendship formation is: (a) emotional access, (b) companionship, (c) situational, (d) dyadic, (e) individual, (f) environmental, (g) protection, and (h) sexual access. Although there was some support of evolutionary theory's predictions regarding protection and sexual access these factors are relatively unimportant compared to the other friendship formation factors.

Footnote

¹ A factor analysis, performed on all 115 friendship formation items in the questionnaire, did not support the expected 9 factors. Instead, it revealed 22 groups that were not comparable to the predicted 9 factors. In order to obtain factors that would better represent the predicted nine categories, I conducted another Factor Analysis with 9 forced groups. Unfortunately, this analysis was not any more profitable than the previous one. This analysis revealed almost the same results as the first analysis did. Once again, these groups were not very comparable to the predicted nine categories.

References

- Afifi, W.A., & Faulkner, S.L. (2000). On being "just friends": The frequency and impact of sexual activity in cross-sex friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17*, 205-222.
- Aukett, R., Ritchie, J., & Mill, K. (1988). Gender differences in friendship patterns. *Sex Roles, 19*, 57-66.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Bank, B. J., & Hansford, S. L. (2000). Gender and friendship: Why are men's best same-sex friendship less intimate and supportive? *Personal Relationships, 7*, 63-78.
- Barrett, M.F. (1980). Sexual experience, birth control usage, and sex education of unmarried Canadian university students: Changes between 1968-1978. *Archives of Sexual-Behaviour, 9*, 367-390.
- Berg, J.H., & Archer, R.L. (1980). Disclosure or concern: A second look at liking for the norm breaker. *Journal of Personality, 48*, 245-257.
- Berman, L. (2003). *The puzzle: Exploring the evolutionary puzzle of male homosexuality*. Wilmette, IL. Godot Press.
- Blass, T. & Schwarcz, P. D. (1982). The relative importance of four determinants of attraction. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 117*, 145-146.
- Bleske, A. L. & Buss, D. M. (2000). Can men and women be just friends? *Personal Relationships, 7*, 131-151.

- Bleske-Rechek, A. L. & Buss, D. M. (2001). Opposite-sex friendship: Sex differences and similarities in initiation, selection, and dissolution. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 1310-1323.
- Booth, A. (1972). Sex and social participation. *American Sociological Review, 37*, 183-192.
- Brehm, S. S. (1992). *Intimate relationships*. New York. Mc Graw-Hill.
- Buss, D. M. (1988). The evolution of human intrasexual competition: Tactics of mate attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 616-628.
- Buss, D.M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12*, 1-49.4
- Caldwell, M., & Peplau, L. (1982). Sex differences in same-sex friendship. *Sex Roles, 8*, 721-732.
- Chown, S. M. (1981). Friendship in old age. In S. Duck & R. Gilmour (Eds.) *Personal Relationship 2: Developing Personal Relationships* (pp. 231-246). New York: Academic Press.
- De-Block, A. & Adriaens, P. (2004). Darwinizing sexual ambivalence: A new evolutionary hypothesis of male homosexuality. *Philosophical Psychology, 17*, 59-76.
- Derlega, V. J., Lewis, R. J., Harrison, S., Winstead, B. A., & Costanza, R. (1989). Gender differences in the initiation and attribution of tactile intimacy. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 13*, 83-96.
- Dickens, W. J. & Perlman, D. (1981). Friendship over the life-cycle. In S. Duck & R.

- Gilmour (Eds.) *Personal Relationship 2: Developing Personal Relationships* (pp. 91-122). New York: Academic Press.
- Duck, S., & Wright, P. (1993). Reexamining gender differences in same-gender friendships: A close look at two kinds of data. *Sex Roles, 28*, 709-727.
- Ebbesen, E. B., Kjos, G. L., & Konecni, V. J. (1976). Spatial ecology: Its effects on the choice of friends and enemies. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 12*, 505-518.
- Fehr, B. (1996). *Friendship processes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fehr, B. (2000). The life cycle of friendship. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A Sourcebook* (pp. 71-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fisher, C. S., & Phillips, S. L. (1982). Who is alone? Social characteristics of people with small networks. In L.A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy* (pp.21-39). New York: Wiley Interscience.
- Hays, R. B. (1985). A longitudinal study of friendship development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*, 909-924.
- Helgeson, V. S., Shaver, P., & Dyer, M. (1987). Prototypes of intimacy and distance in same-sex and opposite-sex relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4*, 195-233.
- Johnson, M.P., & Leslie, L. (1982). Couple involvement and network structure: A test of the dyadic withdrawal hypothesis. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 45*, 34-43.
- Knapp, C. W., & Harwood, B. T. (1977). Factors in the determination of intimate

- same-sex friendship. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 131, 83-90.
- Lewis, R. A. (1978). Emotional intimacy among men. *Journal of Social Issues*, 34, 108-121.
- Martin, R. (1997). "Girls don't talk about garages!": Perceptions of conversation in same- and cross-sex friendships. *Personal Relationships*, 4, 115-130.
- Messman, S. J., Canary, D. J., & Hause, K. S. (2000). Motives to remain platonic, equity, and the use of maintenance strategies in opposite-sex friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 17, 67-94.
- Milardo, R. M., Johnson, M. P., & Husten, T. L. (1983). Developing close relationships: Changing patterns of interaction between pair members and social networks. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 964-976.
- Monsour, M. (1992). Meanings of intimacy in cross- and same-sex friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 9, 277-295.
- Monsour, M. (2002). *Women and men as friends: Relationships across the life span in the 21st century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nahemow, L., & Lawton, M. P. (1975). Similarity and propinquity in friendship formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 205-213.
- O'Meara, J. D., (1989). Cross-sex friendship: Four basic challenges of an ignored relationship. *Sex Roles*, 21, 525-543.
- O'Meara, J. D., (1994). Cross-sex friendship's opportunity challenge: Uncharted terrain for exploration. *Personal Relationship Issues*, 2, 4-7.
- Rawlins, W.K. (1992). *Friendship matters: Communication, dialectics, and the life course*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

- Reisman, J.M. (1981). Adult friendships. In S. Duck & R. Gilmour (Eds.) *Personal Relationship 2: Developing Personal Relationships* (pp. 205-230). New York: Academic Press.
- Rose, S. M. (1985). Same- and Cross-sex friendships and the psychology of homosociality. *Sex Roles, 12*, 63-74.
- Swain, S. O. (1992). Men's friendships with women: Intimacy, sexual boundaries, and the informant role. In P.M. Nardi (Ed.), *Men's friendships* (pp. 153-171). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Thorne, B. (1986). Girls and boys together...but mostly apart: Gender arrangements in elementary schools. In W. W. Hartup & Z. Rubin (Eds), *Relationships and development* (pp. 167-184) Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Trivers, R. L. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual selection and the descent on man: 1871-1971* (pp.136-179). Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Winstead, B. A., Derlega, V. J., & Rose, S. (1997). *Gender and close relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wright, P. H. & Scalon, M. B. (1991). Gender role orientations and friendship: Some attenuations, but gender differences abound. *Sex Roles, 24*, 551-566.

Table 1

Correlations Between all Friendship Formation Factors

Friendship Formation Factors	Env	Sit	Dy	Ind	EmoA	Com	SexA	Pro
Environmental (Env)	-							
Situational (Sit)	.36	-						
Dyadic (Dy)	.53	.63	-					
Individual (Ind)	.33	.64	.72	-				
Emotional Access (EmoA)	.17	.53	.67	.71	-			
Companionship (Com)	.39	.66	.78	.69	.67	-		
Sexual Access (SexA)	.23	.32	.37	.53	.25	.29	-	
Protection (Pro)	.27	.49	.55	.64	.60	.58	.31	-

Note. All correlations are significant $p < .001$.

Table 2

Means for all Participants for each Friendship Formation Factor

Friendship Formation Factors	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Emotional Access	4.37 _a	1.06
Companionship	4.36 _a	.72
Situational	4.11 _b	.92
Dyadic	3.99 _{bc}	.81
Individual	3.88 _c	1.00
Protection	3.29 _d	1.38
Environmental	3.16 _d	1.18
Sexual Access	1.76 _e	1.26

Note. Means with different subscripts are significantly different from each other at $p < .05$.

Table 3

Means for Men and Women for each Friendship Formation Factor

Friendship Formation Factors	Women		Men	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Emotional Access	4.90 _a	.86	3.84 _b	1.24
Companionship	4.59 _b	.64	4.14 _a	.80
Situational	4.26 _c	.94	3.97 _{ab}	.90
Dyadic	4.11 _c	.78	3.86 _b	.84
Individual	4.11 _c	.98	3.66 _b	1.01
Protection	3.71 _d	1.19	2.87 _c	1.32
Environmental	3.08 _e	1.25	3.25 _c	1.10
Sexual Access	1.60 _f	1.44	1.92 _d	1.30

Note. In each column, means with different subscripts are significantly different from each other at $p < .05$.

Table 4

Means for Same- and Cross-sex Friendships for each Friendship Formation Factor

Friendship Formation Factors	Same-sex		Cross-sex	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Emotional Access	4.31 _{ab}	1.00	4.43 _a	1.12
Companionship	4.41 _a	.67	4.31 _{ab}	.77
Individual	3.64 _d	1.09	4.13 _{bc}	.86
Situational	4.15 _{bc}	.90	4.07 _c	.94
Dyadic	4.03 _c	.81	3.94 _c	.80
Environmental	3.25 _e	1.21	3.08 _d	1.13
Protection	3.11 _e	1.25	3.46 _d	1.24
Sexual Access	1.19 _f	1.41	2.33 _e	1.31

Note. In each column, means with different subscripts are significantly different from each other at $p < .05$.

Table 5

Means for Men and Women within Same- or Cross-sex Friendships for each Friendship Formation Factor

Friendship Formation Factors	Same-sex				Cross-sex			
	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Emotional Access	5.26 _a	.68	3.36 _{bc}	1.28	4.53 _a	1.04	4.26 _a	1.19
Companionship	4.78 _b	.62	4.04 _a	.70	4.40 _a	.63	4.23 _a	.90
Situational	4.46 _c	.90	3.85 _{ab}	.88	4.04 _b	.95	4.09 _{ab}	.92
Dyadic	4.33 _c	.76	3.73 _b	.84	3.89 _b	.77	3.99 _b	.83
Individual	4.22 _c	1.07	3.05 _c	1.08	4.00 _b	.79	4.22 _a	.93
Environmental	3.22 _d	1.24	3.23 _c	1.15	2.89 _c	1.22	3.26 _c	1.04
Protection	3.60 _d	1.20	2.63 _d	1.27	3.82 _b	1.11	3.10 _c	1.39
Sexual Access	1.41 _e	1.50	.98 _e	1.19	1.79 _d	1.24	2.87 _c	1.39

Notes. Means in this table differ from the means in tables 6, 7, 8, and 9 because of missing data. In each column, means with different subscripts are significantly different from each other at $p < .05$.

Table 6

Means Comparing Men and Women within Same- and Cross-sex Friendships for Cross-

Sex Friendship Formation Factors

Friendship Formation Factors	Same-sex				Cross-sex			
	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Emotional Access	5.23*	.73	3.49*	1.27	4.53	1.04	4.33	1.19
Companionship	4.79*	.66	4.14*	.72	4.40	.64	4.23	.89
Protection	3.64*	1.17	2.80*	1.27	3.82*	1.11	3.10*	1.37
Sexual Access	1.41	1.50	.98	1.20	1.79*	1.24	2.87*	1.40

Note. Within same- and cross-sex sections, in each row, means with an asterisk are significantly different from each other, $p < .01$.

Table 7

Means Comparing Men and Women Within Same- or Cross-Sex Friendships for Same-Sex Friendship Formation Factors

Friendship Formation Factors	Same-sex				Cross-sex			
	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Situational	4.50*	.89	3.88*	1.00	4.04	.95	4.09	.92
Dyadic	4.36*	.77	3.81*	.82	3.89	.77	4.00	.82
Individual	4.26*	1.05	3.16*	1.05	4.00	.78	4.26	.93
Environmental	3.35	1.23	3.39	1.18	2.89	1.21	3.26	1.03

Note. In each row, means with the same superscripts are significantly different from each other at $p < .001$.

Table 8

Means Comparing Same- and Cross-Sex friendships for Men and Women for Cross-Sex Friendship Formation Factors

Friendship Formation Factors	Women				Men			
	Same-sex		Cross-sex		Same-sex		Cross-sex	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Emotional Access	5.23*	.73	4.53*	1.04	3.49 [†]	1.27	4.33 [†]	1.19
Companionship	4.79*	.66	4.40*	.64	4.14	.72	4.23	.89
Protection	3.64	1.17	3.82	1.11	2.80	1.27	3.10	1.37
Sexual Access	1.41	1.50	1.79	1.24	.98 [†]	1.20	2.87 [†]	1.40

Note. In each row, means with the same asterisks are significantly different from each other at $p < .01$.

Table 9

Means Comparing Same- and Cross-sex Friendships for Men and Women for Same-Sex Friendship Formation Factors

Friendship Formation Factors	Women				Men			
	Same-sex		Cross-sex		Same-sex		Cross-sex	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Situational	4.50*	.89	4.04*	.95	3.88	1.00	4.09	.92
Dyadic	4.36*	.77	3.89*	.77	3.81	.82	4.00	.82
Individual	4.26	1.05	4.00	.78	3.16 [†]	1.05	4.26 [†]	.93
Environmental	3.35*	1.23	2.89*	1.21	3.39	1.18	3.26	1.03

Note. In each row, means with the same superscripts are significantly different from each other at $p < .05$.

Table 10

Mean Number of Friends for Men and Women in Romantic Relationships

Number of Friends	Women		Men	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Total number of reported friends	11.79	17.18	10.72	7.24
Reported female friends	7.41*	11.05	3.72*	3.58
Reported male friends	4.38*	6.42	7.07*	4.43
Total number of listed friends	10.10	5.39	10.24	7.08
Listed female friends	6.26*	3.11	3.37*	3.06
Listed male friends	3.84*	2.98	6.86*	4.55

Note. In each row, means with an asterisk are significantly different from each other at $p < .01$.

Table 11

Correlations Between Length of Time in a Romantic Relationship and the Number of Friends

Number of Friends	Women		Men	
	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Total number of reported friends	-.16	.19	-.18	.30
Reported female friends	-.19	.12	-.25	.14
Reported male friends	-.09	.47	-.11	.51
Total number of listed friends	-.16	.19	-.13	.43
Listed female friends	-.17	.20	-.20	.24
Listed male friends	-.05	.72	-.07	.70

Table 12

Correlations Between Length of Time in a Romantic Relationship and the Number of Friends for Men and Women

Number of Friends	Women		Men	
	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Total number of reported friends	-.15	.11	-.27	.06
Reported female friends	-.18	.07	-.20	.12
Reported male friends	-.09	.24	-.29	.05
Total number of listed friends	-.16	.19	-.24	.03
Listed female friends	-.16	.12	-.12	.25
Listed male friends	-.05	.37	-.28	.06

Appendix A

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Please call to mind a specific person of the other sex that you know very well and who is a **close friend** (that you have been friends with for at least 3 months and is not a member of your family). That is, we want you to think of someone whom you have known for at least three months and who is not a family member. Throughout this questionnaire, when asked about your friend, please think about **this close cross-sex friend** and circle the number that best describes **your impressions** of your friendship.

Please keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions in this package. We are simply trying to learn about people's experiences, beliefs, and impressions of cross-sex friendships.

AS A REMINDER FOR YOUR SELF, YOUR FRIENDS INITIALS ARE:

Appendix B

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Please call to mind a specific person of the same sex that you know very well and who is a **close friend** (that you have been friends with for at least 3 months and is not a member of your family). That is, we want you to think of someone whom you have known for at least 3 months and is not a family member. Through out this questionnaire, when asked about your friend, please think about **this close same-sex friend** and circle the number that best describes **your impressions** of your friendship.

Please keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions in this package. We are simply trying to learn about people's experiences, beliefs, and impressions of same-sex friendships.

AS A REMINDER FOR YOUR SELF, YOUR FRIENDS INITIALS ARE:

Appendix C

Please provide the following background information about **yourself**.

1) Age: _____

2) Gender: _____

3) What country were you born in? _____

3a) If you were not born in Canada, how long have you lived here?

4) What is your first language? _____

5) What is your ethnic background? _____

6) How long (in months) have you been in this friendship? _____
Months

7) Please indicate your sexual orientation by circling one of the following:

a) heterosexual, b) gay or lesbian, c) bisexual, d) transgender, e) undecided, or f) other.

8) Are you in a romantic heterosexual relationship? _____

8a) If you are in a romantic heterosexual relationship, indicate (in months) how long you

have been in this relationship: _____ Months

9) Are you married?

9a) If you are married, indicate (in months) how long you have been married for:

_____ Months

For questions 10, 11, 12, and 16, only include good, close, and best friends (Do not include acquaintances or casual friends. Also, do not include your romantic partner or family members).

10) How many friends do you have? _____

11) How many of your friends are female? _____

12) How many of your friends are male? _____

13) If you are in a romantic relationship, how many of your cross-sex friends were your partners' friends before they were yours? _____

14) If you are in a romantic relationship, how many of your same-sex friends were your partner's friends before they were yours?

15) What sex is your best friend (other than your romantic partner)?

16) Please list your friend's first names below:

Appendix D

Please provide the following background information about **your friend** whose initials you put on the first page of the questionnaire. If you do not know the answer to a question, please write in "don't know."

- 1) Age: _____
- 2) Gender: _____
- 3) What country was he/she born in? _____
- 3a) If he/she was not born in Canada, how long has he/she lived here?

- 4) What is his/her first language? _____
- 5) What is his/her ethnic background? _____
- 6) Please indicate his/her sexual orientation by circling one of the following:
a) heterosexual, b) gay or lesbian, c) bisexual, d) transgender, e) undecided, or f) other.
- 7) Is he/she in a romantic heterosexual relationship? _____
- 7a) If he/she is in a romantic heterosexual relationship, indicate (in months) how long he/she has been in this relationship: _____ Months
- 9) Is he/she married?
- 9a) If he/she is married, indicate (in months) how long he/she has been married for:
_____ Months

Appendix F

Thinking about your cross-sex friend, circle the number between 0 and 6 that best describes the reason **why your friendship was formed**. In other words, rank the importance that each item played in your **friendship formation** (if an item does not apply to you, please circle "not relevant")

1. I felt like I was more important than him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
2. It was easy for us to get together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
3. I was able to receive emotional support from him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
4. He/she watched over me in any situation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
5. We were similar in age.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
6. We could spend time just talking.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
7. He/she was able to comfort me in time of need.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
8. We lived close to one another.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
9. He/she was someone that I could go to dinner with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
10. He/she was good looking.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
11. He/she showed interest in me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
12. I felt that he/she would watch out for me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
13. He/she was someone that I could have fun with/ do activities with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
14. He/she wanted to date me, but I didn't want to date him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
15. I felt that he/she would step in if someone was harassing me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
16. We had similar formal education.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
17. I was sexually attracted to him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
18. We had similar socio-economic status during childhood.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
19. He/she was someone that I could be spontaneous with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				

20. I was able to discuss personal information with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
21. We went to the same University.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
22. He/she walked me to my car at night.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
23. He/she was someone that I could hang out with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
24. We were able to learn from one another.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
25. We lived in the same neighbourhood.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
26. He/she showed concern for me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
27. I felt safer in dangerous situations when I was with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
28. He/she was someone that I could do laundry with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
29. I was willing to spend time with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
30. We had a shared activity together (hockey, piano lessons, dance lessons).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
31. We had similar interests.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
32. I felt like he/she was more important than me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
33. I trusted him/her to keep confidences.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
34. We were neighbours.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
35. He/she increased my self-esteem.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
36. We had a lot of fun together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
37. He/she was someone that I could play games with (cards, video games, golf, etc).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
38. We had similar attitudes about mutually important issues.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
39. He/she was willing to spend time with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
40. We had the same ethnic background.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
41. I was able to talk to him/her about my romantic relationships.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				

42. He/she protected me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
43. We were both male/female.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
44. We went to the same junior high.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
45. I was willing to share my possessions with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
46. He/she was someone that I could share time with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
47. I wanted to date him, but he didn't want to date me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
48. I could be honest with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
49. We lived in the same apartment complex.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
50. We kept running into one another.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
51. He/she had good social skills.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
52. I was physically attracted to him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
53. I was able to give him/her advice.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
54. It was not difficult to get together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
55. We had the same economic status	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
56. He/she was someone that I could share tasks with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
57. I had time to spend with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
58. I was able to talk to him/her about my dates.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
59. He/she was someone that could act as a "date" for special occasions	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
60. She/he had sex with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
61. He/she was someone that I could share special rituals with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
62. He/she responded well to what I told him/her	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
63. He/she knew one of my family members.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				

64. I could discuss personal problems with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
65. I wanted to have sex with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
66. We had similar personalities.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
67. He/she had time to spend with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
68. I did not feel like he/she was more important than me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
69. I agreed with his/her opinions.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
70. He/she was everything I could ask for in a romantic partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
71. We had similar attitudes about many different issues.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
72. Our parents were friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
73. He/she was someone that I could act goofy with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
74. I wanted someone to interact with in a sexual but playful way.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
75. He/she would walk me home at night.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
76. I was able to talk about myself with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
77. He/she seemed to enjoy my presence.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
78. He/she was willing to share his/her possessions with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
79. He/she was physically attractive.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
80. I wanted to pursue her/him as a short-term sex partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
81. He/she was someone that I could do homework with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
82. I did not feel that he/she was my equal.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
83. He/she was someone that I could share routine activities with	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
84. He/she was understanding.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
85. I was able to act naturally around him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				

85. I was able to act naturally around him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
86. We went to the same high school.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
87. He/she was someone that I could go see movies with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
88. He/she thought I was physically attractive.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
89. We had similar religious beliefs.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
90. We went to the same elementary school.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
91. We had free time to spend with one another.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
92. He/she told me the things he/she appreciated about me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
93. I was able to talk about my feelings with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
94. We could spend time together doing the same activity.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
95. There was the possibility of a future relationship beyond friendship.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
96. He/she took care of me when another guy/girl was being to sexually aggressive toward me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
97. I wanted a friendship that would provide sexual benefits.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
98. I felt that he/she was my equal.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
99. We had classes together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
100. We liked the same things.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
101. I showed concern for him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
102. I felt safer when I was with him/her	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
103. I did not feel like I was more important than him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
104. It was not difficult to find time for each other	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
105. He/she knew one of my friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
106. We were from the same town.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				

107. We had similar current financial situation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
108. I was able to seek advice from him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
109. I wanted someone to flirt with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
110. He/she seemed loyal.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
111. I showed interest in him/her	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
112. I responded well to what he/she told me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
113. We worked together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
114. We had the same group of friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
115. I wanted inside information on how the other sex thinks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				

Appendix G

Thinking about your same-sex friend, circle the number between 0 and 6 that best describes the reason **why your friendship was formed**. In other words, rank the importance that each item played in your **friendship formation** (if an item does not apply to you, please circle "not relevant")

1. I felt like I was more important than him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
2. It was easy for us to get together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
3. I was able to receive emotional support from him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
4. He/she watched over me in any situation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
5. We were similar in age.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
6. We could spend time just talking.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
7. He/she was able to comfort me in time of need.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
8. We lived close to one another.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
9. He/she was someone that I could go to dinner with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
10. He/she was good looking.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
11. He/she showed interest in me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
12. I felt that he/she would watch out for me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
13. He/she was someone that I could have fun with/ do activities with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
14. He/she wanted to date me, but I didn't want to date him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
15. I felt that he/she would step in if someone was harassing me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
16. We had similar formal education.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
17. I was sexually attracted to him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
18. We had similar socio-economic status during childhood.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
19. He/she was someone that I could be spontaneous with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			

20. I was able to discuss personal information with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
21. We went to the same University.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
22. He/she walked me to my car at night.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
23. He/she was someone that I could hang out with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
24. We were able to learn from one another.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
25. We lived in the same neighbourhood.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
26. He/she showed concern for me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
27. I felt safer in dangerous situations when I was with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
28. He/she was someone that I could do laundry with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
29. I was willing to spend time with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
30. We had a shared activity together (hockey, piano lessons, dance lessons).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
31. We had similar interests.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
32. I felt like he/she was more important than me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
33. I trusted him/her to keep confidences.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
34. We were neighbours.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
35. He/she increased my self-esteem.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
36. We had a lot of fun together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
37. He/she was someone that I could play games with (cards, video games, golf, etc).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
38. We had similar attitudes about mutually important issues.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
39. He/she was willing to spend time with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
40. We had the same ethnic background.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
41. I was able to talk to him/her about my romantic relationships.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				

42. He/she protected me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
43. We were both male/female.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
44. We went to the same junior high.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
45. I was willing to share my possessions with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
46. He/she was someone that I could share time with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
47. I wanted to date him, but he didn't want to date me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
48. I could be honest with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
49. We lived in the same apartment complex.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
50. We kept running into one another.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
51. He/she had good social skills.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
52. I was physically attracted to him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
53. I was able to give him/her advice.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
54. It was not difficult to get together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
55. We had the same economic status	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
56. He/she was someone that I could share tasks with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
57. I had time to spend with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
58. I was able to talk to him/her about my dates.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
59. He/she was someone that could act as a "date" for special occasions	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
60. She/he had sex with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
61. He/she was someone that I could share special rituals with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
62. He/she responded well to what I told him/her	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
63. He/she knew one of my family members.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			

64. I could discuss personal problems with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
65. I wanted to have sex with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
66. We had similar personalities.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
67. He/she had time to spend with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
68. I did not feel like he/she was more important than me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
69. I agreed with his/her opinions.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
70. He/she was everything I could ask for in a romantic partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
71. We had similar attitudes about many different issues.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
72. Our parents were friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
73. He/she was someone that I could act goofy with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
74. I wanted someone to interact with in a sexual but playful way.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
75. He/she would walk me home at night.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
76. I was able to talk about myself with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
77. He/she seemed to enjoy my presence.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
78. He/she was willing to share his/her possessions with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
79. He/she was physically attractive.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
80. I wanted to pursue her/him as a short-term sex partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
81. He/she was someone that I could do homework with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
82. I did not feel that he/she was my equal.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
83. He/she was someone that I could share routine activities with	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
84. He/she was understanding.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
85. I was able to act naturally around him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				

85. I was able to act naturally around him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
86. We went to the same high school.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
87. He/she was someone that I could go see movies with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
88. He/she thought I was physically attractive.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
89. We had similar religious beliefs.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
90. We went to the same elementary school.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
91. We had free time to spend with one another.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
92. He/she told me the things he/she appreciated about me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
93. I was able to talk about my feelings with him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
94. We could spend time together doing the same activity.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
95. There was the possibility of a future relationship beyond friendship.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
96. He/she took care of me when another guy/girl was being to sexually aggressive toward me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
97. I wanted a friendship that would provide sexual benefits.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
98. I felt that he/she was my equal.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
99. We had classes together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
100. We liked the same things.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
101. I showed concern for him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
102. I felt safer when I was with him/her	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
103. I did not feel like I was more important than him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
104. It was not difficult to find time for each other	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
105. He/she knew one of my friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				
106. We were from the same town.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important			very important				

107. We had similar current financial situation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
108. I was able to seek advice from him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
109. I wanted someone to flirt with.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
110. He/she seemed loyal.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
111. I showed interest in him/her	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
112. I responded well to what he/she told me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
113. We worked together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
114. We had the same group of friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			
115. I wanted inside information on how the other sex thinks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	not relevant
	not important				very important			

Appendix H

Environmental

We lived close to one another.
 We had the same group of friends.
 We were neighbours.
 We lived in the same apartment complex.
 We worked together.
 We went to the same elementary school.
 We went to the same junior high.
 We went to the same high school.
 We went to the same University.
 We had classes together.
 Our parents were friends.
 We were from the same town.
 We lived in the same neighbourhood.
 We had a shared activity together (hockey, piano lessons, dance lessons).
 He/she knew one of my friends.
 He/she knew one of my family members.

Situational

He/she was willing to spend time with me.
 I was easy for us to get together.
 We had free time to spend with one another.
 He/she had time to spend with me.
 I had time to spend with him/her.
 We kept running into one another.
 It was not difficult to get together.
 I was willing to spend time with him/her
 It was not difficult to find time for each other

Dyadic

He/she seemed to enjoy my presence.
 He/she increased my self-esteem.
 I was able to talk about myself with him/her.
 We were able to learn from one another.
 I was able to act naturally around him/her.
 I could be honest with him/her.
 I trusted him/her to keep confidences.
 He/she was willing to share his/her possessions with me.
 I was willing to share my possessions with him/her.
 He/she seemed loyal.
 He/she told the things he/she appreciated about me.

We had the same ethnic background.
We had similar parental means during childhood.
We had similar current financial situation.
We had similar formal education.
We were similar in age.
We had similar personalities.
We had similar attitudes about mutually important issues.
We had similar attitudes about many different issues.
I agreed with his/her opinions.
We liked the same things.
We had similar religious beliefs.
We were both male/female.
We had the same economic status.
We had similar interests.

Individual

He/she was physically attractive.
He/she showed concern for me.
He/she had good social skills.
He/she showed interest in me.
He/she responded well to what I told him/her.
I showed concern for him/her.
He/she thought I was physically attractive.
I showed interest in him/her.
I responded well to what he/she told me.

Emotional / intimacy

I was able to discuss personal information with him/her.
I was able to talk about my feelings with him/her.
I was able to talk to him/her about my dates.
I was able to seek advice from him/her.
I was able to give him/her advice.
He/she was able to comfort me in time of need.
He/she was understanding.
I could discuss personal problems with him/her.
I was able to receive emotional support from him/her.
I was able to talk to him/her about my romantic relationships.

Companionship / shared activities

He/she was someone that I could do homework with.
He/she was someone that I could do laundry with.
He/she was someone that I could hang out with.
He/she was someone that I could act goofy with.

He/she was someone that could act as a "date" for special occasions.
He/she was someone that I could go see movies with.
He/she was someone that I could go to dinner with.
He/she was someone that I could play games with (cards, video games, golf, etc)
He/she was someone that I could share tasks with.
He/she was someone that I could share routine activities with.
He/she was someone that I could share special rituals with.
He/she was someone that I could share time with.
He/she was someone that I could be spontaneous with.
We had a lot of fun together.
We could spend time together doing the same activity.
We could spend time just talking.
He/she was someone that I could have fun with/do activities with.

Sexual access

I wanted someone to flirt with.
I wanted someone to interact with in a sexual but playful way.
He/she wanted to date me, but I didn't want to date him/her.
There was the possibility of a future relationship beyond friendship.
He/she was everything I could ask for in a romantic partner.
I was sexually attracted to him/her.
I was physically attracted to him/her.
He/she was good looking.
I wanted to have sex with him/her.
She/he had sex with me.
I wanted to pursue her/him as a short-term sex partner.
I wanted to date him, but he didn't want to date me.
I wanted inside information on how the other sex thinks.
I wanted a friendship that would provide sexual benefits.

Protection

He/she walked me to my car at night.
He/she protected me.
I felt safer in dangerous situations when I was with him/her.
He/she took care of me when another guy/girl was being to sexually aggressive toward me.
He/she watched over me in any situation.
I felt safer when I was with him/her.
I felt that he/she would watch out for me.
I felt that he/she would step in if someone was harassing me.
He/she would walk me home at night.

Equality

I felt that he/she was my equal.

I did not feel like he/she was more important than me.

I did not feel that he/she was my equal.

I felt like he/she was more important than me.

I felt like I was more important than him/her.

I did not feel like I was more important than him/her.