ADOLESCENT RELATIONSHIPS WITH SIGNIFICANT ADULTS OTHER THAN PARENTS: A COMMUNITY STUDY

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Edward Francis Hauck, B.S., M.Ed.

* * * *

The Ohio State University
1971

Approved by

Alexander Grauer
Adviser
Department of Early and Middle Childhood Education
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer gratefully acknowledges the assistance of those who made this research study possible. First, he is deeply appreciative of the members of his reading committee for their expertise, interest, and guidance. They were: Dr. Alexander Frazier, Chairman, Dr. Edgar Dale, Dr. John E. Horrocks, and Dr. George G. Thompson, of the Ohio State University.

Gratitude is extended to Dr. Stanley Lore, Dr. Richard D. Magee, and Dr. Robert H. Rittle, of the Psychology Department, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, for their services as panel raters. The writer is indebted to Dr. Jack L. Shepler for assistance in statistical treatment.

Finally, the writer acknowledges the cooperation of Dr. Robert P. Martin, Superintendent, Mr. Richard McGee, Senior High Principal, Mr. Joseph Bosnic, Junior High Principal, Mr. Harry McFarland, Elementary Principal, Mr. Eugene Kunselman, Senior High Counselor, and Mr. Charles Stewart, Junior High Counselor, of the Indiana Area School District, Indiana, Pennsylvania
DEDICATION

This research study is dedicated to my wife Ruth, my son Thomas, and daughters Janet and Mary Ann. Their encouragement, patience, and understanding are deeply appreciated.
VITA

September 21, 1933 . . . . . . Born - Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania

1952-1955 . . . . . . Personnel Administration, United States Army, Europe

1958 . . . . . . B. S., Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Pennsylvania

1958-1962 . . . . . Sixth Grade Teacher, Penn Hills School District, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania


1962-1965 . . . . . Assistant Professor, Campus Laboratory School, Slippery Rock State College, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

1965-1966 . . . . . Assistant Professor, Campus Laboratory School, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Pennsylvania

1966-1967 . . . . . Teaching Associate, Elementary Education, College of Education, The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio

1967-1968 . . . . . Research Associate, The Center for Research and Leadership Development in Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1968-1971 . . . . . Associate Professor, Department of Learning Resources and Mass Media Indiana University of Pennsylvania Indiana, Pennsylvania
PUBLICATIONS


FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Elementary Education

Studies in Elementary Education. Professor Alexander Frazier

Studies in Audiovisual Communication. Professor Edgar Dale

Studies in Developmental Psychology. Professors George G. Thompson and John E. Horrocks
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITA</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter**

**I. THE PROBLEM.**

- Introduction to the Problem
- Statement of the Problem
- Need for the Study
- Definitions
- Assumptions
- Limitations
- Organization of the Study

**II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH.**

- Self Concept and Interpersonal Theory
- Youth-Adult Relationships
- Value Definitions and Needs
- Significant Adults in the Community
- Summary

**III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION**

- Development of the Questionnaire
- Questionnaire Validity
- Questionnaire Reliability
- Selection of the Population and the Sample
- Collection of the Data
Chapter

IV. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA .................................................. 60

   Procedures for Analysis of Data
   Extent of Adolescent Friendships with Adults
   Sources of Adult Friends for Adolescents
   Officially Assigned Adults as Sources of Friends
   How Well Adult Friend was Known by Parents
   Effect of Formal and Informal Associations
   Effect of Face-to-Face versus Group Contacts
   Frequency of Interaction and Effect of Proximity
   Age of the Adult Friend
   Sex Differences and Friendships
   Usual Activities for Interaction
   Adolescent Needs Met in Relationships with Adults
   Summary

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ...................... 104

   Purpose and Procedure
   Objectives and Hypotheses
   Conclusions and Implications
   Significance of the Study
   Recommendations for Further Research

APPENDIX

   A .............................................................. 126
   B .............................................................. 143
   C .............................................................. 144
   D .............................................................. 145

   BIBLIOGRAPHY ....................................................... 148
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Respondents Reporting On a Friendship with a Grown-up Other than Parents—By Grade and By Sex</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pre-Adolescents and Adolescents Report of Present Friendship with an Adult Other than Parents</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pre-Adolescents and Adolescents Report of Present Friendship with an Adult Other than Parents, Test by Sex</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students' Reports of Sources of Adult Friends for Present Friendships</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Combined Categories of Relatives, Neighbors, and Friends of Family as Sources of Significant Adults for Present Friendships (Adolescents Only)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students Reporting Present Friendships with Assigned vs. Un-assigned Adults</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assigned Adults vs. Un-assigned Adults as Sources of Adult Friends for Present Friendships</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Responses of Pre-Adolescents and Adolescents to Question &quot;How Well is Adult Friend Known by Parents&quot; for Present Friendship</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Formal vs. Informal Associations as a Basis for Present Friendships with Adults</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Formal vs. Informal Associations as a Basis for Significant Relationships with Adults</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Social Setting for Interaction with Adult Friend—Present Friendship</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Face-to-Face vs. Group Interaction as a Basis for a Present Friendship with an Adult</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Rank Order Report of Frequency of Contact with Adult Friend—For Present Friendships</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The Effect of Geographical Separation (Proximity) on Present Friendships with Adults</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Age of the Adult Friend Reported for Present Friendships</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Test of the Relationship Between the Age of the Present Adult Friend and the Age of the Respondent</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Sex of the Adult Friend for Present Friendships</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Relationship Between the Sex of the Respondent and Sex of Adult Friend—Present Friendships</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Rank Order Tabulation of Usual Activities with Adult Friend—Present Friendships</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Categories for Psychological Needs—Horrocks</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction to the Problem

The terms "significant others" and "influential others" have been used in the literature of social psychology for many years. The interpersonal behavior event is presumed to be the central unit of analysis for the social psychologist. Secord and Backman, in 1964, discussing the role of significant interpersonal relations in the development of self, said:

A presumably vital factor shaping the self-concept, but one little studied by scientists, is found in the influence of a highly significant other person on the individual. Often a person forms a close tie to someone else who greatly influences his behavior. This other person may be a close friend, or he may be someone who is older and highly respected or admired. (Italics added).

Many adults other than parents interact with adolescents in the community. These interactions are often memorable and influential, altering the self concept, goals, and aspirations of the adolescent, and thereby assisting in the development of an interiorized value system which affects the life-role of this young person.


Study of the non-family relationships of adults and adolescents may touch on a number of as yet unanswered questions about adolescent development and adolescent-adult relationships. At the most naive and descriptive level, one might ask:

1. What proportion of our adolescents experience a valued relationship with adults other than their parents?

2. From available members of the community, who do adolescents select as adult friends? What reasons do they give for their selection?

3. How are these relationships formed?

4. What is the frequency of interaction or association?

5. What effect does adolescent maturation have on relationships with adults?

6. What role does the family play in adolescent selection of adult friends?

7. What takes place during adolescent-adult interaction?

8. What do adolescents derive from these relationships?

From the standpoint of theory development, some appropriate questions would be:

1. How well does past and present theorizing about adolescent development account for the findings of a descriptive study in this area? That is, would the same or similar results have been predicted?

2. What theorizing gains support as a result of descriptive findings? Are some theories better than others for predictive purposes?

3. Must present theory be modified to account for descriptive findings? In what ways?

4. Is there a developmental sequence operative in adolescent-adult relationships?
At the level of application, the following questions are posed:

1. Are the descriptive findings consistent with community practices in providing for adolescent development?

2. To what extent do significant relationships arise out of community agencies provided for the socialization and development of adolescents?

3. Must our community efforts be modified? In what ways?

The questions listed above are not exhaustive, nor are they meant to be. They are posed in order to indicate the inextricable link between descriptive studies, theory, and application.

In this study, the writer does not presume to provide satisfactory answers to all of the questions posed. Theories are broadly conceived, and require careful analyses of myriad sources of information, due deliberation by persons skilled in theorizing, and vigorous testing in the social-psychological marketplace. At the level of application, the present study could raise some questions about community practices, offer support for present practices, or indicate some potential directions for change. However, the study was designed to supply information at the naive and descriptive level in order to provide a firmer base for the theoretical and applied levels.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this research was to investigate and describe adolescent relationships with significant adults other than their parents in one community.
Basic to the study was the administration of a moderately structured questionnaire to a cross-section of pre-adolescents and adolescents in one community to obtain self-reports which described a relationship with a significant adult other than their parents. These self-reports were secured from public-school students in grades six, eight, ten, and twelve in a relatively heterogeneous small city.

Information secured in the self-reports was then analyzed to meet specific objectives which had been selected prior to the administration of the questionnaire. Pre-formulated hypotheses were tested for significance.

Specific objectives. The specific objectives which follow were designated for the study:

1. To develop descriptive data showing to what extent pre-adolescents and adolescents report friendships with adults other than their parents.

2. To develop descriptive data showing the sources of influential adults, other than parents, for adolescents in one community.

3. To assess the effect of family relationship, both social friendships and family of orientation or procreation, on the sources of significant adults.

4. To compare the proportion of adults named as significant adults, who are officially assigned to interact with adolescents, against the proportion of adults also named but not officially assigned to interact with adolescents.

5. To analyze the effects of formal versus informal associations with significant adults.

6. To assess the effects of face-to-face (one-to-one) versus group contacts on interaction with significant adults.

7. To analyze the effects of sex and age on relationships with preferred adults other than the parents of the respondents.
8. To assess the effect of geographical separation on adolescent-significant adult interaction.

9. To describe the frequency of interaction and the mode of interaction.

10. To summarize and compare by sex and by age groupings, the self-reports of adolescent needs served in these relationships.

**Hypotheses.** The following research hypotheses were formulated for this study:

1. There will be no significant difference between the number of adolescents in the sample who report a present friendship with an adult, against those who do not report a present friendship with an adult.

2. There will be no significant relationship between the sex of the respondents and the report of present friendships.

3. There will be no significant relationship between sex and age of the respondents and the family relationship of the significant adult.

4. There will be no significant difference between the proportion of assigned and un-assigned adults named as significant adults.

5. There will be no significant relationship between the sex and age of the respondents and how well the adult friend is known by the parents.

6. There will be no significant difference between the proportion of friendships which occur in informal settings versus those which occur in formal settings.

7. There will be no significant difference between face-to-face interaction versus group-based interaction as a basis for significant relationships with adult friends.

8. There will be no significant relationship between the age of the significant adults and the age of the respondents.

9. There will be no significant relationship between the sex of the significant adults and the sex of the respondents.
10. There will be no significant differences among the types of adolescent needs met by adolescent-significant adult relationships when tested by sex and by age of respondents.

Need for the Study

While parents serve as representatives of the culture during the early stages of development, as the adolescent moves into the larger society, peers and other adults also serve as important arbiters of the culture. The adolescent seeking confirmation of his "self" as reflected in the family setting, undoubtedly undertakes some "reality testing" within the larger society. Contacts with persons outside the family would lead him either to stabilize those areas of self which have been reflected within the family setting or to alter his self concept in the light of new information.

Peer influence, while important, would seem to be limited to those areas for which the best friend or peer groups possess relevant experience. Adolescents may be perceptive enough to know that in other areas of personal concern, adolescent friends and peer groups cannot advise from a basis of experience. These areas would include career development, heterosexual adjustment, finances, employment, and adult social practices.

The major sources of significant others would appear to be the family, peers, and others. The "others" who come into repeated, direct contact with adolescents and who could help pave the way for entry into the adult society would include other adults in the community.

In practice we subscribe to the theory that friendly adults are important to normal adolescent development. It is a consideration in the
employment of teachers, school counselors, and adult leaders for youth in church, social, and recreational activities. Many of the efforts to salvage delinquents proceed as if we believe significant adults do make a difference. The assignment of social workers to high-delinquency areas; the effort to develop "understanding" teachers, counselors, therapists, ministers, and social workers who work with delinquents; our concern with personal contact and interaction—all of these indicate acceptance of the hypothesis that interpersonal relations are an effective means of overcoming the debilitating effects of poor environment and family deprivation. The Big Brothers of America organization attempts to supply a significant adult male to delinquent boys or boys thought to be potential offenders.3

Horrocks (1962) in retracing the adolescent development of "Mary Marlowe," a socially maladjusted adolescent who had attempted suicide, stated in the case study, "Essentially it appears that if at almost any point in Mary's high school career she could have had access to a sympathetic and understanding person who would have tried to help her, much might have been accomplished."4

To what extent is the presence of a sympathetic, understanding adult, a part of the normal development of our adolescents? Where are


such people found in our communities? A review of the literature does not reveal any systematic efforts within our culture to identify the significant adults in the community setting, or to describe the adolescent needs which are being met through these relationships.

In France, Rodriguez Tome (1965) asked 235 boys and 149 girls attending lycées in Paris whether or not they had a relationship with an adult aside from their parents, who merited their respect and admiration. If a positive response, a brief description of the adult was to be written. Fifty-two gave positive responses, more of which were given by girls and by sixteen-year-olds (average age of the younger group). A male was the preferred adult in 83 per cent of the boys' responses and in 52 per cent of the girls' responses. Relatives were named by 35.8 per cent, and neighbors, family friends, and instructors were named by about 20 per cent.5

The writer was unable to find evidence of any similar descriptive studies in the United States. Some questionnaires, interviews, direct observation, and biographies have revealed the presence and effects of significant adults other than parents on the lives of our adolescents. These studies have been after-the-fact, or peripheral to this study. Lower (1967) in summarizing his review of the literature and research reported:

Theoretical positions of Rogers, Fromm, Sullivan, and Jersild have been pursued to allow certain important persons, such as

"warm teacher," or "peer leader" to emerge. "Significant others" and "valued persons" have been noted. However, those persons and/or groups whom the student himself may freely designate as having contributed significant influence in his own personality formation has not been investigated. (Italics added).

He explained:

Certain persons and/or groups have been chosen arbitrarily, such as parents, teachers, leaders, and peers, in those studies which deal more concisely with self concept.6

One example of research using arbitrary and exclusive categories is that of Nelson (1967). In a study of the understanding of youth problems on the part of community workers, Nelson asked high school freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors to designate levels of esteem of certain community workers, and to identify persons to whom they turned for help with problems within the previous year. Choices were limited to pre-selected categories of: senior pastor, staff clergyman who works essentially with youth, school counselor, school teacher, peer friend, and parents.7 (Adult friends were not considered, except as they appeared in the previous categories.)

Lower (1967) did not require his subjects to designate influences on personality formation from pre-selected categories--students designated the significant "other" from "all the people ever known." The purpose of Lower's study was to examine certain relationships between

---


college students' self concepts and their perception of influential others. Students were asked to designate past influences on their personality development by greatest level of influence, then to secondary and tertiary levels. After securing students' responses, Lower classified persons or groups designated as influential others into ten categories: father, mother, parents, other family member, school group, social group, service group, peer friend, professional person, and odd mention.8

Lower's research differed from the present study in the following ways: (1) in view of his limited college-age population, age-stage differences were not examined; (2) his subjects were drawn from college populations rather than the more general population found in the community-at-large; (3) attention was focused on the perception of self as a correlate of the students' designated influential others rather than focusing on the nature of the adolescent-adult relationships and the needs served; and (4) it is probable that influential adults other than parents were separated or grouped into the several categories (e.g., other family member, professional person, service group, social group, and odd mention).

Further evidence of the need for a basic descriptive study was found in a research study by Kemper in 1963. After failing to establish a relationship between self concept and the characteristics and expec-

tations of significant others in a study of male business executives, Kemper stated:

The conclusion of this work can only point to the beginning of new investigations into the problem of the relationship between self and others. The failings of this study may perhaps be summed up by the thought that too much was attempted too soon. Instead of island-hopping, a giant step to the goal was attempted. It is by hindsight that we most often learn that the acquisition of empirical knowledge is by tiny-hard-won increments.9

In his suggestions for further research Kemper listed as first priority, the need for descriptive studies of self and others, suggesting:

A fruitful way to enter the area of the relationship between self and others is to start at perhaps the most naive level of all. This would involve asking individuals to name their significant others and, for each of these others, the characteristics and expectations that make him significant.10

The present study was exploratory in nature, designed to provide some information at the descriptive level which could be used as a base for comparative studies with other populations. It seems unlikely that we will be able to understand the external forces which the adolescent encounters in his development unless we possess more adequate information about his social interactions. While human development is recognized as an individual task, yet in understanding the nature of development and in aiding or counseling youth, it is imperative that information about what is normal or typical for human development be available to those attempting to understand and facilitate individual growth.

10Ibid.
In view of the popular attention given to adolescent-adult alienation, objective description of adolescent-adult relationships would seem to be of crucial importance. It was felt that the study might supply some insight into adolescent-adult relationships relative to questions of current interest in our society. One such question might be, "What effect is the so-called 'generation gap' having on adolescent-adult relationships?" If the effect is great, we would expect that more adolescents would report friendships with young adults rather than with older adults.

Another question of importance is, "As a general rule, do adolescents distrust adults?" If such is the case, we might expect to find few adolescent-adult friendships. A third question of interest might be, "Are current reports of adolescent-adult alienation overstated or understated?"

It seemed that in order to deal with these and similar questions on a level removed from piece-meal observation and speculation, objective data from a cross-section of adolescents in one community would provide a normative base for further research and theory testing.

**Definitions**

Terms used in the study were defined as follows:

1. **Significant adult.** Unless otherwise specified, for this study this will be the adult named by the adolescent as being a preferred friend. It will also be used synonymously with influential adult or preferred adult.

2. **Un-assigned adult.** A person, an adult in the community who has no paid, professional responsibility to interact with the youth of the community, e.g., barber, plumber.
3. **Assigned adult.** An adult who has a paid, professional responsibility to interact with adolescents or pre-adolescents, e.g., a minister, teacher, school counselor.

**Assumptions**

The following assumptions were made in order to design and conduct this study.

1. The adult named as a preferred friend is a "significant other" for the adolescent.
2. The grade levels will adequately represent age-stage groupings.
3. The adolescents' responses to "needs met in this relationship" can be reliably sorted into pre-selected need categories.

**Limitations**

Limitations are those aspects of the study which can be identified but not controlled. Following are those identified limitations:

1. The study was limited to the population in attendance in regular classrooms in the community public schools at the time of questionnaire administration. A small number of students with learning problems may have been removed from this group and assigned to special education classes. For the upper grades, some students may already have dropped-out of high school. Some students (22) attend sixth grade in the University School. Students attending a small Roman Catholic parochial elementary school were excluded from the sample.

2. Patterns of interaction with adults may be different for rural areas, smaller communities, urban centers, and suburban developments.
3. The completeness, validity, and reliability of the information received from the subjects limited the relationships that could be established statistically.

4. Some information requested was not salient; that is, it was not a present item of knowledge for the respondents. A respondent might not have been able to say exactly why he likes the adult, or just what he receives from the relationship.

**Organization of the Study**

Research and literature related to this study is reviewed in Chapter II. The topics covered are self concepts and interpersonal theory, youth-adult relationships, value definitions and needs, adolescent friendships, and significant adults in the community.

The methods and procedures for data collection are described in Chapter III. This includes the development of the questionnaire instrument, information on the validity and reliability of the instrument, selection of the population and the sample, and the procedure followed in the collection of the data.

Analysis of the data is presented in Chapter IV. This includes the handling of the data, the procedure followed in hypothesis testing, the descriptive findings related to the specific objectives of the study, the testing of the various hypotheses, and conclusions regarding the hypotheses. Included with the analyses are the appropriate tablings of the data.

Chapter V, the last chapter, includes a summary of and recommendations from the study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

As a background for this research, studies in a number of fields are important. The literature reviewed in this chapter deals with self concept and interpersonal theory, youth-adult relationships, value definitions and needs, adolescent friendships, and significant adults in the community.

**Self Concept and Interpersonal Theory**

The development of a self concept is assumed to be a central developmental process for the individual. Psychologists and sociologists have long recognized that interaction with others plays a significant part in shaping the self concept. James (1890) observed that the individual assumes different social roles and in fact presents a different self, in varied social settings:

Properly speaking, a man has as many social selves as there are individuals who recognize him and carry an image of him in their mind . . . but as the individuals who carry the image fall naturally into classes, we may practically say that he has as many distinct social selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinions he cares. He generally shows a different side of himself to each of these different groups.\(^1\)

---

James focused on the observable behavior of the individual in social settings and theorized that this could represent an unhealthy splitting of man into several selves, or that it might represent a normal division of labor, being merely facets of a harmonious, healthy self. Attention was directed to the acts which proceeded from the self as it was structured.

Cooley (1902), concerned with "the looking-glass-self" or the reflected self, conceived the self as an emerging structure affected and altered by social interactions.  

Mead (1934) in his definition of self concept provided for both the emerging aspect of self and the structured self. "The self is a social structure and it arises in social experience. After it arises, it in a certain sense provides for itself its social experiences." Kohn (1961) observed a relationship between self evaluations and evaluations by parents and peers at pre-adolescence and adolescence.

In the normal individual, the self concept is believed to be reasonably stable or consistent. It is a unified attitude consisting

---


of cognitive and affective elements, undergoing constant change in the light of new experience. There is evidence that the process is circular, with the self concept resisting change by means of a tendency for selective perception of events which maintains and enhances the self as perceived.\(^6\)

Change can and does occur. During the process of developing and re-structuring the self, the individual tests his information, behaviors, values, attitudes, and perceptions in the presence of significant others.\(^7\) Festinger (1954) hypothesized that there is a basic drive in the human organism to evaluate his own opinions and abilities. Furthermore, in Festinger's social comparison theory, he proposes that only persons with fairly similar opinions and abilities are utilized for comparison.\(^8\)

The reflected appraisals of these "others" promote modification of the self only if the appraisals are valued. Other things being equal, it appears that intimate associations in primary relationships are more likely to produce change.\(^9\)


\(^7\)Ibid.


Youth-Adult Relationships

Wilfert (1963) identifies a theme often developed in popular articles on adolescent-adult relationships:

In many countries a marked estrangement is evident between adults and adolescents. This estrangement, which begins for youth with the development of an independent personality at puberty, has assumed proportions which give cause for thought. Adults and adolescents in many cases stand opposed to each other as rivals, or are completely isolated from each other without any mutual understanding and without any attempt being made to bridge the gulf between them. (Italics added.)

Similarly, Jennings (1964) states:

The debate, if it can be called that, between generations, is sharper now than ever before. It is a debate and not a conversation. It has all the elements of conflict and very few aspects of accommodation. Citing the study of James S. Coleman which reported the dominance of adolescent subcultures within the schools, Jennings describes the teenage subculture thusly:

What we have today, as we confront the problem of inducting youth into the adult affairs of this world, is a group that has grown up not within the bosom of the family, but within the "little society of the school." But in addition since the school whatever its hopes or pretensions, cannot provide appropriate real-life experience, as the family once did, nor specific adult models to be emulated, as the parents once offered, youth cleave unto one another and form groups that are at once the natural objects of curiosity and study by scientists and sources of frustration and fear in the rest of society. (Italics added.)

---


A number of studies of normal, average, or middle-class adolescents have resulted in findings which directly contradict the position taken by Wilfert and Jennings.

Bandura (1969), citing a study of middle-class families of adolescent boys conducted by Bandura and Walters (1959), reports, "By the time the boys had reached adolescence, they had internalized the parents' values and standards of behavior to a large degree..." and, "Since the boys adopted their parents' standards of conduct as their own, they did not regard their parents and their authority figures as adversaries but more as supportive and guiding influences."12

In the formation of attitudes, there has been some evidence that significant adults are able to compete favorably with the youth's adolescent peers. Brown (1957) reported an empirical study of the relationship between attitudes referring to self and significant others on a dominance-submissiveness rating. From a population of 101 ninth grade students he found that self-descriptions were positively and significantly correlated with descriptions of the significant adults. This correlation was not significantly different from that between self and significant peers.13

---


Flanders and Havumaki (1960), testing the effect of teacher praise on the sociometric choice of students by peers, found teacher praise of a student significantly increased the choice value of a student by his peers. Thus, for this population of 330 tenth graders, one might conclude that adults may continue to affect adolescent attitudes.\(^\text{14}\)

Lucas and Horrocks (1960), attempting to isolate the psychological needs of adolescents, distinguished a need factor for conformity to adult expectations but failed to distinguish a specific need for peer-group conformity.\(^\text{15}\)

Kohn (1961) tested the relationships between self-evaluations of pre-adolescents and adolescents, against evaluations by parents and peers. His pre-adolescent group consisted of 226 fifth grade students, his adolescent group, 179 twelfth grade students. The groups included both sexes. It was concluded that a person's self-picture does reflect the evaluations of him by the crucial figures of his interpersonal environment.\(^\text{16}\)

The findings also indicate that self-evaluations may be influenced by peers as much as by parents. Kohn reports, "The results further


suggest there is no change between pre-adolescence and adolescence either in the relationship between self-evaluation and evaluations by parents, or in the relationship between self-evaluation and evaluations by peers. Therefore, a hypothesis of the declining importance of parents was not supported, nor was a hypothesis of the increasing importance of peers.  

In England, Musgrove (1963) conducted a survey of adolescents' attitudes to adults and of adults attitudes to "teenagers" in two socially contrasted Midlands areas. He employed an open-ended sentence completion schedule with both adolescents and adults. Both boys and girls made a much higher proportion of favorable references to adults than the cross-section of the adult population made to them. The proportion of favorable attitudes to adults did not decrease markedly as adolescents advanced in age, nor did the proportion of favorable attitudes to peers increase. Musgrove states, "While this study began with the expectation that adolescents would show increasing hostility toward parents and increasing approval of peers, this was not supported." A prediction that between later childhood and early adolescence boys and girls would increasingly prefer peers to parents as leisure-time companions was supported. However, the trend was not uniform. A higher percentage

17 Ibid.
of both boys and girls chose parents rather than peers at age 11 than at age 10.\textsuperscript{18}

Social distance scales were used by Musgrove to show attitudes toward adults (over 30 years), to old people (over 65 years), and to peers. He found that young children (ages 9 and 10) place no greater social distance between themselves and adults than they do between one another, but young adolescents (ages 14 and 15) hold adults at a significantly greater social distance than their peers. Overall, he found the proportion of boys and girls expressing a strong preference for the companionship of over sixty-fives did not differ from the proportion expressing a strong preference for the companionship of over-thirties. Thus, it would seem, for this population the age of the preferred adult companion was not a significant factor.\textsuperscript{19}

Musgrove compared his findings on the peak period of hostility towards the parent of the same sex with findings reported by Liccione (1955)\textsuperscript{20} on American adolescents. He reports:

The peak period of hostility towards the parent of the same sex, 15 years for boys and 14 for girls, is broadly in line with Liccione's findings in America and confirms our original expectations. On the other hand, at no age did either boys or girls indicate the high degree of hostility to mothers that Liccione found among American adolescent girls. A far greater proportion of hostile and critical statements was made by both boys and girls of all ages about fathers.


\textsuperscript{19}Ibid.

than about mothers. Although 14-year-old girls made fewer favorable comments about mothers than older or younger girls, no less than 73.7 per cent of their comments were still favorable. (Italics added.)

Lynch (1963) in an extensive investigation of some basic assumptions prevalent in family sociology, collected data from 717 high school students and 388 college students (predominantly freshmen). His subjects were drawn from three relatively homogeneous communities in Arkansas differing primarily in the degree of industrialization and urbanization. Camden, a city of 15,823 people, had the largest manufacturing index in the state; Arkadelphia, population 8,069, was intermediate; and Bismarck, a hamlet, represented the rural-agricultural scene. Three of the ten assumptions tested were: "adolescents are typically insecure and rebellious"; "middle-class adolescents are the most insecure of all groups"; and "adolescent behavior is dominated by all-pervading, irresponsible youth subculture." Lynch reports:

The assumption that adolescent behavior is dominated by an all-pervading, irresponsible subculture is not supported. Adolescents convey an impression of security rather than insecurity ... in the most fundamental respects, adolescents function as responsible members of society and observe the common norms. Very little conflict between adolescents and parents is indicated; and adolescent aspirations, ambitions, and needs are largely oriented toward the adult social sphere. Consequently there is a need to develop a sociology of normal adolescence to counterbalance previous preoccupation with the social problems of adolescence.

21Musgrove, "Intergeneration Attitudes," p. 221.

Millsom (1966) investigated conformity to peers versus adults in experimentally contrived influence situations. Among seventh graders, she found consistent sex differences. Girls yielded significantly more often to peers than to adults in influence situations while boys conformed about equally to peers and to adults.\(^\text{23}\)

Burlingame (1957) noted that social scientists and educators were commonly utilizing the notion of a "youth culture" or "adolescent society" to account for apparent value discrepancies between adults and adolescents. In order to test the dimensions of youth culture and examine the correlates of adolescent adherence to the youth culture, Burlingame developed a "Peer Dependency Scale" in the form of a Likert attitude scale.

Research was conducted in five proto-typical communities, using the five student body populations, a total of 3,440 adolescents. His findings were:

1. Adherence to the adolescent peer culture was greater among males than females of high school age

2. For both sexes, it was greater in the early years of high school and decreased significantly with age

3. Greater adherence to the youth culture was associated with:
   (a) lesser participation in school activities, and lesser task and social leadership within the high school;
   (b) lesser academic aptitude and achievement;
   (c) lesser socio-economic status

4. Adolescents of differing ages and sexes utilized the peer culture differently according to the demands and needs inherent in their particular station.\(^\text{24}\)


The youth culture was interpreted by Burlingame as a developmental phenomenon which assists in effecting the transition from childhood to maturity.

In summarizing his findings, Burlingame took the position that over-valuing the youth culture was compensatory behavior related to some personal deficit and an absence of other vehicles which promote personal growth.

Value Definitions and Needs

In discussing value definitions and significant others, Vernon (1965) states that different types of learning require different processes and settings. It is his belief that certain types of factual information can be learned as efficiently or more efficiently when intimate or emotional contacts have not preceded the learning task. He suggests that anxiety resulting from emotional involvement may interfere with learning and that impersonal relationships may be the most efficient for learning factual information. Vernon believes that valued relationships with significant others enhances other, non-factual types of learning. He states:

... for learning which involves NERS symbols, especially value definitions, the reference groups and significant others are usually very extensively involved. Such definitions cannot be learned from observation of any empirical qualities of objects to which such definitions are applied. These are imposed by man himself. The acquisition and maintenance of such definitions, then, results from satisfying relationships with significant others.25

25Vernon, Human Interaction, p. 176.
Horrocks (1962) has observed that adolescent needs change as the individual progresses through adolescence. He identifies the most significant change in a developmental trend to be one which causes the adolescent to seek out social relations that are increasingly dominated by the individual's capabilities, mastery and self-expression. This trend would not only permit the trial and refinement of previously learned skills, but would require that the adolescent, in assuming new responsibilities, would also need to learn new skills.

Horrocks notes that the peer group may decline in importance as the individual develops in maturity and self-sufficiency, that it appears that some adolescents find such mastery and self-sufficiency can best be achieved outside the group context. He describes the trend thusly:

Among older adolescents of both sexes (ages 16 through 19 for girls, from age 17 for boys) there is an especially strong need to play self-assertive roles characteristic of adults, to assume increasingly adequate relationships both with the opposite sex and with adults, and to display competence and effectiveness in activities of most personal concern such as driving a car, dancing, and occupational endeavor.

Horrocks and Lucas (1960) conducted a questionnaire survey of the adolescent needs of 725 adolescents ages twelve through eighteen living in a small midwestern city. Subjects responded to ninety items based on twelve needs classifications and eight environmental settings.

---


27 Ibid.
Items were factor-analyzed to permit highly correlated items to emerge as clusters. Five identified orthogonal need factors were isolated. These five need factors follow:

1. **Recognition-acceptance**, was a broad need for acceptance, approval, and recognition from both adults and like-sexed peers, focused on maintaining or securing positive attitudes of others towards self.

2. **Hetero-sexual affection and attention**, had to do with face-to-face and group relationships with members of the opposite sex.

3. **Independence-dominance with regard to adults**, represents behaviors directed toward independence from adult supervision and emancipation from the child's role in the family setting, also represents a degree of dominance behavior.

4. **Conformity to adult expectations**, represents a need to behave according to adult standards and expectations of conduct.

5. **Academic achievement**, represents satisfaction of achievement needs by meeting the standards and expectations in school.28

Offer (1969) conducted a longitudinal study of normal or average adolescent boys over the four years of high school and the first two years of college. In the Modal Adolescent Project, funded by the National Institute of Mental Health, the male population of two midwest high schools representing the range of the middle class, was tested and evaluated for "normalcy." From 106 students originally evaluated, 73 were selected for participation in the project. Tests, questionnaires, and clinical interview techniques were used by two psychiatrists. Each

28 Ibid., pp. 511-12.
subject was interviewed six times, with parents interviewed in the last year of the study.

While the Project did not focus on "needs" as such, there is a striking similarity between "Important Conflict Areas" and adolescent needs described elsewhere in the literature. Offer ranks these areas as follows:

1. Vocational and educational goals, 53 responses
2. Impulsive control, 42 responses
3. Interpersonal relationships, 35 responses
4. Growing up, 23 responses
5. Relations with parents, 16 responses

Vocational and educational goals had to do with academic achievement and selecting a career. Impulse control had to do with avoiding temptation, keeping out of trouble, and learning self-control. Interpersonal relations included getting along with adults, getting along with parents, being understood, developing a personal social life, and avoiding ridicule.

One of the most extensive listings of psychological needs appearing in the literature is that of Murray (1938). In the process of developing his classifications Murray coined new terms which are not in general usage and tend to interfere with clear communication. Hilgard

---


and Atkinson (1967) provide a listing of Murray's psychogenic needs which incorporate changes of terminology made to avoid some of the neologisms coined by Murray. The twenty-eight needs listed were subdivided into six areas: needs associated with inanimate objects; those expressing ambition, will power, desire for accomplishment, and prestige; needs having to do with human power exerted, resisted, or yielded to; needs having to do with injuring oneself or others; those of affection between people; and a category of socially relevant needs—the need for play or entertainment, cognizance, and the need for exposition.

Horrocks surveyed the literature pertaining to psychological needs and found seventy or more separate need categories. These were given to seven judges to sort into needs categories which were believed to be relatively different. Twelve major need areas emerged: acceptance, achievement, affection, approval, belonging, conformity, dependence, independence, mastery-dominance, recognition, self-realization, and to be understood.

Meyer (1957) investigated the sources for needs satisfaction for two of Murray's psycho-social needs with all the boys and girls in grades five through twelve in an upstate-central New York school. His

---


pupils were generally of lower-middle income families. The psycho-social needs were need-playmirth and need-succorance.\textsuperscript{33}

Analyzing ratings received on the Syracuse Scale of Social Relations, for a reference population of "all the people ever known," Meyer found students believed same-sex classmates were better able to satisfy their playmirth needs, while there was some evidence to suggest that the children preferred adult relatives to their same-sex classmates as social companions for satisfying their succorance needs. Grade placement trends revealed that both boys and girls ranked their classmates progressively lower with each successive grade in terms of their ability to satisfy either playmirth or succorance needs.\textsuperscript{34}

\textbf{Adolescent Friendships}

One of the underlying assumptions for this study was that the adolescent-significant adult relationship could be described as a friendship. Two studies on friendship are reviewed here.

Austin and Thompson (1948) investigated the bases on which sixth graders chose their friends. They found the primary factors influencing choices of friends were propinquity, similarity of interests, cheerfulness, and friendliness.\textsuperscript{35}


\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., pp. 162-3.

\textsuperscript{35}Mary Austin and George G. Thompson, "Children's Friendships: A Study of the Bases on Which Children Select and Reject Their Best Friends," \textit{Journal of Educational Psychology}, XXXIX (1948), pp. 101-16.
Winslow and Frankel (1941) investigated the bases on which college students formed friendships. They found that certain personal traits were frequently mentioned and that sex differences were observable. For the formation of friendships with members of their own sex, male students expressed a greater preference for friends with conventional good manners and the ability to be confided in, while females preferred friends who were congenial in face-to-face personal contacts. Female students were found to be stronger in expressing their feelings of liking or disliking than men.36

**Significant Adults in the Community**

Several authors of general works of psychology, sociology, or adolescence stress the important role relatives or adult friends of the family play in adolescent development. Wattenberg describes a study by Bossard and Boll (1946) in which the investigators analyzed essays written about their families by sixty-eight students at an eastern university. Among their findings they reported: (1) there is marked identification with relatives regardless of what they are like or how well they are known by the family, (2) relatives often regard one another as custodians of the family reputation and give correction or advice to youngsters, (3) the degree of closeness varies considerably;

---

some extended families are very intimate, with frequent contacts in the home, and (4) relatives may be liked by some members of a family and disliked by others.\textsuperscript{37}

Wattenberg believes that the affective role of relatives occurs through the identification process. He describes relatives as potential objects of identification:

The aunts and uncles who enter the household may represent to the youngsters ways of living worthy of being copied. This is especially true when an aunt or uncle has no children of his own, and enjoys being liked. In many cases, he may win a youngster's allegiance early in life by giving presents and furnishing the occasion for gay times. As the children grow old enough to relish adult enjoyment, an uncle may lavish time on ball games or fishing expeditions, an aunt may take a niece to shows or on shopping expeditions. . . . Out of the admiration thus created, the teenager may discover a life pattern that appeals to him.\textsuperscript{38}

Lower (1955) employed a semantic differential with college students to examine relationships between their self concepts and their perceptions of persons and/or groups categorized as \textit{Influential Others}. He reports that self concept may be examined in terms of interpersonal relationships, in regard to certain persons--proximal, significant, or valued.

He found that students readily designated those persons and/or groups whom they considered to have been the most significant or


\textsuperscript{38}Ibid.
influential in the formation of their own personality." In summary he states:

All levels of influence considered, students indicated a majority of the influence which had been exerted in their own personality formation had been contributed by parents. Whereas both male and female students designated a majority of total influence to parents, female students designated a significantly greater percentage of influence to parents and other family members combined, than did male students. In both major studies (basic and replication), 'mother' ranked first in total influence, over 'father' or 'parents' in either case.

Other important persons and/or groups, who were indicated as contributing as much as ten per cent (10%) of the total influence on the personality formation of the students were: 'friend,' 'school group,' 'professional,' and 'service group.'

Lower found "influential others" categories of "other family" (other than parents) and "professional person" were mutually exclusive categories of designation. Influential others was found to be an important variable associated with students' self concepts. He concluded that students' self concepts correlated significantly with their perception of "influential others," but not highly enough to be predictive.

In France, Rodriguez Tome (1965) asked 235 boys and 149 girls attending lycees in Paris whether or not they had a relationship with an adult, aside from their parents, who merited their respect and admiration. In the case of a positive response, a brief description of the adult was to be written. Fifty-two gave positive responses, more of which were given by girls and by sixteen-year-olds (average age of

---

younger group). A male was the preferred adult in 83 per cent of the boys' responses and in 52 per cent of the girls' responses. Relatives were named by 35.8 per cent; neighbors, family friends, and instructors were named by about 20 per cent for each category; and ministers or priests were named by about 6 per cent. 40

There was no significant difference by sex or by age except for the sixteen-year-old boys, where the choices were largely taken up by relatives. The principal characteristic of the adult was that he was "comprehending . . . open to communication." Intelligence, strong personality, generosity, and honesty were also reported, as were "success despite obstacles" and "concern for human welfare." Results were interpreted as the adolescent's search for someone to reinforce his desired self-concept. 41

Tome reported the age of the significant adults as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Per Cent of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 plus</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses did not differ significantly when the average age of the subjects, or the sex of the subjects, was considered. 42


42 Ibid., p. 605.
The comparatively low ranking for ministers and priests found by Tomé is supported by Nelson's study in the United States.

Nelson (1967) conducted a study of 297 suburban high school students and 59 adults who work with youth, to assess the understanding of youth problems on the part of community workers. Comparison of responses on the Mooney Problem Check List revealed that the adults differed significantly from youth in what they identify as adolescent problems. He found that professional adults tend to overemphasize their specific area of competency as problem areas for youth.43

On a questionnaire administered to the adolescent subjects, Nelson requested a rank order of esteem and trust held toward five classifications of adult community leaders of youth. Rankings of the five types of adult figures provided by Nelson, resulted in the following rank order (highest to lowest): senior pastor, staff clergyman who works with youth, medical doctor, secondary school counselor, and high school teacher.

The adolescents were asked to indicate which of the five types of adult community leaders of youth they felt most free to talk to about problems other than those pertaining strictly to physical health. Designated rank order was the same as above. However, when subjects were asked to indicate how often they talked about a personal problem

within the past year to a member from the preceding categories, a peer friend, and father or mother, the resultant rank order from greatest to least was: peer friend, parent, counselor, teacher, clergyman who works with youth, and senior pastor. Girls reported turning to their peers more frequently than did boys.

Offer (1969) reports that subjects in the Modal Adolescent Project were asked, "Who, outside of your close family, do you think is really great?" The table summarizing responses is reproduced below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Political figure (e.g., President, Governor)</td>
<td>23 (32.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scientist (e.g., Einstein)</td>
<td>2 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Artist (e.g., writer, painter, musician)</td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sports hero</td>
<td>4 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Personal friend or relative (peer)</td>
<td>4 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Girl friend</td>
<td>4 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Older relative or friend of parents</td>
<td>13 (17.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12 (16.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>N. A. (no answer)</td>
<td>8 (11.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the terminology "really great" might be open to several interpretations both for the subjects of his study and the present reader, none-the-less it appears that once going beyond the renowned public figures, those persons categorized as "older relative or friend of parents" and "other" account for a significant portion of the total.

Although individual adults have singled-out a particular teacher or coach who was influential in the development of a value

---

44 Ibid.

45 Offer, *World of Teenager*, p. 266.
system which affected their life-role, Coleman and Offer found that teachers were not highly regarded by their adolescent students.

Coleman (1961) studied students' responses to a hypothetical situation—the suggestion that the student join a particular club. He reports, "The general level of compliance among all students with the favorite teacher's desires is quite low for both boys and girls." In addition, he reports, "Neither the social elites nor their followers indicate that they would pay much attention to a teacher's wishes outside the classroom—even if it is their favorite teacher. In fact, in a question... which forced a choice between best friend, favorite teacher, and parents, almost no one chose teacher, while the choices were about equally split between friends and parents."\(^{46}\)

Offer says of students' views of teachers, "It has been our impression throughout our interviews that the teachers who were respected the most by faculty and students alike were the coaches and the leaders in the sports activities. The teachers who were leaders of the intellectual courses... were rarely mentioned as meaningful figures for the adolescents." Athletic coaches were almost the only teachers in the high school environment who treated them as individuals he found. He reports the same phenomenon was described by Friedenberg in 1965.\(^{47}\)

Offer found the majority of the students were critical of their teachers. Asked to describe an ideal teacher, the most frequent


\(^{47}\)Offer, op. cit., pp. 42-44.
response concerned the teacher's knowledge of his own subject and ability to communicate it to the students. Students wished that their teachers had a better sense of humor and would use it more frequently. Offer reports, "We had the impression that the students wanted to feel that learning could be enjoyable and that somehow they are conditioned to overlook this aspect of education." 48

Offer states that the teachers did not serve as ego-ideals for the students. When they were asked whom they admired most outside their family, only 5 per cent gave teachers as an example. He summarizes his findings about these relationships by saying, "... we feel justified in stating that our modal student does not value his relationship with any particular teacher, although he has obviously adapted well to the high-school environment in general." 49

Engle (1965) conducted a demonstration study of the use of significant others to produce change in self concept and achievement in secondary school underachievers. The research base for his study was drawn from a study by Brookover, et al., which indicated "the expectations of 'significant others' as perceived by junior high school students are positively correlated with the students' self concepts as learners." 50

48 Ibid., pp. 44-45.
49 Ibid., p. 45.
The hypothesis of Engle's three-year study was that contact with supportive influences (peer leaders, personal counseling interviews, group counseling sessions, and warm, sincere, interesting teachers) would improve the academic performance of underachieving secondary school students. The subjects, 440 seventh, ninth, and tenth graders from the Kalamazoo (Michigan) Public School System, were divided into four experimental and four control groups. Each experimental group received one form of the supportive treatment. The results of the pre- and post-testing indicated that the overall objectives of improved grades and reduced anxiety were not realized. However, the "peer leader" and the "group counseling" groups showed fewer absences and tardinesses and milder, less frequent disciplinary problems. Engle concludes, "These inconclusive findings reinforce the hypothesis that the underachieving syndrome is rooted in the home and environment and that it should be attended to in the upper elementary years."51 It is noteworthy that no particular advantage was indicated for supplying "warm, sincere, interesting teachers" to this particular sample of secondary school underachievers.

There is some evidence that adults do provide models for occupational choice. Uzzell (1958) used a questionnaire and interview technique to investigate the occupational aspirations of urban Negro males. From a proportionate random sample, he reports, that the

51 Ibid.
occupational aspiration level is significantly and positively related to respondents' knowledge of occupational models. Of the 301 respondents in the study, 70 per cent indicated they knew occupational models. Of these, 77 per cent indicated their choices of occupations were influenced by persons they knew in the occupation. Only 23 per cent who knew models indicated that these models did not influence their decisions. In summarizing his findings, Uzzell reported:

Occupational models had a very significant role in influencing occupational choices. Where specific models were not mentioned, the influence of teachers was quite pronounced. . . . The effect of parents and ministers in influencing occupational choices appeared rather slight. Various forms of mass media . . . seemed to have been quite effective in influencing occupational choices.  

Summary

This study had as its purpose to examine and describe certain interpersonal relationships. Interpersonal theory is largely related to the development of self. The self concept contains both cognitive and affective elements—knowledge components and feeling components. From the related literature and research it appears that the self concept is central to individual development and that it is learned in a social setting and undergoing constant modification. To a large extent the child's early social setting is pre-determined. Later, in a normal developmental sequence, his social setting is broadened both as a result

---

of the selective self-expansion of human experiences, and by societal forces which come into play.

It appears that the normal individual strives to test his opinions and attitudes in the presence of significant others, and that persons with fairly similar opinions and abilities are used for comparison. Primary relationships which provide intimate associations are more likely to produce modifications of the self.

The literature on adolescent-adult relationships reflects strongly contradictory points of view. Some theorists and researchers are able to distinguish a separatist movement. Of these, some view this phenomenon as a healthy developmental trend since it represents movement from dependence toward adults to the independence or self-sufficiency requisite for individual maturity. Others view the separatist movement as an unhealthy estrangement with portent for extraordinary and undesirable changes in personal and social values. Some theorists and researchers, particularly those who describe or conduct research with normal or typical adolescents, report a more gradual developmental trend toward independence, with less conflict and more accommodation between adolescents and adults.

While in the United States the news media have given much attention to the phrase attributed to our adolescents, "Never trust anyone over thirty!", research studies in England and France during the middle 1960's revealed the age of the adult was not a significant factor in adolescent-adult relationships.
The literature related to needs, reveals certain developmental needs and trends which might stimulate friendships. These include the tendency toward striving for self-sufficiency and vocational goals and the desire to develop broader interpersonal relationships. Conversely, strivings for self-sufficiency and independence could inhibit such friendships.

A variety of needs listings have appeared, reflecting commonalties, various degrees of specificity, differences in terminology, and different theoretical bases. It has not always been recognized that these listings are constructs which should facilitate classification and description of empirical observations.

Investigations of friendships for pre-adolescents and late adolescents reveal that proximity plays a part in the formation of friendships, as do traits which are generally recognized as positive indices for human interaction—similarity of interests, cheerfulness, trustworthiness, good manners, and friendliness. Congenial face-to-face personal contacts are viewed as facilitative for developing and maintaining friendships.

Several studies, in the United States and in France, suggest that teachers and ministers are likely to be named infrequently as significant adults for adolescents. The proportion of instructors serving as significant adults was considerably higher in France than in the United States.
The review of the literature has indicated that much has been inferred about the value and nature of adolescent relationships with adults other than their parents, but only passing attention has been given to basic research in this area.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION

The general objective of this study has been to investigate and describe adolescent relationships with significant adults other than their parents in one community. The steps followed in collecting the data, described in the pages to follow, includes development of the questionnaire instrument, information on the validity and reliability of the instrument, selection of the population and the sample, and procedures followed in the collection of data.

Development of the Questionnaire

Basic to the study was the administration of a questionnaire to a cross-section of pre-adolescents and adolescents in one community, to obtain self-reports which described a relationship with a significant adult other than their parents. The decision was made to use a written questionnaire in order to survey more subjects than would have been possible using the clinical interview technique. The survey of the larger sample was undertaken to supply normative data, that is, to determine what is normal or typical for the pre-adolescents and adolescents in one community.

The questionnaire was developed in terms of the following criteria:
1. It should contain questions directed toward meeting the specific objectives of the study (see Chapter I)

2. It should be moderately structured in order to elicit ready responses of salient information by the subjects and to facilitate the ordering or classification of the information by the investigator

3. It should provide for some open-ended questions to avoid "leading" the subjects and to secure a wide range of information

4. It should be broadly-based, to secure a maximum amount of information about adolescent-significant adult relationships in the community, that is, one that will elicit information from every subject studied in the sample

5. It should include provisions to discourage an adolescent from describing an "imaginary" relationship with an adult

6. It should meet the reading level of the sixth-grader without appearing simplistic to twelfth-grade subjects

7. It should provide for easy administration in a group setting within a regular classroom setting

8. It should be largely self-explanatory, requiring minimal or no group directions.

The data for this study were gathered by a specially prepared questionnaire (See Appendix A). This sixteen-page questionnaire includes a cover page stating the purpose and calling for these vital statistics: name, name of school, grade, sex, age, address, and sibling information which would indicate ordinal (birth) family position.

Then follows the investigator's description of an adult friend or significant adult. The subject is asked to indicate if he has at present, a friendship with a grown-up other than his parents. If the answer is "yes," the subject is directed to turn to the following pages
where he is asked to write the name and address of the grown-up friend, tell how he met the friend and how often he sees this friend, check the age of the friend, identify sex, list occupation, state the usual meeting place, and describe geographical separation. Further, he is asked to identify his friend's relationship to his own family; designate the setting for meeting with his friend; describe what activity is pursued; and indicate why the friend is liked, or respected and admired. Finally, he is asked to indicate how the friendship helps him.

If the subject does not report a present friendship with an adult other than his parents, he is directed to Section B where he either reports on a past friendship or is directed to Section C. Section B requires the subject to respond to parallel items as described above. Additionally he is asked to tell how old he was when he had the friendship and why the friendship was terminated.

If the subject does not report a past friendship, he is directed to Section C. Section C provides two alternatives. The subject is asked if he would like a friendship with a grown-up in the future. If he responds "no," he is asked to tell why he would not like a grown-up friend other than his parents. If the subject responds "yes," he is asked to turn to following pages and respond to parallel items as described for Section A. These items are prefaced by an item asking if the subject already knows who he wants as a grown-up friend.

The review of the literature provided scant insight into the probable responses of pre-adolescents and adolescents with regard to a
friendship with a significant adult. Popular articles, evidence gleaned from the mass media, some journal articles, and the prevailing social mood at the time indicated that the proportion of adolescents who would in fact report a friendship with a significant adult other than parents would possibly be quite small. The investigator had no desire to assemble and survey a group of subjects in order to obtain useful information from only a few of them. Out of a very real concern, criterion number four was developed. In order to implement the criterion of securing a maximum amount of information about adolescent-significant adult relationships in one community, the adolescent unable to describe a current relationship was asked to describe a past relationship. If unable to describe either a current relationship or a past relationship, he was asked to provide information about a desired relationship in the future. If none of these applied, he was asked to tell why he would not want a friendship with an adult other than his parents.

It was recognized that some subjects, possibly a significant number of them, might have described an "imaginary" relationship with an "adult friend," creatively building the description of the friendship as they proceeded through the questionnaire. Criterion number five was implemented by sequencing the questionnaire so that the subject was quickly branched to the alternate sections of the questionnaire which dealt with past or future friendships, or "no friendship desired."

Another control used to avoid the collection of descriptions of "imaginary" relationships was to have the student identify himself by
name and address before beginning his responses to the questions. Also, as soon as the student indicated he was going to describe a relationship with a "grown-up friend," he was directed to write the name and address of his friend. A ready avenue of escape from his position was possible simply by returning to the previous page, altering his response, and moving to an alternate section of the questionnaire.

When the investigator was satisfied that the instrument appeared to meet the criteria, the questionnaire was informally tested with a few sixth-graders, including the son of the investigator and the children of colleagues and friends.

**Questionnaire Validity**

Scates and Yeomans (1950) stated that the validity of a questionnaire and its parts may be judged by the following types of evidence:

1. Is the question on the subject?
2. Is the question perfectly clear and unambiguous?
3. Does the question get at something stable, which is typical of the individual or of the situation?
4. Does the question pull or have extractive power? Will it be answered by a large enough proportion of respondents to have validity?
5. Do the responses show a reasonable range of variation?
6. Is the information consistent, in agreement with what is known, and in agreement with expectancy?
7. Is the item sufficiently inclusive?
8. Is there a possibility of obtaining an external criterion to evaluate the questionnaire?¹

Informal trial of the questionnaire with a few sixth graders indicated that the items on the questionnaire were communicating the intent of the investigator, did have extractive power, and provided for a reasonable range of variations in responses. The investigator was not aware of any instrument which was designed to collect the same information or which could be used to evaluate the questionnaire.

During the administration of the questionnaire, the investigator noted that the students appeared to be intensely involved—that is, the questionnaire seemed to hold the full attention of the students during the testing period. Examination of the data revealed that the students responded in a serious vein and appeared to be "open" in their responses.

Few questions were asked during the questionnaire administration. Those that were asked tended to relate to two tasks. The first was the problem of designating a preferred adult. Approximately two students in twenty-five expressed some difficulty in choosing between two "grown-up" friends. When informed it was necessary to do so, usually a clear decision was made. Two students, of the 143 responding to the questionnaire, failed to clearly distinguish between a pair of adult friends. In the one case, the questionnaire was discarded because of

multiple-checking of other discrete categories. The second, describing a husband and wife, was retained since the information in the questionnaire was usable, with the exception of Item # 6, the description of the sex of the adult friend. Item # 6 had been left blank.

The second type of question asked was in reference to Item # 9, which required the student to estimate geographical distance. Again, about two in twenty-five respondents were uncertain of the distance. The request for the address of the adult friend, Item # 2, and the investigator's familiarity with the community, were useful in quickly resolving the problem. After the collection of the data, a spot-check of the estimates given, revealed a reasonable degree of accuracy of the distance estimates.

A further check of the validity of the questionnaire was provided when the data were analyzed. An adequate number of usable responses were provided for each analysis, and the range of variations of responses was quite satisfactory.

A further note on validity was made during the follow-up test for reliability of the instrument. During the administration of the questionnaire, it was observed that the students were responding freely and openly. No evidence of strong anxiety was present. It appeared to the investigator that the questionnaire administration was non-threatening. By comparison, in the interview setting, during the reliability follow-up (described below) only two of the twelve students interviewed appeared to be free of anxiety. In the initial stages of the interview,
both of those appeared quite uncomfortable until the interview had progressed for approximately five to ten minutes. Both of the students who were eventually able to discuss the relationship without observable anxiety were twelfth graders. The completed questionnaire in the hands of the investigator at the time of the interview was of immense value in conducting the interview in all cases. Thus, it appeared that the written form possessed more extractive power than did the interview mode.

Information given during the interview was the same as that given on the questionnaire but was more difficult to extract in the interview setting. Probing by the investigator did not result in significant additional information not given in questionnaire responses. Responses tended to be sketchy and less complete in this setting. In the case of the two twelfth graders, it was found that with the background information provided in the questionnaire it was possible to discuss values and other affective components of the relationship.

**Questionnaire Reliability**

By random selection, three respondents from each of grades six, eight, ten, and twelve, were interviewed seven weeks after the administration of the questionnaire. These were private interviews conducted by the investigator in a counseling office. Given the intervening experiences of active students over that period of time, the responses provided in the interview were remarkably similar to the student's questionnaire responses.
Every student designated the same "grown-up" friend. The information given did not vary significantly from the written responses. Responses to the open-ended or free-response questions were essentially similar; frequently the words used to communicate about the relationship were the same.

**Selection of the Population and the Sample**

The sample for this study had to satisfy the following criteria:

1. The sample had to be representative of a community with a diverse socio-economic population to increase the external validity of the research findings.

2. The sample had to be large enough to provide reasonable evidence which could be indicative of the normative or typical developmental trends for the community surveyed.

3. Since the sample was to be drawn from the school setting, the attendance area for a particular school should include representative subjects from the community-at-large.

4. Since the questionnaire would be administered in a classroom setting, classes provided should be representative of the range of abilities and socio-economic status of the pre-adolescents and adolescents in the community.

5. To evaluate the reliability of the information, it would be advantageous if the investigator has some familiarity with community agencies, the people in the community, and the street names which would appear in the questionnaire responses.

The investigator had lived and worked in a community which would provide the required socio-economic diversity. He was sufficiently familiar with the community to be able to assess the reliability of the information given.
The community was sufficiently isolated from a large urban center which might provide coloration of the adolescent population. The community was believed to be fairly typical of many communities within the 8,000 to 20,000 population range. Located in central-western Pennsylvania, the community has a population of 15,000. A county-seat, it is located in a rural-agricultural and coal-mining section of the state. The principal industries are light-manufacturing industries, mine-mouth electric power generating stations, and an emerging state university. Service industries related to the population, mining and agriculture, natural gas exploration, and the university population provide employment for many of the people in the community. The depressed state of the coal-mining industry and related employment, coupled with relatively low-income employment in light-manufacturing and service industries, results in the presence of families of low socio-economic status within the community-at-large. Professional services, managerial persons, university faculty, and skilled workers provide a representation of middle-class families. Owners and first-level managers of light-manufacturing and service industries provide a representation of upper-class families. A few upper-class families in the community also have some holdings in gas and oil exploration companies and in the coal-mining industries.

The community is largely Protestant, with many churches both large and small. The Roman Catholic population supports one church and a new religious center opened near the university campus across town.
Persons of the Greek Orthodox faith in the community and the surrounding area attend church in a nearby town. There is a Jewish Synagogue in the community, serving approximately 100 active families. Members of the various denominations seem to mix very easily in social and economic relationships, as do their religious leaders.

There are present in the community the usual mix of recreational organizations: YMCA; Little League; Pee Wee Football; a Community Recreation Center; all types and levels of Scouting organizations; and church-related, school-related, and YMCA-related recreation leagues. The community also has a mix of service and growth organizations such as 4-H Clubs, Rainbow Girls and Demolay.

There are four public elementary schools in the school attendance area. The school attendance area includes White Township, which contains the suburban housing developments for the community plus the low-cost housing which surrounds the community. The gradual growth of the community, coupled with the present attendance areas, provides a fair balance of students from all socio-economic classes. A University School enrolls twenty-two sixth graders who would otherwise be scattered through-out the public schools. A Roman Catholic parochial school enrolls a small number of students who might have appeared in the population. All elementary children feed into the one junior high school, then later into the one senior high school.

A decision had been made to collect data from one classroom each of grades six, eight, ten, and twelve. This range would provide some
insight into developmental trends, including pre-adolescents as well as a fair representation of subjects through adolescence.

The presence of a single junior high school and a single senior high school in the community eliminated much of the risk in sampling error, since nearly all the students in the community and a small area surrounding the community feed into these schools.

The fairly common practice of placing junior and senior high school students into "tracking patterns" or groupings based on academic ability was of concern to the investigator at this point. Assurance was needed that a representative sample of the students could be provided from the junior and senior high schools and that one of the four elementary schools drew from an attendance area which would be representative of the community-at-large. Thus, it seemed timely to consult the Superintendent of Schools to determine if the criteria for the sample could be met and if permission to conduct the study could be secured.

In recent years there has been some sensitivity on the part of citizens about the nature of research studies in their schools. In some communities the school board has reserved the right to review all research proposals, and review all questionnaires and instruments, or procedures to be used with students. Since school board review was a possibility, and in order to make the request formal, a letter was drafted to the Superintendent of Schools (Appendix B). The investigator requested permission to conduct the study, offered to work only with students being granted parental permission, offered to share the find-
ings, and appended a copy of the questionnaire. An appointment was made with the Superintendent. In the initial meeting, the investigator briefly outlined the purpose of the study, described the study, presented the letter and questionnaire, and responded to questions posed by the Superintendent.

After lengthy discussion, the Superintendent agreed that the criteria for the sample could be met and that his concern for the compromising of the rights of citizens, parents, and students, was satisfied. He telephoned the principals of the participating schools to secure their support. He then directed a follow-up memorandum to the principals and gave the investigator permission to involve entire class groupings without parental permission. The latter act, initiated on his own accord, had two desirable effects. It further reduced the chance for sampling error and eliminated the necessity to remove portions of a class from an on-going school setting.

The investigator then telephoned each principal to arrange a planning meeting.

In the planning meetings with the respective building principals, the investigator briefly outlined the study, described the requirements of the study from the viewpoint of the school, and supplied the principal with a copy of the questionnaire. In each case, the principal indicated an interest in the results of the study and indicated that the criteria for the sample could be met. The elementary principal agreed to provide a classroom of students which would be representative of the students from his attendance area.
At the junior high school, the principal discussed the study, examined the questionnaire, then called into the planning meeting one of the two guidance counselors assigned to the building. The guidance counselor observed that the descriptive findings for the adolescent population might prove useful in the counseling setting. He stated that history classes were not grouped according to academic ability and would provide a representative sample, then offered to make the arrangements for the questionnaire administration.

At the senior high school, the planning meeting proceeded as in the junior high school. One of the two guidance counselors assigned to the building was brought into the planning meeting. He expressed interest in the study and agreed to make arrangements for the questionnaire administration. He stated it would be best to include two English sections from each grade, which combined would provide a representative sample of all levels of the socio-economic and ability ranges. The guidance counselor indicated that the two English sections could be scheduled into the library for the same period in order to provide physical space for a single administration of the questionnaire to the tenth grade subjects. Later, the same procedure could be used for the twelfth grade subjects.

It was recognized by the investigator that changes in the seasonal activities of adolescents could affect their relationships with adults. That is, during the summer the subjects would have fewer opportunities for interaction with teachers and more opportunities for inter-
action with Little League coaches, camp directors, and summer employers. Hence, in the planning meetings, two concerns were expressed. First, that the testing of all groups be conducted within a time span of only a few weeks in order that changes in seasonal activities of pre-adolescents and adolescents would not affect the comparisons made across the age groupings. Second, that brothers, sisters, friends, or schoolmates should not be able to discuss the questionnaire to any extent in order to pre-determine their responses. It was determined that it would be physically and administratively possible to conduct all testing on the same day. Therefore, plans were made to do so.

After the planning meetings, the investigator prepared letters for each of the principals, reviewing the plans and procedures as understood by the investigator (Appendix C).

The elementary principal and the guidance counselors stated in the planning meetings that they would assemble the students, introduce the investigator, then they and the teachers would leave the room. In view of this procedure, the investigator developed a standard introduction to the study and directions to the subjects. The introduction was designed to develop interest in the study, elicit cooperation, evoke thoughtful responses, dispel fears about making personal information public, and to supplement the written directions (Appendix D).

Three days prior to the designated day for administering the questionnaires, the investigator telephoned the person in the schools
who had agreed to make the arrangements in order to verify that arrange-
m ents had been made. The investigator also indicated he would arrive in
the building twenty minutes prior to the scheduled time.

Collection of the Data

The investigator brought to each school on his visit to collect
data a card containing the introduction, the necessary questionnaires,
and a supply of sharpened pencils. The introduction to the study was
made (Appendix D), the questionnaires were provided, and the students
were instructed that upon completion of the questionnaire they should
turn it over on the desk, then read or study until the end of the
period. Students were encouraged to proceed without further instruction,
to raise their hand for clarification only as a last resort. All
students were able to complete their responses prior to the end of the
class period (about 40 minutes).

A few minutes prior to the end of the designated class period,
the questionnaires were collected, and the students were thanked for
their cooperation.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

In this chapter the data will be presented and analyzed. The data will be presented which meets the specific objectives of the study, and related hypotheses will be tested.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The data from the questionnaires were transferred to analysis sheets, grouped by grade and by sex. Two questionnaires were discarded from the sample during this process. One, an eleventh grade boy, was taking both tenth and twelfth grade English and appeared in both testing groups. A judgment was made when he appeared in the second testing group, not to require him to file a second questionnaire, and since he was not in fact a tenth grader, to discard the previous questionnaire. The second discard was that of a tenth grade girl who made multiple checkings of responses when single responses were called for. Her multiple responses had the effect of cancelling each other in the case of discrete categories.

Frequency tables were then developed from the analysis sheets.

Percentages were computed to describe the data which satisfied the specific objectives of the study without reference to testing hypotheses, such data to be reported at the descriptive level.
To test the research hypotheses, information from the frequency tables was punched on cards for computer processing. The computer program used was a Fortran IV program for chi-square analysis (CHICHI) which was designed to give a chi-square analysis of frequencies. In this program, data from punched cards are read in and analyzed. Printed output consists of an alpha numeric problem label, a chi-square value with its associated chance probability, the degrees of freedom, the total frequency of all cells, observed frequencies, marginal totals, and expected frequencies.

The method consists of reading in punched cards which define the parameters and frequencies upon which the program will work. If there is only one column of frequencies, the list of frequencies is tested against a hypothesis of equal frequencies. If multiple rows and columns are involved, the expected frequencies for each cell are computed from marginal totals for the appropriate row and column; their product is divided by the table total to yield the expected frequency. The chi square formula is

\[ \chi^2 = \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} \]

The chi square test was selected because much of the data was simply classificatory, that is, measurement on a nominal scale. Mills summarizes the value of the chi square test as follows:

Knowledge of the distribution of \( \chi^2 \) provides the investigator with a powerful research tool. It is chiefly used in testing hypotheses that provide a set of theoretical frequencies, with which observed frequencies may be compared. Using \( \chi^2 \), they are able to evaluate discrepancies between observed and theoretical frequencies, and thus to decide whether, on stated levels of
significance, the hypotheses in question are to be accepted or rejected.¹

Hypotheses were of two types, the one-sample case and the two-sample case. Siegel (1956) reports that for the one-sample test, the test tells whether the sample could have come from some specified population. Siegel describes the one-sample case as follows:

The one-sample test is usually of the goodness-of-fit type. In the typical case, we draw a random sample and then test the hypothesis that this sample was drawn from a population with a specified distribution.²

In contrast to the one-sample case, the two-sample tests compare two or more independent samples and test whether it is likely that the two came from the same population.³

If the agreement between the observed and expected frequencies is close, the differences will be small and consequently the computed value of chi square will be small. If the divergence is large, the value of the computed chi square will also be large.⁴ Siegel notes, for the one-sample case, "Roughly speaking, the larger \( \chi^2 \) is, the more likely it is that the observed frequencies did not come from the population on which the null hypothesis is based."⁵


³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 104-11.

⁵Ibid., p. 43.
When cells with an expected frequency of less than five appear in contingency tables with D. F. larger than 1, the chi square test may be used if fewer than 20 per cent of the cells have a frequency of less than five, and no cell has an expected frequency of less than one.\(^6\) This principle was adhered to.

In one case, in order to test for developmental trends, it was deemed necessary to eliminate the grade six subjects from the test in order to eliminate cells with low frequencies. In this case, the remaining three adolescent age-grade groups were tested against each other using the reduced N.

For each category for which a chi square statistic was obtained, the highest level of significance that could be secured was noted in a range from the .05 to the .001 level of confidence. The appropriate degree of freedom was reported in each case.

In each case of hypothesis testing, the critical value of chi square was determined by consulting an abridged table originally developed by Fisher and Yates.\(^7\)

**Extent of Adolescent Friendships with Adults**

One question central to the study was, "To what extent do adolescents report a friendship with an adult other than their parents?" Considering the group-as-a-whole (Table 1), of the 142 respondents, 130

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 110.  \(^7\)Ibid., p. 249.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade six, male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11 subjects)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade six, female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16 subjects)</td>
<td>(93.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade eight, male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14 subjects)</td>
<td>(92.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade eight, female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16 subjects)</td>
<td>(87.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade ten, male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23 subjects)</td>
<td>(91.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade ten, female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20 subjects)</td>
<td>(95.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade twelve, male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20 subjects)</td>
<td>(90.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade twelve, female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22 subjects)</td>
<td>(86.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(91.6%)</td>
<td>(6.3%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(91.6 per cent) reported they had at present a friendship with a "grown-up" other than their parents. Nine respondents (6.3 per cent) reported that while they did not have a "grown-up" friend at present, they had experienced a friendship in the past. Two respondents (1.4 per cent), reported they did not have a "grown-up" friend at present or in the past, but desired a "grown-up" friend in the future. One subject (0.7 per cent) reported no present friendship, no past friendship, and no desire for a future friendship.

When past friendships and present friendships are combined, 139 of the 142 respondents (97.9 per cent) reported a significant relationship with an adult other than their parents.

For the sample tested, could the differences observed have resulted from chance? This was tested by stating the null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference between the number of adolescents in the sample who report a present friendship with an adult, against those who do not report a present friendship with an adult." To test the hypothesis of no difference, a chi square goodness-of-fit test was applied (Table 2).

The resultant chi square was 96.4. The critical value of chi square with D. F. 1 is 10.83 at the .001 level of confidence, hence we can be sure that these results are significantly different from those which might have resulted from chance. Thus the decision was made to reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis that for the population of adolescents in the community under observation, there
is a strong likelihood an adolescent will report a friendship with an adult other than his parents.

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present Friendship</th>
<th>No Present Friendship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Frequency</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Frequency</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = 0.0000 for chi square = 96.401 with D. F. = 1.

These percentages (Table 1) for the age-grade levels are highly homogeneous, ranging from 86.4 per cent for Grade Twelve to 100 per cent for Grade Six.

Considering the group-as-a-whole, did one sex report present friendships with adults more frequently than the other sex? This was tested by stating the null hypothesis, "There is no significant relationship between the sex of the respondents and the report of present friendships." To test the hypothesis of no relationship, a test of contingency was applied (Table 3).

The resultant chi square was 0.022. The critical value of chi square with D. F. 1 is 3.84 at the .05 level. The hypothesis of no relationship could not be rejected at the .05 level. Thus a decision was
made to accept the hypothesis of no relationship between sex of respondent and the report of a present friendship with an adult other than parents.

**TABLE 3**

**PRE-ADOLESCENTS' AND ADOLESCENTS' REPORT OF PRESENT FRIENDSHIP WITH AN ADULT OTHER THAN PARENTS, TEST BY SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Present Friendship</th>
<th>No Present Friendship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>62.25</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>67.75</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 142

P = 0.8764 for chi square = 0.022 with D. F. = 1.

**Sources of Adult Friends for Adolescents**

What were the sources of adult friends for the subjects in the sample who reported a present friendship? From responses on the questionnaire, discrete categories were developed. These categories are preserved in Table 4. While the preservation of the discrete categories tends to make the table unwieldy, they may be of sufficient interest to the reader to warrant inclusion. The categories are presented in rank order.
TABLE 4
STUDENTS' REPORTS OF SOURCES OF ADULT FRIENDS FOR PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS (N = 130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Adult</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend of Family</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Relationship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of Peer Friend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend of Peer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Member</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Direct comparisons of frequencies should not be made. Group sizes vary.
For the group-as-a-whole, relatives account for 42.3 per cent of the adult friends. Neighbors were mentioned by 13.8 per cent. Friends of the family provide 10.8 per cent of the adult friends. Adults met through non-school work relationships account for 9.2 per cent of the friendships. School faculty are reported for 5.4 per cent of the cases, followed by non-church community organizations, 4.6 per cent; and then parent of peer friend, 3.8 per cent. Businessmen accounted for 3.1 per cent of the total. Friend of peer and ministers were mentioned with equal frequency, 2.3 per cent. Finally, other professional (singing and piano teachers mentioned by two eighth grade females) accounted for 1.5 per cent and one mention was made of a church member, 0.8 per cent.

Combining categories of relatives, neighbors, and friends of the family, for the group-as-a-whole, yields 66.9 per cent of the total.

It is noteworthy that the three most frequently mentioned categories—relatives, neighbors, and friends of the family—accounted for all of the adult friends reported by sixth graders.

Observing the variations in the spread of the categories for sources of adult friends, the investigator decided to test the significance of the differences when grade and sex were considered. The first three categories—relatives, neighbors, and friends of family—were combined in order to test for differences by grade and by sex.

The null hypothesis was stated, "There will be no significant relationship between sex and age of the respondents and the family relationship of the significant adult."
The first trial resulted in low cell frequencies in more than 20 per cent of the cells for the expected frequencies. A second trial was made testing only the adolescents (grades eight, ten, and twelve) in order to test for developmental trends (Table 5). The resultant chi square was 6.399 with D. F. 5. The critical value of chi square with D. F. 5 is 11.07 at the .05 level of confidence. The decision was made to accept the null hypothesis. For the adolescents in grades eight, ten, and twelve, age or sex were not significant factors in the reporting of a present friendship from the combined category—relative, neighbor, friend of family.

The sources of adults for those reporting a past friendship with an adult (9 persons), were all from the first three categories—relative, neighbor, friend of family.

Note that in Table 4, the fourth ranked category for sources of adult friends, "Work relationships," gained in strength from the youngest to the oldest age-grade groupings. Significance was not tested because of the limited number of frequencies recorded in grades six and eight. Observed differences are reported at the descriptive level.

No adult friendships arising out of "Work relationships" appeared in the sixth grade group. One appeared within the eighth grade group, accounting for 3.7 per cent of the friendships reported. Three appeared in the tenth grade group, accounting for 7.5 per cent; and eight appeared in the twelfth grade group, accounting for 21.6 per cent of the adults named as present friends for that age group.
TABLE 5
COMBINED CATEGORIES OF RELATIVES, NEIGHBORS, AND FRIENDS
OF FAMILY AS SOURCES OF SIGNIFICANT ADULTS FOR
PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS (ADOLESCENTS ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Present Friend This Category</th>
<th>Present Friend Other Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 104

P = 0.2693 for chi square = 6.399 with D. F. = 5.
Officially Assigned Adults as Sources of Friends

The next objective was to compare the proportion of adults named as significant adults who are officially assigned to interact with adolescents, against the proportion of adults also named but not officially assigned to interact with adolescents. "Assigned" adults were defined as those who have a paid, professional responsibility to interact with adolescents.

From questionnaire responses, the description of the occupation of the adult friend (Item #7), the description of how the adolescent met the friend (Item #3), whether the friend was seen at home or at their place of work (Item #9), whether the friend was a relative (Item #12), and the manner in which the adolescent gets together with the adult friend (Item #15), responses were cast into the two discrete categories—assigned or un-assigned (Table 6).

For the 130 respondents reporting a present friendship with an adult other than their parents, 115 (88.5 per cent) of the adult friends were in the "un-assigned" category.

To test the level of significance, a null hypothesis of no difference was stated, "There will be no significant difference between the proportion of assigned and un-assigned adults named as significant adults." A chi square goodness-of-fit test was used (Table 7).

The resultant chi square was 75.392. The critical value of chi square with D. F. 1 is 10.83 at the .001 level of confidence. Hence, we can be sure that the observed difference is significant. The decision
### TABLE 6

**STUDENTS REPORTING PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS WITH ASSIGNED VERSUS UN-ASSIGNED ADULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Assigned Adult</th>
<th>Un-assigned Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 130
TABLE 7

ASSIGNED ADULTS VERSUS UN-ASSIGNED ADULTS
AS SOURCES OF ADULT FRIENDS
FOR PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assigned Adults</th>
<th>Un-assigned Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Frequency</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Frequency</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 130

P = 0.0000 for chi square = 75.392 with D. F. = 1.

was to reject the null hypothesis in favor of the alternate hypothesis. For the adolescent population in the community under observation, adults not officially assigned to interact with adolescents provide a significant proportion of the significant relationships.

Sixth graders uniformly did not report any friendships arising from interaction with "assigned" adults. For the nine respondents who described a past friendship, all adults came from the "un-assigned" category.

**How Well Adult Friend was Known by Parents**

In addition to the findings reported under the discussion of the sources of significant adults other than parents, the respondent was asked to report how well the adult friend was known by the parents (Item #10). Four categories were provided in the questionnaire—"very
well," "fairly well," "just a little," and "not at all." The responses are reported in Table 8.

TABLE 8
RESPONSES OF PRE-ADOLESCENTS AND ADOLESCENTS TO QUESTION
"HOW WELL IS ADULT FRIEND KNOWN BY PARENTS"
FOR PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS (N = 130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Sex of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just a little</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Direct comparisons of frequencies should not be made.
Group sizes vary.

For the group-as-a-whole which reported present friendships, 70.0 per cent of the adult friends were reported to be "very well known" by the parents. The four categories were combined into two categories. When combined, adults categorized as "very well known" and "fairly well known" by the parents accounted for 83.8 per cent of the total. This cluster accounts for all friendships for sixth graders. The clustered categories "just a little" and "not at all" accounted for 16.2 per cent of the total. Only five adults (3.8 per cent) were not known by the parents. It is noteworthy that a developmental trend was evident as
revealed by the strength of "just a little" and "not at all" categories appearing for the eighth grade male (not the female) and then stabilizing fairly well for the males and females in the older age-grade groups. Age and sex variations were not tested for significance since low frequencies would have resulted within some of the cells.

Effect of Formal and Informal Associations

The next objective was to assess the effects of formal versus informal associations with significant adults as the basis for adolescent-adult friendships.

Item # 8, "Where do you usually meet with your grown-up friend?" and Item # 15, "How do you usually get together with your friend?", provided information used to cast each response into the "formal" or "informal" categories. Responses are tabulated in Table 9.

For the group-as-a-whole which reported present friendships, informal associations accounted for 91.5 per cent of the associations. To test the level of significance, a null hypothesis was stated, "There will be no significant difference between the proportions of responses for formal or informal settings, for significant relationships with adults." A chi square goodness-of-fit test was applied (Table 10).

The resultant chi square was 88.069. The critical value of chi square with D. F. = 1 is 10.83 at the .001 level of confidence; hence, the observed difference was significant at the .001 level. The decision was made to reject the null hypothesis of no difference, and to accept
TABLE 9

FORMAL VERSUS INFORMAL ASSOCIATIONS AS A BASIS FOR PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS WITH ADULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Students*</th>
<th>Forma1 Associations</th>
<th>Informal Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS 11 119**

N = 130

*Note: Direct comparisons of frequencies should not be made. Group sizes vary.*
the alternate hypothesis that for the adolescent population in the community under observation, adolescent-adult friendships are developed and sustained in informal associations.

**TABLE 10**

**FORMAL VERSUS INFORMAL ASSOCIATIONS AS A BASIS FOR SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS WITH ADULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Associations</th>
<th>Informal Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Frequency</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Frequency</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 130

P = 0.0000 for chi square = 88.069 with D. F. = 1.

**Effect of Face-to-Face versus Group Contacts**

Another objective was to assess the effects of face-to-face versus group contacts on interaction with significant adults.

Item #13 provided the data for this analysis. Table 11 provides a summary of the responses. These have been summarized from the highest to the lowest rank for the group-as-a-whole. It was necessary to discard five responses (two grade ten boys; two grade twelve boys; one grade twelve girl) as a result of multiple checking of discrete categories. After securing the data, the investigator decided to combine two of the categories which logically seemed to offer a similar supportive influence to an adolescent interacting with an adult friend. These two categories
### TABLE 11

**SOCIAL SETTING FOR INTERACTION WITH ADULT FRIEND—PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Setting</th>
<th>Grade and Sex of Respondents*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 M 6 F</td>
<td>8 M 6 F</td>
<td>10 M 6 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With family</td>
<td>9 M 8 F</td>
<td>3 M 5 F</td>
<td>4 M 6 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By self</td>
<td>1 M 4 F</td>
<td>4 M 5 F</td>
<td>6 M 4 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>0 M 2 F</td>
<td>0 M 1 F</td>
<td>4 M 6 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-15 persons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a person</td>
<td>1 M 1 F</td>
<td>2 M 3 F</td>
<td>4 M 3 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>0 M 0 F</td>
<td>4 M 0 F</td>
<td>1 M 0 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(more than 15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 125

*Note: Direct comparisons of frequencies should not be made. Group sizes vary.*
and their respective frequencies were "with a friend your own age" (14 responses) and "with a person your own age" (4 responses). They are combined in Table 11 in the category "with a person your own age" (18 responses).

The highest ranked category was "with your family," 36.8 per cent. "By yourself" accounted for 28.8 per cent; "with a small group other than your family" (3-15 persons), 15.2 per cent; "with a person your own age," 14.4 per cent; and "in a large group" (more than 15 persons), 4.8 per cent.

Noteworthy in Table 11, is the strong tendency for the sixth graders to have available the supportive influence of the family during youth-adult interaction. The twelfth grade girls revealed in the "by yourself" category, a strong tendency to interact with the adult without other supportive social influences. It might be noted that two of the girls in twelfth grade described a dating relationship which might account for some of the strength in that category.

In order to test for the effects of face-to-face interaction versus group-based interaction, limits had to be defined for the terms. In addition to the "by self" category, it seemed logical to assume that significant face-to-face interaction can easily and naturally occur in the presence of a peer or within the usual family setting. This type of interaction can and does occur within the small-group setting but is likely to diminish as a function of increasing group size. For hypothesis
testing, the decision was made to cluster "small group" setting and
"large group" setting into the single category, "Group-based inter-
action" (Table 12).

TABLE 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group Interaction</th>
<th>Face-to-Face Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Frequency</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Frequency</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 125

P = 0.0000 for chi square = 43.808 with D. F. = 1.

Pre-adolescents and adolescents spend a large portion of their
waking hours in large group and small group settings—in school, in
recreation activities, in Scouts, in church, and in other organized
activities. A null hypothesis was stated, "There will be no significant
difference between face-to-face interaction versus group-based inter-
action as a basis for significant relationships with an adult friend."

The resultant chi square was 43.808 with D. F. = 1 (Table 12).
The critical value of chi square with D. F. = 1, is 10.53 at the .001
level of confidence. Hence the decision was made to reject the null
hypothesis of no difference, and accept the alternate hypothesis that a
significant proportion of adolescent friendships with adults are based on
face-to-face interaction.
Frequency of Interaction and Effect of Proximity

A question of interest to the investigator was how often the adolescent interacts with his adult friends; that is, what frequency of interaction is required to develop and sustain a friendship. Responses to Item #4 of the questionnaire provided the information contained in Table 13. For the group-as-a-whole, 36.9 per cent reported they saw the adult daily; 39.2 per cent saw the adult weekly or twice a week; 16.2 per cent saw the adult monthly or bi-monthly; 6.2 per cent saw the adult four to six times a year; and 1.5 per cent saw the adult less than four times a year.

TABLE 13

RANK ORDER REPORT OF FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH ADULT FRIEND—FOR PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Category</th>
<th>Grade and Sex of Respondents*</th>
<th>6 M F</th>
<th>8 M F</th>
<th>10 M F</th>
<th>12 M F</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly or twice a week</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td>10 11</td>
<td>7 7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>8 6</td>
<td>5 6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly or bi-monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four to six times a year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 130

*Note: Direct comparisons of frequencies should not be made. Group sizes vary.
Item # 9 provided data for examining the effect of proximity or geographical separation on adolescent friendships with adults (Table 14). Responses were clustered into the following categories: walking distance (same home - six to twelve blocks); short-drive distance (two to ten miles); and long-drive distance (more than ten miles). Nine responses were not categorized.

For the group-as-a-whole (121 responses), the adult was within walking distance in 52.9 per cent of the cases; within short driving range in 28.1 per cent of the cases; and was in the long-drive range in 19.0 per cent of the cases. There was a tendency for twelfth graders to report a higher proportion of friendships in the six to twelve block category.

**Age of the Adult Friend**

Another objective was to determine the age of the preferred adults, then test for relationships between the age of the adolescents and the age of the adult friend.

Item # 5 provided the data for this objective. The data are tabulated in Table 15. Considering the group-as-a-whole, for those who reported present friendships, six "grown-up" friends (4.8 per cent) were in the 15 to 19 year range. The 20 to 29 year range accounted for thirty-seven (29.8 per cent); the 30 to 39 year range accounted for twenty-four adults (19.4 percent); the 40 to 49 year range, twenty-five adults (20.2 per cent); and thirty-two adults (25.8 per cent) were fifty
TABLE 14
THE EFFECT OF GEOGRAPHICAL SEPARATION (PROXIMITY) ON PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS WITH ADULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Separation</th>
<th>Grade and Sex of Respondents</th>
<th>6 M</th>
<th>8 F</th>
<th>10 M</th>
<th>12 F</th>
<th>Total M</th>
<th>Total F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same house</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One block</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to five blocks</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to twelve blocks</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to ten miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven to forty miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forty-one to sixty miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than sixty miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Direct comparisons of frequencies should not be made. Group sizes vary.

N = 121
TABLE 15

AGE OF THE ADULT FRIEND REPORTED
FOR PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of &quot;grown-up&quot; friend</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 years and older</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 124

Note: Direct comparisons of frequencies should not be made. Group sizes vary.

years or older. There was a tendency for the sixth graders to report ages in the two higher ranges, probably because of the many uncles, aunts, and grandparents named as "grown-up" friends. The adolescents in grades eight, ten, and twelve, displayed a tendency to report more adult friends from the ranges twenty to twenty-nine years, and thirty to thirty-nine years.

To test for the relationship between the age of the respondent and the age of the adult friend, a hypothesis of no significant relationship was stated, "There will be no significant relationship between the age of the significant adults and the age of the respondents," (Table 16).
TABLE 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade of Respondent</th>
<th>Age of Adult Friend (Years)</th>
<th>(15-29)</th>
<th>(30-39)</th>
<th>(40-49)</th>
<th>(50+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 124

P = 0.0925 for chi square = 14.987 with D. F. = 9.

The resultant chi square was 14.987 with D. F. 9. The critical value of chi square is 16.92 with D. F. 9, at the .05 level of confidence. The hypothesis could not be rejected at the .05 level of confidence, therefore the decision was made to accept the null hypothesis.
Sex Differences and Friendships

Another objective was to describe the effect of sex differences on friendship relationships between the significant adults and the preadolescents and adolescents in the community surveyed. Identification material and Item #6 of the questionnaire provided the necessary data. The information is tabulated in Table 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX OF THE ADULT FRIEND FOR PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sex of Adult Friend | Grade and Sex of Respondents* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 |
| Male | M | F | M | F | M | F | Total |
| Male | 6 | 2 | 12 | 5 | 20 | 6 | 17 | 5 | 73 |
| Female | 5 | 13 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 13 | 56 |

*Note: Direct comparisons of frequencies should not be made. Group sizes vary.

For the sixth grade boys, adult friends were about as likely to be female as male. For all other age-grade groupings, boys overwhelmingly, but not exclusively, reported a male adult friend. For sixth grade girls, adult females accounted for 86.7 per cent of the present friendships. By eighth grade, adult females accounted for 64.3 per cent of the girls' friends; grade ten girls reported adult females as friends in 68.4 per cent of the cases; and twelfth grade girls reported adult
females as friends in 72.2 per cent of the cases. One grade twelve girl
failed to distinguish between a man and his wife as the "grown-up"
friend; therefore, no response was given for this item.

To test for the significance of the relationship between the sex
of the adult and the sex of the respondent, a null hypothesis was stated,
"There will be no significant relationship between the sex of the
significant adults and the sex of the respondents." The test is reported
in Table 18.

TABLE 18

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SEX OF THE RESPONDENT AND SEX
OF ADULT FRIEND—PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Adult</td>
<td>Female Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1, Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2, Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$P = 0.0000$ for chi square $= 44.869$ with D. F. $= 1$.

The resultant chi square was $44.869$ with D. F. 1. The critical value of
chi square with D. F. 1 at the .001 level of confidence is 10.83. The
decision was made to reject the hypothesis of no significant relation-
ship in favor of the alternative hypothesis. For the adolescent popu-
lation in the community under observation, the adult friend would be
likely to be of the same sex as the adolescent.
Usual Activities for Interaction

Item # 16 of the questionnaire asked the students, "What do you usually do when you and your friend get together?" Some students reported a single activity, others listed several activities. For the group reporting present friendships, the investigator cast the responses into several categories. One student did not respond to this item (sixth grade boy). A rank order listing appears in Table 19.

The most frequently listed activity was "talk" mentioned by 100 of the 129 respondents. At the descriptive level there were no major age or sex variations for this category. This activity was mentioned far more frequently than any other category.

Student responses categorized as "go places" were ranked second highest, with 38 responses. Included in this category were responses: "go to movies," "ride around," "go to a store," "go to a camp," "go sightseeing," "go for walks," and "go visit someone."

A sex difference was observable. Girls made mention of activities which were cast into the "go places" category more than twice as frequently as boys. Furthermore, the tenth grade boys failed to mention any activities for this category. Perhaps they are sufficiently free to "go places" without adult support and therefore attach no significance to this category.

Third highest category was "Sport" mentioned by 31 respondents. Here again sex differences were observed. Sixth grade girls made no
### TABLE 19

RANK ORDER TABULATION OF USUAL ACTIVITIES WITH ADULT FRIEND—PRESENT FRIENDSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grade and Sex of Respondents*</th>
<th>Summary By Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 M F 8 M F 10 M F 12 M F</td>
<td>Total M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>6 11 7 14 17 17 12 16 100</td>
<td>42 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go places</td>
<td>4 5 4 8 0 7 4 6 38</td>
<td>12 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>1 0 5 1 12 2 4 6 31</td>
<td>22 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work or share work</td>
<td>1 3 5 3 5 1 4 1 23</td>
<td>15 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play and play games</td>
<td>5 8 1 1 1 1 2 1 20</td>
<td>9 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch TV or listen to records</td>
<td>0 4 2 1 1 4 1 1 14</td>
<td>4 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joking</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 4 2 2 2 11</td>
<td>7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat or drink</td>
<td>1 2 0 0 3 0 0 4 10</td>
<td>4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicrafts and home crafts</td>
<td>0 6 0 0 1 0 0 2 9</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Direct comparisons of frequencies should be made only when considering the varying group sizes.

Respondents to This Item:

- Grade six, boys (10)
- Grade six, girls (15)
- Grade eight, boys (13)
- Grade eight, girls (14)
- Grade ten, boys (21)
- Grade ten, girls (19)
- Grade twelve, boys (18)
- Grade twelve, girls (19)

N = 129
mention of activities within this category, and no strength in the
frequencies appeared for females until twelfth grade. Twelfth grade
girls reported activities falling within this category slightly more
frequently than did twelfth grade boys. Boys' responses for this cate­
gory were more than twice as frequent as girls. It was observed that
this category showed strength for eighth grade boys, but reached its
highest level for tenth grade boys.

"Work and share work," fourth-ranked, was mentioned by all grades
and both sexes (total of 23 responses). Boys' responses dominated this
category in all grades except sixth grade, where girls' responses were
dominant.

The fifth-ranked category was "Play and play games." Here the
sixth graders dominated the responses, accounting for 13 of the 20
responses. The remaining responses were spread rather evenly across the
columns of the table. It may be noted that there seemed to be a
parallel between the sixth graders' focus on "Play and playing games"
and the category "Sport" for the adolescents, at least for the boys.
Specific game or play activities described in this category included
cards, checkers, Monopoly, chess, jacks, Parchesi, playing with race
sets, and shooting pool.

"Watch TV and listen to records," the sixth-ranked category, had
14 mentions. Ten of these were made by girls, predominantly the sixth
and twelfth grade girls.
"Joking" was specifically mentioned by eleven persons, all but one of those a tenth or twelfth grader. Most frequent mention was made by tenth grade boys.

Ten students reported "Eating or drinking" as usual activities. Twelfth grade girls mentioned this more frequently than did the other age-grade or sex groups.

Responses which were categorized as "Handicrafts and home crafts" were received from nine students. Girls provided eight of the nine responses. Six of the nine responses were from sixth grade girls (about one-third of that group) and two responses were from the twelfth grade girls. Activities which were cast into this category were knitting, sewing, painting, baking, and from one boy, planning and carrying-out Scouting activities.

Other responses were cast into categories which were mentioned infrequently (not shown in Table 19). In rank order they were "Learning and schoolwork" (4 responses), "Receive services" (3 responses), "Dance" (2 responses), "Double-date" (1 response), and "Mutual exchange of gifts" (1 response).

Adolescent Needs Met in Friendships with Adults

The final objective of the study was to determine what adolescent needs were being met in adolescent-adult relationships.

Item # 18 of the questionnaire asked the student, "How does this friendship help you?" The free responses secured were tested against several sets of needs categories or listings including Murray's list of
psychogenic needs;\(^8\) Douglass' eight areas of needs;\(^9\) the Lucas and Horrocks list of five orthogonal need factors;\(^10\) and the Horrocks listing of twelve major needs areas.\(^11\) The investigator found through repeated trials, that Murray's listing of twenty-eight psychogenic needs would require finer discriminations than were tenable from the free-response material. Repeated attempts to cast the free-response material into needs categories provided by the remaining listings (see above), revealed that the Horrocks listing of twelve major needs categories best retained the flavor and intent of the original material. A decision was made to use that listing (Table 20).

**TABLE 20**

**CATEGORIES OF PSYCHOLOGICAL NEEDS—HORROCKS*\(^1\)**

1. **Acceptance.** The need to feel that others' attitudes toward one are favorable or positive. To feel that others respect, sanction, or approve of one. To be secure in the feeling that one is a worthy person in another's eyes. To feel that others regard one as equal. To feel that one is not rejected.

2. **Achievement.** The need to acquire, gain, receive, win, or strive to accomplish goals, tokens of status and respect, or knowledge. To attain, secure, prove, surmount through praiseworthy exertion.

3. **Affection.** The need to be loved, cherished, emotionally wanted for one's own sake; to receive unconditional love and affection. To receive emotional love from parents, relatives, friends or lover.

---

\(^8\) Hilgard and Atkinson, 1967, op. cit., p. 143.


\(^10\) Ibid., p. 511.

\(^11\) Ibid., pp. 507-8.
| 4. **Approval.** The need to have others' behavior toward one indicate that one is a satisfactory person, or that one's deeds are satisfactory. To seek overt rewards or other signs of approval. To be given overt demonstration by others of one's worthiness. To avoid blame, criticism, punishment. |
| 5. **Belonging.** The need to feel a part of the group or institution. To identify oneself with a person, group, institution, or idea. To be a member of a congenial group. |
| 6. **Conformity.** The need to be like others, to avoid marked departure from the mode. To yield or conform to custom. To avoid being different in dress, behavior, attitudes, ideals. |
| 7. **Dependence.** The need to have to ask for or depend on others for emotional support, protection, care, encouragement, forgiveness, help. |
| 8. **Independence.** The need to be free of external control by friends, family, associates, and others. To do things in a self-determining manner, to make one's decisions, to be self-sufficient, to rely on oneself. |
| 9. **Mastery-dominance.** The need to control, to be in power, to lead, to manage, govern, overcome people, problems, obstacles. To influence the behavior, feelings or ideas of others. |
| 10. **Recognition.** The need to be noticed, to become known. To avoid effacement of one's individuality. To be identified by others as a unique individual, to be distinguished from others. To find one's place, to be regarded as an important human being. |
| 11. **Self-realization.** The need to function at one's ability level. To learn, understand, perform to the best of one's ability, to avoid performing at a mediocre level. To strive for increasingly better accomplishment within the limits of one's capacity. |
| 12. **To be understood.** The need to feel in sympathetic rapport with parents, relatives, friends, associates. To feel at one with others. To feel free to express one's innermost thoughts and problems to one or more persons without loss of affection or personal status. To feel that another identifies with oneself. |

In trial attempts, the investigator discovered decision-making was facilitated by reviewing other information on the data analysis sheets. Of particular value, in some cases was the information in the column "Usual activity," and the student's response to Item # 17, "Why do you respect and admire this person?" Often, in answering Item # 17, the student had described how the significant adult aided him.

For ease of comparison and description, the investigator made the decision to cast each student's response to Item # 18 into one major need category. That is, for the several things being discussed in some responses, a primary need area was to be designated. The response was to be read, considered in the light of the accompanying information on the data analysis sheet, a judgment made, and the response cast into one of the twelve categories. A few students had made no response to Item # 18, or a sketchy response. The raters were asked in these cases to determine if a need area could be assigned on the basis of the other information on the data analysis sheets. From the raters' responses, apparently this was possible.

Two psychologists were independently approached to sort students' responses into the twelve major needs categories. To avoid injecting investigator bias, the raters were not trained by the investigator. All had some prior familiarity with the listing employed. Each performed his sorting in isolation, on the basis of the descriptions of the major needs areas provided in Table 20.
The ratings of the two judges were then placed on an analysis sheet identified only as "Rater # 1" and "Rater # 2" classifications. A third psychologist was then asked to consult the original data analysis sheets and Table 20, consider only subjects' responses which had received two different classifications from Rater # 1 and Rater # 2, then cast the response into one of the two different categories which had been designated by the first two raters.

The tabulated data are presented in rank order in Table 21. In view of the spread of responses and the tentative nature of needs classification only the major tendencies will be discussed.

No student responses were classified as "Conformity" or "Independence." Only one response was classified within the major needs area of "Mastery-dominance."

For "present friendships," the group-as-a-whole indicated that the primary needs being met through their friendships with preferred significant adults were: "To be understood," 26 responses (20.0 per cent); "Self-realization," 21 responses (16.2 per cent); "Belonging," 19 responses (14.6 per cent); "Acceptance," 17 responses (13.1 per cent); "Achievement," 12 responses (9.2 per cent); "Approval," 12 responses (9.2 per cent); and "Dependence," 11 responses (8.5 per cent). Other categories were: "Affection," 7 responses (5.4 per cent); "Recognition," 4 responses (3.1 per cent); and "Mastery-dominance," 1 response (0.8 per cent). No student responses were classified under the categories "Conformity" or "Independence."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Category</th>
<th>Grade and Sex of Respondents*</th>
<th>6 M</th>
<th>6 F</th>
<th>8 M</th>
<th>8 F</th>
<th>10 M</th>
<th>10 F</th>
<th>12 M</th>
<th>12 F</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be understood</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-realization</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery-dominance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Direct comparisons of frequencies should not be made. Group sizes vary.*

N = 130
Some sex and age-grade differences were observed. A tendency was noted for the tenth and twelfth grade girls to report information which was cast into the need area, "To be understood." By comparison tenth grade boys more frequently provided responses which were classified as "Belonging." No twelfth grade boys responses were classified as "To be understood." Sixth graders provided all seven of the responses classified as "Affection," with boys reporting five of the seven. Responses classified as "Self-realization" were recorded for four boys and four girls in the sixth grade age-grade grouping. Three of the sixth grade girls' responses were classified as "To be understood." "Achievement" responses were dominated by boys—only two of the responses were from girls, neither of these from tenth and twelfth grade girls. Responses classified as "Dependence" were principally obtained from tenth and twelfth graders.

Responses which were classified as "To be understood" often contained reference to "being able to understand adults better" or "able to discuss problems freely." Responses which were classified as "Self-realization," more frequently contained "helps me to learn." Responses classified as "Belonging" frequently contained a direct statement of the desire for imitation, emulation, or modeling after the adult friend.

Hypothesis testing was not attempted since the spread of the responses in the table indicated many of the cells would be likely to have a low expected frequency.
For those students who described a past friendship (nine respondents), responses were classified as "To be understood" (2 responses), "Acceptance" (3 responses), and "Approval," "Belonging," and "Self-realization," one response each.

The two students who desire a future friendship (a sixth grade girl and a twelfth grade boy) both gave responses which were classified as "Dependence."

Summary

Certain general findings seem to arise from a review of the data as presented:

The extent of adolescent friendships with an adult other than their parents. For the community observed, it was the norm for preadolescents and adolescents to report a friendship with a grown-up other than their parents. Of the 142 subjects, only three had not experienced a friendship with a preferred adult, and only one of these did not desire a friendship with an adult. For the pre-adolescents and adolescents observed, a chi square test for significant difference between the group reporting present friendships and the group reporting no present friendships revealed a significant difference at the .001 level of confidence.

Sex differences with regard to reporting present friendships. There was no significant relationship between the sex of the respondents and the report of present friendships with a preferred adult. Both sexes were likely to designate a preferred adult friend.
Sources of adult friends for adolescents. The major sources of adult friends were relatives, neighbors, and friends of the family. For the sixth graders, and adolescents reporting past friendships, all adult friends came from these three categories. A test was made for sex and age differences among the adolescents only, for these three categories combined. For the adolescents in the sample (grades eight, ten, and twelve) age or sex were not significant factors in reporting a present friendship from the combined category--relative, neighbor, friend of the family.

Work relationships as a source for preferred adults. A developmental trend was evident in the number of older adolescents who reported present friendships with a preferred adult arising from non-school work relationships.

Assigned versus un-assigned adults as preferred adult friends. For the community observed, professional persons assigned to interact with youth were infrequently named as preferred adult friends. "Un-assigned" persons were named as preferred adult friends by almost 90 per cent of those reporting present friendships. The difference was significant at the .001 level of confidence. Sixth graders did not report any friendships arising from interaction with "assigned" adults. For the nine persons who described a past friendship, all adults came from the "un-assigned" category.

How well the adult friend was known by the parents. It was the norm for the adult friend to be known by the parents. Seventy per cent
reported the adult friend was "very well" known. Only five adults (3.8 per cent) were "not at all" known by the parents. Slight age and sex variations were observable but were not tested for significance.

The effect of formal and informal associations on adolescent-adult friendships. A significant proportion of adolescent-adult friendships are based on face-to-face interaction. The observed difference in favor of face-to-face interaction was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

Frequency of interaction with the adult friend. Most adolescent-adult friendships appeared to require frequent face-to-face contact. For those reporting present friendships, 36.9 per cent see the adult daily, 39.2 per cent weekly or twice a week, 16.2 per cent monthly or bi-monthly, 6.2 per cent four to six times per year, and only 1.5 per cent see the adult friend fewer than four times per year.

Effect of proximity on adolescent-adult friendships. More than one-half of the adult friends were within walking distance of the adolescents' homes.

Age of the adult friend. There was no significant relationship between the age of the respondents and the age of the adult friend. All age-groupings reported friendships with significant adults over forty and over fifty years old. Slight sex and age variations were observable but not significant.

Sex differences and adolescent-adult friendships. Excepting sixth grade boys, it was the norm for pre-adolescents and adolescents to have a same-sex preferred adult friend. For sixth grade boys, adult
friends were about as likely to be female as male. However, some opposite-sex adult friends were reported in all age-grade groups.

**Usual activities for adolescent-adult interaction.** The most frequently mentioned activity was "Talk." At the descriptive level no significant age or sex variations were observable. This category was mentioned far more frequently than any other. Second-ranked were responses categorized as "Go places." A sex difference was observable. Girls mentioned this category more than twice as frequently as boys. The tenth grade boys did not mention this category. Third-ranked category was "Sport" with sex differences favoring boys and reaching its zenith for tenth grade boys. Some strength appeared for twelfth grade girls. "Work and share work," fourth-ranked, was mentioned by all grades and both sexes. Boys' responses dominated this category in all grades except sixth, where girls' responses were dominant. Fifth-ranked category was "Play and playing games" dominated by sixth graders. Other major categories in rank order included: "Watch TV and listen to records," "Joking," "Eating or drinking," and "Handicrafts or home crafts."

**Adolescent needs met in friendships with adults.** For present friendships, responses were weighed against twelve major psychological needs areas. The primary needs being met through friendships with preferred adult friends are: "To be understood" (20.0 per cent), "Self-realization" (16.2 per cent), "Belonging" (14.6 per cent), "Acceptance" (13.1 per cent), "Achievement" (9.2 per cent), "Approval" (9.2 per cent), and "Dependence" (8.5 per cent).
Other categories mentioned were: "Affection" (5.4 per cent), "Recognition" (3.1 per cent), and "Mastery-dominance" (0.8 per cent).

No responses were classified under the categories "Conformity" or "Independence." Some sex and age-grade differences were observed.

Tenth and twelfth grade girls dominated the category "To be understood." No twelfth grade boys' responses were classified as "To be understood." Sixth graders accounted for all responses classified as "Affection"—boys dominated these. Tenth grade boys more frequently provided responses classified as "Belonging." "Achievement" responses were dominated by boys—with no responses in this category from tenth and twelfth grade girls.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a restatement of the purpose and procedure of this study, a section on conclusions and implications, a statement of the significance of the study, and recommendations for further research.

Purpose and Procedure

The purpose of this research was to investigate and describe adolescent relationships with significant adults other than their parents in one community.

This study recognized that the development of a self concept is central to human development; that the self is constantly undergoing modification as a result of significant interpersonal relations; that adults other than parents do interact with adolescents; and that a gap exists in the literature with regard to adolescent-adult significant relationships.

The study, exploratory in nature, was designed to supply information at the descriptive level that might be useful as a base for comparative studies with other populations and also provide information for theorizing and application.
It is recognized that human development is an individual task, that each individual develops uniquely. Yet in understanding the nature of development and in aiding or counseling youth, it is imperative that information about what is normal or typical be available to those attempting to understand and facilitate individual growth. In view of the popular attention given to adolescent-adult alienation, objective description of adolescent-adult relationships would seem to be of crucial importance. It seems unlikely that we will be able to understand the external forces which the adolescent encounters in his development unless we possess more adequate information about his social interactions.

Basic to the study was the administration of a moderately structured questionnaire to a cross-section of pre-adolescents and adolescents in one community to obtain self-reports which described a relationship with a significant preferred adult other than parents. The questionnaire was specially prepared for this study.

The population under observation was from a relatively heterogeneous small city in central-western Pennsylvania. Self-reports were secured from public school students in attendance on the day of questionnaire administration, both male and female, in grades: six (27 respondents), eight (30 respondents), ten (44 respondents), and grade twelve (42 respondents). From these, one questionnaire (a tenth grade female) was discarded because of multiple-checking of several discrete categories.
Pre-adolescents were included in the survey sample in order that age-stage differences might be examined. One hundred forty-two usable questionnaires were secured in all.

Students were asked to respond to one of four sections of the questionnaire. Students described a present friendship with an adult other than their parents, a past friendship, a friendship desired in the future, or stated why no future friendship with an adult was desired.

The questionnaire requested the vital statistics of name, name of school, grade, sex, age, address, and sibling information which would indicate the ordinal family position. Then followed the investigator's brief description of a preferred adult friend. The respondent was asked to indicate if he had at present, a friendship with a grown-up other than his parents. If the answer was "yes," the subject was directed to turn to the following pages (Section A), where he was asked to write the name and address of the grown-up friend, tell how he met the friend, and how often he sees the friend, check the age of the friend, identify sex, list occupation, state the usual meeting place, and describe geographical separation. Further, he was asked to identify his friend's relationship to his family; describe what activity is pursued; and indicate why the friend is liked, or respected and admired. Finally, he was asked to describe how the friendship helped him.

If the subject did not report a present friendship, he was directed to Section B where he either reported a past friendship or was directed to Section C. Section C provided two alternatives. The subject
was asked if he would like a friendship with a grown-up friend in the future. If he responded "no," he was asked to tell why he would not like a friendship with a grown-up friend. Those subjects responding "yes" to Sections B or C were asked to respond to items which paralleled the items in Section A.

The questionnaire was administered in a group setting in a regular classroom. The results of the questionnaire administration indicated that the instrument and procedure was valid for this purpose. Pre-adolescents and adolescents were able to designate a preferred adult friend and were willing to describe the relationship. A post-test interview for reliability of questionnaire responses revealed a high degree of reliability.

Information provided in the self-reports was analyzed to meet specific objectives which had been selected prior to the administration of the questionnaire-instrument. Pre-formulated hypotheses were tested for significance by use of the chi square statistic.

Objectives and Hypotheses

The following specific objectives were designated for the study:

1. To develop descriptive data showing to what extent pre-adolescents and adolescents report friendships with adults other than their parents.

2. To develop descriptive data showing the sources of influential adults, other than parents, for adolescents in one community.

3. To assess the effect of family relationship, both social friendships and family of orientation or procreation, on the sources of significant adults.
4. To compare the proportion of adults named as significant adults, who are officially assigned to interact with adolescents, against the proportion of adults also named but not officially assigned to interact with adolescents.

5. To analyze the effects of formal versus informal associations with significant adults.

6. To assess the effects of face-to-face (one-to-one) versus group contacts on interaction with significant adults.

7. To analyze the effects of sex and age on relationships with preferred adults other than the parents of the respondents.

8. To assess the effect of geographical separation on adolescent-significant adult interaction.

9. To describe the frequency and the mode of interaction.

10. To summarize and compare by sex and by age groupings, the self-reports of adolescent needs served in these relationships.

The following research hypotheses were formulated for this study (the result of testing with the chi square statistic is also indicated):

1. There will be no significant difference between the number of adolescents in the sample who report a present friendship with an adult, against those who do not report a present friendship with an adult. (REJECT)

2. There will be no significant relationship between the sex of the respondents and the report of present friendships. (ACCEPT)

3. There will be no significant relationship between sex and age of the respondents and the family relationship of the significant adult. (ACCEPT)

4. There will be no significant difference between the proportion of assigned and un-assigned adults named as significant adults. (REJECT)
5. There will be no significant relationship between the sex and age of the respondents and how well the adult is known by the parents. (NOT TESTED)

6. There will be no significant difference between the proportion of friendships which occur in informal settings versus those which occur in formal settings. (REJECT)

7. There will be no significant difference between face-to-face interaction versus group-based interaction as a basis for significant relationships with adult friends. (REJECT)

8. There will be no significant relationship between the age of the significant adults and the age of the respondents. (ACCEPT)

9. There will be no significant relationship between the sex of the significant adults and the sex of the respondents. (REJECT)

10. There will be no significant differences among the types of adolescent needs met by adolescent-significant adult relationships when tested by sex and by age of respondents. (NOT TESTED)

**Conclusions and Implications**

This study had as its general objective to investigate and describe adolescent relationships with significant preferred adults other than parents in one community. An analysis of the data in this research study yielded the following conclusions. These conclusions are qualified by the dimensions of the particular research population.

First, it was extensively the norm for pre-adolescents and adolescents to report a friendship with a significant preferred adult other than his parents. This finding is in contradiction with some of the current literature in related psychologies; some of the training materials used in social, educational, and religious institutions; some
programming and information presented through the mass media; and some accommodations being made for adolescents in social, religious, and educational institutions. This finding supports the viewpoint of theorists, researchers, and writers who report a more gradual developmental trend toward independence with less conflict and more accommodation between adolescents and adults.

The extent of the friendships reported clearly indicates the need for additional research directed at these interpersonal relationships.

Second, the major sources of adult friends for adolescents are relatives, neighbors, and friends of the family. This is true for all age groups. A developmental trend was observed for older adolescents to discover new sources of significant preferred adults in non-school work relationships. The evidence indicates that most friendships arise from casual, frequent, face-to-face interactions. The family and neighborhood settings in the community observed seem to provide adequate opportunities for such interactions to occur. Whether this would be true for other types of family and neighborhood settings is at this time a matter of conjecture. There is a need for comparative descriptive studies to provide additional empirical information relating to the effects of family and neighborhood settings on adolescent-adult friendships.

Although the relationships develop through casual circumstances, students' responses indicated that the relationships are valued.
The finding that relatives and friends of the family account for a significant proportion of preferred adult friends could be principally attributed to proximity and availability of those persons; however, it might reflect the valuing by adolescents of those persons valued by the family. That is, it might be indicative of shared values within the family setting. This interpretation would be supported by research conducted on middle-class adolescents by Bandura and Walters.¹

Third, professional persons who are specifically employed by the community to interact with adolescents are infrequently named as significant preferred adults. This would appear to be in contradiction to the intent of the governing boards who employ teachers, counselors, athletic coaches, ministers, community recreation leaders, and paid professionals in YMCA and Scouting. Further, few significant preferred adults are named from volunteer social, religious, and recreational leaders in the community, e.g., Boy Scout and Girl Scout leaders, Demolay leaders, Little League and Pee-Wee Football coaches, and Sabbath School teachers. This finding would appear to be in contradiction not only with the intent of the governing and advisory boards of community institutions and organizations, but also with the intent of the individuals who volunteer to perform social services for the youth of the community.

If it is the intent of the governing and advisory boards of community institutions and organizations to provide for significant

¹Bandura, "Stormy Decade: Fact or Fiction."
adolescent-adult interpersonal relationships, and it is the intent of professional and volunteer youth workers to participate in these relationships, the evidence indicates this objective is not being met to any great extent.

The implication is that causal factors need to be examined. What forces preclude the development of significant adolescent-adult friendships with professional and volunteer youth workers in the community?

Evidence emerged from this research study which illuminates certain causal factors. One relevant finding was, it was extensively the norm for adolescent-adult friendships to occur in informal settings. This was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

An inherent hallmark of community activities in educational, social, religious, and recreational domains is that they are organized. That is, there is inherent a significant degree of formal organization—a structure and a content.

A second finding relevant to this discussion was the finding that a significant proportion of adolescent-adult friendships are based on face-to-face interactions. This was significant at the .001 level of confidence. Again, the structure of organized community activities may be in question. Education has most often been group-based and retains that characteristic in the community observed. Community recreation and social activities tend to be group-based. That is, the major attention of the leaders is directed toward the organized activity of the group--
with infrequent opportunities for significant periods of time devoted to groups of two or three adolescents, or interaction on a one-to-one basis. Even when this does occur, the size of the group usually precludes frequent interaction between the same adolescent and adult. Another possibly relevant finding was that frequent interaction was found to be requisite to adolescent-adult friendships. For example, 76.1 per cent reported interaction with the adult friend once each week or more frequently; of these, 36.9 per cent see the adult daily.

What are the implications of these findings? If it is the intent to provide for significant adolescent-adult relationships, then it may be necessary to change the structure and content of community activities.

More than ten years ago, some psychologists, educators, parents, and interested adults were expressing a concern that our youth were being over-organized—in communities, in cities, and in suburbia. The effects which could preclude significant adolescent-adult relationships are twofold. One, the adolescent engaged in many organized activities might not have the time to engage in frequent, informal, interpersonal relations with adults. And secondly, the adults who might otherwise participate in these valued relationships are themselves intensely involved in providing social services to adolescents in the organized setting. Although no formal test was made, the investigator observed that the names of the adults in the community who are esteemed by the community as leaders in social and community services were conspicuously
absent from the pre-adolescents' and adolescents' questionnaire responses.

Teachers are professionally trained to work with adolescents and have frequent, daily contacts with adolescents, yet were named as significant preferred adults by only 5.4 per cent (seven) of the adolescents reporting a present friendship with an adult (130 subjects). For the nine adolescents reporting past friendships, no teachers were named. This finding supports the conclusions of Coleman and Offer that teachers are not valued as significant adults.  

Coleman provided a seminal research report which serves as the basis for much theorizing about the nature of adolescent-adult relationships and emphasizes the existence of an adolescent sub-culture. One of the bases on which the existence of a "youth culture" was predicted was the students' responses to a hypothetical situation (the suggestion that the student join a particular club). The student was asked that he indicate his probable compliance with the suggestion if it was made by his "favorite teacher." Coleman reported, "Neither the elites nor their followers indicate that they would pay much attention to a teacher's wishes outside the classroom--even if it is their favorite teacher."  

In view of the finding in the present study, that even the "favorite teacher" would not be likely to be a significant preferred adult, a

---

2 Coleman, Adolescent Society, p. 141; Offer, World of Teenager, pp. 42-5.

3 Coleman, op. cit.
person whose opinions are valued, this documentation should be re-
examined. Perhaps the level of compliance would be higher if the
suggestion had been made by a significant preferred adult—and this
aspect would need to be examined outside the school setting in order to
ascertain the significance of this factor as an indicator of a separate
"youth culture."

Our educational institutions are becoming aware of the limitations
placed on significant interpersonal relations by group-based instruction.
The trend is toward team-teaching, large-group, small-group, individ-
ualized learning, and independent study. Efforts directed toward these
educational changes plus modular scheduling and mediated instruction
have as an underlying assumption the belief that more opportunities will
be created for significant interpersonal relations within the school
setting. New emphasis is being placed on the development of informal
learning situations.

To test the effects of these educational changes, a hypothesis
could be stated that a significantly greater number of teachers would be
named as preferred adult friends in the new circumstances. A comparison
could be made between schools which have fully implemented these changes
against schools which have not.

It is noteworthy that for the teachers named as significant
preferred adults in this study, adolescent-adult interaction occurred in
informal settings. One teacher was not the adolescent’s teacher but was
a friend of the family and interaction took place in the home of the
adolescent or in the teacher's home. One teacher named was the stage
director and the interaction took place during the time the adolescent
served on the stage crew. One teacher was yearbook editor and the
adolescent was a member of the yearbook staff. One teacher was advisor
to the student government and the significant interpersonal relations
took place as the adolescent and the teacher planned together for stu-
dent government activity.

It was not evident that personal qualities, professional pre-
paration, or the intentions of the teachers were preventing significant
interpersonal relationships with adolescents. Rather, the conditions
under which interaction occurs in the school setting seemed to preclude
significant interpersonal relationships.

In the same vein, religious leaders, service leaders, recrea-
tional leaders, and volunteer workers for youth might strive to provide
for less emphasis on the present structure and content for the group,
and place more emphasis on frequent, informal interaction with very small
groups of adolescents and individual adolescents. Self-directed and
mediated experiences might be used to provide the formal structure and
content to meet other objectives for members of the group, while the
leader engages in informal interaction with very small groups and
individuals.

Fourth, there was no significant relationship between the age of
the respondents and the age of the adult friends. All age-grade groupings
reported friendships with significant adults over forty and over fifty
years old. Slight age and sex variations were observable but not significant. The concern displayed toward age differences and adolescent-adult interpersonal relationships is not supported by this research study. Accommodations in our social institutions to provide young-adults to interact with adolescents do not seem strongly warranted by the findings.

Fifth, with the exception of sixth grade boys, it was the norm for pre-adolescents and adolescents to have a same-sex preferred adult friend. For sixth grade boys, adult friends were about as likely to be female as male. However, some opposite-sex adult friends were reported in all age-grade groups. Research might well be directed toward illuminating the exception of the sixth grade boy. Perhaps he lacks the mobility and social ease to develop his own same-sex adult friendships, and finds too few adult males interested in engaging in frequent interaction in informal settings with a sixth grade boy. The regular classroom teacher for the sixth graders in the sample, was a male teacher.

Sixth, the most frequently mentioned usual activity for adolescent-adult interaction was "Talk." This category was mentioned far more frequently than any other. The frequency of mentions could be attributed to the social nature of interpersonal relations, or it might be an indicator of the significance which adolescents impart to this activity. One might ask, "What is going on in all of this 'talk'?" That this activity should dominate these valued interpersonal relationships would seem to suggest that adolescents are striving to communicate
with adults in a setting of mutual respect—that adult opinions are valued by adolescents.

This activity is external, observable, and susceptible to empirical study. It is also the means by which many social and personal values are transmitted. The structure and content of this activity should be carefully and empirically examined.

Second-ranked category was "Go places." Apparently, preferred adult friends provide broadening experiences for the pre-adolescents and adolescents. "Sport," the third-ranked activity, reflects joint adolescent and adult interest. Sex and age-grade differences were observable as this category was dominated by boys, reached its peak for tenth grade boys, and for the girls displayed increased strength in twelfth grade. "Work and share work," the fourth-ranked activity, was mentioned by all grade and sex groupings. Boys' responses dominated this category in all grades except sixth, where girls' responses dominated. A developmental trend appears. As older adolescents engage in employment outside the home and school, this contact provides a new source for significant adult friends. This finding supports the conclusion by Horrocks regarding the especially strong need for older adolescents to assume increasingly adequate roles with adults and the increasing concern for occupational endeavor.4 This finding also

---

4Horrocks, Psychology of Adolescence, pp. 516-17.
supports Offer's conclusion that "vocational and educational goals" are important areas of concern for adolescents.\(^5\)

The responses of all age-grade groups and both sexes, which indicated "Work and share work" activities were engaged in during adolescent-significant adult interaction, could indicate a valuing of shared productive activities. The implication which follows would be that provisions must be made by adults in the community to provide for shared-work experiences for the pre-adolescents and adolescents in the community. Adolescent attention to these tasks may indicate an awareness of productive work being a part of the socialization and maturation process. Or it might be engaged in principally to provide for self-realization as the adolescent learns to work, learns to work with others, and learns new skills.

Fifth-ranked category was "Play and playing games" dominated by sixth graders. Other major categories in rank order included: "Watch TV and listen to records," "Joking," "Eating or drinking," and "Handicrafts or home crafts." In addition to the frequent mention of "Talk" as a usual activity, "Joking" received specific mention by adolescents. This finding would tend to support Meyer's conclusion that need-play-mirth is increasingly satisfied outside of classmate relationships as the adolescent matures--that adults play an increasingly important role in this need satisfaction.\(^6\)

\(^5\)Offer, *World of Teenager*, Table 3-2.

Finally, it was the conclusion that the principal adolescent needs being met in relationships with preferred adult friends are "To be understood," "Self-realization," "Belonging," "Acceptance," "Achievement," "Approval," and "Dependence." No responses from the pre-adolescents or adolescents were classified as "Conformity" or "Independence" by the panel of raters. Pre-adolescents (sixth graders) accounted for all the responses classified as "Affection." Generally the adolescents' responses were stated in a manner which would indicate that the friendships are leading toward positive, healthy human development. A desire was expressed, or a valuing observed, for meaningful contacts with adults which aided the adolescent in understanding adults and being understood by them.

It was evident that adolescents valued learning from adults—learning vocational and useful skills used in everyday living, learning to participate in adult forms of recreation, developing competitive skills in sports, and learning how to control emotions. There also emerged the desire to belong to congenial groups—extended family groups and groups which included other adults. A direct desire to imitate, emulate, or model after the preferred adult friend was stated by several adolescents. The category of "Achievement" was dominated by boys. There was evidence that tenth and twelfth grade girls are more likely to be using these friendships to fulfill a need "To be understood" than any other kind of need.
It might appear that these adolescents are prolonging dependence on adults. However a broader look at the findings indicates that they are in fact gradually broadening their social experiences to include adults, that they are seeking contact with adults who accept them as a respected friend; that they are made to feel that these adults value their opinions; and that they are striving for self-realization in vocational and social endeavors. The students' responses indicate that they are valuing experiences and participating in experiences with preferred adult friends, which will have positive effects toward the completion of the human socialization process.

Significance of the Study

This study has documented the existence of significant interpersonal relations, affecting the socialization process of youth, which have largely escaped the attention of researchers. It has demonstrated that this area is susceptible to productive research and merits additional attention.

The procedures used to investigate adolescent relationships with significant preferred adults proved to be valid and reliable. This method of obtaining information about sensitive, valued relationships was demonstrated to be fruitful, and was perceived by the respondents as non-threatening. The questionnaire developed for this research proved to be a useful research instrument, worthy of being used for replication and comparative studies.
The findings demonstrated conclusively that it was extensively the norm for pre-adolescents and adolescents to have significant, valued friendships with adults other than their parents in one community.

The descriptive data which emerged can be used as a basis for comparative studies with other research populations.

The study has provided empirical data which can be used as a base for theorizing about adolescent socialization and adolescent-adult relationships.

Evidence was secured which provides support for theorists who propose that the socialization process for adolescents is a gradual developmental trend with less conflict and more accommodation between adolescents and adults than has sometimes been thought. The study has indicated one direction from which supporting empirical evidence might be obtained.

The findings from this study reveal that professional and volunteer members of the community who work with youth in educational, social, and religious institutions are not generally significant preferred adult friends of adolescents. More importantly, through analysis of adolescents' descriptions of their relationships with significant preferred adults, certain causal factors were identified which probably inhibit the development of these valued relationships, and directions for change were indicated.

The findings revealed that if it is the intent of the community to provide select professionals and esteemed social service volunteers
to engage in the transmission of personal and social values, and Vernon is correct in his assumption that value definitions result from satisfying relationships with significant others, then this study has revealed a monumental mis-match.7 The select professionals and esteemed volunteers are cast into roles and settings with adolescents where the structure and content of the setting possibly inhibits the development of significant interpersonal relationships—thus preventing the transmission of values.

Conversely, in the community settings which provide for significant interpersonal relationships, the adolescent may encounter only the non-select and the non-esteemed, with whom he develops his value definitions. It should not be inferred that the investigator considers value transmission the preserve of a select few in the community. Evidence from the study indicated positive social values are being transmitted by the non-select and the non-esteemed.

The value attached to the relationships with significant adults other than parents by the adolescents and the relative ease with which this information can be obtained would indicate that guidance counselors and other professionals who counsel youth might usefully obtain information about the youth's preferred friends.

The study findings should serve to alert adults that what might appear to the adult to be casual contacts with adolescents, may not be

viewed as casual by the adolescent. The adolescent may well be involved in a valued relationship, testing and evaluating values, and forming new value definitions. Adults will need to provide the time to engage in informal interaction with the youth of the community—perhaps to the extent that some organized community activities will receive a de-emphasis in adult and community support.

This research study indicated some potential directions for related research in this area as summarized in the concluding section.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

1. A replication study should be undertaken in a community with a similar population, employing the same procedures.

2. Comparative studies should be made with rural, urban, and suburban populations to determine the effects of family and neighborhood settings on interpersonal relationships between adolescents and significant preferred adults.

3. Research should be conducted to test the effects of modifications of traditional educational patterns on adolescent-school faculty interpersonal relationships.

4. According to reports from adolescents "talking" was the principal activity engaged in during interaction with significant preferred adults. This activity is external, observable, and susceptible to empirical study. It is also a principal means by which values may be transmitted. The structure and content of this activity should be carefully and empirically studied.
APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A

To understand how people live together we must ask them how they do it. If I asked you some questions and you answered them, and I listened carefully, I would know something about you and your friends. But, this wouldn't help us know very much about how a lot of people live together. Because it would take a very long time to talk with enough people, I am going to ask you to write your answers to some questions.

Name_________________________ Name of School__________________________
Grade__________ Boy ☐ Girl ☐ (check one ☑)
Age__________

Please write the name and age of your brothers and sisters here (example: Charles, 8 years).

Brothers:________________________________________________________

Sisters:________________________________________________________

Write your address here:__________________________________________

Turn the page
Even though you are still in school you may have friends who are older. In addition to your parents, you may have a grown-up friend you respect and like. One way of thinking about this grown-up friend is that it is a person you like to be with. This friend might be a relative such as a grandparent, an uncle or an aunt; a friend of the family; a neighbor; a teacher; a minister or church worker; a doctor; a businessman; a recreation leader; a Scout leader; the parent of a friend; or just an adult you know.

Please answer the following questions as well as you can.

G 1. How many different kinds of grown-ups, other than your parents, do you spend time with often? (examples: grandmother, teachers, barber)

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

G 2. Now, is there one of these grown-ups you have a friendship with?

[ ] Yes    [ ] No (check one box [ ] )

Is there one of these adults you like most to be with?

[ ] Yes    [ ] No

If your answer was No to both questions, please answer the questions beginning on page 7.

If your answer was Yes to one or both of the questions, answer the questions beginning on page 3.
Section A

1. Write the name of this grown-up friend __________________________

2. Where does your friend live? (address) __________________________

3. How did you meet this friend? ________________________________

4. About how often do you see this friend? (check one box [ ])
   a. several times a day ................................
   b. two times a day ...................................
   c. once a day ........................................
   d. two times each week ............................
   e. once a week ......................................
   f. every two weeks .................................
   g. one time each month .........................
   h. four to six times each year ...............
   i. less than four times each year ...........

5. About how old is your friend? (check one box [ ])
   a. 15 years to 19 years ..........................
   b. 20 years to 24 years ..........................
   c. 25 years to 29 years ..........................
   d. 30 years to 34 years ..........................
   e. 35 years to 39 years ..........................
   f. 40 years to 44 years ..........................
   g. 45 years to 49 years ..........................
   h. 50 years or older ............................
   i. not sure ........................................

6. Is your friend a
   man [ ]  Woman [ ]

7. What kind of work does your grown-up friend do? ________________

   ----------------------------------------------
   Don't know [ ]
8. Where do you usually meet with your grown-up friend?
   a. at your home
   b. at his or her home
   c. at school
   d. at church or Sunday school
   e. at a friend's house
   f. some other place (example: playground)
      (write in the place here)

9. How far from your home does your grown-up friend live? (If you see him or her at his home or at your home) Don’t know
   How far from your home does your friend work? (if you see him or her at work)

10. How well do your parents know your grown-up friend? (check one box)
    a. very well
    b. fairly well
    c. just a little
    d. not at all

11. If your parents know your friend, how did they get to know him or her?

12. Is your grown-up friend a relative? Yes No
    If your answer was Yes, check one box.
    a. grandfather
    b. grandmother
    c. Uncle
    d. aunt
    e. cousin
    f. brother
    g. sister
    h. niece
    i. nephew
13. Do you usually meet with your grown-up friend when you are:
   a. in a large group (15 or more persons) .................................. □
   b. in a small group other than your family (3-15 persons) ........ □
   c. with a person your own age ............................................. □
   d. with a friend your own age ............................................. □
   e. by yourself ................................................................. □
   f. with your family ......................................................... □

14. When you meet with your grown-up friend, which do you like most?
    (check one box ____)
    a. being in a large group .................................................. □
    b. being in a small group other than your family .................... □
    c. being with a person your own age ..................................... □
    d. being with a friend your own age ..................................... □
    e. being by yourself ....................................................... □
    f. being with your family or a member of your family ............ □

15. How do you usually get together with your friend?
    a. at a meeting or a class (could be at church) ....................... □
    b. before or after a meeting or a class ............................... □
    c. I stop by his/her place of business or work ....................... □
    d. I make an appointment to see him/her ............................. □
    e. he/she is invited to our house ...................................... □
    f. he/she comes to our house ........................................... □
    g. I see him/her outside ................................................... □
    h. I go to his/her house .................................................. □
16. What do you usually do when you and your friend get together?

________________________________________________________________________

17. What do you like most about your grown-up friend? Why do you respect and admire this person?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

18. How does this friendship help you?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your help.
Section B

1. Write the name of your grown-up friend ______________________________

2. Where does, or did, your friend live? (address) ____________________________

3. Where did you live when you had this friend? ______________________________

4. How long ago was this? ___ weeks ___ months ___ years

5. How did you meet this friend? ____________________________________________

6. About how often did you see this friend? (check one box □)
   a. several times a day ........... □
   b. two times a day ............... □
   c. once each day ................. □
   d. two times each week ........... □
   e. once each week ............... □
   f. every two weeks .............. □
   g. one time each month ......... □
   h. four to six times each year ... □
   i. less than four times each year. . . □

7. About how old was your friend? (check one box □)
   a. 15 years to 19 years □
   b. 20 years to 24 years □
   c. 25 years to 29 years □
   d. 30 years to 34 years □
   e. 35 years to 39 years □
   f. 40 years to 44 years □
   g. 45 years to 49 years □
   h. 50 years or older □
   i. Not sure □
8. How old were you when you had this friendship? _____ years old

9. Why is this grown-up not your friend now? ______________________________

10. Was your friend a:  
    Man [ ]  
    Woman [ ]

11. What kind of work did your grown-up friend do?  
    ________________________________  Don't know [ ]

12. Where did you usually meet with your grown-up friend?
    a. at your home. . . . . . . . . . . [ ]
    b. at his/her home . . . . . . . . . . [ ]
    c. at school . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . [ ]
    d. at church or Sunday school. . . . [ ]
    e. at a friend's house . . . . . . . . . . [ ]
    f. at some other place [ ] (for example: playground)

    (write in the place here)

13. How far from your home did your grown-up friend live? (if you saw him/her at his home or at your home) _________ Don't know [ ]

    How far from your home did your friend work? (if you saw him/her at work) _________ Don't know [ ]

14. How well did your parents know your grown-up friend? (check one box)
    a. very well . . . . . . . [ ]
    b. fairly well . . . . . . [ ]
    c. just a little . . . . . [ ]
    d. not at all . . . . . . [ ]
15. If your parents knew your grown-up friend, how did they get to know him or her?

16. Was your grown-up friend a relative? Yes □ No □

17. If your answer was Yes to question 16, check one box □

   a. grandfather □
   b. grandmother □
   c. uncle □
   d. aunt □
   e. cousin □
   f. brother □
   g. sister □
   h. niece □
   i. nephew □

18. Did you usually meet with your grown-up friend when you were:

   a. in a large group (15 or more persons) □
   b. in a small group other than your family (3-15 persons) □
   c. with a person your own age □
   d. with a friend your own age □
   e. by yourself □
   f. with your family or a member of your family. □

19. When you met with your grown-up friend, which did you like most?

   a. being in a large group □
   b. being in a small group other than your family. □
   c. being with a person your own age □
   d. being with a friend your own age □
   e. being by yourself. □
   f. being with your family or a member of your family. □
20. How did you usually get together with your friend? (check one box)
   a. at a meeting or a class (could be at church)          □
   b. before or after a meeting or a class                   □
   c. I stopped by his/her business or place of work       □
   d. I made an appointment to see him/her                   □
   e. he/she was invited to our house                        □
   f. he/she came to our house                               □
   g. I saw him/her outside                                  □
   h. I went to his/her home                                  □
   i. my family visited him/her                               □
   j. he/she lived in our house                              □
   k. some other way (tell how)                              □

21. What did you usually do when you and your friend got together?

22. What did you like most about your grown-up friend? Why did you respect and admire this person?
23. How did this friendship help you? _______________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

Thank you for your help.
Section C

You said you did not have a grown-up friend now and you did not have a friendship with a grown-up, other than your parents, in the past.

G 4. Would you like a grown-up friend now or sometime in the future? (check one box) Yes ☐ No ☐

If you checked Yes, answer the questions in Section C, page 14.
If you checked No, please write about the following question.

G 5. Write about why you would not want a grown-up friend, other than your parents. _____________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Section C

1. Do you already know who you would want for a grown-up friend?
   □ Yes    □ No

2. If Yes was checked, write the name of the person here._______________
   ________________________________________________________________

3. If you know his or her address, write it here._______________
   ________________________________________________________________

4. About how often would you want to see this friend? (check one box)
   a. several times a day  ........................................ [ ]
   b. two times a day  ........................................ [ ]
   c. once a day  ........................................ [ ]
   d. two times each week  ........................................ [ ]
   e. once each week  ........................................ [ ]
   f. every two weeks  ........................................ [ ]
   g. one time each month  ........................................ [ ]
   h. four to six times each year  ........................................ [ ]
   i. less than four times each year  ........................................ [ ]

5. How old would you want this friend to be? (check one box)
   a. 15 years to 19 years  ........................................ [ ]
   b. 20 years to 24 years  ........................................ [ ]
   c. 25 years to 29 years  ........................................ [ ]
   d. 30 years to 34 years  ........................................ [ ]
   e. 35 years to 39 years  ........................................ [ ]
   f. 40 years to 44 years  ........................................ [ ]
   g. 45 years to 49 years  ........................................ [ ]
   h. 50 years or older  ........................................ [ ]
   i. Not sure  ........................................ [ ]
6. Would you want this grown-up friend to be:
   Man □  Woman □  Don't care □

7. What kind of work would you want him or her to do, that is, what kind of job would you want them to hold? ________________________
   Don't know □  Doesn't make any difference □

8. Where do you think you will usually get together with your grown-up friend?
   a. at your home .............. □
   b. at his or her home........ □
   c. at school .................. □
   d. at church or Sunday school.. □
   e. at a friend's house .......... □
   f. some other place (example: playground). □
   (write in the place here) __________________

9. How far from your home will you want this person to live? (if you will see him or her at his home or at your home)
   ___________________________  Don't know □

How far from your home will you want your friend to work? (if you will see him or her at work)
   ___________________________  Don't know □

10. How well would you want your parents to know your grown-up friend?
    (check one box)
    a. very well □  c. just a little □
    b. fairly well □  d. not at all □
11. Is the grown-up you want for a friend known by your parents?

Yes □  No □

If you checked Yes, how did your parents get to know him or her?

12. Is that person a relative? Yes □  No □

If your answer was Yes, check one box.

a. grandfather □  f. brother □
b. grandmother □  g. sister □
c. uncle □  h. niece □
d. aunt □  i. nephew □
e. cousin □

13. How do you think you will usually meet with your friend?

a. in a large group (15 or more persons). □
b. in a small group other than your family (3-15 persons) □
c. with a person your own age □
d. with a friend your own age □
e. by yourself □
f. with your family or a member of your family □

14. Would you best like to meet with your grown-up friend when you are: (check one box)

a. in a large group □
b. in a small group other than your family □
c. with a person your own age □
15. How do you think you will usually get together with your friend?
   a. at a meeting or a class (could be at church) ............... [ ]
   b. before or after a meeting or a class ......................... [ ]
   c. stop by his or her place of business or work ............... [ ]
   d. make an appointment to see him or her ...................... [ ]
   e. have him or her invited to your house ....................... [ ]
   f. have him or her just come to your house .................. [ ]
   g. see him or her outside ......................................... [ ]
   h. go to his or her house ......................................... [ ]
   i. have your family visit your friend .......................... [ ]
   j. have your friend live at your house ....................... [ ]
   k. some other way (tell how) ................................... [ ]

   16. What will you usually want to do when you and your friend get together?

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
17. What would you like most about this friend, that is, what kind of person do you want him or her to be?

18. How do you think this friendship will help you?

Thank you for your help.
October 31, 1969

Dr. Robert P. Martin
Superintendent
Indiana Area School District
Administrative Offices, 501 East Pike
Indiana, Pennsylvania 15701

Dear Dr. Martin:

Request permission to conduct a research study in the Indiana Area Schools.

This study is designed to obtain information about the relationships of adolescents and non-parental preferred adults in a community setting. Very little research is available which deals with the role of non-parental adults in meeting adolescent needs. The study will be a descriptive-survey of students from grades six, eight, ten, and twelve.

The level of student involvement would be:

1) To obtain parental permission to participate in the study
2) To respond to a semi-structured questionnaire (one-half hour to forty minutes)
3) Eight to twelve students (some from each grade level) will be asked to volunteer to be interviewed for one-half hour to forty minutes in order to validate questionnaire responses.

The findings of this study would be made available to the School District. They should be helpful in planning future community activities, particularly as the community plans to organize activities for our adolescents and to staff our programs for youth.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,
March 5, 1970

Joseph Bosnic, Principal
Indiana Junior High School
245 North Fifth Street
Indiana, Pennsylvania 15701

Dear Mr. Bosnic:

On Tuesday, March 3, I discussed with you and your Guidance Counselors, a research study designed to obtain information about the relationships of adolescents and non-parental preferred adults in a community setting. I would like to thank you and your counselors for your cooperative attitudes and your expression of interest.

Very little research is available which deals with the role of non-parental adults in meeting adolescent needs. The study will be a descriptive-survey of students in grades six, eight, ten, and twelve. As I explained, the level of student involvement will be:

1) To respond to a semi-structured questionnaire for approximately forty minutes

2) Four students from each grade level will be requested to volunteer to be interviewed for one-half hour or less, in order to validate questionnaire responses (this phase would be carried-out within two to four weeks after responding to the questionnaire.

The findings of this study will be made available to the School District. They should be helpful in planning future community activities particularly as the community plans to organize activities for our adolescents, and staff our programs for youth. Additionally, the findings should provide a firmer base for theorizing about adolescent development, and counseling adolescents.

I plan to meet Mr. Stewart in the Guidance Office, and administer the questionnaire to an eighth grade section, at 1:45 p.m., on Monday, March 9.

Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,
APPENDIX D

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY AND DIRECTIONS

TO THE SUBJECTS

Good morning. I am Mr. Hauk. I teach at the University. Over a year ago, I wanted to find out what people your age said about some adults they knew. So I did what many of you do when you want information. I went to the library to see what I could find out. I searched for books and magazine articles in which such information would be written. I found that a man in Paris had been interested in the same kind of information and had gotten some information from French students. Now, if I was living in France, that would have answered my questions. But, I wasn't. Next, I went to a man I know who writes books about adolescents and should have known where to find the information. He didn't. He said, it would be important information, but he didn't know of anyone who had asked students about it. Well, a year later, here I am to ask you to share some information with many adults who are interested in how people live together, in a community, and in the United States. The information you share will be confidential. That is, we are interested in what a group of students say about some adults they know. We are not interested in what a student, let's say Tom Jones, says about Mr. Robert Fisher.
The information you give will be grouped with the information given by others and just as I do not know the names of the French students who gave information or the names of the adults they knew, neither will others know your name or the name of the adult you know.

This is not a test of any sort but because you may not have thought about these questions very much, you will have to think carefully before you write your information.

Do not hurry to answer the questions. You will have plenty of time. Because only a small number of all the students your age will supply this information, it is more important to give thoughtful, complete answers.

As soon as you receive your papers, check to see that you have all sixteen pages. You will not be asked to answer questions on all of these pages, so you do not need to hurry.

If you are writing your information, and you run out of space, write the word over in parentheses, and continue writing on the back of that same page.

Give the most thoughtful, complete answer you can.

Thank you for your help.
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