

Student Work

12-11-1990

The Development of Trust for Best Friend Versus Other Friend in Childhood and Adolescent Relationship

Eileen Molzen

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Molzen, Eileen, "The Development of Trust for Best Friend Versus Other Friend in Childhood and Adolescent Relationship" (1990). *Student Work*. 2055.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2055>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

The Development of Trust for
Best Friend Versus Other Friend
in Childhood and Adolescent Relationships

A Thesis
Presented to the
Department of Psychology
and the
Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
University of Nebraska at Omaha

by
Eileen Molzen
December, 1990

UMI Number: EP73595

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73595

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Name	Department
<i>Merian B. Salzman</i>	<i>Special Educ. & Comm. Disorders</i>
<i>Gregory R. Sims</i>	<i>Psychology</i>
<i>Richard L. Wilkoff</i>	<i>Psychology</i>

Joseph C. LaVail
 Chairman

December 11, 1990
 Date

Abstract

Trust as experienced in childhood and adolescent best friend and other friend dyads was examined with respect to age differences, sex differences, and differences in perspective taking. A sample of 109 students in grade levels 4 (9-10 years; N =27), 6 (11-12 years; N = 29), 8 (13-14 years; N = 25), and 10 (15-16 years; N = 28), were selected to provide for a cross-section of school age youth. Age and gender differences for trust in regard to the dyadic relationships were investigated using a modified version of Sharabany's Intimacy Scale, and a modified version of the Prisoner's Dilemma Game; the latter being a measure developed by the principal investigator. In addition to these two measures, approximately 55 % of the subjects were rated for level of perspective taking by using a modified version of Selman's Friendship Domain Interview. This measure allowed the youths to answer open ended questions and probes about trust in a friendship.

The findings in this study are the product of data generated from three trust measures. Some ubiquitous findings did emerge from the statistical analyses, suggesting that significant differences among the factors were dependent on the type of task/measure, and the nature of the relationship being addressed. An effect for age was not

significant with the SISm measure, but was significant for the PD and Issue-Concept measures. However, interpretations of these results were not consistent, and were reflective of the measure employed. Significant gender differences were observed in the modified Sharabany Intimacy Scale, with females making more trusting descriptive choices than males. In the Prisoner's Dilemma, gender differences were embedded in the effect for grade. Gender differences were not present in the issue-concept scores from the interviews, an effect which supports previous research (Brion-Meisels, 1977; Enright, 1977; Selman, 1980). Finally, with respect to friend, significant differences were noted in the SISm and PD measures with trust ratings for best friend being higher than those for other friend.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my husband, Mark, whose continued patience and support over these past years has allowed me to reach this point in my academic career. I wish to extend my thanks to my Committee chairman, Dr. Joseph LaVoie for his encouragement and guidance during this project. I also wish to thank my other Committee members, Dr. Richard Wikoff, Dr. Gregory Simpson, and Dr. William Callahan, whose suggestions and comments resulted in a significant improvement in the quality of the experimental design. Appreciation is also extended to the students and faculty from H. E. Hoover Elementary School, Kirn Junior High School, and Abraham Lincoln Senior High School for their patience and cooperation, and to the parents for allowing their children to participate in the project. A special thanks goes to my co-researcher, Susan Snyder, for the many months of hard work involved in reaching, "the light at the end of the tunnel". In addition, I would like to thank Diane May-Sader, Theresa Cochran, Bruce Lemon, and Jim Snyder for their assistance in the organization of the data. Finally, I would like to thank all of my friends and family members who provided me with a place to rest my weary head during this past year.

Table of Contents

Acceptance Page	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vii
List of Appendices	vii
Chapter I Introduction	1
Review of the Literature.....	5
Theoretical Approaches	6
Gender Differences	10
Trust as a Variable	10
Purpose of the Study.....	14
Hypotheses.....	14
Chapter II Methods	17
Subjects.....	17
Instruments.....	18
Sharabany Intimacy Scale modified	18
Adaptation of the Prisoner's Dilemma	20
Adaptation of Selman's Friendship Dilemma	21
Procedure.....	30
Identification of "Best Friend" Versus "Other Friend"	30
Identification of Trust	31
Defining Trust	33
Chapter III Results	35
Analysis of Trust Scores.....	37
Analysis of Age Differences	37
Analysis of Gender Differences	40
Analysis of Friend Differences	42
Analysis of Scenario Differences	42

Reliability Analysis.....	46
Sharabany's Intimacy Scale, modified, Trust Scores	46
Correlations of Trust Score Measures.....	48
Sharabany's Intimacy Scale, modified, Trust Scores	48
Prisoner's Dilemma Trust Scores	48
Sharabany's Intimacy Scale, modified, Prisoner's Dilemma, and Selman's Interview Trust Scores	48
Chapter IV Discussion.....	51
Age Differences	51
Gender Differences	55
Friend Differences	57
Limitations of the Study	59
Suggestions for Further Research	60
Conclusions and Implications	62
References	64
Appendices	74

LIST OF TABLES

1	Developmental Levels and Stages of Friendship for Selman's Friendship Domain Interview	23
2	SISm Means and Standard Deviations for Best Friend Versus Other Friend at Each Grade Level for Males and Females	37
3	PD Means and Standard Deviations for Best Friend Other Friend at Each Grade Level for Males and Females	38
4	Frequency Table for Selman's Stage by Grade	40
5	Frequency Table for Selman's Stage by Sex	41
6	Means and Standard Deviations for the Prisoner's Dilemma Scenarios	43
7	Reliability Scores for the Sharabany Intimacy Scale, modified, Measure of Trust	47
8	Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Total Scale, Total Subscales, and Subscales by Friend for SISm, PD, and I-CTScale	49
9	Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Total Scale, Total Subscales, and Subscales by Friend for SISm, PD, and I-CTScale	50

LIST OF APPENDICES

A	Parental Consent Form	74
B	Youth Assent Form	78
C	The Sharabany's Intimacy Scale, modified	79
D	The Prisoner's Dilemma, (adaptation)	87
E	The Friends Dilemma (Children's version)	93
F	The Friends Dilemma (Adolescent and Adult version) .	95
G	Trust and Reciprocity Questions for the Friends Dilemma	96
H	Information Page	97
I	Instructions for Administration of SISm	98
J	Overview of the Trust and Reciprocity Aspects of Selman's Friendship Domain Interview	102
K	Summary Table for SISm, PD, and I-C Scale	112

Chapter I

Introduction

During the past three decades interest in the field of childhood and adolescent friendships has flourished with ensuing research into such areas as the formation, maintenance, and possible termination of this special relationship. The attempt to formulate a compilation of the various facets of friendship into a theoretical framework has produced a vast amount of work focusing on the development of generalized expectations of the perceived qualities associated with the generation and continuance of a best friend relationship (Bigelow & LaGapia, 1975; Bittle & Clark, 1986; Furman & Bierman, 1984; LaGapia, 1981, Reisman & Shorr, 1978; Youniss & Volpe, 1978). It has only been recently that researchers have begun to take a step beyond the question of "Who is my friend?", in order to examine the various aspects (e.g. popularity, environmental cues, and prosocial behavior) embedded in this special type of relationship. It is the examination of one of these domains, namely that of trust, which provides the basis of this study.

In reviewing the literature, one quickly discovers that the concept of trust in children's friendships has been addressed in only a scattering of studies (Kahn & Turiel,

1988; Nucci & Nucci, 1982; Rawlins & Holl, 1987; Rotenberg, 1980, 1984, 1986). In general, the question of trust has garnered only limited investigation, and for the most part has been treated as an aggregate within more inclusive topics such as friendship and intimacy (Berndt & Hoyle, 1985; Bigelow & LaGapia, 1975; Buhrmester, 1990; Furman & Bierman, 1984; Jones & Dembo, 1989; and Sharabany, Gershoni, & Hofman, 1981). As a result, operational definitions of trust have been vague or absent. This may be attributed in part to the fact that much of the work cited in this area has focused on adult relationships, (Rotter, 1967), or narrowly limited the operational definition to the breaking of a promise or a secret, (Rotenberg, 1980, 1986), or violating a social norm, (Kahn & Turiel, 1988).

In her paper, "Trust and Antitrust", Baier (1986), suggests that one explanation for this problem of definition may lie in the fact that trust, not unlike many other abstract endeavors, is a multifaceted concept, embracing a range of emotions and behaviors for different situations. Baier successfully impresses this point upon the reader by presenting several contexts or situations in which trust involves distinctly different dimensions. For example, an infant trusts his/her parents to provide all caretaking needs. An individual expresses vulnerability when he or she entrusts a close friend with personal information or a

secret. When traveling in an unfamiliar area, one often trusts total strangers to provide direction rather than misdirection. And finally, one depends on the good will of a physician or plumber to act competently in attending to problems that may be beyond one's own general knowledge.

An alternative position to this lack of consensus of definition is that there may be a difference in the cognitive level or interpersonal perspective the child is engaging in within a peer relationship (Oden, 1980; Selman, 1981). It has been posited by several researchers (e.g., Reisman & Shorr, 1978; Selman & Jaquette, 1978; Youniss & Volpe, 1978) that as a child develops and is exposed to new and different experiences, the various domains of understanding undergo a refinement or change in which the child moves within a relationship from one of physical proximity or sharing of resources to one based on a mutual understanding of two distinct personalities. Following this notion of a stage like progression of change within the peer relationship, it becomes evident that in studying the development and procurement of trust, one should adopt a more comprehensive definition.

Given the problem of definition, further difficulty arises in the interpretation of the results from the measures being utilized to examine the concept of trust. Again, in reviewing the literature it becomes apparent that there is an

inconsistency in types of measures employed. Some researchers, (Kahn & Turiel, 1988), have used rating stories, while others, (Buzzelli, 1988), used peer nominations and clinical interviews. Along this same vein, Buhrmester and Furman, (1986), administered a self-report questionnaire to obtain data, in which the scales were adapted from a relationship inventory. Three types of measures, an open-ended interview, a picture recognition task, and a forced-choice rating task were implemented in the friendship research conducted by Furman and Bierman (1983). The differences between utilized instruments makes comparisons in the results and interpretations of these limited investigations difficult.

Finally, gender differences have been examined in only a few studies and with inconsistent results (Buhrmester & Furman, 1987; Jones & Dembo, 1989, Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Sharabany et al., 1981; Rotenberg, 1984, 1986). Results from these studies suggest gender differences do exist; however, some ambiguity arises when discussing the nature of these differences. These inconsistencies may be related to the above mentioned methodological difficulties.

The purpose of this study is the examination of age and gender differences in the operational characterization and application of trust in childhood and adolescent friendships in regard to best friend versus other friend relationships.

Trust in the present study will be defined as a firm reliance on the integrity, ability or character of another person (Morris, 1981). The developmental progression of trust patterns are investigated in this study in order to affirm previous research and to continue constructing a framework for the social functioning of these children and adolescents.

Review of Relevant Literature

An overview of the literature reveals that the volume of relevant work undertaken in the area of trust is relatively small, and for the most part has fallen under the guise of friendship literature. Drawing from the conceptual foundation of social, cognitive, and developmental theorists such as Mead (1934), Sullivan, (1953), and Piaget (1965), the field of friendship research has produced a wealth of information about social interaction among individuals. But, an attempt to draw a dichotomy between trust and friendship would be fruitless because it is in the understanding of the theoretical orientations encompassing the concept of friendship that the subtleties of trust emerge.

In general, peer relationships are varied in their longevity and purpose of interaction. Who is my friend is dependent on with whom I come into contact, what purpose or need this individual will fill, and finally, how willing I am to invest in this relationship. Although inferences have been drawn from attachment, attraction, and social learning

theory, a conceptual thread among these theories is the perception that friendship expectations appear to reflect and are influenced by an individual's "stage" in life (Dickens & Perlman, 1981). Given this perspective, it is interesting to note the slight differences in theoretical focus on peer relationships.

Theoretical Approaches

Social learning theory posits that children learn to seek out relationships within their immediate environment through reinforcement and imitation. Engaging in these various experiences over time allows for the development and diversification of social interactive and relationship skills (Oden, 1980). Similar to this line of thinking, social context theory purports that each social context supports its own unique structure and mechanisms, and as such may thus define or structure the nature of that particular peer relationship (Oden, 1980). An interesting offspring from this theory has been the work carried out by Epstein (1983a, b). She has examined developmental and environmental influences within various types of classroom settings, noting significant differences in reciprocity within the differently organized environments. She maintains that there are specific conditions or factors within the school setting that may directly influence the development of friendship relationships: the demography, grouping policies, academic

and extracurricular offerings, classroom task, and reward and authority structures. These factors affect the students with whom an individual comes into contact, why they interact, which interactions are rewarded, and who becomes friends (Epstein, 1983a). Epstein's work substantiated the work of Asher and his colleagues (1977), which examined the area of friendships in school settings.

Theorists from the social cognitive tradition of Piaget (1965) and Sullivan (1953) suggest that young children's views of their friends are initially simple and egocentric, being based on physical or external factors such as proximity (Bigelow & LaGapia, 1975; Piaget, 1965; Selman & Jacquette, 1978). As the individual matures, their views of friends becomes more complex and less egocentric. This allows for a relationship to begin to emerge in which its continuance is based on intimacy and mutuality (Berndt, 1981; Bigelow & LaGapia, 1980; Reisman & Shorr, 1978; Selman, 1980; Youniss & Volpe, 1978). Empirical studies supporting this theory submit that younger children, ages six and seven, often describe a friend as someone who plays with them in a shared activity (Bigelow, 1977; Kahn & Turiel, 1988). On the other hand, children, eight years old and older, report personality traits such as similar attitudes, understanding, and trust as being essential for a friendship (Buhrmester & Furman, 1987; Furman & Bierman, 1984).

Perhaps the most significant shift in friendship relations and expectations occurs in adolescence-- a period of life most often characterized by change. Marked by the onset of puberty, the adolescent is faced with trying to adjust to such things as physical maturation, new social environments, new expectations (associated with changing schools and dating), and, with the refinement of cognitive abilities, an increased awareness of self and others (Berndt, 1982; Berndt & Perry, 1986; Selman, 1981). This is also a time of transition in which the adolescent begins to gradually disengage from his or her family, and consequently, the development of peer relations play an increasingly important role in socialization (Furman & Buhrmester, 1986).

Literature in the area of companionship and intimacy during adolescence is quite extensive (Berndt, Hawkins, & Hoyle, 1986; Berndt & Holye, 1985; Bigelow & LaGapia, 1980; Buhrmester & Furman, 1987; Jones & Dembo, 1989; Kon & Losenkov, 1978; Sharabany, Gershoni, & Hofman, 1981; Tesch, 1983). Harry Stack Sullivan, (1953), was one of the first theorists in this area of psychology to attempt to formulate a systematic examination into the development of companionship and intimacy. Sullivan maintained that the need for companionship has its roots in early childhood in the form of same-sex relationships he called a "chumship". Transition in this relationship appears to occur during

preadolescence, (roughly ages 8-10) in which the individual begins to experience a need for "interpersonal intimacy", the sharing of personal or private thoughts and feelings (1953, p.246). He expanded this definition to also include a knowledge of a personal information about a friend.

Sullivan's work provided a useful framework for investigation into the types of relationships children of different ages seek to fulfill social needs. Subsequent work in this field has focused on age differences; however, a lack of consensus arises when interpreting results across the various studies. Nonetheless, some general findings have been established. Investigators (e.g., Berndt, 1981a; Bigelow & LaGapia, 1980) have reported that in examining children's descriptions of their friendships, there is an increase in the number of comments relating to the disclosure of intimate thoughts and feelings around 13 to 16 years of age. Interestingly, Furman and Bierman, (1983), report that this increase can occur as early as age seven, noting that the differences in results may be reflective of the types and methodology in the measures employed. In their further development of this research focus Furman and Buhrmester (1986) have proposed a neo-Sullivan theory to explain the development of friendship and intimacy. Some writers (Jones & Dembo, 1989; Sharabany, Gershoni, & Hoffman, 1981) also

suggest that during adolescence there appears to be a more gradual increase in self-report ratings of intimacy

Gender Differences

One other major issue addressed in the literature has been that of gender differences. Overall, investigators find that girls report greater intimacy, (most often in the form of self-disclosure), in friendships than boys (Douvan & Adelson, 1966; Duck, 1973; Berndt, 1981b; Furman & Buhrmester, 1986; Sharabany, Gershoni, & Hofman, 1981). Interestingly, studies conducted by Selman (1980), Enright (1977), and Brion-Meisels (1977) found no sex differences in levels of perspective taking. Discussion of these results may reflect overall gender differences in social interactive relationships. It has been suggested that girls tend to form close dyadic relationships, whereas boys participate in more "gang" like interactions (Berndt & Hoyle, 1985; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Eder and Halliman, 1978).

Trust as a Variable

Many researchers have alluded to the concept of trust in the maintenance of a friendship relationship. However, few empirical investigations have undertaken the task of studying the development of trust as an independent factor in this relationship. Of those studies attempted, each appears to examine a slightly different aspect of this concept. As

such, procuring an overview of this body of work appears disjunctive.

Early investigations into the area of interpersonal trust are marked by the implementation of Rotter's Interpersonal Trust Scale (Rotter, 1967). For this scale Rotter defines trust as "an expectancy held by an individual or group that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon" (Rotter, 1967, p. 651). This definition and consequential wording of the items suggests that the trust being examined is contractual in nature. As such, an individual would consider the consistency between other's promises and behavior in deciding who they trust. It should be noted that the mass of Rotter's work was conducted with adult subjects and as such, evidence supporting a position for children is lacking.

One direct outcome from this work with trust was the introduction of situational dilemma games, to assist in the stimulation of such concepts as interdependence, moral action, and trust (Dawes, 1975; McClintock, 1978; Rapoport & Chammah, 1965). Two of the most referenced game-dilemmas are the Prisoner's Dilemma (Luce & Raiffa, 1957) and Deutsch's Acme Bolt Company (Deutsch & Krauss, 1960). In each game, which is most often a two-person non-zero sum game, a conflict is built into the play of the game. Any given outcome is a function of the behavior of both actors, and as

such, reward indices are greater if the two partners agree to cooperate. Application of the Prisoners Dilemma and other social dilemma situations in the laboratory setting suggest a possible interaction between prosocial intentions and behavior and friendship status, (friends versus acquaintances). Namely, that cooperative behaviors are adopted more often when playing against a friend versus an acquaintance or a stranger (Berndt, 1981a; Coady, 1986; McClintock, 1978; Mannarino, 1976; Matsumoto, Haan, Yabrove, Theodorou, & Cooke Carney, 1986; Newcomb, Brady, & Hartup, 1979).

More recently, the theoretical context of trust was investigated in a series of studies by Turiel and Nucci (e.g. Kahn and Turiel, 1986; Nucci, 1981; Nucci & Nucci, 1982; Turiel, 1978). They examined three different types of trust: moral trust, which included such things as lying; psychological trust, which focused on helping a friend in time of distress; and social trust, which included such things as dress code. Moral and psychological trust were shown to maintain both casual and intimate friendships, whereas social trust was not a determinant in maintaining a friendship. Utilizing hypothetical story situations, their results indicated that once trust was violated, moral trust was more difficult to reestablish than social or psychological trust. When an individual feels as if he/she

had been let down by the friend, this situation subsequently would lessen feelings of intimacy. Age differences are also reported in terms of a shift toward greater concern with reciprocity as age increases, supporting in turn, a developmental progression in the theoretical context of trust.

Buzzelli (1988) examined the relationship between interpersonal trust, participation in a best friend relation, and social status (accepted, neglected, rejected, or socially isolated). Results from this study showed that children who easily got along with each other and then became friends were initially more self-disclosing in sharing of ideas and feelings. According to this study, the relation between participation in a best friendship and trust appears to vary depending on the children's social status.

The examination of gender differences in children's trust in peers has been addressed primarily through the work compiled by Rotenberg (Rotenberg, 1980, 1984, 1986; Rotenberg & Mann, 1986; Rotenberg & Sliz, 1988). In his work, Rotenberg has reported the emergence of same-sex trust patterns in which same-sex peers tend to share personal disclosures. However, caution should be taken in reference to this body of material because restrictive definitions of trust were adopted for the various studies. In many of the

studies trust was defined as the keeping or breaking of a promise or a secret.

Purpose of Study

Given these criticisms, a lack of established developmental patterns in the area of trust is not surprising. Taking heed of these problems, the major objective of this study is to clarify and extend the existing work on trust in friendships in childhood and adolescence, and to investigate at least one alternative direction (the trust vignettes), for future research into the nature of these types of relationships. This research approach will examine the relationship between a subject and his or her best friend, and this same subject and a casual acquaintance. Three hypotheses emerged from this research perspective:

Hypothesis 1 predicts that the overall trust scores or level of perspective taking (Friendship Domain Interview), will increase with chronological age. The test of this hypothesis will expand on previous investigations (Bigelow & LaGapia, 1975; Furman & Bierman, 1983; Kahn & Turiel, 1988; Rotenberg, 1980; Rotenberg & Mann, 1986), by measuring trust over a developmental span from ages 9 to age 16, and will support in turn, studies which have investigated similar age spans (Berndt & Hoyle, 1985; Jones & Dembo, 1989; Sharabany, Gershoni, & Hoffman, 1981; Selman, 1980; Winstead, 1986). In proposing a difference or transition in the identified

qualities of trust, which are viewed as important in a friendship, the pattern of age effects for friendship will follow that suggested by Berndt (1986). Berndt's findings purport that younger children most often associate friendships, and subsequently trust, with common daily activities, (e.g., the keeping or breaking of secrets or promises), while older children will allude to the more abstract qualities of trust in a friendship. More specifically, these older children will incorporate into their definitions of trust the idea of a relationship in which there is a sense of reliance and mutual support between the two individuals, yet within the nature of the relationship they are allowed to develop their own independence.

Hypothesis 2 further analyzes suggested gender differences in trust with the prediction that with respect to three measures of trust, females will display higher rating scores than males (Bigelow, 1977; Buhrmester, 1990; Buhrmester & Furman, 1987; Jones & Dembo, 1989; Sharabany, 1974; Winstead, 1986).

Hypothesis 3 examines descriptive differences in a subjects best friend and other friend relationship. This aspect was incorporated into the design to inspect the exclusive nature of a best friend relationship. As such, Hypothesis 3 predicts that for the Sharabany Intimacy Scale,

modified and Prisoner's Dilemma measures, trust scores in reference to the self/best-friend dyad will be higher than the overall scores in the self/other-friend dyad. This assumption is reflective of the conclusion drawn from the body of friendship research (e.g. Berndt, 1982; Furman & Bierman, 1984; Mannarino, 1976; Matsumoto et al, 1986 ; Newcomb, Brady, & Hartup, 1979; Sharabany, 1974) .

Chapter II

Method

Subjects

The subject sample consisted of 109 children and adolescents selected from a predominantly white public school district in a large metropolitan area of the Midwest. The study included students from the fourth (age 9-10 years; N = 27), sixth (age 11-12 years; N = 29), eighth (age 13-14 years; N = 25), and tenth (age 15-16 years; N = 28) grade levels. This grade and age range was selected in order to provide a cross-section of school-aged youth.

Schools were chosen which had a large selection of students. Subjects from the fourth and sixth grades attended one school, while the remaining subjects attended a junior high or senior high school within the same district.

Distribution and collection of both parental and youth consent forms (see Appendix A and B) was completed prior to testing periods. Inclusion of participants within each school was determined by affirmative parental and youth consent forms. All students were separated into grade categories, from which those subjects to be used in the study were selected from students who were identified by teachers as those who were not currently involved in special education

classes. It was assumed that all children were familiar with the other children in their grade.

Instruments

Sharabany Intimacy Scale (SISm). This measure was taken from the questionnaire developed by Sharabany (1974). The original measure is a 64-item Likert-scaled questionnaire consisting of sentences descriptive of friendship. Each sentence is worded so as to address the subject's point of view and presented again in a reworded manner so as to address the point of view of a best friend. The scale is further subdivided into eight categories, with eight items each, (four items worded for "Self" and four items worded for "Other"). The components are (a) Frankness and Spontaneity, (b) Sensitivity and Knowing, (c) Attachment, (d) Imposition (e) Giving and Sharing, (f) Exclusiveness, (g) Common Activities, (h) Trust and Loyalty.

Reported reliability and validity data indicate considerable internal consistency and high item-total and cluster-total correlation (Sharabany, 1974; Sharabany, Gershoni, & Hoffman, 1981). Sharabany reported that reliability of this measure for total scores ranged from .90 to .94. Cluster reliability as determined by utilizing the Guilford estimation formula ranged from .51 to .82.

For the purpose of this study four of the original cluster categories were selected; Frankness and Spontaneity,

Trust and Loyalty, Sensitivity and Knowing, and Common Activities. Sharabany defines each cluster item as follows: (a) Frankness and Spontaneity-- To what extent are the people involved in a relationship in which they are frank and spontaneous with each other about other people, including pleasant as well as unpleasant information, emotions, fears, hopes, and plans; (b) Trust and Loyalty-- The degree to which A believes the other person will not betray him or her, will keep promises and secrets, but will also act for his/her best interest when he/she is not around; (c) Sensitivity and Knowing-- To what extent does B know about A: facts, tastes, preferences, needs, emotions?; (d) Common Activities-- The degree to which A and B work together and play together, and enjoy it.

The first three item clusters were chosen for the modified version because it was felt that they assess a more inclusive definition of the components of trust which is a focal aim of this study. Common Activity items were incorporated as filler items (see Appendix C). Exclusion of the remaining categories was undertaken so as to allow for utilization of a succinct measure within the allotted time constraints imposed when testing in a school setting. Items were randomly presented so as to discourage any ordering effects. Total and subscale scores were computed by summing the response scores for each of the eight items within the

Frankness and Spontaneity, Sensitivity and Knowing, and the Trust and Loyalty clusters. Pilot studies suggested a significant difference in the rating scores for best friend versus other friend as age increased.

Adaptation of the Prisoner's Dilemma. The Prisoner's Dilemma Game is a two-party, non-zero sum game developed by Luce and Raiffa (1957). The original anecdote concerns two prisoners accused of the same crime and held incommunicado. Each has the choice of confessing to the crime or not. If both confess, both will be convicted; if neither confess, they will both be acquitted due to lack of evidence. However, if only one of the prisoners confess, he will not only go free, but will get a reward for turning state's witness; while the prisoner who refused to confess will get "the book slapped at him" (Luce & Raiffa, 1957, p.95).

In this study, four vignettes of hypothetical events were developed in which a conflict resolution would reflect four different types of violation within a friendship: moral violation (Luce & Raiffa, 1957), violation of dependency and reliability on another (Furman & Bierman, 1984), violation of a secret (Rawlins & Holl, 1987), and backstabbing (Rawlins & Holl, 1987) (see Appendix D). Similar to the original game situation, subjects were asked to make a forced choice selection from four possible outcomes: (a) both parties "win", (b) individual A "wins" and individual B "loses", (c)

individual A "loses" and individual B "wins", and (d) both parties "lose". Each of the four response choices in the vignettes were weighted as follows: both parties "win" = 4; individual A "wins" and individual B "loses" = 3; individual A "loses" and individual B "wins" = 2; and both parties "lose" = 1. As such, a higher score would indicate a more positive outcome for both partners and in turn, a more trusting interaction between the two partners. The adaptation of the vignettes provides for a more ecologically valid instrument. In contrast to the number matrix of the original game dilemma, these dilemmas reflect situations which are thought to be real life situations for the age group of subjects being tested. Conflict resolution scores, or total scores, were calculated by summing the response scores by friend for each of the four vignettes. The data from the pilot studies suggested that subjects were able to understand the nature of the different violations, and that with an increase in age, there was a corresponding increase in rating scores for best friend versus other friend.

Selman's Friendship Domain Interview. This measure was taken from the body of work conducted by Selman and his associates as part of the Harvard-Judge Baker Social Reasoning Project (Selman, 1974, 1981; Selman & Jacquette, 1978). Similar to the findings proposed by Bigelow (1977), Selman (1980) has argued that children's friendships pass

through a series of stages relating to the individual's cognitive development. Selman has identified five stages in children's views of friendship (see Table 1). These stages are progressive in nature in that as an individual moves to a higher stage there is an increasingly more comprehensive awareness, especially in perspective taking abilities. Selman made a distinction between levels and stages by describing levels as, "referring to developmental aspects of perspective taking to represent their relatively formal nature, and stages to referring to codevelopments in our system of interpersonal concepts to represent their relatively content-laden nature". (Selman, 1980)

As such, Selman and his colleagues developed two hypothetical story dilemmas in which a conflict of interest arises for one of the actors in the close friendship relationship (see Appendix E, F, and G). Each story is a basis for an open-ended interview designed to elicit the subject's interpersonal reasoning as applied to the resolution of the dilemma. Scoring for this measure followed the guidelines established by Selman in his scoring manual, in which transcribed responses are coded so as to reflect stage level or degree of perspective taking.

Table 1.

Developmental Levels and Stages of Friendship for Selman's Friendship Domain Interview

A. Developmental levels in the coordination of social perspectives (relation between perspectives of self and others)

Level 0: Egocentric or undifferentiated perspectives. Although the children can recognize the reality of subjective perspectives (e.g. thought and feelings) within the self and within others, because they do not clearly distinguish their own perspective from that of others, they do not recognize that another may interpret similarly perceived social experiences or courses of action differently from the way they do. Similarly, there is still some confusion between the subjective (or psychological) and objective (or physical) aspects of the social world, for example, between feelings and overt acts, or between intentional and unintentional acts. (Roughly ages 3 to 7.)

B. Stages of reflective understanding of close dyadic friendships.

Stage 0: Momentarily physicalistic playments. Conceptions of friendship relations are based on thinking which focuses upon propinquity and proximity (i.e. physicalistic parameters) to the exclusion of others. A close friend is someone who lives close by and with whom the self happens to be playing with at the moment. Friendship is more accurately playmateship. Issues such as jealousy or the intrusion of a third party into a play situation are constructed by the child at stage 0 as specific fights over specific toys or space rather than as conflicts which involve personal feelings or interpersonal affection. Trust, to the extent that the concept is familiar to young children, appears to be limited to faith in the physical capability, that is, the belief that to trust a friend is to know he is capable of playing with one's toys without breaking them.

Level 1: Subjective or differentiated perspectives. The child understands that even under similarly perceived social circumstances the self and others' perspectives may be either the same or different from each other's. Similarly, the child realizes that the self and the other may view similarly perceived actions as reflections of disparate or distinct individual reasons or motives. Of particular importance, the child at Level 1 is newly concerned with the uniqueness of the covert, psychological life of each person. (Roughly ages 4 to 9.)

Stage 1: One-way assistance. Friendship conceptions are one-way in the sense that a friend is seen as important because he or she performs specific activities that the self wants accomplished. In other words, one person's attitude is unreflectively set up as a standard, and the "friend's" actions must match the standard thus formulated. A close friend is someone with more than Stage 0 demographic credentials; a close friend is someone who is known better than other persons. "Knowing" means accurate knowledge of other's likes and dislikes. Trust is recognized as more than a Stage 0 confidence in another's capabilities; it is now understood to include a faith in a person's motives and intentions. However, a trusting relationship is still seen as one in which one party, the friend, has good intentions or motives toward the self. Still missing is the perceived sense of reciprocity.

Level 2: Self-reflective or reciprocal perspectives. Children are able to reflect on their own thoughts and feelings from another's perspective-- to put themselves in the other's shoes and to see the self as a subject to other. This new understanding of the relation between self and other's perspective allows children to consider their own conceptions and evaluations of others' thought and actions. In other words, children are able to take a second-person perspective, which leads to an awareness of a new form of reciprocity, a reciprocity of thought and feelings rather than a reciprocity of action. (Roughly ages 6 to 12.)

Stage 2: Fair-weather cooperation. The advance of Stage 2 friendships over the previous stages is based on the new awareness of interpersonal perspectives as reciprocal. The two-way nature of friendships is exemplified by concerns for coordinating and approximating, through adjustment by both self and other, the specific likes and dislikes of self and other, rather than matching one person's actions to the other's fixed standard of expectations. The limitation of this Stage is the discontinuity of these reciprocal expectations. Friendship at Stage 2 is fair-weather-- specific arguments are seen as severing the relationship although both parties may still have affection for one another inside. The coordination of attitudes at the moment defines the relation. No underlying continuity is seen to exist that can maintain the relation during the period of conflict or adjustment. Trust is understood as a reciprocal relation in thought as well as in deed. It implies that a friend is someone to whom one can reveal inner thoughts (e.g. secrets) which will be safely stored away, not revealed to outsiders.

Level 3: Third-person or mutual perspectives. The subject at Level 3, aware of the infinite regress potential of the chaining of reciprocal perspectives, moves to a qualitatively new level of coordination, an understanding of the person's ability to step outside of an interpersonal interaction and coordinate simultaneously the perspectives of each party in the interaction. This ability to take the third-person perspective leads to the awareness of the mutuality of human perspectives, and hence of the self-other relationship. (Roughly ages 9 to 15.)

Stage 3: Intimate and mutually shared relationships. At Stage 3 there is the awareness of both a continuity of relation and affective bonding between close friends. The importance of friendship does not rest only upon the fact that the self is bored or lonely; at Stage 3, friendships are seen as a basic means of developing mutual intimacy and mutual support; friends share personal problems. The occurrence of conflicts between friends does not mean the suspension of the relationship, because the underlying continuity between partners is seen as a means of transcending foul-weather incidents. The limitations of Stage 3 conceptions derive from the overemphasis of the two-person clique and the possessiveness that arises out of the realization that close relations are difficult to form and to maintain. Trust is a major conceptual force in the vocabulary of subjects whose understanding is coded at this stage; signifies that each party is willing to share these intimate thoughts and feelings with his or her partner, thoughts and feelings that are not shared with less intimate friends or acquaintances.

Level 4: Societal or in-depth perspectives. The subject conceptualizes perspectives of persons toward one another (mutuality) to exist not only on the plane of common expectations or awareness, but, also simultaneously at multidimensional or deeper levels of communication. For example, perspectives between two persons can be shared on the level of superficial information, on the level of common interests, or on the level of deeper and un verbalized feelings. Also, perspectives among persons are seen as forming a network or system. These perspectives become generalized- e.g., into the concept of society's perspective or the legal or moral point of view. (Roughly ages 12 to adulthood.)

Stage 4: Autonomous interdependent friendships. The interdependence that characterizes Stage 4 is the sense that a friendship can continue to grow and be transformed through each partner's ability to synthesize feelings of independence and dependence. Independence means that each person accepts the other's needs to establish relations with others and to grow through such experiences. Dependence reflects the awareness that friends must rely on each other for psychological support, to draw strength from each other, and to gain a sense of self-identification through identification with the other as a significant person whose relation to the self is distinct from those with whom one has less meaningful relations. Trust in a friendship is viewed in the context of each person having complex and multivariate needs; it is now felt that in a good friendship each partner helps the other and allows the other to develop independent relations.

Source: R. L. Selman, (1981). The child and friendship philosopher. In S. Asher & J. M. Gottman (Eds.), The Development of Children's Friendships.

Rater Reliability

Scoring reliability for the interview was assessed by dividing the number of agreements between the two investigators by the number of agreements plus the number of disagreements. Twenty-five percent of the total interviews were rated by both of the primary researchers, resulting in an interrater reliability of 86%. Interrater reliability for two independent judges (who scored the protocols using the procedures set forth in the manual) with the primary investigator was 80% for one judge and 73% for the other judge. Intrarater reliability for the primary researcher was 90%, and 90% for the secondary researcher.

Due to the fact that only one issue-concept was examined within the friendship domain, reliability scores were not generated. However, through his research, Selman has ascertained each of the domain interviews to be a valid and reliable measure of perspective taking in light of his proposed model. Selman and his colleagues, (1980), reported the reliability of scoring procedures between scoring the issue-concepts after they were excerpted from the interview protocols with normal scoring procedures of the same protocols to be .86, suggesting that the degree of stage synchrony of issue-concepts, issues, and domains is not a process of the scoring procedures itself. In respect to other reliability analyses, Enright, Colby, & McMullin (1977)

reported test-retest reliability correlations of .92 in fifth and sixth grades across a 22 week period. Brion-Meisel (1977), reported correlations of .61 in the same age-range across a six month period. The results from these two investigations suggest short-term stability-reliability of the measure, although caution should be taken in generalizing these results because they exhibit variation and are limited to elementary grade children whose scores are primarily at Stages 1, 2, or 3.

Correlations for the issue-concept are restricted in this investigation due to the fact that only one issue-concept was investigated. In a blind-scored reliability test, Selman (1980) reported that an issue-by-issue correlation matrix of the 16 issue scores across the three domains (N = 40), generated a range of Pearson correlations between .52 and .96, with a mean correlation of .81. A moderately high correlation between level of perspective taking and chronological age has been reported. Byrne (1973), found a correlation of .86 for perspective taking level and age for a sample of 56 males ages 10, 13, 16, and 23-30 years. Selman and Byrne (1974), reported similar findings, reporting an $r = .80$ (N = 40) between perspective taking level and age for a younger sample of subjects (ages 4, 6, 8, and 10 years). Although there appears to be a relationship between level of perspective taking and age,

Selman has noted little evidence for significant correlations between sex and perspective taking levels.

Procedure

With the exception of the personal interviews, administration of the test measures was accomplished by using groups consisting of a single class of a grade, allowing for the examination of a large selection of subjects within a limited time period.

Having gathered a group of subjects, the investigator provided opening comments delineating the general nature of the study. During this introduction, the investigator emphasized that the material was not a test so there were no right or wrong answers. In addition, the researcher affirmed that no one would see the respondents answers except the people who were working on the project. Finally, the investigator used this time to outline some of the general guidelines implemented to successfully complete the material presented.

Identification of "best friend" versus "other friend" relationships. After opening comments, each subject was provided with a research packet and instructed to turn to the last page (see Appendix H). Having located this page, they were first asked to fill out the general information at the top of their page indicating their name, grade, age, and sex. Once this had been completed they were asked to think about

the names of the children they know and would consider as friends. Then they were instructed to look at the six lines provided and write the names of the friends they are thinking about, starting with the name of their "best friend", then their second best friend, etc.. After this task had been completed, the subjects were asked to put an X in the appropriate column next to the names of their friends, who were in that same class.

Next, it was brought to their attention that the last page appears to "stick out" from the rest of the packet creating a margin. On the margin area they were asked to write the name of their "best friend" on the A line and the name of their 6th friend, or "other friend" on the line proceeded by the letter B. Finally, they were asked to indicate sex and relationship, (boyfriend/girlfriend or good friend), of the person they chose as their best friend".

Identification of trust. One of the aims of this investigation was to examine trust separately from the other facets that encompass a particular friendship. As such, two distinct measures of trust were used, a modified version of Sharabany's Intimacy Scale (1974) and an adaptation of the Prisoner's Dilemma Game (Luce & Raiffa, 1957). All instructions and questions were read aloud to the subjects by one of the principal investigators in grades four and six to account for any students who may have had reading

difficulties. Both measures were administered in the classroom setting as part of the research packet. In reference to the Sharabany' Scale, administration was carried out by using the guidelines set forth in the corresponding manual (see Appendix I). The subjects were asked to turn to the first page of their packet and locate the section marked SISm. The students were then instructed to listen to each situation statement as it was read aloud to them. Then, thinking about the person they marked as their "best friend", (A), select a response best indicating how they would answer the statement in reference to this person. Next, they were asked to think about their "other friend, (B), and again choose a response that would best indicate how they would respond in reference to this person. Choices for responses were presented in a Likert type response scale ranging from FITS to DOES NOT FIT, (For an example, refer to Appendix B). After completing the SISm section the students were instructed to turn to the section of the packet marked PD (see Appendix F). At this time the principal investigator directed the students' attention to the four short stories and the statements following each story. They were instructed to carefully listen and follow along as each story dilemma was read. Time was allowed to clarify any contextual information for each story dilemma. After listening to each story, the subjects were instructed to first think about

their "best friend", (A), and then from the statements provided choose a statement which best describes how the subject and (A) would act in the situation. Next, using the same story dilemma, the subjects were asked to think about their "other friend", (B), and then from the statements provided choose an appropriate response.

Defining trust. In an attempt to generate a child and adolescent definition of trust an adaptation of Selman's Friendship Domain Interview (1980) was utilized. This measure consisted of presenting the subjects with a hypothetical dilemma followed by an interview of standardized questions and probes. In order to facilitate testing procedures a minimum of 35% of the total subjects from each grade level were randomly selected to be interviewed. The sample consisted of: fourth grade, males = 10, females = 10; sixth grade, males = 9, females = 9, eighth grade, males = 6, females = 6; and tenth grade, males = 4, females = 6. Using the guidelines provided by Selman, the subjects were told that the story to be read was about students who go to a school similar to their school and that in this story two of the youths are best friends. Upon completion of the story, the students were asked to retell the story, to eliminate the possibility that responses would be limited to faulty memory. Following clarification of any confusion, the interviewer continued with the appropriate questions and probes. Subjects

were identified by a code number. Protocols of the interviews were scored using the guidelines presented in the corresponding manual (see Appendix I).

All instruments were presented in random order for each group to discourage ordering effects.

Chapter III

Results

The data analyzed in this study consisted of written and verbal measures of responses by children and adolescents to questions about trust in friendship relationships. Trust scores for the modified Sharabany's Intimacy Scale (SISm) were derived from the Frankness and Spontaneity, Sensitivity and Knowing, and Trust and Loyalty clusters of the complete Sharabany Intimacy Scale. Trust scores for the Prisoner's Dilemma (PD) were taken from the responses chosen for each of the four trust vignettes. Finally, issue-concept scores were generated from the answers given to the issue-concept of Trust and Reciprocity excerpted from Selman's Friendship Domain Interview (Selman, 1974).

To test the hypotheses a repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted for the modified Sharabany Intimacy Scale with grade and sex as the between subjects factors and friend as a within subjects factor. A repeated measures analysis of variance was also applied to the PD measure with grade and sex as the between subjects factors and friend and scenario as within subjects factors. One repeated measures analysis examined the total PD measure. A second analysis examined the ratings for each of the scenarios for best

friend and other friend. Significant interactions were further analyzed with simple effects analysis and post hoc comparisons (Tukey's HSD). Summary tables for the repeated measures analyses appear in Appendix K.

An analysis of variance was used to examine the interview data, with grade and sex on the variables of interest. In addition to the analysis of variance, data for the issue concept scores is reported for frequency of stage of perspective taking by grade and, by sex. A Chi Square analysis was used to evaluate this data.

Age ranges for each grade were as follows: fourth (ages 9-10 years), sixth (ages 11-12 years), eighth (13-14 years), and tenth (ages 15-16 years).

Analysis of Trust Scores

Analysis of Age Differences

Hypothesis 1 predicted that overall trust scores would increase with chronological age. Trust scores were measured with the SISm. Table 2 contains the means and standard deviations for the SISm scores for each grade, friend, and sex. A repeated measures analysis of variance indicated that Grade was a nonsignificant main effect, $F < 2.00$.

Table 2

SISm Means and Standard Deviations for Best Friend Versus
Other Friend at Each Grade Level for Males and Females

FRIEND	MALES		FEMALES		COMBINED
	M	SD	M	SD	
Best					
grade 4 (N = 27)	63.67	5.74	68.17	5.15	65.92
grade 6 (N = 29)	62.85	6.95	63.06	4.55	62.96
grade 8 (N = 25)	61.14	5.96	67.33	4.99	64.24
grade 10 (N = 28)	60.64	8.89	66.06	9.11	63.35
Other					
grade 4 (N = 27)	45.80	9.28	54.92	8.62	50.36
grade 6 (N = 29)	45.80	9.53	44.50	9.28	46.18
grade 8 (N = 25)	39.29	12.45	50.28	10.99	44.78
grade 10 (N = 28)	47.27	12.36	54.24	9.65	50.76

The repeated measures analysis for TPDA and TPDB by grade and sex revealed an overall between-subjects main effect for Grade, $F(3,101) = 3.36$, $p = .022$. Table 3 contains the means and standard deviations for each grade, friend, and sex. The between-subjects effect for Grade X Sex was not significant ($F < 1.00$). Within-subjects analyses for TPDA and TPDB revealed a significant interactional effect Grade X Sex X Friend, $F(3,101) = 3.74$, $p = .014$.

Table 3

PD Means and Standard Deviations for Best Friend Versus Other Friend at Each Grade Level for Males and Females

FRIEND	MALES		FEMALES		COMBINED
	M	SD	M	SD	
Best					
grade 4 (N = 27)	11.26	1.81	11.75	1.29	11.50
grade 6 (N = 29)	12.00	1.73	11.19	1.05	11.60
grade 8 (N = 25)	10.57	1.99	11.17	1.82	10.87
grade 10 (N = 28)	9.64	1.21	10.70	2.54	10.18
Other					
grade 4 (N = 27)	9.40	1.88	7.08	1.24	8.24
grade 6 (N = 29)	8.15	1.95	9.00	1.59	8.58
grade 8 (N = 25)	9.71	1.38	9.11	2.25	9.41
grade 10 (N = 28)	9.00	2.14	7.76	1.82	8.38

Simple effects analyses were used to examine the Grade X Sex X Friend interaction, and indicated differences between grades in females and their trust choice selection for other friend, $F(3,101) = 2.92, p < .05$. Post hoc comparison utilizing Tukey's HSD, ($p < .05$), indicated that with respect to other friend, females in the eighth grade ($M = 9.11$) made significantly more positive outcome choices than females in the fourth grade ($M = 7.08$).

Males differed by grade in the trust choice selections that they made for best friend, $F(3,101) = 8.54, p < .05$. The Tukey's revealed that males in the sixth grade ($M = 12.00$) made more positive outcome choices than males in the tenth grade ($M = 9.64$). The simple effects analyses also revealed the for other friend, males in the fourth grade scored significantly higher than females in the fourth grade $F(1,101) = 8.09, p < .05$.

Analysis of the Trust and Reciprocity interview scores showed a marginally significant between-subjects main effect for Grade $F(3,60) = 2.44, p = .075$. Post hoc analysis using Tukey's ($p < .05$) indicated that tenth-graders ($M = 1.83$) scored at a significantly higher level than fourth-graders ($M = 1.38$). The effect of Grade X Sex were not significant (F 's < 1.00).

For each grade there was a difference in modal stage. Fourth and sixth-graders scored at a modal stage of 2. Eighth-graders scored at a modal stage of 3(2), with a major stage of 3 and a minor stage of two. Tenth-graders scored most often at stage 3. Frequencies for the Chi Square analysis appear in Table 4 for grade.

Table 4

Frequency Table for Selman's Stage by Grade

STAGE	GRADE				ROW TOTALS	ROW %
	4th	6th	8th	10th		
1 (2)	3				3	5.0
2 (1)	3	3		1	7	11.7
2	10	11	3	1	25	41.7
2 (3)	4	2	4	1	11	18.3
3 (2)		1	4	3	8	13.3
3		1	1	4	6	1.0
COLUMN						
TOTAL	20	18	12	10	60	
COLUMN %	33.3	30.0	20.0	16.7		100.0

Analysis of Gender Differences

Hypothesis 2 predicted that overall trust scores for females would be greater than those generated by males. For the Sharabany Intimacy Scale, modified, a repeated measures analysis of variance showed there was a significant between-subjects main effect for Sex, $F(1,101) = 14.21$, $p < .01$. A significant effect was found for the between-subjects interaction, Grade X Sex, $F(3,101) = 3.03$, $p = .033$. Simple effects analyses of this interaction revealed that females assigned higher trust ratings, regardless of friend status in

the eighth grade, $F(1,101) = 3.92, p = .05$. All other sex and grade differences were nonsignificant.

The analysis for TPDA and TPDB by grade and sex revealed between subjects effects for Sex, and Grade X Sex were not significant (F 's < 1.00). Analysis of the Trust and Reciprocity interview scores did not indicate a main effect for Sex ($F < 1.00$). Frequencies for the Chi Square analysis appear in Table 5 for Sex.

Table 5

Frequency Table for Selman's Stage by Sex

STAGE	MALES	FEMALES	ROW TOTAL	ROW %
1 (2)	1	3	4	6.7
2 (1)	3	3	6	10.0
2	16	9	25	41.7
2 (3)	4	7	11	24.1
3 (2)	6	2	8	13.3
3	1	5	6	10.0
COLUMN TOTAL	31	29	60	
COLUMN %	51.7	48.3		100.0

Analysis of Friend Differences

Hypothesis 3 predicted that trust rating scores for best friend dyads would be greater than those in other friend dyads. A repeated measures analysis of variance for the Sharabany Intimacy Scale, modified, indicated a significant within-subjects effect for Friend, $F(1,101) = 245.83, p < .01$. Trust ratings for best friend ($M = 64.12$) were significantly higher than those for other friend ($M = 48.02$).

The analysis for TPDA and TPDB revealed a significant effect for Friend, $F(1,101) = 65.50, p < .01$, an interaction effect for Sex and Friend, $F(1,101) = 4.79, p = .031$, and a significant interactional effect for Grade X Sex X Friend, $F(3,101) = 3.74, p = .014$. Simple effects analyses were used to examine the Grade X Sex X Friend interaction, and revealed that for males in the sixth grade, $F(1,101) = 22.30, p < .05$, ratings for best friend were significantly higher than those for other friend. For females, significantly more positive resolution choices to the dilemmas were found for fourth, $F(1,101) = 32.82, p < .05$, sixth, $F(1,101) = 7.22, p < .05$, eighth, $F(1,101) = 6.38, p < .05$, and tenth, $F(1,101) = 13.10, p < .05$ grades, when comparing rating scores for best friend to other friend.

Analysis of Scenario Differences

Although the effect for Scenario was not included within the design of this study as a separate hypothesis, some of

the effects generated in the repeated measures analysis of variance were relevant to the predicted hypotheses.

With respect to age differences, the repeated measures analysis of scenario for best friend by grade and sex revealed a between subjects main effect for grade $F(3,101) = 3.35$, $p = .022$. A Tukey's analysis for this effect indicated that eighth-graders made significantly higher ratings than fourth-graders. The between subjects effect for Grade X Sex was not significant ($F < 2.00$).

Examining gender differences, The scenario interaction with Sex was not significant (F 's < 2.00). An effect was indicated in the interaction of Grade X Sex X Scenario, $F(9,303) = 2.34$, $p = .015$. The means and standard deviations for this analysis can be found in table 6.

Table 6

The Means and Standard Deviations for the Prisoner's Dilemma Scenarios

	M	SD
Principal	2.58	.90
Homework	1.83	1.05
Secret	2.84	.55
Backstab	3.78	.72

Simple effects analysis examining grade and scenario revealed significant differences in trust choice scores across the four scenarios at each grade level, $F's (3,303) = 13.38$ to 15.66 , $p's < .01$. Similar differences across scenarios were found when sex and scenario were examined, $F's (3,303) 12.39$ for females, and 16.66 for males, $p's < .01$. For both grade and sex, the ordering of scenarios according to the magnitude of the trust choice, from high to low, was Backstab ($M = 3.78$), Secret ($M = 2.84$), Principal ($M = 2.58$), and Homework ($M = 1.83$). Subsequent means comparisons using the Tukey's HSD analysis found significant differences ($p < .05$) between each of the pairs in descending order of higher trust, except for the differences between Secret and Principal. However, Sex by Grade differences for the trust choice ratings for the Secret and Principal pair were found for fourth- and tenth-grade males.

Some sex by grade differences also appeared within each of the scenarios. Fourth- and tenth-grade females made higher trust choices for the principal scenario than males. Sixth-grade males made higher trust choices in the Homework scenario than females.

The repeated measures analysis for other friend by grade sex, and scenario indicated a significant between-subjects effect for Sex, $F (1,101) = 5.01$, and for Grade X Sex, $F(3,101) = 3.52$, $p = .018$. Simple effects analysis for this

interaction revealed a gender effect across grades; males $F(3,101) = 6.66, p < .05$, and females $F(3,101) = 14.16, p < .05$. Mean comparisons using the Tukey HSD showed the following grade differences for males: fourth ($M = 9.40$) and eighth ($M = 9.71$) grade males made more trusting choices than sixth grade males ($M = 8.15$). For females, sixth ($M = 9.00$) and eighth ($M = 9.11$) grade females made more trusting choices than fourth ($M = 7.08$) and tenth ($M = 7.76$) grade females. Sex differences appeared within certain grades. In the fourth grade, males ($M = 9.40$) made more trusting outcome choices than females ($M = 7.08$). Sixth grade females ($M = 9.00$) made higher trust score ratings than sixth grade males ($M = 8.15$). Tenth grade males ($M = 9.00$) made more positive choice outcomes than tenth grade females ($M = 7.76$). There was no significant gender difference between the eighth-graders.

Because the previous analyses did not provide a direct test of scenario differences for best friend versus other friend choices, a repeated measures analysis with both friend and scenario as within subjects factors, and grade and sex as between subjects factors was performed. Only the Friend by Scenario interaction was significant in this analysis, $F(3,303) = 96.81, p < .01$. Subsequent simple effects analyses revealed significant differences between trust choice ratings for best and other friend for the Secret,

$F(1,303) = 24.90$, $p < .05$, and Backstab, $F(1,1,303) = 34.98$, $p < .05$ scenarios, where higher ratings were given when best friend was involved in the conflict. The trust rating choices for best and other friend for the Principal and Homework scenarios were not significant F 's < 2.00 , although slightly higher ratings were given to other friend in these conflicts.

Finally, the the repeated measures analysis found a significant effect for scenarios, $F(3,303) = 42.07$, $p < .01$. The order of means for trust choices across the four scenarios from highest to lowest trust was Principal ($M = 3.00$), Homework ($M = 2.32$), Secret ($M = 1.80$), and Backstab ($M = 1.38$). Tukey analyses of the means showed a significant difference ($p < .05$), with higher trust choices for the Principal scenario than the Secret or Backstab, and for Homework over Backstab. Within subjects' interactions for grade, sex and scenario were nonsignificant, F 's < 2.00 .

Reliability Analysis

Sharabany's Intimacy Scale, modified (SISm)

Reliability for the modified version of the Sharabany Intimacy Scale (SISm) was computed using a Coefficient Alpha Analysis. Total, friend, and cluster coefficients for the SISm appear in Table 7.

Table 7

Reliability Analysis of Sharabany Intimacy Scale, Modified,
Measure of Trust*

SISm			
Total SISm	0.84		
Total Frankness	0.69		
Total Sense	0.62		
Total Trust	0.66		
Best Friend (SISmA)		Other Friend (SISmB)	
Total	0.73	Total	0.84
Frankness	0.61	Frankness	0.62
Sense	0.39	Sense	0.66
Trust	0.34	Trust	0.69

* Coefficient Alpha Values

Correlations of Trust Score Measures

Sharabany's Intimacy Scale, modified (SISm)

Relationships among the various scores derived from the modified Sharabany scale were examined with a Pearson Correlational analysis. The coefficients for these comparisons appear in Table 8.

Prisoner's Dilemma Measure

Relationships among the the PD measure were also analyzed with a Pearson Correlations Analysis. The correlations for these comparisons appear in Table 9.

Sharabany's Intimacy Scale, modified, Prisoner's Dilemma, and Selman's Interview, modified

In the present study, the correlations between TPD and TSISm was $-.08$. TPD correlated at $.03$ with the Selman interview scores, while the relationship between TSISm and the interview scores was $.11$.

Table 8

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Total Scale, Total Subscales, and Subscales by Friend for EISM, PD, and

ISCALE

	PDA1	PDA2	PDA3	PDA4	PDB1	PDB2	PDB3	PDB4	TPD	TPDA	TPDB	ISCORE
PDA1												
PDA2	0.14											
PDA3	0.09	0.08										
PDA4	0.30	0.01	0.03									
PDB1	-0.29**	-0.09*	0.01	0.15								
PDB2	-0.04	-0.23*	-0.01	0.16	0.02							
PDB3	-0.06	-0.09	-0.31**	0.03	-0.36**	0.13						
PDB4	0.02	-0.31**	-0.05	-0.09	0.02	0.04	0.17					
TPD	0.38**	0.23	0.15	0.48**	0.09	0.44**	0.36**	0.37**				
TPDA	0.65**	0.66**	0.41**	0.48**	-0.14	-0.08	-0.16	-0.21*	0.55**			
TPDB	-0.16	-0.36**	-0.20	0.11	0.23**	0.58**	0.56**	0.62**	0.63**	-0.30**		
TSCALE	0.11	0.10	0.28**	0.01	0.14	-0.12	-0.25*	-0.27**	-0.08	0.20*	-0.28**	0.11
TBEST	-0.09	0.19	0.33**	0.12	-0.04	0.09	-0.16	-0.23*	0.09	0.30**	-0.18	0.17
TOTHER	0.06	0.03	0.18*	-0.07	0.21*	-0.21*	-0.25*	-0.23*	-0.16	0.09	-0.27**	0.05
TFRANK	0.05	0.16	0.30**	0.09	0.16	-0.05	-0.24*	-0.33**	-0.03	0.24*	-0.25**	0.14
TSENSE	0.11	0.01	0.33**	-0.04	0.05	-0.14	-0.20*	-0.15	-0.09	0.14	-0.23**	0.15
TTRUST	0.14	0.09	0.08	-0.06	0.12*	-0.13	-0.20*	-0.20*	-0.09	0.12	-0.22**	-0.01
FRANKA	0.03	0.20*	0.31**	0.12	0.02	0.11	-0.15	-0.29**	0.07	0.27**	-0.17*	0.20
FRANKB	0.05	0.08	0.20*	0.04	0.23*	-0.16	-0.24*	-0.26**	-0.10	0.14	-0.24**	0.05
SENSEA	0.12	0.09	0.37**	0.09	-0.01	0.08	-0.22*	-0.12	0.07	0.26**	-0.15	0.15
SENSEB	0.07	-0.04	0.22*	-0.10	0.07	-0.22*	-0.13	-0.12	-0.18	0.04	-0.22**	0.11
TRUSTA	-0.12	0.14	0.11	0.07	-0.13*	0.01	-0.00	-0.11	0.07	0.20	-0.10	0.04
TRUSTB	0.12	0.04	0.04	-0.12	-0.24*	-0.18	-0.27**	-0.20*	-0.17	0.05	-0.24**	-0.03
ISCORE	-0.05	0.08	0.02	-0.02	0.14	0.10	-0.11	-0.07	0.03	0.02	-0.01	

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

Table 9

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Total Scale, Total Subscales, and Subscales by Friend for EISM, PD, and IScale

	TSCALE	TBEST	TOTHER	TFRANK	TSENSE	TTRUST	FRANKA	FRANKB	SENSEA	SENSEB	TRUSTA	TRUSTB
PDA1	0.11	-0.10	0.09	-0.05	0.11	0.14	-0.03	0.05	0.12	0.07	-0.12	0.12
PDA2	0.10	0.19	0.03	0.16	0.01	0.09	0.20*	0.08	0.09	-0.04	0.14	0.04
PDA3	0.28**	0.33**	0.18*	0.30**	0.33**	0.08	0.31**	0.20*	0.37*	0.22*	0.11	0.04
PDA4	0.00	0.12	-0.08	0.09	-0.04	-0.06	0.12	0.04	0.08	-0.10	0.07	-0.12
PDB1	0.14	-0.04	0.21*	0.16	-0.05	0.12	0.02	0.23*	-0.03	0.07	-0.13	0.24*
PDB2	-0.12	0.09	-0.22*	-0.05	-0.14	-0.13	0.11	-0.16	0.08	-0.22*	0.01	0.18
PDB3	-0.25**	-0.16	-0.24*	-0.24*	-0.20*	-0.20*	-0.15	-0.24*	-0.22*	-0.13	-0.00	-0.27**
PDB4	-0.27**	-0.23*	-0.23**	-0.33**	-0.15	-0.20*	-0.29**	-0.26**	-0.12	-0.12	-0.11	-0.20*
TPD	-0.08	0.09	-0.16**	-0.04	-0.09	-0.09	0.07	-0.10	0.08	-0.16	0.07	-0.17
TPDA	0.20*	0.30**	0.09	0.24*	0.14	0.12	0.27**	0.14	0.26**	0.04	0.20*	0.05
TPDB	-0.28**	-0.18	-0.27**	-0.25**	-0.23**	-0.22*	-0.17	-0.24**	-0.14	-0.22**	-0.10	-0.24*
TSCALE		0.72**	0.91**	0.87**	0.81**	0.84**	0.58**	0.84**	0.59**	0.72**	0.58**	0.80**
TBEST			0.36**	0.73**	0.48**	0.59**	0.87**	0.39**	0.78**	0.18	0.74**	0.32**
TOTHER				0.73**	0.80**	0.78**	0.25**	0.89**	0.32**	0.85**	0.32**	0.86**
TFRANK					0.55**	0.62**	0.78**	0.87**	0.46**	0.45**	0.44**	0.58**
TSENSE						0.54**	0.26**	0.61**	0.67**	0.91**	0.30**	0.56**
TTRUST					0.54**		0.37**	0.63**	0.37**	0.49**	0.74**	0.92**
FRANKA					0.26**	0.37**		0.37**	0.52**	0.04	0.45**	0.24**
FRANKB					0.61**	0.63**	0.37**		0.27**	0.64**	0.29**	0.68**
SENSEA					0.46**	0.37**	0.52**	0.27**		0.30**	0.41**	0.26**
SENSEB					0.91**	0.48**	0.41	0.64**	0.30**		0.15	0.57**
TRUSTA					0.30**	0.74**	0.45**	0.29**	0.41**	0.15		0.41**
TRUSTB					0.56**	0.92**	0.24*	0.68**	0.26**	0.57**	0.41**	
ISCALE					0.15	-0.01	0.20	0.05	0.15	0.11	0.04	-0.03

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

Chapter IV

Discussion

The findings in this study are the product of data generated from three trust measures. Some findings did emerge from the statistical analyses, suggesting that significant differences among the factors were dependent on the type of task/measure, and the nature of the relationship being addressed.

Age Differences

Hypothesis 1 predicted that trust scores would increase with age. Support for this hypothesis was not consistent across the three measures. The overall main effect for grade was not significant. However, the Grade by Sex interaction was significant; therefore, analysis of simple main effects was performed. Fourth-grade females scored significantly higher on trust than either male or female students in the other grades. This effect is consistent with the findings suggested by Berndt (1981a), in which he stated that younger children claim to have many best friends when asked to list those friends in their class who are their best friends and those who are other friends or acquaintances. These findings are also consistent with the results from previous studies which have used the Sharabany scale (Sharabany, 1974; Sharabany, Gershoni, & Hofman, 1981; Jones

& Dembo, 1989). In these studies with same-sex peers, Trust and Loyalty ratings scores peaked in middle childhood (4th and 5th grades), then stabilized and remained strong throughout subsequent age levels. Frankness and Spontaneity and Sensitivity and Knowing rating scores showed an overall increase with age. Including younger age groups in the sample of the present study may served to confirm these trends.

In the Prisoner's Dilemma measure of trust the effect for age was found in the interactions with Sex, Friend, and/or Scenario. For the total PD measure, a significant effect for age occurred in an interaction of grade, sex, and friend. For best friend, sixth-grade males made significantly higher trust resolution ratings than tenth-grade males. This effect may reflect the attempt of tenth-grade males to establish cross-sex relationships. When considering the emotional aspects of how an individual and best or other friend would act in the different vignette situations, cross-sex responses may be lower than same-sex responses. This reasoning is supported by the Prisoner's Dilemma Game research conducted by Rapoport (1965), in which he found more similarity in types of responses (competitive vs. cooperative) between same-sex dyads and more "martyr " type responses in opposite-sex dyads. It is important to

note that in the present investigation the percentage of cross-sex dyads was not empirically established.

Explanations of the grade effects for other friend for males and females (sixth-grade females greater than fourth-grade females; eighth-grade males greater than sixth-grade males) are somewhat ambiguous, and again may reflect the subtleties made in the distinction between what constitutes a best friend compared to any other friend. The gender and grade effect for males may be explained in the research findings which suggest that males form gang-like groups (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Similarly, the empirical research indicated that females most often pair off in closely knit dyads or triads, thus the effect of grade with other friend for females may occur (Berndt & Hoyle, 1985; Buhrmester, 1990; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

Effects for grade within the interaction involving scenario suggest that differences are occurring with respect to the salience of the scenarios and the type of trust violation that is addressed. An overall grade effect between subjects responses to the scenarios for best friend indicated that fourth and sixth-graders made greater trust resolution responses than tenth graders. This effect may be because of prior differences noted for classroom groups and gender distinctions. It is interesting to examine the best friend grade by sex by scenario effects with respect to the type of

violation posed in the vignettes. For the violation of a social convention involving dependability and reliability (Homework), fourth-grade females, made more positive outcome responses than sixth-grade females. The simple effects analysis of this interaction indicated that for the violation of morality by lying and stealing (Principle), sixth-grade males made more positive choice outcomes than did tenth-grade males. These interactional effects suggest that for best friend a gender effect may be occurring across the vignette conventions.

Significant grade effects with respect to other friend are found in the interaction of Grade X Sex X Friend.. While males in the fourth-, eight-, and tenth-grades made overall more positive trust resolution choices than males in the sixth-grade, females in the sixth-grade made more positive trust resolution choices than females in the other grades. This effect becomes more pronounced when analyzing the grade by sex by scenario interaction. A grade effect was found for males in the scenario involving moral convention (Principle), however, an opposite effect was apparent for grade in reference to other friend, with tenth-grade males generating more positive resolution choices than sixth-grade males. Significant grade effects were reported for females with respect to other friend. For the social convention scenario of backstabbing, sixth-grade females averaged higher response

choices than fourth-grade females. These effects for grade, gender, and type of violation are consistent with the findings reported in the friendship and intimacy literature (Berndt, 1981b; Buhrmester & Furman, 1986; Bigelow & LaGaipa, 1980), which suggest that friendship expectation with respect to intimacy potential seem to emerge as young as 13 years. More specifically, the findings (e.g. Buhrmester & Furman, 1987), suggest that during this stage of preadolescence, friends may serve a more vital role as providers of intimacy for girls, with boy's intimacy development lagging somewhat behind .

Finally, age differences were found with respect to the Trust and Reciprocity issue-concept scores. Interview protocols of the tenth-graders were scored as having a significantly higher level of perspective taking than the protocols for the fourth-graders. This difference between age groups was consistent with the modal stages derived through the Chi Square analyses. This effect confirms previous research conducted by Selman and his colleagues (Brion-Meisel, 1977; Enright, Colby, & McMullin, 1977; Selman, 1974).

Gender Differences

Hypothesis 2 predicted that overall trust scores for females would be greater than those generated by males. With respect to the modified Sharabany Intimacy Scale, the main

effect for grade was not significant. However, a between subjects effect for sex was reported for the Sex by Grade interaction. Females in the eighth grade made significantly higher trust rating scores than males in this grade. This effect supports previous findings reported in the intimacy literature that intimacy potential for females increases with age (Burhmester, 1990). However, generalization of this effect should be made with caution due to the disparity in the number of females and males in the subject sample for the eighth grade.

Gender was not significant for the PD measure. However an effect for gender was found within the Grade by Sex by Friend interaction, with males in the fourth grade making more positive outcome choices for their other friend than females in the fourth grade. This finding is consistent with the conclusion drawn from Rapoport (1965) that same-sex male dyads show a stronger imitation effect over same-sex female dyads, and suggests a "tit-for-tat" type of social interaction for males when engaged in a forced choice task.

Finally, no gender differences were found with the issue-concept scores for Trust and Reciprocity, which is consistent with the research conducted by Selman and his colleagues (e.g., Selman & Byrne, 1974). This effect suggests that more cognitively-based schema rather than gender-based schema are being used by the older students in

the generation of the answers (Berndt, 1981b; Enright, Colby, & McMullin, 1977).

Friend Differences

Hypothesis 3 predicted that trust rating scores for best friend dyads would be greater than those in other friend dyads. The effect for friend was examined only in the modified Sharabany Intimacy Scale and Prisoner's Dilemma measures because the structure of the Friendship Domain Interview does not include questions which differentiate between these types of relationships.

The overall main effect for friend was found to be significant in the SISm measure with higher positive descriptive responses given to best friend. This effect is consistent with the work conducted by Sharabany (1974), and the friendship literature on prosocial behavior (Berndt, 1981a; Berndt, 1982).

A significant overall effect for friend was found in the PD measure. However, significant friend effects were found in the Grade by Sex by Friend interaction. The simple effects analysis indicated that males in the fourth- and sixth-grades made more positive outcome choices for best friend than for other friend. The effect of friend (best over other) was found to be significant across all grade levels for females. The exclusion of the eighth and tenth-grade males are consistent with the class cohesiveness or gender effects

(gang-like configuration, and cross-sex relationship for tenth-graders) suggested earlier.

Although the effect for Scenario was not included within the design of this study as a separate hypothesis, some interesting findings were generated from the analyses. Perhaps the most striking effect for scenarios appeared with respect to friend type. The analyses for best friend revealed the ordering of the scenarios with respect to most positive outcome responses to least positive outcome responses to be: Backstab, Secret, Principal, and Homework. On the other hand, the order of response score choices for other friend were: Homework, Principle, Secret, Backstab. These effects indicate that within the best friend relationship, social conventions relating to interpersonal issues are rated more positively than moral conventions relating to lying and stealing, and, the social convention relating to dependency and reliability. Conversely, the ordering of scenarios for other friend indicated that the social convention relating to dependency and reliability was rated more positively than the moral convention relation to lying and stealing, and the social conventions relating to personal issues. This mirroring of effects may support the exclusive nature thought to exist in best friend dyads. Within the best friend relationship, the salience of interpersonal issues may serve a vital role in the

maintenance and continuance for this relationship. However, the expectations established in the other friend relationship may involve a stepping back in the degree of vulnerability one is willing to take with this other individual, and as such, lower ratings may be seen in situations involving interpersonal issues.

Limitations of the Study

The interpretation of the results for this study should be addressed with respect to the nature of the limitations surrounding the investigation processes. Although theoretical perspectives were presented to explain the reasoning behind using three different types of measures, difficulty arose in attempting to formulate an overall rating of trust. However, as previously stated, the concept of trust is not something one can simply define, and as such only some of the aspects involved in the procurement of a trusting relationship were used.

A secondly limitation in this study was the loss of the twelfth-graders from the study. Including this age group as well as younger students from the second grade may have allowed for more discriminating developmental trends to be addressed. This increase in the subject sample should also confirm trends reported in other research investigations.

Another limitation of this study was the low reliability found with respect to the Prisoner's Dilemma measure.

Utilizing a test-retest analysis of reliability may have addressed this problem. Also, increasing the number of vignettes may increase reliability of the measure, and confirm the results indicated in the present study.

Suggestions for Future Research

The area of trust is lacking in empirical evidence, hence any endeavors in investigating an aspect of this concept would be of the utmost value to the realms of friendship and intimacy literature. Although some of the qualitative aspects of this concept were defined in this study, there still exists the need to capture the prevailing essence in trust which permeates the various social interactions engaged in by individuals. In attempting to find the glue which holds these aspects together, future research should consider the transference of needs in relationships across the life span (i.e. parent-child dyads, same-sex peers, opposite-sex peers). As stated earlier, in examining trends, it may be beneficial to expand the age span and include subjects from lower grades (second and third) and those in the twelfth grade. To allow for more concrete gradations in friendship type, distinctions should be examined between an "other" friend who is included in the inner sphere of an individuals world, and someone who is literally an acquaintance.

One aspect not addressed in this study, but which may have implications for future research is the nature of the classroom structure, and the cohesiveness observed within a school setting, (including interactions between students and teachers). It is evident that non-traditional forms of classroom structures are being implemented more frequently, thus changing the boundaries for traditional types of social interactions. The introduction of computer-assisted learning into the classroom is only one of the more recent changes in these classroom structures which can generate a new form of communication among the students and staff. Finally, with the increasing awareness in targeting at-risk children, knowledge about the function of trust in relationships is vital in working towards fostering skills which will enhance positive relationships among individuals in society.

In addition, implementing vignettes which examine different types of violations may allow for the examination of different groupings of violation for trust. Future research should strive towards gathering samples of subjects which are equal in number for males and females, and across age levels to insure less ambiguous grade and gender effects. Finally, although written responses to the question "What is trust?" were collected in the design of this study, they were not examined, and should be included in future undertakings.

Conclusions and Implications

The design of this investigation maintained that conclusions drawn from the results be made with regard to the aspect of trust assessed in the instruments, and the type of friendship being examined. Nonetheless, some conjectural findings can be discussed.

Perhaps the most striking observation drawn from the data suggests a change in friendship structures and expectations as females begin to incorporate the aspects of intimacy into their conceptions of "Who is my friend?", and become significantly different from males. Although much of the friendship and intimacy literature is consistent on this issue, exactly why this change occurs is still yet unanswered. However before making generalizations, it is important to take into considerations that trust for males may not mean the same thing as trust for females. As such, instruments being utilized in investigations may be measuring those aspects of trust which are considered to be important for females, but not males.

Another observation which appeared to be of interest in the study was the gender and friend interactions across the various scenarios. The ordering of the scenarios for best friend and then for other friend suggest that differences are occurring in the degree of exploitation or vulnerability that a person is willing to engage in a particular relationship.

This suggests that participating in a best friend relationship means that one is willing to take risks with that other individual, especially with respect to personal and social conventions. Not being able to trust someone enough to take these types of risks may lead to the breakdown in the social functioning of the child or adolescent.

The termination of a friendship relationship can be devastating in a child's life, often leading to feelings of isolation and at times alienation. This dissolution will be compounded if relationships within the home are unstable, leaving the child with doubts about the trustworthiness of people. Being able to identify those factors involved in the generation and maintenance of relationships can serve to alleviate some of this turmoil. The results from the present study suggest that differences in response choices for the dilemmas may reflect differences in how varying contextual situations are viewed, and subsequently acted upon.

Increasing the number of vignettes for the different social conventions may provide further insight into the aspects of trust which are considered to be important in the formation and maintenance of a friendship relationship.

References

- Asher, S. R., Oden, S. L., & Gottman, J. M. (1977). Children's friendships in school settings. In L. G. Katz, (Ed.), Current Topics in Early Childhood Education (pp. 33-61). Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Baier, A. (1986). Trust and antitrust. Ethics, 96, 231-260.
- Berndt, T. J. (1981a). Effects of friendship on prosocial intentions and behavior. Child Development, 52, 636-643.
- Berndt, T. J. (1981b). Relations between social cognition, nonsocial cognition, and social behavior: The case of friendship. In J. H. Flavell & L. Ross (Eds.), Social Cognitive Development, (pp. 176-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berndt, T. J. (1982). The features and effects of friendship in early adolescence. Child Development, 53, 1447-1460.
- Berndt, T. J., Hawkins, J. A., & Hoyle, S. G. (1986). Changes in friendship during a school year: Effects on children's' and adolescents' impressions of friendship and sharing with friends. Child Development, 57, 1284-1297.
- Berndt, T. J., & Hoyle, S. G. (1985). Stability and change in childhood and adolescent friendships. Developmental Psychology, 22, 1007-1015.

- Berndt, T. J., & Perry, B. (1986). Children's perceptions of friendships as supportive relationships. Developmental Psychology, 22(5), 640-648.
- Bigelow, B. J. (1977). Children's friendship expectations: A cognitive developmental study. Child Development, 48, 246-253.
- Bigelow, B. J., & La Gaipa, J. J. (1975). Children's written descriptions of friendship: A multidimensional analysis. Developmental Psychology, 11(1), 857-858.
- Bigelow, B. J., & La Gaipa, J. J. (1980). The development of friendship values and choice. In H. C. Foot, A. J. Chapman, & J. R. Smith (Eds.), Friendship and Social Relations in Children, (pp. 15-44). New York: Wiley.
- Bittle, M. L., & Clark, M. L. (1986). Friendship expectations and the assessment of present friendships. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association.
- Brion-Meisels, S. (1977). Helping, sharing, and cooperation: An intervention study of middle childhood. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah.
- Buhrmester, D. (1990). Intimacy of friendship, interpersonal competence, and adjustment during preadolescence and adolescence. Child Development, 61, 1101-1111.
- Buhrmester, D., & Furman, W. (1986). The changing functions of Friends in childhood: A neo-Sullivan perspective. In V.J. Derlega & B.A. Winstead (Eds.), Friendship and Social Interaction. New York: Springer-Verlag Inc..

- Buhrmester, D., & Furman, W. (1987). The development of companionship and intimacy. Child Development, 58, 1101-1113.
- Buzzelli, C. A. (1988). The development of trust in children's relations with peers. Child Study Journal, 18(1), 33-46.
- Byrne, D. F. (1973). The development of role taking in adolescence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Coady, H. (1986). Behavioral correlates of moral judgement. Journal of Psychology, 120(2), 191-198.
- Dawes, R. M. (1975). Formal models of dilemmas in social decision-making. In S. Schwartz & M.f. Kaplan (Eds.), Human Judgment and Decision Processes. New York: Academic Press.
- Deutch, M., & Krauss, R. M. (1960). The effect of threat upon interpersonal bargaining. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61, 181-189.
- Dikens, W. J., & Perlman, D. (1981). Friendship over the life-cycle. In S. Duck & R. Gilmore (Eds.), Personal Relationships. 2: Developing Personal Relationships, (pp. 91-122). New York: Academic Press.
- Douvan, E. & Adelson, J (1966). The Adolescent Experience. New York: Wiley.
- Duck, S. W. (1973). Personal Relationship and Personal constructs: A Study of Friendship Formation. New York: Wiley.
- Eder, D., & Halliman, M. T. (1978). Sex differences in children's friendships. American Sociological Review, 43, 237-250.

- Enright, R. D. (1977). An experimental analysis of a social-cognitive model through a cross-age training program.
Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Enright, R. D., Colby, S., & McMullin, I. (1977). A social-cognitive developmental intervention with sixth and first graders. The Counseling Psychologist, 6(4), 10-12.
- Epstein, J. L. (1983a). Choice of friends over the life span: Developmental and environmental influences. (Report No. 345).
Baltimore: John Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.
- Epstein, J. L. (1983b). Examining theories of adolescent friendship. In J. L. Epstein & N. Karweit (Eds.), Friends in School, (pp. 39-61). New York: Academic Press.
- Furman, W. L., & Bierman, K. L. (1983). Developmental changes in young children's conceptions of friendship. Child Development, 54, 549-556.
- Furman, W. L., & Bierman, K. L. (1984). Children's conceptions of friendships: A multimethod study of developmental changes. Developmental Psychology, 20(5), 925-931.
- Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1986). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. Developmental Psychology, 22(5), 1016-1024.
- Gottman, M. T., & Parkhurst, J. T. (1980). A developmental theory of friendship and acquaintanceship processes. In W. A. Collins

- (Ed.), Minnesota Symposium of Child Psychology, 13, 197-253.
Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Hartup, W. W., Brady, J.E., & Newcomb, A. F. (1983). Social cognition and social interaction in childhood. In E. T. Higgins, D. N. Ruble, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), Social Cognition and Social Development, (pp. 82-109).
- Jones, G. P., & Dembo, M. H. (1989). Age and sex role differences in intimate friendships during childhood and adolescence. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 35(4), 445-462.
- Kahn, R. H., & Turiel, E. (1988). Children's conceptions of trust in the context of social expectations. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 34(4), 403-419.
- Keller, M., & Edelstein, W. (1985). The reasoning about promise-keeping: The early development of interpersonal moral concern. Paper presented at the Annual Symposium of the Jean Piaget Society.
- Kon, I. S. & Losenkov, V. A. (1978). Friendship in adolescence: Values and behavior. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 143-155.
- Kurdek, L. A. & Krile, D. (1982). A developmental analysis of the relation between peer acceptance and both interpersonal understanding and perceived social self-competence. Child Development, 53, 1485-1491/

- LaGaipa, J. J. (1981). Children's friendships. In S. Duck & R. Gilmore (Eds.), Personal Relationships, 2: Developing Personal Relationships, (pp. 161-185). New York: Academic Press.
- Luce, R. D., & Raiffa, H. (1957). Games and Decisions: Introduction and Critical Survey. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
- Maccoby, E. G., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Mannarino, A. P. (1976). Friendship patterns and altruistic behavior in preadolescent males. Developmental Psychology, 12(6), 555-556.
- Matsumoto, D., Haan, N., Yabrove, G., Theodorou, P., & Cooke Carney, C. (1986). Preschooler's moral actions and emotions in the Prisoner's Dilemma. Developmental Psychology, 22(5), 663-670.
- McClintock, C. G. (1978). Social values: Their definition, measurement and development. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12(1), 121-137.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morris, W. (Ed.), (1981). American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Newcomb, A. F., Brady, J. E., & Hartup, W. W. (1979). Friendship and incentive condition as determinants of children's task-oriented social behavior. Child Development, 50, 878-881.

- Nucci, L.P. (1981). The development of personal concepts: A domain distinct from moral and societal concepts. Child Development, 52, 114-121.
- Nucci, L. P., & Nucci, M. S. (1982). Children's social interactions in the context of moral and conventional transgressions. Child Development, 51, 614-617.
- Oden,, S. (1980). Peer relationship development in childhood. In L. G. Katz (Ed.), Current Topics in Childhood Education, (pp 214-232). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Piaget, J. (1965). The Moral Judgement of the Child. New York: Free Press.
- Rapoport, A., & Chammah, A. M. (1965). Sex differences in factors contributing to the level of cooperation in the Prisoner's Dilemma Game. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2(6), 831-838.
- Rawlins, W.K., & Holl, M. (1987). The communicative achievement of friendship during adolescence: Predicaments of trust and violation. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 51, 345-363.
- Reisman, J. M., & Shorr, S. I. (1978). Friendship claims and expectations among children and adults. Child Development, 49, 913-916.
- Rotenberg, K. J. (1980). "A promise kept, a promise broken": Developmental basis of trust. Child Development, 51, 614-617.

- Rotenberg, K. J. (1984). Sex differences in children's trust in peers. Sex Roles, 11(9-10), 953-957.
- Rotenberg, K. J. (1986). Same-sex patterns and sex differences in the trust-value basis of children's friendships. Sex Roles, 15(11-12), 613-626.
- Rotenberg, K. J., & Mann, L. (1986). The development of the norm of the reciprocity of self-disclosure and its function in children's friendships. Child Development, 57(6), 1349-1357.
- Rotenberg, K. J., & Sliz, S. I. (1988). Children's restrictive disclosure to friends. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 34(2), 203-215.
- Rotter, J. B. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. Journal of Personality, 35, 651-665.
- Rubin, Z. (1980). Children's Friendships. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Selman, R. L. (1974). Assessing Interpersonal Understanding: an interview and scoring manual in five parts constructed by the Harvard-Judge Baker Social Reasoning Project. Unpublished scoring manual. Harvard-Judge Baker Social Reasoning Project.
- Selman, R. L. (1980). The Growth of Interpersonal Understanding. New York: Academic Press.
- Selman, R. L. (1981). The child and friendship philosopher. In S. Asher & J. M. Gottman (Eds.), The Development of Children's Friendships.

- Selman, R. L., & Byrne, D. F. (1974). A structural-developmental analysis of levels of role taking in middle childhood. Child Development, 45(2), 803-806.
- Selman, R. L., & Jaquette, D. (1978). Stability and oscillation in interpersonal awareness: A clinical-developmental analysis. In C. B. Keasey (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. XXV). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Sharabany, R. (1974). Intimate friendship among kibbutz and city children and its measurement. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 1028B-1029B. (University Microfilms No 74-17, 682).
- Sharabany, R., Gershoni, R., & Hofman, J. E. (1981). Girlfriend, boyfriend: Age and sex differences in intimate friendships. Developmental Psychology, 17, 800-808.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: Norton Publications.
- Tesch, S. A. (1983). Review of friendship development across the life span. Human Development, 26, 266-267.
- Turiel, E (1978). Morality and social convention: Two separate and distinct systems. In C.B. Keasey (Ed.), Twenty-fifth Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.
- Winstead, B. A. (1986). Sex differences in same-sex friendships. In V.J Derlega & B.A Winstead (Eds.), Friendship and Social Interaction. New York: Springer-Verlag Inc..

Youniss, J. (1980). Parents and Peers in Social Development: A Sullivan-Piaget Perspective. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Youniss, S. A., & Volpe, J. A. (1978). A relational analysis of children's friendships. In W. Damon (Ed.), New Directions for Child Development, (Vol. 1). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing.

APPENDIX A

Parental Consent Form

Dear Parents:

Your child has been identified as meeting the selection criteria for participation in a research project on trust and friendship in school-age youths. The selection criteria are that your child must be in grades four through twelve, and must be an average student or higher in terms of academic performance. This research project will be conducted by Eileen M. Molzen and M. Susan Snyder, Department of Psychology, University of Nebraska at Omaha. It has been approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Nebraska. The research project has been reviewed and approved by the Coordinators of Elementary and Secondary Education for Council Bluffs Public Schools and the principal of the school your child or adolescent attends.

The study in which your child is invited to participate is concerned with examining trust in school-age and high school friendships. To assist us in this project, each of the students involved will complete a brief series of rating scales and questionnaires. These instruments measure a child's or adolescent's trust, peer relations, and personal characteristics. In addition, your child may be one of those randomly selected to participate in an interview process. Each of the rating scales/questionnaires will be completed by your child during a free period in the school day, so that participation in this study will not interfere with your child's classroom learning. All of the information collected will be kept confidential with the principal investigators. The data collected in this study will be used to examine a measure of trust. The findings from this study may be published later in a professional journal.

Insofar as we can determine, there are no risks involved in this study. Your child will be answering a series of questions, but none of the questions ask for confidential personal information. All of the questions asked have been reviewed by the authorities previously mentioned. Your cooperation in permitting your child to participate in this study is very important. We need all of the identified students to take part in this study to maintain the

representativeness of the sample. Please complete the attached permission form **as soon as possible** and send it to school within the next 2 days with your child to be turned in to his/her teacher. In order to ascertain that all parents have received this request, we would appreciate receiving a reply by April even if you do not want your child to participate.

If you have any questions regarding this research project, please call Eileen Molzen at 558-2092 or Susan Snyder at 402-253-2029.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Eileen M. Molzen
Principal Investigator

Joseph C. LaVoie, Ph.D.
Research Supervisor
Office - 554-2398

M. Susan Snyder
Principal Investigator

School Principal

Invitation to Participate

Your child is invited to participate in a study of friendships in fourth- to twelfth-grade students. Your child was selected for this study because he/she is in grade four to twelve and is an average student or above in classroom work.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to learn more about the development of trust in friendships in school-age youths.

Explanation of Procedures

Each child will be asked to complete a series of brief rating scales/questionnaires. In addition, some students will be randomly selected to participate in an interview process. These activities will be done during a free period for the student.

Potential Risks and Discomforts

There are no risks or discomforts associated with this study.

Assurance of Confidentiality

The information collected in this study will not be associated with any individual child because stringent confidentiality practices will be utilized.

Withdrawal from the Study

Participation in the study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to allow your child to participate will not affect your present or future relationship with the University of Nebraska at Omaha. If you decide to permit your child to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue his/her participation at any time.

Offer to Answer Questions

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Eileen M. Molzen at 558-2092 or M. Susan Snyder at 402-253-2029.

YOU ARE MAKING A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO ALLOW YOUR CHILD TO PARTICIPATE. YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT, HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE, YOU HAVE DECIDED TO PERMIT

YOUR CHILD .TO PARTICIPATE. YOU WILL BE GIVEN A COPY OF THIS
CONSENT FORM TO KEEP.

Parents who permit their child to participate will receive a
report on the findings of the study.

Signature of Parent/Guardian

Date

Eileen M. Molzen
Principal Investigator
Home - 558-2092

M. Susan Snyder
Principal Investigator
Home - 402-253-2029

APPENDIX B

Student Youth Assent Form

Because you are a student in grades four, six, eight, ten or twelve, you are invited to participate in a research project on trust and friendship in school-age youths. In this project you will be asked to answer some questions about your relationship with friends. The total time to answer these questions will be about 50-55 minutes. The questions that you answer will not embarrass you in any way, and none of the questions will ask about personal matters that you would not want to answer. All of your answers will remain confidential. The information that you give will not be shared with anyone by the principal investigators. The school will receive some summary information about this study, but the school will not receive any information on how individual students answered any of the questions. Please feel free to discuss your participation in this research project with your parents.

Participation in this project is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship with the school you attend or the University of Nebraska at Omaha. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time.

If you have any questions about this study or this form, please ask them now, or you may contact Dr. Joseph C. LaVoie, at 554-2398, University of Nebraska at Omaha. When you have completed the questionnaires, you will be given an explanation of this research project and what it means. You may ask additional questions at that time.

YOU ARE MAKING A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO PARTICIPATE. YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT, HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE, YOU HAVE DECIDED TO PARTICIPATE. YOU WILL BE GIVEN A COPY OF THIS CONSENT FORM TO KEEP.

 Your Name

 Date

 Eileen M. Molzen
 Principal Investigator
 Home - 558-2092

 M. Susan Snyder
 Principal Investigator
 Home - 402-253-2029

 Dr. Joseph C. LaVoie
 Research Supervisor
 Office 554-2398

APPENDIX C

SISm

SISM**EXAMPLE QUESTIONS**

1. I TELL HIM/HER WHAT I DO IN MY FREE TIME.

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain
-----------------------	-------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------------

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain
-----------------------	-------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------------

2. HE/SHE STAYS WITH ME WHEN I WANT TO DO SOMETHING
THAT OTHER KIDS DO NOT WANT TO DO.

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain
-----------------------	-------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------------

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain
-----------------------	-------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------------

1. I KNOW WHATEVER I TELL HIM/HER IS KEPT BETWEEN US.

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

2. WHENEVER YOU SEE ME YOU CAN BE SURE HE/SHE IS
 ALSO AROUND.

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

3. IF HE/SHE DOES SOMETHING I DO NOT LIKE, I CAN
 ALWAYS TALK WITH HIM/HER ABOUT IT.

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

4. I KNOW HOW HE/SHE FEELS ABOUT THE GIRL/BOY HE/SHE LIKES.

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

5. I TELL HIM/HER WHEN I HAVE DONE SOMETHING THAT OTHER PEOPLE WOULD NOT APPROVE OF.

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

6. I SPEAK UP TO DEFEND HIM/HER WHEN OTHER KIDS SAY
BAD THINGS ABOUT HIM/HER.

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

7. I CAN TELL WHEN HE/SHE IS WORRIED ABOUT
SOMETHING.

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

8. I TALK WITH HIM/HER ABOUT MY HOPES AND PLANS FOR
THE FUTURE.

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

9. I WORK WITH HIM/HER ON SOME OF HIS/HER HOBBIES.

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

10. I WILL NOT AGREE TO CO-OPERATE IN ANYTHING AGAINST HIM/HER.

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

11. I KNOW HOW HE/SHE FEELS ABOUT THINGS WITHOUT HIS/HER TELLING ME.

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

 absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
 certain certain so so certain certain

12. I TELL PEOPLE NICE THINGS ABOUT HIM/HER.

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain
-----------------------	-------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------------

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain
-----------------------	-------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------------

13. I FEEL FREE TO TO TALK TO HIM/HER ABOUT ALMOST EVERYTHING.

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain
-----------------------	-------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------------

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain
-----------------------	-------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------------

14. I WORK WITH HIM/HER ON SOME OF HIS/HER SCHOOL WORK.

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain
-----------------------	-------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------------

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely certain	fairly certain	I guess so	I guess so	fairly certain	absolutely certain
-----------------------	-------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------	-----------------------

15. I KNOW WHICH KINDS OF BOOKS, GAMES, AND ACTIVITIES
HE/SHE LIKES.

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

16. I LIKE DOING THINGS WITH HIM/HER.

B

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

A

DOES NOT FIT

FITS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

APPENDIX D

PD

PD

Here are some stories about situations which you might run in to with your friends. Fill in the names of the friends you wrote on the first page beside **A** and **B** in the blanks beside **A** and **B** below for each of the four stories. Please follow along as I read each story aloud.

Now read the story to yourself two times:

1. The first time think of your best friend **A** as you read. After you have given it some careful thought, please circle the number beside the sentence that you feel would best fit how you and your best friend **A** would treat each other if this situation were really to happen to you two.
2. Now read the story again. The second time please circle the number beside the sentence you feel would best fit how you and your other friend **B** would treat each other if this situation were really to happen to you two.

Story 1

One day, at school, you and your friend are asked to go to the principal's office. The principal has you come in one at a time. He tells you that the janitor saw two students taking something out of another student's locker during study hall time. The janitor was not very close to the two students, but he thinks it was you and your friend. The principal then tells you that your name and your friend's name are on the list of students who missed study hall during that time. You know that you and your friend did it. The principal tells you and your friend that you have only two choices: to say you did do it or to say you did not do it.

Story 1**A**

1. If you say you did it and your friend does not, then you will have two days of detention and nothing on your school record, while your friend will get a week of detention and have the event put in his/her school record.
2. If you both say that you did not do it, then both of you will have two days of detention for being out of study hall and the matter will be dropped.
3. If you do not say you did it and your friend does say that he/she did it, then you will get a week of detention and have the event put in your school record, while your friend will get two days of detention and nothing will be put on his/her school record.
4. If you both say that you did it, then you both will receive one week of detention, and the principal will not put it on your school record.

B

1. If you say you did it, and your friend does not, then you will have two days of detention and nothing on your school record, while your friend will get a week of detention and have the event put in his/her school record.
2. If you do not say you did it and your friend does say that he/she did it, then you will get a week of detention and have the event put in your school record, while your friend will get two days of detention and nothing will be put on his/her school record.
3. If you both say that you did it, then you both will receive one week of detention, and the principal will not put it on your school record.
4. If you both say that you did not do it, then both of you will have two days of detention for being out of study hall and the matter will be dropped.

Story 2

You and your friend need and trust each other a lot. One day last week your friend was sick and missed school. He/She asked you to bring his/her homework to him/her so he/she could get ready for the big test. He/She was depending on you to bring it so he/she could be ready. A bunch of your friends were planning to get together after school that afternoon to do something fun. You have to decide if you will take the homework to your sick friend or if you will meet your other friends after school.

A

1. If you take the homework to your friend, he/she will be able to study for the big test and you may still have time to join your friends.
2. If you meet your other friends instead, your friend will not get the homework and will probably fail the big test.
3. If you take the homework to your friend and explain it to him/her, you probably will not have the time to join your other friends.
4. If you do not take the homework to your friend, he/she probably will not pass the big test and will be mad at you.

B

1. If you take the homework to your friend and explain it to him/her, you probably will not have the time to join your other friends.
2. If you do not take the homework to your friend, he/she probably will not pass the big test and will be mad at you.
3. If you take the homework to your friend, he/she will be able to study for the big test and you may still have time to join your friends.
4. If you meet your other friends instead, your friend will not get the homework and will probably fail the big test.

Story 3

When you are friends, you share thoughts and feelings with your friend that you do not want other people to know. You want your friend to keep them a secret. One day you and your friend told each other something secret that you and he/she did not want anyone else to know. Later, at lunch, a bunch of your friends were talking about your friend. They hinted that they knew the secret your friend had told you. You must decide if you will keep the secret or tell the other friends.

A

1. If you do not tell your friend's secret but find out that he/she has told your secret, you will probably be mad at and not speak to him/her the next time you see each other.
2. If you both tell each other's secret, you both will be mad at each other and know it will be a long time before you can be good friends again.
3. If you do not tell your friend's secret, the two of you will still be good friends.
4. If you tell your friend's secret, he/she will probably be mad at you and not speak to you the next time you see each other.

B

1. If you do not tell your friend's secret, the two of you will still be good friends.
2. If you tell your friend's secret, he/she will probably be mad at you and not speak to you the next time you see each other.
3. If you do not tell your friend's secret but find out that he/she has told your secret, you will probably be mad at and not speak to him/her the next time you see each other.
4. If you both tell each other's secret, you both will be mad at each other and know it will be a long time before you can be good friends again.

Story 4

You and your friend have known each other for a long time. Two months ago a new student joined your class. After awhile, you found that you and the new student like to do things together in your free time.

Lately you noticed that your friend and the new student seem to share many things they like and they are always together. This makes you feel kind of sad and left out. This week is Spring Break. Your friend is going out of town with his/her family. This means you and the new student will have time to get together. You must decide if you will just get together with the new student and have fun, or if you will tell the new student things about your friend that may change how the new student feels about your friend.

A

1. You decide to backstab and feel left out because your friend and the new student always seem to be together.
2. You decide not to backstab and you and the new student find yourselves spending a lot of time together. When your friend returns from Spring Break, he/she feels left out.
3. You decide to backstab and lose your friend.
4. You decide not to backstab and you and your friend remain friends.

B

1. You decide to backstab and feel left out because your friend and the new student always seem to be together.
2. You decide not to backstab so you and your friend remain friends.
3. You decide not to backstab and you and the new student find yourselves spending a lot of time together. When your friend returns from Spring Break, he/she feels left out.
4. You decide to backstab and lose your friend.

APPENDIX E

THE FRIENDS' DILEMMA (CHILDREN'S VERSION):

Kevin and Brian have been best friends since they were 5 years old. They went to the same kindergarten and have been in the same class ever since. Every Saturday they would try to do something special together, to the park or the store, or play something special at home. They always had a good time with each other.

One day a new boy, Jessie, moved into their neighborhood and soon introduced himself to Kevin and Brian. Right away Jessie and Kevin seemed to hit it off very well. They talked about where Jessie was from and the things he could be doing in his new town. Brian, on the other hand, didn't seem to like Jessie very well. He thought Jessie was a showoff, but was also jealous of all the attention Kevin was giving Jessie.

When Jessie left the other two alone, Brian told Kevin how he felt about Jessie. "What did you think of him, Kevin? I thought he was kind of pushy, butting in on us like that."

"Come on Brian. He's new in town and just trying to make friends. The least we could do is to be nice to him."

"Yeah, but that doesn't mean we have to be friends with him," replied Brian. "Anyway, what would you like to do this Saturday? You know those old puppets of mine, I thought we could fix them up and make our own puppet show."

"Sure, Brian, that sounds great," said Kevin. "I'll be over after lunch. I better go home now. See you tomorrow."

Later that evening Jessie called Kevin and surprised him with an invitation to the circus, the last show before it left town. The only problem was that the circus happened to be at the same time that Kevin had promised to go to Brian's. Kevin didn't know what to do, go to the circus and leave his

best friend alone, to stick with his best friend and miss a good time.

APPENDIX F

THE FRIENDS' DILEMMA (ADOLESCENT AND ADULT VERSION)

Carrie and Jessie have been good friends since they were five. Now they were in high school and Jessie was trying out for the school play. As usual she was nervous about how she had done, but Carrie was there to tell her she was very good and give her support. Still Jessie was worried that a newcomer in school would get the part. The new girl, Tina came over to congratulate Jessie on her performance and then asked if she could join the girls for a snack. Right away Carrie and Tina seemed to hit it off very well. They talked about where Tina was from and the kinds of things she could do in her new school. Jessie, on the other hand, didn't seem to like Tina very well. She thought Tina was a little pushy, and maybe she was a bit jealous over all the attention Carrie was giving Tina.

When Tina left the other two alone, Jessie and Carrie arranged to get together on Saturday, because Jessie had a problem that she would like to talk over with Carrie. But later on that day, Tina called Carrie and asked her to go to a movie.

Carrie had a dilemma. She would have jumped at the chance to go with Tina, but she had already promised to see Jessie. Jessie might have understood and been happy that Carrie had the chance to go, or she might feel like she was losing her best friend when she really needed her.

APPENDIX G

TRUST AND RECIPROCITY QUESTIONS FOR FRIENDSHIP INTERVIEW

The value and nature of trust and reciprocity in a close friendship.

1. What kinds of things do good friend, like Carrie and Jessie (Kevin and Brian) do for each other? Is it important to do things for each other for a good friendship? Why?
2. Do you think it is important for Carrie and Jessie (Kevin and Brian) to trust each other in order to stay good friends? Why?
3. Do you think trust is important for a good friendship? Why?
4. What is trust anyway? Is it something more than just keeping secrets and paying back? Is there something more, something deeper to trust?
5. Is there a difference between the trust someone has in a best friend and the trust you have in someone you just know from school or something?

Appendix H

Information Sheet

Date _____ Name of School _____ Grade _____
Name: First _____ Last _____
Age: Years _____ Months _____ Sex: Male _____ Female _____

The first and last names of my 6 best friends are:

- A** My very best friend _____ **A:** _____
My 2nd friend _____
My 3rd friend _____
My 4th friend _____
My 5th friend _____
B My 6th friend _____ **B:** _____

1. Please write in the name of (A) your best friend on the **A** line and the name of (B) your 6th friend on the **B** line in the right margin of this paper.
2. Look at the column with an **X** at the top of it. Please mark an **X** in the space beside the name of each of your friends who is also in your grade.
3. Please put an **X** by the correct answer:
a) The person I listed as my best friend is: Male _____ Female _____
b) The person I listed as my best friend is:
Boy friend/girl friend _____ Really good friend _____
4. In your own words describe: What does it mean to trust a friend?

APPENDIX I

Instructions for Administrator of SISm

1. Identification of 'best' and 'other' friend:

Hello, I am . . . and my co-worker is We are graduate students at UNO. We are asking students in grades 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 to help us in our research projects by answering a series of questionnaires.

We want you to know these are not tests. There are no right or wrong answers. We want to know how you and other students like you think and act. We are the only people who will see your answers.

Here are some general instructions for you to keep in mind throughout this hour.

1. Please stay with the class. Do not get ahead of us as we proceed through the questionnaires.
2. Please answer for yourself. We want to know what is true for YOU, not what your parents, teacher, or others might want you to say.
3. If at any time you have a question to ask or need us to slow down, please raise your hand and one of us will respond to you.
4. As we go through the research packet, if you cannot find what we are talking about, please raise your hand and we will supply what is missing.

Please open the research packet to the back page - the one that is wider than all the rest. Please fill in the general information: Today's date is _____, the name of your school, grade, your first and last name, your age in years and months, and your sex.

Now we want you to think about the names of students who are your friends. The first and last name of your 'best' friend - or the first letter of their last name - should be written on the top line; that is Line **A**, where it says "very best

friend'. The second name would be the second student who is your friend and whom you go around with and so on, until you have 6 names, or as many as you can list.

Next, see the line that says 'my very best friend'. Write that name on the line with the big **A** at the far right side of the page.

Look at the line that says 'my 6th friend' or use the name of the last friend you wrote down. Write that name under the big **B** at the far right of the page.

Please check to see that you have written the same name of your 'very best friend' two time, once in the list on the left and again on the big **A** line to the right.

Please check to see that you have written the same name of your 6th friend, or last one named, 2 times, once on the bottom of your list and second on the big **B** line to the right.

Look at the list. Some of the names are probably from you class. Put an X in the column beside the names of your friends who are in this grade or homeroom at your school with you.

Now look at #3. It says: Please put an **X** by the correct answer-a) The person I listed as my best friend is Male/female, b) The person I listed as my best friend is: Boy friend/girl friend or really good friend.

For #4 In your own words describe: What does it mean to trust a friend? (*Approach any student with a question on his/her own and respond appropriately to his/her question.*)

You may turn over the paper if you need more space.

2. Identification of Trust - SIS:

Please open your packet to the page which is marked **SIS** with example questions. Sample question # 1: "I tell him/her what I do in my free time."

Look at the name you wrote next to the big **A** and think of him/her. Ask your self: Do I really tell **A** what I do in my

free time, or not? If I do tell him/her, then this sentence fits this friend. If I do not tell him/her, then this sentence does not fit.

How do we mark the answer? You see that after the question there is a scale marked with the letter A in the middle, which means: Here you answer for friend A.

The scale is like a see-saw. You have to decide first, on which side you are: If you DO tell him/her, then the sentence FITS and you are on this side of the see-saw.

If you DO NOT tell him/her, then the sentence DOES NOT FIT and you are on this side of the see-saw.

Now you have to finish your decision, and to say how sure you are in your answer. Notice that there are 3 choices on each side of the see-saw: 'I guess so', 'fairly certain', and 'absolutely certain'. They tell you how strongly the sentence fits or does not fit. 1) 'I guess so' means a "so-so" fit (*waffle hand*). 2) 'Fairly certain' means you are "pretty certain" and fits most, but not all, of the time. and 3) 'Absolutely certain' mean it really fits all of the time. If you think that the sentence FITS and you are ABSOLUTELY SURE, then you put a circle here.

If you really DO tell him/her, but you are only 'pretty certain' where would you make your answer? __

Right. You make your answer on the DOES FIT side, on 'fairly certain'.

If you really DO NOT tell him/her, but you are only 'pretty certain' where would you mark your answer?__

Right. You mark your answer on the DOES NOT FIT side, on 'fairly certain'.

If you are only a little certain and it does fit where would place the circle?__

Now, think of **B**. do you tell him/her what you do in your free time, or do you not? Does this sentence fit B or doesn't it fit him/her? Put a circle in the place which applies to **B**.

Right. Now you can answer the next example question:

#2. "He/She stays with me when I want to do something that other children do not want to do."

Does **A** really stay with you or not? Does this sentence fit him/her or not? Put a circle around what is right for **A**:
'absolutely sure, pretty sure, I guess so.'

Now let us continue with **B**: "He/She stays with me when I want to do something that other children do not want to do."

Does **B** really stay with you or not? Does this sentence FIT or does it NOT fit? Make a circle where you think it is right for B: "absolutely sure, pretty sure, I guess so."

(For the first page read every question and scale twice for A AND B. At the end of the page say:)

Check that you have answered all questions on this page, so that on each line there is a circle marked and only one circle.

Now turn the page and listen as we read the statements out loud and answer as you did on the example page.

3. Trust Measure -PD:

Please turn to the page marked PD. . . .

4. Closing Statements

Please put all your question and answer sheets and booklets and pencils together so we can collect them.

We have done this study to look at trust in friendships of children and adolescents with their best versus other friends.

Are there any questions you want to ask?

Thank you very much for your participation.

Appendix J

Overview of the Trust and Reciprocity Aspects of Selman's Friendship Domain

Trust and Reciprocity

Stage 0-- Momentary and physical orientation to trust and reciprocity.

The concept of trust at Stage 0, in the sense of "trusting" a friend, is equal to the idea that the friend is capable of performing some particular physical act, e.g., is physically competent not to break something valued by the self, e.g., a toy. Reciprocity is a sense of physical action-reaction, on the part of each participant.

1) Reciprocal acts of physical affection or reciprocal restraint from harm. Social reciprocity at Stage) is a reciprocity of actions. In fact, "friendship" cannot be truly spoken of as a reciprocal relation at Stage). If one considers conceptions of action-reaction (she hugs me, I hug her-- she doesn't hit me, I don't hit her) as reciprocity, then Stage 0 is a form of reciprocity. However, the basic focus of Stage 0 is on the physical activity and not on the reciprocity of attitudes.

(What kind of things do for each other?) Hug each other.

(Why do good friends hug each other?) They like to.

(What do good friends do for each other?) Play.

2). Trust equivalent to confidence in physical prowess and ability. Adults use the concept of trust in many ways: to mean 1) faith in other's physical ability (e.g. trust the baby can drink from the bottle), 2) belief in other's statements or claims, 3) trust in other's discretion, 4) trust to share intimate concerns and to receive support. For the child, each of these conceptions of trust emerges at a new stage of interpersonal development. At Stage 0, children only equate trust with physical ability or skills. When a

child at Stage 0 trusts another with a toy, he is saying that he believes that the other will know how to play with the toy and will not break it. At Stage 0, although the young child is concerned that the other may take his toy, his concern is limited to a judgment about whether the friend is capable of taking the toy, not whether the friend intends to take it or not. If the child knows his friend can't break the toy or can't take it away, then he beneficently "trusts" him.

(Who is your best friend?) Eric. (Do you trust him?)
 Sure. (Why?) If I give him my toy he won't break it.
 (Why not?) He isn't strong enough.

Stage 1-- One way conceptions of trust and reciprocity.

At Stage 1 Reciprocity between friends is characterized as one-way in the sense that although the child now focuses on psychological reactions, he/she does so for only one of the two parties; the other party is still seen as performing some physical act to which the party focused upon will have some formed reaction. Trust in a friendship is a sense that the friend not only does well but also means well.

1) Reciprocity as one-way street-- actions which please another. It is hard to coordinate a conception of reciprocity with a one-way conception of relations. However, there is a conception of reciprocity at Stage 1-- a reciprocity between the actions of one party and the expectations of the other. The advance over Stage 0 is that there is a concern with the subjective perspective of one of the parties; the limitation is the inability to consider the perspective of both parties together. At Stage 1, when asked a question about reciprocity, for example, "What do good friends do for each other," the child still tends to respond by telling us what the other person does for the self, what one person does for the other.

(What do good friends do for each other?) Give them candy. (Why is that a good thing to do?) So he will play with you.

2) Trust as knowing what other will do as well as can do. The difference between Stage 0 and Stage 1 trust is the

difference between a sense of what other can do (Stage 0) and a sense of what other intends to do. Stage 1 trust is based upon knowing the subjective state of them, i.e., knowing of other's thoughts, feelings, or motives, trusting a friend's intentions. While this is certainly a reasonable conception of trust, it must be kept in mind that Stage 1 trust goes no further than this.

For a minute I didn't trust Alison but she is one of my friends. She said she was going to save my ice cream, except I didn't trust her. I thought she was going to eat it. (So what is trust?) I guess knowing your friend will do what you want them to.

3) Doing other's bidding. There is another Stage 1 conception of trust, one that clearly reflects the limitations of a one-way conception of relations. Trust in this sense means that in a friendship, one party does what the other party wants him to-- in other words, there is the same structure that we see in conceptions of reciprocity-- trust means that one friend follows orders or does what he or she is told by the other. Which person plays which role is not crucial, as can be seen in the following example. What is crucial is that the child using Stage 1 reasoning has difficulty relating two subjective perspectives to each other, and so the bidding is done by one person at a time.

(What does it mean for you to trust your friend Michael?) He does what I want at my house. I do what he says over his house. You trust a friend if he does what I tell him.

Stage 2-- Fairweather cooperative conceptions of reciprocity and trust.

1) Two way reciprocity. In a one-way reciprocity, one person acts in such a way as to meet the expectations of the other. At Stage 2, there is a two-way reciprocity, a belief made possible by the awareness that each person can take the other's perspective. The two-way reciprocity dictates that each person must act in a way that is judged "okay" by the other. Otherwise there is no friendship. The child realizes

that there are two sets of expectations that must be met at the same time, not just one at a time. There is a rejection of the lower level conception that one friend does or acts in a way that is satisfactory to the other.

(How can you show someone you are good friends with them?) Play with them a lot and sometimes if you are really sick of a toy and he likes it, you can give it to him. (Why is that good for a friend?) It makes the other guy feel really good, and it makes you feel good.

(What does it mean to really trust a friend?) Well you know, be friends and play with each other a lot of the time. (Is that necessary?) Yah! If you don't, the guy won't like you and you won't like him back.

2) Equal satisfaction. At Stage 2 there is an interesting form of equality. Each party must be equally satisfied with what the other is doing for him. Each of the two have to be satisfied with the situation. Each must be satisfied with the balance of the relationship as constituted.

(What are some things that friends do for each other?) You go to the store, and if you have some candy, or you help sneak food out when you are not supposed to. We snuk some orange juice out today from our tray. (Is it good for kids to do good things for each other?) Yah. (Why is that important?) If they made you do everything, you would say I don't like this kid, he makes me do everything. (What happens if one kid does everything?) It wouldn't be such a good friendship anymore, because you find out the other person is much too bossy, so you know they wouldn't be such a good friend. (Do friends have to do the same amount?) Not the same but they can't have one person do everything.

There is a concern for a balance of payments based on straight equity-- to avoid friends who are "bossy"

3) Trust = keeping secrets. We have stressed that at Stage 2 the basic perspective-taking discovery involves the awareness that although the self's thoughts are private, and

can be hidden, they are subject to the other's attempted inspection. At Stage 2, trust in a friendship is the belief that a friend is someone to whom one can reveal a private thought, and this thought will be kept as a private through by the friend. Most usually the content of these thoughts are (negative or positive) opinions about others (e.g., I think Johnny is a jerk - I think Carol is cute). However, these secrets can also be beliefs about the self which the self finds embarrassing or shameful and does not wish to publicly share.

(Why is trust important for a friendship?) Like if you say, if you tell somebody a secret and say - don't spread it around - that is trust.

(What sort of things do good friends do for each other, important things than good friends do for each other?) They don't give away secrets. (Why is that important, not to give away secrets?) Because if it is something like breaking 8 bones, then everybody will tease you about breaking 8 bones and say oh, you broke 8 bones, Wow. I have one friend who told me that. (Do you think trust is important for a friendship?) Yes. Because you are not going to just walk up to somebody and say you broke 8 bones and then that person goes around telling everybody else, they don't feel good when than happens. You would rather have it that you would know that the person won't tell anybody. (What is trust anyway?) You know that the other person won't tell.

4) Trust as payback--reciprocating tangible products and services. At Stage 1 trust is a process which involves one party judging the other. At Stage 2 trust is much more a two-way street. Trust does not work unless both parties participate in the process. The limitation of Stage 2 is that although each party must trust the other, each does so relatively independently of the other. Stage 2 trust is not a mutual agreement, it is more a reciprocal agreement in which each party is independently satisfied. In practical terms this means a trust of the marketplace based on paying back products or services.

(Is trust important in a friendship?) Yah. If you don't trust a guy, then he won't trust you. (How does that work?) Say here is a friend and here is another friend and this guy is about to go someplace for the weekend and he says who would like to take this thing while I go. I will. No, I don't trust you, you might break it. So this guy goes away next weekend and says who would like to take this while I go? I will. No. I don't trust you.

(What is trust in a friendship?) It is like letting people hold your money or something like that. If you are fooling around, to let you hold it. (Why do you trust them?) They won't steal from you. They know you won't steal from them. (What if you do steal?) Then they will also.

Stage 3-- Intimate mutual conceptions of trust and reciprocity.

Trust in a friendship at Stage 3 is more than sharing or keeping secrets, it is a sense of mutual confidence and mutual confidentiality-- a belief that two friends will share and help each other resolve conflicts, and that underlying specifics acts like keeping secrets is a deeper mutual bond.

1) Reciprocity of mutual support and admiration. At Stage 3 reciprocity turns to mutuality-- a conception of "we" replaces the conception of you and I. What one does for one's friend also feeds back to the self-- not just because the friend will react in kind, but because the self gains from giving to the friend. The friendship is a team of two and any prestige or accolade accorded one member reflected to the other member as well. (A mutual admiration society.) Friends function as reciprocal companions, the interests of one compatible with the interest of the other.

(What do good friends do for each other?) Good friends cheer each other up. Say you got banged up in a car accident. Your friend would feel really bad. He'd come over and make sure you don't get behind in work and he'd try to make you feel better. You'd do the same for him.

(What do good friends do for each other?) Well, one guy can help the other get real good at something-- like ice skating. Then if he wins a prize, they both feel good.

2) Trust as shared intimacy. At Stage 3 friends do not simply share secrets, they share and help each other with intimate and personal concerns. Friends discuss each other's relationship with people and not just each other's attitudes about others, i.e., the shift is to a concern with helping each other get along with (relate to) people from a prior concern with only what each thinks of other people (Stage 2). Trust involves the sharing of these intimate and personal problems.

(Why is trust important for a friendship?) Oh yah, I know what you are saying. Yah. I have told him a lot of real personal things and he has told me a lot of things. (Why is it in a good friendship you can trust somebody, with kind of private things, or things you don't want other people to hear?) It is easy. If I told Barry something, I could tell him and he wouldn't tell anybody. I know I could trust him. And he trust me I hope. (Why is that kind of understanding important in a friendship?) If I said something to him and he didn't understand a thing that I was saying to him, he would probably go tell someone because he didn't understand a thing that I was saying. Don said this to me, you can tell me what it is, and to have a good friendship you definitely have to understand what the person is saying.

(What are the kinds of things that friends would do for each other?) One of the things is you help out with homework, things that are going on in you life and the other person's life and if something goes on at home and they can get it off their chest if they talk to you. If they can't trust anybody else except what they told you. Say there was a family argument, and this happened to a friend of mine, and he is 17 years old and he has a car, and that night he had an argument with the guys at work, with his family, and things were really bad, and that night he went to the

bank, withdrew all his money, he packed up, got in the car and just left home. I met him down the square and he hadn't returned home yet and his parents apparently weren't worried about him and he went back home and he talked to a lot of his friends about what was going on, and he was just about ready to leave home and not return. (When you get things off your chest when you have a good friend, why is that?) That is the trust thing, it all depends on the trust, on who you can tell, who won't let it get back to the family. (I there anyway that a real good friend understand what you are saying better?) Yah. (Do you think that is important?) Yes. (Why?) That the person who doesn't understand might make a big joke of it, and make the person feel even worse, but a person who know a person and they really become good friends, that he knows they are not going to make a joke out of it and make a serious thing and gives him advice on what to do. Even when it comes to a younger person and an older person, sometimes the older person will come to the younger person for advice, or the younger person goes to the older person-- that is the biggest thing that you hear.

3) Trust as faith in the consistency and dependability of personality. Trust in a relationship is also influenced at Stage 3 by the conception of the consistency of person across various social interaction and the stability of relations over time and space. Trust in a friendship implies both a conception of predictability and security. It means knowing the other person's personality, and being confident that one will be able to predict how the friend will behave in a particular situation.

(Do you think trust is important in a friendship?) Yah, you have to trust somebody, you have to trust them no matter what. (Why is that so important?) I am trying to think what trusting is. (We all have different feelings, there is not one definition. Work it out.) You got me on that question. Like if I said, can you go to the store for me, and I will give you money, you can really tell if he is your best friend, and if you can trust him with your money. Some

friends, they would just go off and you would never see them again. He will be lying about his friendship. He will just take your money and leave and you will never find him again. (Is trust a matter of trusting someone with your money?) No, it is not just trusting like that, it is trusting about, if you can trust them to go somewhere for you, or to go with you. If you can trust them on their behavior. (There is trust you have in a baby not to do things that he should no do. Is there anything else about trust?) Yah, trust him if you take him out to dinner with you parents, trust him to have good manners. You should trust in the way they act. Because you can't just go out to dinner and do what you regularly do, you have to trust them.

Stage 4-- Interdependent aspects of trust and reciprocity.

Trust in a friendship at Stage 4 is the awareness that persons have complex needs and that in a good friendship each partner both psychologically helps the other and allows the other to develop independent relationship. Both needs for dependency and for autonomy are seen as being essential to friendship and the meeting of those needs is seen as basic trust.

1) Reciprocity of emotional and psychological support--bolstering of the egos as a psychological system. At stage 4 the subject conceptualizes the function of a friend as a reciprocal counselor, therapist, or sympathist. There is reciprocity at an emotional level, i.e., the friendship support system functions to bolster each other's ego, each other's psychological system. In simpler terms, friends help each other when one is feeling down or depressed. This is a slightly different emphasis than at Stage 3. Stage 3 mutuality sees friends function as general interpersonal problem solvers. But because persons at Stage 3 are seen relatively stereotypically, it is not yet understood that friends serve to help each other sort out more complex psychological conflicts. Through the deeper understanding which emerges at Stage 4, friends are able to grasp their underlying personality dynamics of each other.

(What do friends do for each other?) They know each other's strengths and weaknesses. They are sympathetic

to each other's emotional needs. They are tuned in to you at a deep level.

2) Trust is the ability to let go-- openness to change and growth in self and other. By conceptualizing trust at Stage 4 as the ability to let go - we are juxtaposing this more open attitude of Stage 4 (at least on an intellectual level) with the natural possessiveness in relations at Stage 3. At Stage 3, the intensity of the discovery of mutuality provides a natural experience for forming in and out relations-- close friends versus everyone else. At Stage 4, there is a realization that each person's interpersonal needs transcend any one particular friendship and that it is worthwhile to have a range of types of friendships. In a friendship there is a need both for mutual dependence and for independence. It is this realization of the need to synthesize dependency and independence into a form of interdependence which allows for both feelings of support and autonomy.

(What does trust mean?) Trust means that you've got to grow to let your friend grow. The more you hold on, the less you have. You've got to trust that your friend will be loyal even if he goes off with someone else. You have to have confidence in yourself as a good friend. Then you'll have trust in your relationship.

Appendix K

Summary Table for SISm, PD, and Issue-Concept Scores

<u>SIS</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between Subjects					
Grade	506.33	3	168.94	1.91	.133
Sex	1258.18	1	1258.08	14.21	.000
Grade by Sex	804.54	3	268.18	3.037	.033
Within Cells	8938.89	101	88.51		
Within Subjects					
Friend	13005.69	1	13005.69	245.83	.000
Grade by Friend	286.21	3	95.40	1.80	.151
Sex by Friend	42.90	1	42.90	.81	.370
Grade by Sex by Friend	151.73	3	50.58	.96	.417
Within Cells	5343.37	101	52.90		
 <u>PD</u>					
<u>TPD</u>					
Between Subjects					
Grade	24.02	3	8.01	3.36	.022
Sex	1.94	1	1.94	.82	.368
Grade by Sex	4.80	3	1.60	.67	.571
Within Cells	240.28	101	2.38		
Within Subjects					
Friend	272.98	1	272.98	65.50	.000
Grade by Friend	25.35	3	8.45	2.03	.115
Sex by Friend	19.96	1	19.96	4.79	.031
Grade by Sex by Friend	46.71	3	15.57	3.74	.014
Within Cells	420.91	101	4.17		
 <u>PDA1-4</u>					
Between Subjects					
Grade	7.84	3	2.61	3.35	.022
Sex	1.18	1	1.18	1.52	.221
Grade by Sex	3.82	3	1.27	1.64	.186
Within Cells	78.68	101	.78		

	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
PDA1-4					
Within Subject					
Scenario (A)	197.77	3	65.92	112.30	.000
Grade by Scenario	6.11	9	.68	1.16	.322
Sex by Scenario	2.89	3	.96	1.64	.180
Grade by Sex					
by Scenario	12.37	9	1.37	2.34	.015
Within Cells	177.88	303	.59		
PDB1-4					
Between Subjects					
Grade	4.50	3	1.50	1.75	.161
Sex	4.29	1	4.29	5.01	.027
Grade by Sex	9.06	3	3.02	3.52	.018
Within Cells	86.62	101	.86		
Within Subjects					
Scenario	126.20	3	42.07	45.83	.000
Grade by Scenario	10.53	3	1.17	1.27	.250
Sex by Scenario	2.76	3	.92	1.00	.393
Grade by Sex by Scenario	7.08	9	.79	.86	.564
Within Cells	278.12	303	.92		
PDA1-PDB4					
Between Subjects					
Grade	6.00	3	2.00	3.36	.022
Sex	.49	1	.49	.82	.368
Grade by Sex	1.20	3	.40	.67	.571
Within Cells	60.07	101	.59		
Within Subjects by Friend					
Friend	68.25	1	68.25	65.50	.000
Grade by Friend	6.34	3	2.11	2.03	.115
Sex by Friend	4.99	1	4.99	4.79	.031
Grade by Sex by Friend	11.68	3	3.89	3.74	.014
Within Cells	105.23	101	1.04		
Within Subjects by Scenario					
Scenario	63.03	3	21.01	34.64	.000
Grade by Scenario	3.98	9	.44	.73	.682
Sex by Scenario	2.92	3	.97	1.60	.189
Grade by Sex by Scenario	12.26	9	1.36	2.25	.015
Within Cells	174.53	303	.58		