CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THESES CANADIÉNNES SUR MICROFICHE

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Canada

74

0-315-15983-9

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

Katherine Ann Dawson

Date of Birth — Date de naissance	Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance
October 28, 1952	Canada

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

c/o Mr & Mrs T. Dawson
495 Briarhill Court
London, Ontario   N5Y 1P8

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

Friendship and the Theory of Positive Disintegration

University — Université

University of Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

M. Ed.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade	Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse
1983	Dr. William Hague

Date	Signature
Mar 8/83	K. Dawson

NL-91 (4/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FRIENDSHIP AND THE THEORY

OF POSITIVE DISINTEGRATION

by

KATHERINE DAWSON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION IN COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1983

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR   Katherine Dawson

TITLE OF THESIS   Friendship and the Theory
of Positive Disintegration

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED   Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED   1983

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY

OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this

thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private,

scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and

neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may

be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's

written permission.

K. Dawson

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

9341 - 108 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T5H 1A1

March 8, 1983
DATED

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and
recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for
acceptance, a thesis entitled Friendship and the Theory of
Positive Disintegration by Katherine Dawson in partial fulfill-
ment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

....
Supervisor

....

November 22, 1982
Date

Your friends will know you better in the

first minute you meet than your acquaintances

will know you in a thousand years.

                                    — Richard Bach

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to describe close friendship as perceived and experienced by people at different levels of personal development as outlined by Dabrowski's theory of positive disintegration, to compare the developmental levels of pairs of close friends, and to ascertain the developmental level of strangers to whom one is most and least attracted.

The subject sample consisted of eight adults, two males and six females. Level of development was estimated using the Verbal Stimuli test. Four subjects were at Level I-II, two were at Level II-III, one was at Level III and one was at Level IV. Developmental level of a close friend was obtained for the close friend of six of these subjects. Data on friendship was obtained through individual interviews. Subjects were administered a modified version of the Faces test as a measure of developmental level of those whom they would most and least like to get to know.

The results showed that characteristics of friendship differed greatly according to level of development. These differences formed trends from Level I-II to Level IV as follows: a decrease in egocentricity, similarity and compatibility, an increase in trust, knowledge, commitment and reverence, and an increase in difficulties to a peak at the middle levels and their virtual disappearance at the highest level. The trends represented not only quantitative but qualitative changes as well. Egocentricity became empathy, difficulties became increasingly inner oriented, similarity took place on a more spiritual level, trust became less dependent upon proof, knowledge became deeper

and more intuitive, commitment became motivated more by desire than obligation and reverence replaced taking the other for granted. These trends reflect the direction of movement which underlies the transition from lower to higher levels of development. It is a movement from less to more complex, from automatic and impulsive to reflective and deliberate, from external to internal, from less to more refined, from egocentric to allocentric and from scarcely to highly conscious. A comparison of the developmental level of the subjects and their close friends supports Dabrowski's notion that people tend to choose friends who are at a similar developmental level as themselves. The data on developmental level of those whom one would most and least like to get to know revealed no significant differences between levels. All subjects preferred the faces at higher levels over those at lower levels. This finding was not in agreement with that of previous research.

PREFACE

My original interest as a topic for this thesis was the clarification of the counselling relationship. The research in this area is extensive and some of it seemed to point towards the presence of common qualities basic to effective helping relationships, qualities which were an outgrowth of the personality and perceptions rather than the role of the helper (Brammer, 1970; Carkhuff & Berenson, 1977; Combs, 1969; Heine, 1950; Rogers, 1961). The effectiveness of the relationship in providing conditions necessary for the growth of the client was more dependent on these qualities than on the theoretical perspective or techniques of the helper. According to Heine's research 91950), "theoretical background and techniques per se are less important than the characteristics of the person who employs them" (p.22). If the basic qualities of the helping relationship were personal, it seemed fruitful to investigate the relationship according to the level of personal development of the helper. Because of the breadth and depth of Dabrowski's theory of positive disintegration, this theory seemed promising as a basis for distinguishing levels of development. 'Upon further thought, however, the complications of such an undertaking became apparent; consequently this task has been left to another more experienced and qualified researcher, and I turned instead to a similar but much more familiar relationship--that of friendship.

A reading of the psychological literature revealed two distinct ways of talking about friendship. According to the most popular method, friendship was seen as a relationship of give and take in which the partners could be depended upon to provide for each other, benefits of

comparable value (Duck, 1973; Levinger, as in Levinger & Raush, 1977; Wright, 1969, 1973). the other method emphasized the experiential aspects of friendship and discussed it in terms of such variables as freedom, truth, joy, communion, sacrifice, equality and commitment. (Becker, 1973; Sadler, 1970). I wondered whether these views represented two different but compatible perspectives of the same phenomenon or whether they were focusing on different types of friendship, perhaps characteristics of people at different levels of development.

It became clear, as I worked with the data on friendship gathered from people at four levels of development according to the theory of positive disintegration, that there was a major difference between friendship as conceptualized and experienced by those at the lower two levels, as compared to that at the upper two levels. The view which emerged at the lowest level was a relationship in which the partners enjoyed each other's company, depended upon each other for, and were willing to provide, various types of support, could be honest with each other, and were able to get along without conflict. This conceptualization was in keeping with that found in much of the psychological literature and with that which I would most readily have had of close friendship. The fact that a commonly held view of friendship was, from the perspective of the theory of positive disintegration, associated with a low level of development was surprising. It seemed to me, to indicate a general lack of awareness of the existence of higher levels of friendship. This is precisely the problem pointed out by Sadler (1970): a confusion about the meaning and nature of friendship by which we mistake casual relationships as acceptable substitutes, thereby diminishing the significance of

friendship for personal growth.

With the perspective of high levels of friendship beyond what normally was considered good, and of which I previously had little awareness, it became difficult to view the lower levels in the original positive light. I saw the higher forms of friendship as more desirable and my main interest became the clarification of their unique and higher quality and of the structure of the underlying personality which gave rise to them. Consequently the results are presented in such a way that the higher levels of friendship are seen in a positive light and the lower levels are seen in a relatively negative light.

Although the study can, in the above sense, be considered biased, I believe that the way in which the data have been handled is in keeping with the theory of positive disintegration. This is because an integral aspect of the theory is the greater value placed on higher levels of development and the phenomena associated with them.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the aims of counselling is to foster development within the client toward greater personal growth or self-actualization. One of the major influences in such a process is the quality of one's relationships with others, especially friendships.

The importance of friendship for mental and physical health has long been recognized by philosophers, poets and religious leaders. More recently psychology has found supporting evidence. For instance, the effect of personal disruptions such as health problems, marital break-up and unemployment on one's well being are related to the type and amount of contact with friends (Linn & McGranahan, 1980). Other research (Armstrong, 1969; Parham & Tinsley, 1980) has shown that during times of stress and need friends are usually one's preferred choice as a source of help. Since such times have potential for motivating growth, one would expect the quality of the friendship to be an important determinant, either positive or negative. Greenwald (1976) states that avoiding toxic and non-nourishing relationships is critical in enabling the person to experience adequate emotional support and growth. He warns that in giving or loving indiscriminately, one contributes to one's own destruction; therefore, it is important to recognize the quality of one's relationships and to choose those which are nourishing.

This gives rise to the issue of the significance of different types of friendship for personal development. Do some types aid this process while others are detrimental? Are some types more characteristic of

people at higher levels of development while others are found more often among people at lower levels?

The theory of personal development used in this study is the theory of positive disintegration originated by Kazimierz Dabrowski. He outlines five empirically verifiable levels of development which represent a continuum from an integrated, self-serving, unreflective personality to a personality capable of universal love and self-sacrifice. Dabrowski maintains that people develop both because of and in spite of their environment, of which relationships play a major role. At the same time, he is also reported as having said that, in their efforts to grow, people seek to find friends and mentors who are at the same developmental level or slightly higher. In other words, one's friends influence one's development, yet the level of development which one has attained influences whom one chooses or maintains as friends.

The main purpose of the present study is to investigate the nature of friendship at different levels of personal development as outlined by the theory of positive disintegration. The aspects of friendship focused on are characteristics of friendship (as shown by one's concept of a good friendship and a present relationship with a good friend), and developmental level of a good friend. Attraction to strangers as potential friends will also be investigated.

General Research Questions

(1) Do the characteristics of friendship differ according to level of development? If so, how do they differ?

(2) What is the relationship between people's level of development and that of a good friend?

(3) What is the relationship between people's level of development and that of strangers whom they would like to get to know?

Significance of the Study

It is generally agreed that one's friendships are important for psychological wellbeing. However, there seems to be some concern in the literature about the quality of present day friendships. Sadler (1970) states that in our Western society there is a confusion about the meaning and nature of friendship which invites us to mistake casual relationships as acceptable substitutes, thereby diminishing the significance of friendship for personal development. He maintains that if we are to build friendships we need to have a clear idea of what we are aiming for. Kurth (as in McCall, McCall, Denzin, Suttles, & Kurth, 1970) says that people tend to prefer friendly relations to friendships because they involve less cost, and conflict is more easily avoided. He admits though that we seem to search for friendships.

In light of the above, it would be useful for those who are interested in promoting personal growth in themselves and others to have an understanding of the nature of friendship at various developmental levels, especially at the higher levels. This information can better enable one to clarify possible changes in relationships which would promote further development. As well, it will add to our understanding

of what is involved in personal development. Since the theory of

positive disintegration and the measures used here which are derived

from it are in need of further research, the study will contribute to

the body of knowledge about this theory.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Friendship

Friendship is one of the most difficult relationships to define because it has very broad and ambiguous boundaries. "It lacks normative definitions external to the relationship and is the least role bound or legalistic of any important interpersonal relationship" (Wright, 1978, p.99). The most common criterion used in defining friendship is that it has a focus on the people involved as unique individuals. For example, Kurth (as in McCall et al., 1970) defines it as "an interpersonal relationship involving each individual as a personal entity" (p. 136). Other definitions include further criteria. According to Wright (1978) friendship involves not only a personalistic focus but also voluntary interaction. Friends perceive each other to be irreplaceable and genuine, respond to each other as unique individuals and spend time together in the absence of external pressure to do so. Lowenthal, Thurner, Chiriboga and Associates (1975) state that friendship is "a voluntary, unique, dynamic relationship" (p. 48) in which continued interaction and a view of themselves as its sole members are assumed. According to Suttles (as in McCall, 1970) there are three defining elements of friendship: it is between equals, it is volunteeristic and personal, and it is subject to private negotiation rather than outside consultation.

Differences in friendship are found at the theoretical, descriptive

and experimental levels. The focus of this review of the literature will be to outline the differences in these three areas.

Differences at the Theoretical Level

Theoretical conceptualizations of the purpose of friendship have tended to be of three types depending upon the extent to which it is perceived as a maintenance relationship, a restricting relationship or a growth producing relationship. As a maintenance relationship friendship serves to support the individual and make it possible for him to maintain or restore his customary level and style of functioning in the world. The type of support most commonly associated with friendship is psychological support although physical and material support are often included. This view of friendship is most prevalent in the literature. As a restricting relationship, friendship is seen as hindering or preventing an individual's growth, usually psychological growth, in some important way. As a growth relationship, it is seen as promoting personal development, not only in a horizontal direction as in the acquisition of new skills or interests, but, more importantly, in a vertical direction towards greater self actualization, in Maslow's sense of the term. The possible resources available to friends by which they maintain, restrict or promote the growth of each other are of six types: love, status, information, goods, services and money (Foe & Foe, 1971; as in Duck, 1977).

The maintenance view of friendship is best exemplified by Wright's extensive theory of friendship (1969, 1978) and by the ideas of Duck (1973). Wright's theory is from the perspective of the psychology of

self. According to this perspective people are concerned about the wellbeing and worth of their conception of self. In their interactions with the environment they act to maintain and reaffirm their sense of individuality, reaffirm those self attributes which have evaluative implications, evaluate themselves in a positive manner in situations which encourage self evaluation, and to some extent, make changes in self attributes in the direction of positive elaboration and growth. In order to receive such benefits from interactions with others, there is a tendency to invest the self in the relationship. There is a personalized interest in the other and a commitment to him in terms of time, energy and other personal resources. Thus, to some extent, the relationship becomes one of the subject's self attributes and "the other person becomes a entity in whose wellbeing and worth the subject has a vested interest" (p. 198). Friendship, because of it's voluntary nature and focus on the other as a unique person, becomes an important relationship in terms of rewardingness.

According to Duck (1973) people need others because they can, by consensus, facilitate and secure the predictability of the world. His fundamental assumption is "that events, facts, things, objects and all the paraphernalia of existence have no absolute meaning or particles of an absolute truth attached to them. Men, or other sentient beings, can impose on events, facts, etc., whatever categorizations, meanings, labels, rules or laws they choose - and they must accept responsibility for their choices" (p. 14). However, people also need others who can validate the finer, more idiosyncratic and, therefore, less generally accepted aspects of their outlook, particularly their opinions of other people. This is the role of friends. He states that "the ultimate

function of friendship is the discover of support for the partners' personalities" (Duck & Allison, 1978, p. 43). Support is in terms of similarity, and the type of similarity considered to be supportive depends upon the stage of development of the relationship. The type of similarity necessary for close friendship to develop is psychological similarity, that is, the use of similar psychological processes and constructions of experience. The major focus of Duck's research has been to clarify the type of similarity which is both necessary and sufficient at a given time to allow the friendship to grow in intimacy.

The restricting aspect of friendship is dealt with by Suttles (as in McCall et al, 1970) who talks about friendship in a sociological framework. In modern, industrial society it is a relationship based on voluntary deviancy because, within it, the societal norms and roles are not required to operate, and we are allowed to be our "real selves" and to know what someone else is 'really like'. However, friendship has little chance to grow within the societal structure and has a tendency to become restricting and obligation producing, "an uneasy balancing between personal and social obligations" (p. 128). At best it provides a place of relative freedom from the rules and norms of society; at worst the norms which develop within the friendship produce a bondage greater than that which one has to society. The partners feel bound by the obligations created or by "mutual blackmail" in the form of knowing too much about each other and the relationship continues even though it is unrewarding for one or both parties.

The growth producing aspect of friendship is best represented by the phenomenological perspective. This perspective focuses on the unique way in which the friendship relationship contributes to personal

growth and on describing the ideal - what friendship can be rather than on lesser representations. For example, Rake says that "true friendship is above all, honest and affirms the becoming of the authentic, true selves of the participants" (as in Becker, 1973, p. 14). According to Sadler(1970), friendship is a form of love and as such is not based on feelings or on gratification of needs but is a "union of two individuals who, in the bond of love, discover and realize both their oneness and their freedom" (p. 184). However, friendship, as opposed to a marriage or a romantic relationship, is primarily focused on enhancing and clarifying each partner's individuality through their oneness rather than on making their oneness the goal. The aim is more to cultivate their growth as individuals rather than as a couple.

Differences at the Descriptive Level

Friendships have been described and differentiated according to the rewards which they offer and the attributes which make up their nature. Wright (1978) describes four specific rewards of friendship: utility value, self-affirmation value, ego support value and stimulation value. Utility value is the degree to which a friend is seen as willing and able to use his time and resources to help one meet one's needs and goals. Self affirmation value is the degree to which a friend is seen as acting and reacting in ways which facilitate one's recognition and expression of one's more highly valued self attributes. Ego support value is the degree to which a friend is seen as being encouraging, supportive, non threatening and capable of helping one maintain an impression of oneself as a competent, worthwhile person. Stimulation value is the degree to

which a friend is seen as capable of introducing new ideas and activities and fostering an expansion or elaboration of one's knowledge and perspectives.

In a similar way Davis (1973) discusses the physical and psychological services which are offered within friendships. Physical services are those designed to improve, restore or support one's physiological, economic or social wellbeing. Examples include doing small favours, giving advice, protection, using one's social or economic power or material resources to help the other, and giving up one's life to save the other's. Psychological services are those which support or restore one's psychological strength. Some such services are bolstering a friend's self esteem, listening and providing insight which includes helping him see his own faults. Friends can also help each other towards self improvement by establishing a relationship which is conducive to optimum development and providing the motivation to reach for one's potential. This function is described by Thoreau (as in Davis, 1973) who states that sometimes we "realize that there have been many times when our Friends" thoughts of us were so pure and lofty a character that they passed over us like the winds of heaven unnoticed; when they treated us not as what we were but as what we aspired to be" (p. 151).

Phenomenological authors have described what they consider to be the basic, essential elements of true friendship. The following list of seven elements is a compilation of those outlined by Sadler (1970) and Becker (1973).

(1) Joy - Friends enjoy deeply each other's presence.

(2) Communion - This is the building of a common life by the

sharing of meaningful events such that the unit of identity becomes us and not you and me. It requires the gift of each other's presence both in objective time and space and in an inner availability through openness, sensitivity and frankness.

(3) Freedom - Friendship, more so than any other love relationship, enhances personal individuality, affirms each other's separateness and enables one to become the kind of person one truly intends to be. One's faith for the other is not blind because it sees the problems, yet holds out hope for the future and in this way frees the other from anxiety, expectations and ideas which would impede his growth.

(4) Truth - Friendship is not based on mutual liking but truth; a friend is an objective onlooker who can censure the other, clarify his understanding and free him from self deception. Possibly why friendship is so important in self development is that it helps create our sense of identity.

(5) Sacrifice - Friendship requires that one sacrifice selfishness, self assertion and peculiar desires; sometimes it requires that one live for the sake of the other. It accepts that suffering is one condition of the relationship.

(6) Commitment - It is a trusted recognition of what has been shared as well as faith in the continuance of the relationship; it is a promise and a desire to stay with the friend through varying experiences. There is a trust in its mutuality.

(7) Equality - It is the sense of being in similar places along

important dimensions; there is a balance of each having something to offer that the other desires or is reaching for whether it be something new, old and treasured or unfamiliar and difficult.

Other authors who have focused on clarifying the factors working in the friendship relationship are Lowenthal et al (1975) and Arsenian (1970). Lowenthal et al did a large study of friendship patterns in lower middle class people across four life stages from adolescence to preretirement. They differentiated 19 dimensions of friendship which were grouped into six conceptual categories as follows:

(1) Similarity - common behaviour and interests including shared experiences and ease of communication.

(2) Reciprocity- helping and support, confidants.

(3) Compatibility - comfort and ease of the relationship and likeability of the friend.

(4) Structural Dimensions - duration, geographic closeness, convenience.

(5) Role Model - attributes in the other which one respects or aspires to, including the friend as an ideal self.

(6) Other - a catch-all for miscellaneous attributes.

They found that the qualities most frequently attributed to friendships were similarity (36%), reciprocity (21%), and compatibility (16%). When asked to consider the qualities of an ideal friendship, the same three were most frequently cited, although the order was changed. Reciprocity was highest (45%), followed by similarity (28%) and compatibility (17%). Lowenthal et al concluded that, while a reciprocal relationship with emphasis on understanding or acceptance and supportive - dependable as

the important dimensions, is the most desirable, it is not often realized in actual friendships.

Arsenian (1970) compiled a list of 12 characteristics of friendship based on descriptions of 'best friend' from 500 people ranging in age from nine to 90 years old. The 12 characteristics were mutual interests, understanding and empathy, trust and loyalty, moral character, acceptance, mutual confidence, willingness to compromise, considerate and kind, sincerity, interested and encouraging, sharing humour and laughter. These characteristics are very similar to Lowenthal et al's categories of similarity, reciprocity and compatibility.

The characteristics of friendship as described by the authors above may be present in differing degrees from one friendship to another thereby giving rise to a number of qualitatively different friendships. Thus, some friendships may be oriented more towards certain types of psychological services whereas others may be more balanced between psychological and physical services. Some friendships may provide high levels of ego support and self affirmation rewards while others provide mainly stimulation or utility value. According to Becker the list of essential elements of friendship can be viewed as a universal skeleton of all types and degrees of friendship. Although this list represents those elements which are necessary for true friendship, there are other, presumably lesser, types of friendship in which only some of these elements are present or they are present to a lesser extent.

There has been some research which has clarified and labelled the different types of friendship generally found. Chasin (1968) describes three types of friendship – casual, good and best. They differed in the

degree of intimacy and in their willingness to help each other. According to Rose (1980), best and close friendships differ qualitatively from casual friendships. Best and close friends are seen as honest, accepting, dependable, providing intimacy and support and are formed and maintained by repeated interaction and positive feelings. Casual friends are seen as stimulating and providing life enhancement and tend to be formed through proximity.

Aristotle's philosophy of friendship, as outlined by Murstein and Spitz (1973-74), differentiates among three levels of friendship - good, useful and pleasant friendships. The highest is that between two "good" men. "Good" was assumed to mean just, virtuous and loves another good man for these same qualities. In a friendship based on utility the partners do not love each other in themselves but insofar as some benefit accrues to them from each other. In a friendship based on pleasure the partners enjoy each other's company not because of what they are in themselves but because they are witty and agreeable. The good friendship includes both pleasant and useful values, requires time and intimacy for its establishment and is long lasting. The pleasant and useful friendships are based on the other being the source of something desired. They are established and dissolved quickly according to the underlying motive. Murstein and Spitz did a study based on Aristotle's views in which they asked female college students to describe their best friend, most useful friend, most enjoyable friend and most admired friend as well as self and ideal self. The results of a factor analysis showed almost no overlap among most useful, enjoyable and admired friends and a greater similarity between best and most enjoyable friend than between best and most useful friend. These results were

interpreted to mean that specialized need friendships are present when the person is not also a best friend.

Paine (1970) discussed some of the anthropological writings on types of friendship. According to Wolf (1966, as in Paine) there is a distinction between expressive or emotional friendship and instrumental friendship. The emotional friendship satisfies some kind of deficit in each partner; it provides emotional release from the pressures of the role playing required in other aspects of one's life. The important element of instrumental friendship is a striving for access to natural and social resources. Cohen (1961, as in Paine) compares four types of friendship - inalienable, close, casual and expedient. The inalienable friendship is unique and independent of the other three. It is based on a world view which pictures human relationships as ideally permanent, intense and irrevocable and is "governed morally by super natural and quasilegal sanction" (Cohen, as in Paine, p. 144). However, it is not necessarily a relationship of greater intimacy nor is it always permanent. The other three friendships differ along a continuum of decreasing intimacy and increasing materialism as one goes from close to casual to expedient friendship.

Differences at the Experimental Level

Experimental research has aimed to isolate and quantify the causative factors working within the friendship relationship. The following are the findings which are relevant to differences in adult friendships. Verbrugge (1977) reviewed the literature on adult friendships and concluded that in general "adult friendships are highly

homogeneous in social and demographic statuses, attitudes, interests, intelligence, and personality traits, and that observed homogeneity is higher than expected, on the basis of a random choice model" (p. 577). There was more similarity between best friends than between more casual friends.

Becker (1973) reviewed the literature on friendship choice and outlined some tentative trends. She found that perceived personality similarity is a more valid predictor of friendship choice than objectively measured personality similarity, although for social and physical variables objectively measured similarity is more valid. However, similarity of any type becomes less important with increased age, length of acquaintance and higher social and occupational status.

Male friendships differ in nature from female friendships. According to Lowenthal et al, females stress the importance of supportiveness whereas males stress sharing activities and interests. Armstrong (1969) found that females tended to form more intimate friendships, were more self disclosing, and friendship was more central to their lives.

Friendship also differs across life stages. Lowenthal et al found that friendship participation and importance of similarity decreased through successive stages from adolescence through young newly marrieds, to middle aged married adults with families, to older adults facing retirement. Perception of friends became increasingly more complex with the exception of middle aged adults who viewed their friendships with the least affective and cognitive richness. The need for friends seems to be less during this phase because the focus is more strongly on family relations for women and on building up security in preparation for

retirement for men. Shulman (1975) had similar findings for his middle aged group. They were more likely to include kin and neighbours in their friendship network, more likely to see obligation as a reason for sustaining relationships than younger or older unmarried people, and less likely to view their friendships in an extensive or multifaceted way.

Development of Friendship

In any study of friendship an important aspect to consider is its development and the stage in development of the relationship under observation. According to Duck (1977) and Rose (1980) the reason that the literature is often ambivalent in its findings is because different researchers have studied friendship at different stages of development.

Much of this research is from the perspective of the development of intimacy. The focus is usually on the development of the heterosexual relationship in which friendship is seen as a stage perhaps midway between strangers and marriage partners. Exceptions to this are Wright, Duck and the phenomenological theorists who have discussed the development of friendship in its own right.

Wright (1978) states that "friendships develop from an opportunity in interpersonal contact through a prelude in friendly relations to varying levels of voluntary interdependence" (p. 201). This is basically a process of perceiving the other as increasingly more individualistic and less role bound and of allowing one's plans, activities and decisions to be increasingly more contingent upon those of the other when both members are free to exercise a certain amount of choice. During the friendly relations stage informal, unrequired

interaction is initiated and the intimacy level of self disclosure is reciprocated. If each sees in the other potential rewards related to one's own needs and tendencies for self affirmation or growth then they risk a small investment in expanding the relationship. This leads to increasing degrees of voluntary interaction if the anticipated rewards are forthcoming, and an increasing investment of the self in the relationship and in the wellbeing of the other.

Every friendship has a potential upper limit of development, or optimal level of voluntary interaction, which is determined by its rewardingness. The rewardingness of a friendship depends upon personality compatibility which, according to Wright, implies neither similarity nor complementarity. Rather, it is based upon the meshing of the rewards each characteristically seeks with those which the other is characteristically able to provide, given situational and intrapsychic factors. The better the meshing over a broader range of rewards sought, the greater potential the relationship has for development.

Duck has focused on the role of personality similarity in the developmental process. Unlike Wright, Duck believes that the rewardingness of friendship is determined by the degree of personality similarity between the two partners. However, there are different levels on which this can occur and it is possible that partners can be similar on the level which is crucial for that particular stage of development while being complementary or different on other levels. "The process of intimacy growth is conceived to centre on information-gathering where each partner explores, sequentially and at successively greater depths, the extent to which similarity or support for his personality is provided by his partner" (Duck & Allison, 1978). One

first gathers information about the other's personality, then constructs and modifies a model of his personality, and finally, assesses the degree of support for one's own personality. Friendship is established if negatively evaluated data in the form of dissimilarity is not discovered. This process is reflected by the fact that acquaintances tend to perceive each other in terms of interaction styles or habitual activities and roles whereas good friends describe each other in terms of character, personality or cognitive attributes.

In the beginning stages of a relationship the type of similarity which is considered supportive is evaluative and attitude similarity. The emphasis then switches to the amount of similarity of personality traits and finally to the extent of psychological similarity. Psychological similarity means the degree to which the same concepts are used to describe and categorize other people. Evidence to support this hypothesis comes from a study comparing established friendship pairs with random pairs (Duck 1973). Results showed that although the two groups were no different in the amount of attitude or personality similarity within pairs, as measured by the Allport-Vernon Scale of Values and the California Psychological Inventory respectively, the friendship pairs were significantly more similar psychologically than random pairs as measured by constructs used on Kelley's Reptest.

The process of friendship development from the phenomenological point of view is a description of the changes which occur as a relationship becomes increasingly more effective in promoting individual personal growth. The process has been described by Rake (1969, as in Becker, 1973) and by Becker (1973). It begins with a common ground of similar values, interests or projects and the opportunity to share

objective time and space. According to Rake friendship arises more naturally when the endeavor which brings the participants together allows for personal growth and the embodiment of an ideal. The more personally meaningful and transcendant this ideal, the more potential there is for the friendship to be authentic and lasting. With consistent moments of encounter which "necessarily includes a balance of both identification and opposition, personal autonomy and relatedness" (p. 12), the shared world expands to include differences and to be less dependent on time spent together. As the relationship broadens and deepens there is a mutual realization of their spiritual sameness as well as a greater ability to accept their separate worlds. The situational and circumstantial aspects of the external world play a diminishing role and the relationship begins to transcend objective space and time. This is a trusted basis from which to move to a more open, enthusiastic and active involvement in the world beyond the friendship.

There are certain conditions which aid in the continuation of the relationship despite separation and changes. They are individual autonomy, an ability to transcend oneself and attend primarily to the wellbeing of the other, a reciprocal desire and need for what the other has to offer and a commitment to individual and shared growth.

In some ways the phenomenological view of friendship development differs from those of Wright and Duck. For instance, the balance of oneness and autonomy is emphasized by the phenomenological view even in the beginning stages whereas the other views do not focus on it until later stages and instead emphasize the testing and analysis of relatively superficial aspects of the other's personality. A related difference is that the growth of intimacy is less connected to

increasing time spent together from the phenomenological view. According to the other views increased intimacy is reflected in greater time together. This tends to put limits on the growth of friendship partly because people do not have unlimited amounts of time to invest in friendships and, partly because they are seen as relatively more subject to circumstances. A friendship could, for example, decline because of such changes as a move to a distant place or a marriage on the part of one member. According to the phenomenological view, time together increases to a certain point and then the relationship begins to transcend time and space and intimacy has a more spiritual quality. In this way the potential for friendship growth is seen as relatively unlimited.

Summary

Friendship has been differentiated according to theoretical conceptualizations of its purpose, descriptions of its nature, the variables which influence the relationship and according to stages of development. However, there are no value implications attached to these differences. Although friendships are seen as varying along a horizontal continuum they are not treated as being arranged in a hierarchy according to some standard of better or worse. Nor are the different types of friendship discussed as being more conducive to or representative of personal development. Possible exceptions to this are the phenomenological and Aristotelean views of friendship. The phenomenological view is hypothesized to represent friendship in its ideal state as a vehicle of personal growth and as such would be placed

at the upper end of a hierarchy. For Aristotle the types of friendship reflected moral differences with the good friendship representing the perfect friendship relationship. Assuming that good people, in Aristotle's sense of the term, have reached a high level of personal development, this type of friendship would also be at the upper end of a hierarchy.

Friendship and Personal Development

Studies linking differences in friendship to levels of personal development have been lacking. An exception is Maslow's work on the hierarchy of needs and the self actualizing person. His theory of personal growth is illustrated by the hierarchy of needs. The basic human needs are arranged in a hierarchy according to relative prepotency, as follows: physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, esteem needs, self actualization needs. When the needs of one level have been satisfied, those of the next level emerge. One cannot be motivated by the needs at any particular level until those of all previous levels are being satisfied. As with other behaviour, one's interpersonal relations are motivated by a desire to fulfill the needs of the level which one is on.

At the level of physiological needs, interpersonal relations are minimal; one's behaviour is focused on satisfying hunger, thirst and sexual needs and there is little awareness of individual others. At the level of safety needs, one is in search of a protector or a stronger person on whom to depend. Those with love and belongingness needs feel keenly the absence of a friend, sweetheart, spouse or children. They

hunger for affectionate relations with people in general and for a place in the group. At the level of esteem needs one wants a stable, firmly based, high evaluation of self, self respect and esteem from others. At the self actualization level there is a desire for self fulfillment and a sense of, "What I can be, I must be." A major distinction between the first four levels and that of self actualization is that at the first four levels one is motivated by deficiency, that is, to fulfill something which is lacking, whereas at the level of self actualization one is motivated to grow. This difference in motivation has implications for relationships. "Deficiency motivated people must have other people available, since most of their main need gratifications (love, safety, respect, prestige, belongingness) can come only from other human beings. But growth motivated people may actually be hampered by others. The determinants of satisfaction and of the good life are for them now inner individual and not social" (as in Lowrey, 1973, p. 189). They are dependent for continued growth and development on their own potentialities and latent resources.

Maslow did a study in 1950 (as in Maslow, 1970) of the characteristics of self-actualizing people. As regards their relationships with others, he described them as detached, which is often interpreted by others as coldness, snobbishness, lack of affection, unfriendliness or even hostility. "The ordinary friendship relationship is more clinging, more demanding, more desirous of reassurance, compliment, support, warmth, and exclusiveness. It is true that self actualizing people don't need others in the ordinary sense. But since this being needed, or being missed, is the usual earmark of friendship, it is evident that detachment will not easily be accepted by average

people" (Maslow, 1970). Although they are more detached from others, their interpersonal relations are deeper and more profound than those of other adults. According to Maslow, they are capable of more fusion, greater love, more perfect identification and more obliteration of ego boundaries than other people. Their love relationships are characterized by certain qualities such as an absence of anxiety, a tendency toward more complete honesty and spontaneity and a dropping of defences, roles and striving. This includes allowing one's physical and psychological faults and weaknesses to be seen. There is an identification of each others' needs as one's own such that the two partners become as one; yet there is the acceptance of and respect for each other's individuality. There are the two tendencies - to transcend individuality and to sharpen and strengthen it. They form especially deep ties with relatively few people, thus having a small circle of friends. This seems in part to be due to the great deal of time required for this type of relationship. They are highly selective of whom they choose to develop close relationships with; their friends are usually closer to self actualization than the average person.

Because the hierarchy of needs is a process of personal growth, the levels represent value differences. It is a process from lower to higher needs, from what is common to all animals to what is uniquely human, from lesser to greater physical and psychological health in the long term, from least to most valued in terms of the subjective experience of gratification. Because the various types of friendships are tied to levels in the hierarchy they necessarily imply value differences. Thus, some friendships are higher, more uniquely human, more healthy, more valid experientially and require a higher level of

personal growth of the participants than those of other adults.

Theory of Positive Disintegration

The theory of personal development used in this study was Dabrowski's theory of positive disintegration which also postulates value differences between levels of development. It was chosen because of the great breadth and depth of its scope, thus providing a good basis for studying friendship over the widest possible range of development and for illuminating its higher and lower forms. Because this theory is the main framework for the study it will be reviewed extensively.

There are three aspects which contribute to the broad perspective of the theory. (1) The theory takes a holistic view of man; development is seen as multi dimensional, occuring in five areas of mental functioning: psychomotor, sensual, imaginational, intellectual and emotional. Thus, it is global and fully rounded rather than restricted to the refinement of a few capacities or skills. (2) Dabrowski postulates three factors as affecting development: biological, social environmental and the third factor. Biology and environment are the two factors usually associated with psychological development. The third factor is a set of autonomous processes by which one both participates in and directs one's own development in accordance with an emerging personality ideal. (3) Development is multi level in nature. That is, the changes which occur consist not only of quantitative growth or replacement, but of the acquisition of qualities which make man capable of transcending biological and environmental influences. The transition from lower to higher levels represents

movement from less complex to more complex, automatic and impulsive to reflective and deliberate, external control to internal control, less refined to more refined, egocentric to allocentric, and scarcely conscious to highly conscious.

The levels of development represent differences in the structural organization of personality which underlies behaviour. Development then, is a process of reorganizing at increasingly greater depths, the personality structure. This process is non-ontogenetil; it is not an automatically produced succession of changes during the life cycle as a function of age or learning. Development is, instead, dependent upon the developmental instinct which is the tendency to evolve from lower to higher forms of mental life. This instinct is the source of developmental forces called dynamisms which carry out the process of reorganizing the personality structure. It operates with variable intensity among individuals; many people, for biological or sociological reasons do not develop beyond the lowest level and rarely does an individual reach the highest levels. In fact, development is characterized by tension, struggle, nervousness and depression. One of the unique aspects of the theory is the emphasis placed upon the positive role of these negative experiences in development.

The theory of positive disintegration outlines five levels of development representing a progression from primitive integration, through stages of disintegration, to secondary integration. The developmental instinct acts differently at different levels and each level is characterized by a different set of dynamisms. Dabrowski claims that the distinction between levels is empirically verifiable and offers some non-clinical methods for assessing level of development.

The five levels are divided into two phases. The first phase, consisting of Levels I and II, is heteronomous. Here, development is biologically and socially determined. The second phase, consisting of Levels III, IV and V, is autonomous and accelerated. Development is self-conscious and depends increasingly on deliberate acts of choice. Here the third factor has an increasing influence and the developmental instinct becomes stronger than more primitive impulses from lower levels.

The five levels are as follows:

Level I (primary integration). The personality structure is narrow and rigid. The focus is egocentric without consideration for others. Behaviour is motivated by biological impulses. Conflict is external because there is no reflection on one's experience or behaviour or evaluation of its consequences in emotional or moral terms. At the extreme, one is intent on winning and advancing oneself at any cost. In a milder form, one has a narrow scope of interests, thinking, aspirations and affect and follows a stereotyped, predictable path of development.

Level II (unilevel disintegration). The stable structure of level I begins to loosen and becomes unbalanced. One is highly susceptible to environmental influence, has little self awareness and experiences many doubts and conflicting tendencies. There is a lack of direction, a vascillation between pros and cons rather than a value hierarchy or a larger sense of order.

Level III (spontaneous multilevel disintegration). An internal, emotionally discovered value hierarchy emerges and the third factor begins to guide behaviour. There is great internal conflict between

what one is and what one ought to be, a struggle to be free from biological and social influences, This level is characterized by reflection, negative self evaluation, existential anxieties, a search for the ideal and a perception of the uniqueness of others.

Level IV (directed multilevel disintegration). The internal hierarchy of values becomes more strongly developed and is consciously established. Behaviour moves one in the direction of a more clearly defined personality ideal; what ought to be, will be. There is a high degree of self awareness and self control and an expanding empathy for mankind. This level corresponds to Maslow's self actualizers.

Level V (secondary integration). This is the embodiment of the personality ideal; what ought to be becomes what is. One has great inner peace and is capable of universal compassion of self sacrifice.

The five areas of mental functioning (psychomotor, sensual, imaginal, intellectual, emotional) represent different dimensions of experiencing and of responding to stimuli. Excess energy, called overexcitability, is channelled through these dimensions and manifested as the dynamisms which shape development. Each person has preferred dimensions such that overexitability tends to be channelled through certain ones moreso than others, thus determining the way in which he will experience and respond to stimuli. The significance of the different types of overexcitability is that they have a differential impact upon development. For instance, when overexcitability is exclusively psychomotor and sensual, development is limited to the lower levels only. The potential for development is strongest if all forms of overexcitability are present. For the autonomous development of the higher levels, intellectual, imaginational and emotional

overexcitability must be present. However, the highest level is possible only if the emotional overexcitability is the strongest or no less strong than the others. This importance placed on the role of emotional functioning in development is unique to the theory.

The levels of development postulated by the theory of positive disintegration carry strong implications for the quality of personal relationships. However, nowhere does Dabrowski directly address the issue as it relates to friendship. At level I there is little sense of emotional attachment to others. That which does occur is limited to a group feeling based on participation in common activities or belonging to a certain class, team or ethnic group. The attitude is one of "us against them" and this sense of oneness ceases as soon as there is conflict of interest within the group. At Level II a psychological need for the company, opinions and feelings of other people develops, which is based on dependency needs, need to conform and to have approval and admiration. At Level III empathy, caring and respect begin to enter into one's relationships as well as feelings of acceptance of others in their subjectivity and individuality. This leads to a sense of responsibility in relation to them. Exclusivity in relationships is valued. One begins to emotionally evaluate one's relationships and their role in one's development. At Level IV, behaviour tends towards service to others. Empathy becomes a greater concern for others in their development, for helping them and for protecting those who suffer. Exclusive bonds of friendship become deep and enduring. At Level V one is motivated by a universal compassion for mankind; one is prepared to sacrifice one's life for another. There is an intuitive ability to make moral differentiations among others and to help them towards perfecting

themselves.

The present study will attempt to expand what Dabrowski has said about the relationship between quality of personal relationships and level of development, by providing information about differences in the nature of friendship at different developmental levels. The aspects of friendship which will be studied are characteristics of friendship as shown by one's concept of friendship and a present relationship with a good friend; relationship between developmental levels of two good friends and developmental level of those to whom one is most and least attracted to get to know. The following chapter is an outline of the method by which the data was obtained and analysed. In the fourth chapter the data is presented for each of the levels of development represented and discussed according to the theory of positive disintegration. In the final chapter the differences between friendship at the various levels of development are discussed as regards characteristics of the relationship, the level of development of the friend, and the extent to which it reflects as well as promotes personal development. The contributions and limitations of the study are also presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

To answer the questions raised in the previous chapter the plan of study was as follows. Eight subjects were interviewed individually regarding their concepts of friendship and a present relationship with a good friend. Developmental level of the subjects and their good friend was assessed by a test developed by Dabrowski known as the Verbal Stimuli test. The Faces test, also developed by Dabrowski, was used to assess the level of development of those to whom the subject was most and least attracted to get to know.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was carried out to assess the interview format. The guideline questions were revised at this time. Three subjects, all acquaintances of the investigator, were interviewed. One subject was subsequently included in the main study.

Subjects

The subjects were eight adults, two males and six females, ranging in age from 25 years to 70 years. It was hoped that the subjects would represent as wide a range of developmental levels as possible although

in only one case was developmental level ascertained before most of the rest of the data had been collected. They were chosen on the basis of impressions formed through previous personal contact by either the investigator or others familiar with the theory of positive disintegration.

Instruments

Interview. Data on friendship were obtained by means of individual, tape recorded interviews. The interviews were semi structured in that all subjects were asked the same questions although the specific order and wording varied. In this way all subjects provided the specific information relevant to the study but were allowed to describe their friendships in their own way and were encouraged to elaborate on their descriptions. See Appendix A for a list of the guideline questions. Each interview was transcribed and a summary written and shown to the subject. This review of the interview material was an opportunity for the investigator and subject to make revisions towards a more complete, accurate and mutually understandable representation of the subject's views.

The issue of the validity of the information obtained during the interviews was considered. Because of the exploratory nature of the study and the personally meaningful nature of the content, the interview format was considered to be the most appropriate method. According to Phillips (1971) a strength of the interview is that it allows "for the study of motives, beliefs, values, attitudes - things "inside" an individual that are often not directly reflected in observable behaviour

or appearance" (p.100).

Maccoby and Maccoby (as in Lindzey, 1954) mention two possible sources of bias which are relevant for this study. The first is bias due to variations in the fullness of probing; the second is bias due to variations in the willingness of subjects to communicate their views accurately. These were minimized in the following ways. The review of the interview material with the subject at a later time enabled the investigator to gather further information and allowed the subject to revise statements which subsequent thought showed to be inaccurate. The subjects' interest and involvement in discussing the topic was seen as enhancing the likelihood that the information provided was accurate. The topic was one which most subjects had never discussed before although a few had done some thinking about it. This produced an initial hesitation which soon gave way either to enthusiastic discussion or to slow and thoughtful statements. One subject described his responding as "thinking out loud." Several subjects indicated their surprise at discovering that they had more to say than they had thought or that the topic was more complex than it seemed, and therefore found the experience stimulating. The majority of the information provided was voluntary rather than in answer to direct questions. According to Becker (1958) such statements are least likely to be influenced by the investigator's preoccupations and biases. For the above reasons, as well as the fact that participation in the study was voluntary, the interview data are considered to be valid.

Verbal Stimuli Test. Level of personal development was measured by the Verbal Stimuli test developed by Dabrowski. Subjects and friends

were asked to complete this questionnaire as an indication of the degree of similarity of attitudes between friends. This test consists of 12 stimulus words to which subjects are asked to write out their emotional associations and experiences. It can be seen in Appendix B. The words were selected because the responses elicited by them reflect emotional attitudes which clearly differentiate levels of development. Responses are assigned one of nine possible levels, including the five levels described by the theory of positive disintegration and four intermediate half levels. A level index is calculated to indicate the average level of functioning. Responses can also be rated for types of dynamisms and types of overexcitabilities manifested, and combined for an estimate of developmental potential. For a more in depth discussion of the methods used, the reader is referred to Dabrowski and Piechowski (1977, Vol.2).

A study of the reliability of the test (Spreng & Lai, Note I) showed inter-rater reliability to be moderately low (r=.50) for overall as well as specific response ratings. However, the difference between the highest and lowest mean ratings was only 0.6 of a level. The most important variable affecting the accuracy of the test at this stage of its development is the raters' familiarity with and understanding of the theory. According to the most recent research (Dabrowski & Piechowski, 1977, Vol.2) estimates of developmental level based on the Verbal Stimuli test are in agreement with those based on two other tests derived from the theory--the autobiography and the neurological examination. The Verbal Stimuli test is designed to be used in conjunction with the autobiography; used alone, the amount of written material obtained is often less than the minimum suggested for an accurate analysis. However, because of the above mentioned agreement between estimates based on each

test separately and because the purpose in this study was to obtain a general index rather than a detailed analysis of developmental level, the use of the Verbal Stimuli test alone was deemed appropriate.

Faces Test. Level of development of those to whom one is attracted to get to know was investigated by means of a modified version of the Faces Test developed by Dabrowski. The Faces test is a projective type of test designed to reveal dynamisms and overexcitabilities, as indications of level of development. It consists of a collection of photographs of faces each of which has been evaluated by Dabrowski as to the developmental level it reflects, according to specific criteria (Dabrowski, Note 2). There are 20 photographs, five at each of the first four levels of development. Subjects are asked to rank the five they like the best and to give reasons for their choices.

In this study the test was used not to measure the level of development of the subject but to compare his level of development (as measured by the Verbal Stimuli test) with that of faces to which he is attracted. Subjects were asked to evaluate each face on the basis of how much they would like to get to know that person. They were asked to choose the five most liked and the five least liked faces, to rank them in order of liking and to briefly explain their choices.

Procedure

Most of the data for each subject was obtained in two sessions, the second session occuring two weeks to six weeks after the first one. On the initial contact, either by phone or in person, subjects were

informed of the nature of the study, their participation was requested and if they agreed, an appointment was made for the first session. During the first session, which lasted approximately an hour to an hour and a half, the subject was interviewed, given the Verbal Stimuli test to complete at home, and asked for permission to contact a good friend to complete the Verbal Stimuli test. In the second session the subject read and revised the summary of the interview and was administered the Faces Test. For four subjects the sessions took place in their homes; for three subjects the sessions took place in a quiet room at the university; for one subject the first session was held at her place of work and the second at her home. The subjects' friends who were asked to complete the Verbal Stimuli test were contacted by phone if they lived in the city and by mail if they lived outside the city. In all cases the friend was considered to be a very good friend and was one whose relationship with the subject had been discussed during the interview.

The Verbal Stimuli test responses were analysed independently by two raters experienced with the technique and the theory. One of the raters was involved with Dabrowski in the research on the inter-rater reliability of the Verbal Stimuli test. She was at this time trained as a rater which included many hours of research spread over approximately a three year period. Dabrowski's standards were used as the measure of accuracy. This rater has remained involved in research connected with the theory up to the present. The second rater, although not formally trained, gained experience with the test in a graduate seminar conducted by Dabrowski and through her own research based on the theory. One piece of research was reviewed by Dabrowski and her analysis found to be

accurate. The raters were given no identifying information about the subjects or their friends. In all but four cases the raters were in agreement. In these four cases, two of which were subjects and two of which were friends, the discrepancy was less than a full level. The discrepancies were resolved by means of discussion of each case by the raters until agreement was reached.

The above procedure was altered slightly in the case of Subject 8. This subject's developmental level had previously been assessed by one of the raters using the Verbal Stimuli test and the autobiography. The assessment had been confirmed by Dabrowski. This assessment was used rather than readministering the Verbal Stimuli test. In all other aspects the procedure was the same as for the other subjects.

Treatment of the Data

Interviews were transcribed and case summaries written and discussed with each subject for further clarification. Subjects were placed in groups on the basis of level of development as measured by the Verbal Stimuli test. Analysis proceeded according to the following steps:

(1)   For each level of development represented, individual presentation of interview data was followed by a composite description of the characteristics of friendship.

(2) Statement of the relationship between developmental level of two good friends for each level of development represented by the subjects.

(3) Statement of the relationship between developmental level of the subjects and those to whom they are attracted to get to know as well as a

description of the basis on which these choices were made for each level of development represented.

(4) Description of the differences among levels of development in terms of the above factors and as related to the theory of positive disintegration.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The results are based on the complete data for six subjects and incomplete data for two subjects. For these two subjects the data on the developmental level of a good friend was missing. In both cases the friend lived out of town and did not respond to the investigator's written requests to complete the Verbal Stimuli test.

The developmental levels of the eight subjects are as follows:

Level I-II	Subjects 1, 2, 3 and 4
Level II-III	Subjects 5 and 6
Level III	Subject 7
Level IV	Subject 8

This distribution, with the majority of the subjects at the lower levels, is similar to that which is postulated to exist in the general population. Dabrowski is reported as having estimated that 60-65% of the population is psychopathic or sociopathic, that is, at a developmental Level of I or I-II and 25% of the population is at Level II (Rankel, Note 3). Excerpts from the subjects' Verbal Stimuli responses showing the basis upon which their developmental level was assessed can be seen in Appendix B.

In the remainder of this chapter the data for each subject are presented separately in sections for the interview data, developmental level of friend and Faces test. An analysis of the characteristics portrayed follows the presentation of the interview data for each level.

Level I-II

This level is represented by Subjects 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Subject 1

This subject is a female, 25 years old, married with no children. For her, friendship is "where you've got a mutual thing...With a good friend she's going to come to you and you're going to go to her at any time. Sort of a 50-50 thing. Like you give to receive, hopefully."

She had very strong expectations as to what friendship should involve. These included that each partner will give and receive equally and responsibility for the maintenance of the relationship will be shared. Each will be available to the other whenever needed, to talk or help in whatever way possible and will not fall apart in a crisis. There is an openness to share deep, personal things with each other and a willingness to put themselves in each other's shoes so as not to unnecessarily cause hurt. They are honest about how they perceive each other in the relationship and can be trusted to keep confidential what is shared. They know that when they do things together socially, they will have a good time. There is also the expectation that a friendship, if it is a good one, should not end. Both parties should be willing to do what is necessary to remove any barriers to its continuation. She placed a high value on friendships in her life which were longstanding even though the quality of the relationship was less than that of others of shorter duration.

In her relationships the subject was keenly aware of occasions when

a friend failed to meet these expectations and remembered them long after they had passed. She was able to relate in detail such occasions even though some had happened years ago. She was also aware of her own efforts to live up to these expectations. She told of being available to her friends even in the middle of the night and of occasions when she had disrupted her personal life even to the extent of affecting her marriage.

Her concept of friendship as described above is based on what she has experienced in a number of friendships, since early adolescence, which have ended. The most significant is a friendship of ten years which has deteriorated over the last two years to the point of almost complete withdrawal from each other with anger and hurt feelings on both sides. Throughout the relationship there were good and bad times. The good times were very good; they had fun, took vacations together and talked about everything. They also had bad times when they fought about stupid things which never were talked about openly. However, until recently the good times always made up for the bad times. The subject has had difficulty with her friend's increasing withdrawal; she no longer knows her friend's problems or how she is thinking or feeling and the last few times they have been together conversation has been strained. She has tried to help her friend in a number of ways but has been hurt and frustrated by her friend's continuing withdrawal and lack of reciprocation or thoughtfulness. "I've had it where I've called somebody over and over and over again and sort of realized that I wasn't getting any calls back. It was always to their convenience that I did all the work. I said, 'Forget it. I'm obviously working too hard at something that doesn't want to be.'" However, she also feels that "it's been a friendship of ten years and I don't want to throw ten years away. I've

put up with a lot of things through the ten years that maybe a lot of people would never do and I've always hoped she'd realize the different things she's done." In order for the friendship to be renewed it was necessary for her friend to recognize her own inadequacies in the relationship as well as appreciate the subject's patient and generous efforts to improve it.

The subject's closest friend at present is a female, 23 years old, single with no children. They have been friends for approximately eight months. They are in close contact with each other, talking on the phone daily and doing social activities together, sometimes spontaneously. She values highly this aspect of the relationship. She appreciates her friend's honesty and willingness to share herself. Because of this she has come to know her friend very well and feels the freedom to discuss her perceptions of her friend and their relationship.

Difficulties in the friendship tend to revolve around the fact that her friend has many personal problems with which she has burdened the subject, depending upon her for help and advice which when given is not acted upon. She has accepted and been overwhelmed by the role of helper and feels as if she is her friend's family. She is trying to curb her tendency to take care of her friend although she is prepared to help her in any way. A related difficulty is that she does not feel that she can confide in her friend or ask for help from her. Her reasons for this are that her friend has too many problems of her own and that she does not fully trust her not to tell anyone about what they discuss.

The most disappointing aspect of her friendships has been that although she has made herself available as a source of support during problems, she has not felt that her friends have done this for her. "A

full out deep friendship would be to be able to confide in somebody and know that you can turn to them at any time...I've never really had that feeling with anybody that I could do that."

Subject 2

This subject is a female, 30 years old, married with no children. For her, friendship is a warm, comfortable, easygoing relationship in which the partners feel free to talk easily and spontaneously with each other. The most important functions of a good friendship is as a dependable source of emotional support. With a good friend "you always know the person is there. You don't have to talk to them all the time—just to know they're there." There is a sense of security in knowing that the other is loyal and available whenever needed.

An important part of friendship for this subject was being able to trust that the other is genuine and honest. That is, a good friend does not gossip, her interest and willingness to listen and help are not simply a hypocritical act to be nice, her happiness does not mask concerns which she is unwilling to share. This ensures that one is not deceived about how one is viewed by the friend and that one will not be hurt or taken advantage of.

Ideally, friendship is a relationship in which the partners are totally accepting of each other. This would mean that they could be completely honest with each other without having to plan or censor their thoughts, knowing that they will not be rejected. It would also mean not being upset on the occasions when the other does not do what one was depending upon her for. For this subject the difficult aspects stemmed

from a less than total acceptance of each other. The major difficulty
was knowing where to draw the line between things which if said might
hurt the friend's feelings or strain the relationship and things which if
left unsaid make oneself feel uncomfortable and somewhat dishonest. "I
wouldn't want to be real judgmental 'cause it would probably really hurt
her feelings. I guess that's also important, is a person who doesn't
hurt the other person's feelings. Well, it's kind of touchy there.
Isn't it? You can say some things, but then some things you can't say.
But I guess if it's a real good friend then I guess you should be able to
say anything knowing that they still accept you even though you said
that." Another difficulty is dealing with one's feelings of hurt when
the other does not meet one's expectations.

The subject enjoys people and has a number of relationships which
she considers good friendships. She requires little of those who would
be her friends—only that they take the time to talk to her, are
friendly, warm and open. She said that she intuitively senses whether
or not a people are being genuine.

Her closest friend is a female, 30 years old, married with two
young children. They have known each other for about fifteen years.
Because they live in different cities they see each other about twice a
year but have contact by phone approximately once a month. She
described her friend as "honest and warm and reliable, responsible and
willing to give you a hand in anything." "It's quite a happy
relationship...it's a very pleasant, positive feeling that I get when I
see her." She said that they are more alike in their personalities than
their interests and their relationship is more one of providing support
for each other than of doing activities together.

There are few difficulties in the relationship itself because they see each other infrequently. In fact, the most negative aspect of the relationship is that the subject does not see her friend as often as she would like. There is also an issue regarding her feelings about her friend's husband which she does not feel free to discuss fully with her. Otherwise, she sees her friend as "pretty well a perfect person. I can see hardly anything negative or wrong with her or our relationship."

Subject 3

This subject is a female, 26 years old, married with no children. For her, the main purpose of friendship is companionship. Friends are a security against loneliness, depression and withdrawal, an enjoyable companion for doing activities with and a source of emotional support in times of trouble. "I just need to know someone is there when I really need them, when you're happy, when you're sad, when you want to do something...when I do get into one of these mental ruts I know that there's someone I can call up and do something or talk about something different." She termed a good friend a "jack of all trades."

She described the relationship as one in which there is freedom to be one's self without the restraints which characterize most other relationships as well as an expectation that they will understand and accept each other just as they are. Although she said that there are no expectations or roles that one feels obligated to live up to, she does expect to be able to honestly share her thoughts and feelings without fear of rejection. For example, "If they're close friends then you have the right to get angry at them...and they still love you as a friend."

The most difficult aspect of friendship, according to this subject, is the disappointment felt when one's friend is not available when needed or when she does not do what one had expected.

This subject has lived in several different cities in the past few years and has cultivated at least one very close friend in each place. Because she has so often been in the position of having to make friends she has become very sensitive as to who is open in this way. "I can tell instantaneously whether that person wants to be my friend or not." The first quality she looks for is the willingness to relate person to person rather than according to a particular role. Other important qualities are similar beliefs and common interests. She also placed importance on her friend being female because being the same sex makes for greater understanding of some aspects of each other's lives.

This subject's best friend is female, 26 years old, single with no children. They have known each other for approximately nine years. They met during their last year of high school and worked together for a few months. Since they they have not lived close to each other. At present they get together once or twice a year and keep in touch by letter. The most important aspect of the relationship is its longstanding character. They have cultivated a closeness which is based on a sense of history. They know what each other has been and done in the past which has led to who they are in the present. There are memories and good feelings which go along with this as well as a sense of understanding who the other really is as a person. She described the relationship as follows:

> I would think of her almost like a sister....It's almost like a love I think. She's like a sister --I wouldn't want to lose contact with my sister.

> I almost feel as close to her as I do to my
> husband. I would think she's my closest friend.
> I have other close friends that I don't think I
> have [had] the time to get to know them as well.

Another aspect of the relationship which she values is the way in which they complement each other by their differences. It is almost as if there is something in the other's life which is missing in one's own. She is intrigued by her friend's exciting and unusual lifestyle. On the other hand she feels that she herself offers a stability which is missing in her friend's life.

The only negative aspect to the relationship, apart from her friend's occasional annoying habits, is the infrequency of contact; her friend is not always available when she would like to see her. However, she has found that since her marriage her need for her friend is not as great because her husband provides companionship.

Subject 4

This subject is a female, 28 years old, divorced with no children. She was enthusiastic in her support of friendship and clear and decisive in her ideas as to what it involved. For her, a good friendship is a place of rest and peacefulness where the partners can relax and be themselves. It is characterized by understanding of the kind of person each other is, honesty and closeness. There is no sense of competition or hostility even when disagreeing and there is the liberty "to be cruel in order to be kind" knowing that the other will understand. She described it as follows:

> I think my idea of friends—it has to be a really
> easy flow. I sort of would like to symbolize it
> by saying that a nice walk in the fall among the
> leaves and nobody's talking but you've got that
> nice feeling of being close. But that's simple,
> like really simple; no arguments, no fights. We're
> friends; we're here to share things, to disagree,
> to discuss, but we're not here to fight.

She placed emphasis on the importance, between close friends, of similarity in their ways of thinking and of evaluating situations, in the qualities they value in people and relationships, and in the kinds of activities they like to do. The depth of understanding and closeness which develops depends upon the extent to which they are similar and is the basis for the relaxed, easy flow between them. The differences, occuring in less important areas, are valued for the part they play in broadening her perspective and her experiences.

She said the major difficulty involved in a close friendship is the energy required to maintain it. There are occasional clashes of personality or opinion and times when the other will not do what was expected and they must work at understanding each other, coming to compromises and realizing that they will not get what they would like from the relationship all the time.

For this subject there are many different kinds of friends. They differ in the extent to which they understand and can share themselves with each other. She enjoys others and would prefer to establish some type of friendly relationship with most people. However, she has definite criteria by which she chooses and rejects friends. She will no establish a friendship with those who try to impress her or put her down or who talk about her to others rather than to her face. However, there is also the possibility that if she doesn't like what they have to say,

"then we can't be friends." "I like to take people individually. Show me what you have. If I like it I'll go for it; if I don't then it was real nice meeting you, but acquaintances is all we'll be."

This subject's closest friend is female, 29 years old, single with no children. They have been friends for eight months although they have been acquaintances for several years. The friendship began at the subject's initiative some time after separating from her husband. They see each other socially at least twice a week and have some type of contact approximately every other day. They do many things together and what they don't share they tell each other about. She said that this friend is the one who "best knows the deep, inner part of me." She appreciates her friend's courage to discuss the negative as well as the positive aspects of their relationship and her knowledge in areas in which their different personalities complement each other.

They are aware that each has needs which the other cannot fulfill and have tried to guard against becoming overly dependent upon each other. They have discussed and agreed upon their expectations of each other which will allow each to have their needs met as fully as possible. For example, although they have established a regular pattern of social contact, they realize that each may occasionally want to cancel a previously made arrangement in favour of spending time with someone else. In such a case they ask for enough notice to make their own alternate plans. The only difficulty in the relationship is the anticipated problem of making adjustments when their circumstances change such as when one of them finds a steady boy friend, gets married or moves out of town.

Analysis

In the accounts of friendship of Subjects 1, 2, 3 and 4 there were some commonalities.

The most evident was a predominantly egocentric point of view, that is, an ability to clearly perceive the relationship only from one's own perspective. Although they verbalized and intellectually accepted friendship as a reciprocal relationship, their subjective experience and understanding of it were based only on how well it did or did not meet their own needs. They did not have an emotional understanding of the friend's experience of the relationship. This point of view was seen in the subjects' global attitudes towards friendship. It was conceptualized as comfortable, easygoing and spontaneous, a place to relax and be oneself. It was seen as a relationship in which there was freedom from problems, restrictions and obligations. Ideally it was a relationship at which one didn't have to work, yet well suited to meeting one's needs. For the closest friendships of Subjects 1 and 4 this was in the context of the needs of daily life. For those of Subjects 2 and 3 it was in a broader context removed from that of daily life. Their best friends, whom they saw infrequently, were ideally suited to providing support and sympathy because there was no opportunity for the problems of daily contact to arise.

This tendency to emphasize the positive aspects of friendship while having little awareness of its responsibilities is shown in the subjects' views of honesty. An important attribute of friendship, it was seen as a liberty to speak and act as one wanted without having to worry about consequences. The responsibility was with the friend to be

sufficiently accepting. This is most clearly shown in a statement by Subject 3 - "If they're really close friends then you have the right to get angry at them...and they still love you as a friend." Subject 2 was uncomfortable with the thought that her honesty might hurt her friend's feelings yet felt hypocritical if she kept negative thoughts to herself. She was cautious about what she said in such situations, but found this a disadvantage of the relationship. The ideal situation, though unlikely, was for more acceptance on the part of her friend. "If it's a real good friend then I guess you should be able to say anything knowing that they still accept you even though you said that." She also thought it was important for her friend to be honest with her although she saw this more as something her friend should be responsible to provide rather than as something she, by her own behaviour, could call forth from her friend. In Subject 1's case, there was a tendency to assign a different meaning to honesty for herself as compared with her friend. In reference to her friend it was seen as the act of sharing her personal problems. In reference to herself it meant giving her opinion when asked for it. "We are very open. At times she asks me for my opinions and I give them to her and hit her between the eyes." In this context, her statement that their friendship is "a really deep one because I know her so well," highlights her tendency to view it only from her perspective.

The subjects had expectations of their friends, some of which they brought to their relationships and some which developed as they learned to rely on their friends in certain ways. They seemed to base their expectations on the attitude that they deserved to be treated in certain ways and tended to take them for granted as rights. Situations in which

their expectations were not met were generally considered to be the difficult aspects of friendship. When this happened, there was a tendency to find fault with the other. This is most clearly seen with Subjects 1 and 4. Subject 4 was very clear about the qualities she thought important in a good friend and excused herself from relationships which showed little potential by finding fault with the other person. "I'm going to give you a chance to get it straight because I like you enough, but if not, then I'm sorry; we can't be friends." Subject 1 was not able to share her concerns with her best friend because "of her having so many problems". Thus, she not only put the blame on her friend but made herself appear to be an especially good friend by her "kindness" and avoided the risk of being vulnerable in the relationship. The unexpected end of a friendship was reasoned as being due to the other's shortcomings. "It went down the tubes because she became jealous of me." Subjects 2 and 3 were less willing to directly blame the other. When their friends did not come through at a time when they were depending upon them, their reaction was disappointment based on a sense of having been let down. In anticipation of a number of such occasions Subject 2 showed a greater readiness to doubt the friend than to examine her expectations. "Just a few instances wouldn't upset me, but if it went on then I would start to question that relationship."

The subjects showed few signs of reflection on their behaviour. In general they were either unable to see or did not consider the possibility that they may have played a part in causing the difficulties they encountered although they occasionally, but not seriously, entertained such thoughts. For example, Subject 1 wondered, "Maybe I think I'm a martyr and maybe I'm the one in the wrong too a lot of

times. Maybe I'm expecting too much." However, it was fleeting and quickly followed by a sense of having been wronged. Their emotional reactions were feelings of disillusionment or disappointment which did not include a sadness concerning their own behaviour. The greatest evidence of self-reflection was shown by Subject 2 in her concern over the fact that she was not as accepting of her friends as she could be when they didn't do as she expected they would.

In their efforts to help their friends some of the subjects tended to focus more on their own needs than on a sensitive perception of those of their friends. For instance, Subject 1 helped in an almost zealous manner to her friends but it was with the expectation that they would recognize and appreciate her generosity and patience. When instead they withdrew, perhaps feeling an uncomfortable obligation to her, she wondered, "Why couldn't she put herself on my side of the fence for a change." She did not realize that she had not done that for her friend. In this light it is interesting to note that her best friend at present has many problems and depends heavily upon her. Subject 4 gave her opinions and advice in order to help her friends feel better about themselves. Although there may have been benefit in this form from the friend's perspective, its underlying purpose was to ensure that her friends were people whose companionship she would enjoy. "If she doesn't feel good about herself, feels that I am better than her in whatever way then...you get this imbalance and I think it's hard to have a really honest, closeness good time together."

These subjects emphasized the importance of a good friend having similar beliefs and interests. The main reason for this was to minimize potential difficulties. With the exception of Subject 1, areas of

disagreement or confrontation tended not to be of major importance--
habits, taste in clothes, preferred location for an activity. It seems
that disagreements on a larger scale either ended friendships (Subjects
1 and 4) or put the subject in a position of having to decide whether or
not to discuss it, as in the case of Subject 2's dislike of her friend's
husband.

In the above analysis are found some of the dynamisms which occur
at a developmental level of I-II. External conflict is shown in the
tendency to find fault outside oneself when difficulties arise without
reflecting on one's own behaviour and its consequences. The sense of
commonality with others is based on similar interests and is lessened
when there is conflict in the relationship. There is some evidence of
rigid thinking with a low tolerance for conflict. For example,
friendships are structured according to certain expectations; they are
good or bad and friends are liked or disliked according to how well they
fit into the structure. The sources of motivation for one's behaviour
are primitive drives and instincts as shown by the egocentric
perspective. The clearest sign of movement toward Level II is found in
Subject 2. She showed some hesitation and confusion regarding
conflicting courses of action in her inability to decide whether it was
best to be totally honest with her friend or to refrain from hurting her
feelings.

Level II-III

Level II-III is represented by Subjects 5 and 6. Although
characteristics of both Level II and Level III were present in the

questionnaire responses of both subjects, movement toward Level III was more strongly evident in Subject 6 than in Subject 5. The raters indicated that under pressure to change, Subject 6 would probably move upward whereas it was unclear what Subject 5 would do. Some of the Verbal Stimuli responses showed a tendency on the part of Subject 5 to be less aware of the potential for development inherent in difficult situations. For example, death was seen as "a tragedy" and "an end"; nervousness was related to situations in which he was "worried I'd make a fool of myself." To the item "great sadness" he told of a situation in which he was surrounded by poverty, realizing he could do little about it. His response was to retreat to a lower level of behaviour by "watching myself grow calloused toward the situation in order to protect my sanity. In contrast, Subject 6 saw death not only as "a painful letting go of the past" but also as "a frightening embrace of the future - or if prepared for the death - an exciting embrace of the future." Similarly nervousness was seen as "that which could be translated into excitement...if leaned into - can be the beginning of new growth."

Subject 5

This subject is a male, 35 years old, single with no children.

There are two major aspects to this subject's concept of friendship. The first is its quality of being a secure, nurturant environment in which one can relax and grow, away from the frustrations of the world. He described it as "sort of a comfortable, warm area in your life to go to...Friends tend to provide sort of a blanket for you." One comes to trust that a friend's care is genuine and there is a

growing sense of not having to question the underlying intent of the other's behaviour. One feels free to talk about difficult issues, to express what is experimental or formative within oneself and thereby to grow.

> A friend is a person I can be open with and feel
> that my openness doesn't mean I'm getting judged
> but there's a receptiveness to listen and concern
> to listen. They realize that I am an individual
> and one who's sharing with them but one also who
> has their own ideas, direction they're going and
> that I want to grow as a person within that
> friendship and we offer each other our support,
> concern and a willingness to share in those kinds
> of endeavours.

He emphasized the importance of similar interests and cultural background, feeling that such similarity lessened the possibility of misunderstanding and increased trust between friends.

The second aspect of friendship involved the responsibility of providing the same secure and nurturant environment for one's friend. It includes a responsibility to live one's values within the relationship. For example, "If I talk about trust and that's all I do is talk about it and I don't provide the opportunity to express it, to live it, then I don't have a friendship." One accepts the responsibility of supporting the other in times of need, of being honest about each other's faults when appropriate and in a way which is supportive, and of working out compromises in areas in which they are incompatible.

These two aspects reflect this subject's idea of friendship as a balance over the long term of giving and receiving based on a mutual concern for each other rather than on the expectation of benefit.

The difficult aspects of friendship were related to situations in which the balance was lost. "If in a friendship relationship someone is always putting themselves out for the other person and there isn't that concept of sharing then at a certain point I think that friendship begins to dissolve because it is too onesided." He tended to become frustrated when, over a long period of time, the other was in much need of support or he was in the awkward position of feeling a desire to support the other in whatever he did, yet not feeling free to discuss his reservations about his friend's behaviour. Another difficulty is related to his acceptance that over time people change and grow. There is the risk then, of having to admit that one is growing away from one's friend or of having to change the basis of the friendship. However, if the relationship is perceived as meaningful and lasting it is easier to flow with the rough times and believe that it will survive them.

This subject has a number of different kinds of friendships which serve different functions and meet different needs. He has friends with whom he discusses personal issues, other friends with whom he shares frustrations and problems and still others whom he sees on a casual social basis. Ideally a friend would serve all functions. However, he thought it unlikely that any particular friendship would have this potential and was satisfied with his present situation.

His closest friend is a male in his mid-thirties, married with no children. They have known each other for 17 years, ever since they met at university. They roomed together for a year and travelled together for six months. In recent years they have seen each other two or three times a year, never write and have contact by phone infrequently. Despite this he feels a bond between them. It is very much a

"comfortable, warm area" in his life for they do not share the abrupt fluctuations and daily frustrations of their lives. It is rather a "mutual reflection on our lives" where they gain a new perspective on the patterns and directions of their lives and a sense of their own and each other's growth. He stated that because they are in touch with each other's core as a person, changes and increasing differences on more superficial levels are readily accepted. There is a sense of the history of the relationship as well as a deep, unspoken assurance that it will continue. The only possible negative aspect of the relationship is the infrequency with which they see each other. However, he was aware that with significantly greater contact the basic nature and function of the relationship would be affected.

Subject 6

This subject is a female, 36 years old, married with two young children. For her a close friendship is a caring, long term, mutual commitment between two people who feel connected at the deepest, most valued level of their lives.

She has found that in her important friendships there has been from the beginning, an intuitive sense of being connected on a spiritual level. They discovered that they shared a similar faith in God and a desire to explore their relationship with Him in meaningful ways. As the friendships developed they realized how much alike they were on a number of level. She is aware of how they are uniquely able to help each other grow and wonders if it was a bond on an unconscious level that brought them together. "I have a feeling that our being together is

directly related to unconscious issues within us...I don't think it was coincidence I think we knew it on a psychic level or an intuitive level and that we could use each other to work through some of these things."

The relationships are built upon a desire to travel the road of personal and spiritual growth together. "We have a desire to go to deep places to explore our faith in God...It's exciting to be around people who are wanting to think like that and explore and risk and trust." There is a commitment to developing a deeper, more caring relationship where each can risk revealing personal issues and help each other work them through. She emphasized that friendship is intentional, "developed by conscious choice and effort on both our parts...It isn't something that just happens I don't think; you really have to want to create it."

She mentioned a number of ways in which her commitment to her friends has been tested. For instance, she has difficulty tolerating behaviour by the other which is not considered growth oriented and when personal issues are avoided, or when one partner is unable to give much to the relationship there is a feeling of distance between them. "There's only so far you can support people when they're going through pain, and they still feel pain. And that caused some distance for a period of time where we weren't having any fun together because of the heaviness around." There have also been times when she has questioned the worth of pursuing a relationship both because of her negative reactions to difficulties and because as people grow, their interests and needs change. With one friend, a married man, she has had to deal with her angry and judgmental attitude towards him when he had an affair. With her closest friend she has had to overcome her fear of intimacy and her tendency to withdraw when they started to become close.

There are several factors which have helped the subject in dealing with such situations. An ability to understand them from the other's point of view has helped in accepting the other and in ignoring his negative behaviour. An acceptance of themselves has given them the courage to be honest about their own problems and to risk dealing with them in the relationship. Her feelings about this issue are summed up in the following quote.

> There is the knowledge of the caring and all that
> we've been through in the past and what we've had
> is unique to anything in our past lives. And I
> think friendship is intentional. And so even
> through the rough times you can rely on what's
> been strong in the past to carry you through...
> we'd discover that the risking was worth it because
> at the bottom line we had a pretty firm trust in us.

Although such times as these could be difficult, they were not considered negative aspects of the relationships but rather an integral part of the growth process. She thought that perhaps, in an ideal friendship, if there was total acceptance of each other, the difficult times would be lessened. The only negative aspect of friendship is the deliberate effort involved in making time to see each other. Since they are busy people it requires structuring their time closely.

This subject and her husband and five friends have evolved into a family group. Although they relate individually and she is closer to some members than others, they have committed themselves to grow together as a group. The group has been in existence for four years. They get together at least twice a month as a group and the subject sees the members individually about twice a week. They are involved in each other's lives on a number of levels from the spiritual and personal to the mundane and practical, from crises to fun activities. However, they

also lead very separate lives and find that their differences enhance rather than hinder their relationships.

She has known her closest friend, a member of the group, for six years. She is in her mid-thirties, married and has two young children. They are alike in many ways including interests, circumstances, past occupations, parental upbringing and issues related to personal growth. They've created a relationship where they can work on these issues. "Being able to bring them out and talk about them has probably helped us risk being closer with each other than we have with anybody in our lives as female friends."

The friend who participated in the study, also a member of the group, is a female, 59 years old, married with one grown child. They have known each other for eight years. There is a sense between them of appreciating what they have together. For this subject it is a deeper kind of friendship than she has had at any other time or place in her life. That is has occurred at this point in her life she feels is a combination of being ready and looking for deeper relationships and having met these particular people with whom she wanted to do this. "In a lot of ways, maybe we're lucky we found each other and maybe, if there's anything to reincarnation, we were meant to find each other."

Analysis

There are some similarities in these two descriptions of friendship as well as some important differences.

One of the most apparent similarities is their view of friendship as a vehicle of personal growth for both partners, that is, as a

relationship which helped them to better themselves in ways which they felt were important. For Subject 5 this meant being able to reveal oneself in a nurturant and unrestricting atmosphere. "You feel more secure to open yourself...and so the friendship allows you, I think, to experiment which provides a potential for growth." For Subject 6 it meant working through personal issues and relationship problems which hindered their journey together toward spiritual maturity.

Both subjects showed an awareness that as a reciprocal relationship friendship involved a responsibility and a commitment to the other. For example, according to Subject 5, a crucial part of friendship was supporting another in a time of need even though it involved putting oneself out or doing something one would rather avoid. It is "the overriding thing which is that friendship which brings you to do it...You're doing it because of a concern for that person and not a direct concern for just yourself." Subject 6 was prepared to work hard to see her friendships develop which meant acknowledging that they were important and making the time for them. "Working hard means structuring something I guess...And all wanting to do it, not 'cause we should or whatever but we're there because we want to do that sort of thing."

For these subjects, difficult times were an expected part of friendship. Subject 5 said that there were occasions "when you'd just as soon hit somebody or some frustration is there." For Subject 6 "being close to people who are projections of your own disowned self, it's not going to be any picnic some of the time as you greet those issues." Their difficulties were related to similar situations. Both had difficulty accepting their friends when they behaved in ways which the subject did not consider healthy. Their tendency was to become

impatient, showing frustration or being judgmental. A lack of balance of giving and receiving over the long term was felt as being detrimental to the relationship. Both were aware that as the partners change there is the possibility that they might grow apart; there was no guarantee that friendship would be permanent.

Although the subjects were agreed as to the purpose, responsibilities and difficulties of friendship they differed in other ways. For example, Subject 6 showed a greater acceptance of herself and of the difficulties and a greater openness to change in both herself and the relationship. She looked upon the difficult times as an integral part of the relationship; in some ways they were the relationship. She did not spend time and energy wishing that they didn't occur or hoping to avoid them. In fact, she did not consider them in a negative sense but rather as the available means for developing intimacy. "You can say, 'Oh, to heck with this.' On the other hand I mean that's life. There's always a give and a take and times of one giving more than another. The moments of mutuality are more precious because of that." She was not afraid of facing and working through relationship problems because "there's nothing to lose in confronting whatever's happening." This is shown in her relationship with her closest friend in which a number of personal issues have arisen and been discussed and have resulted in greater intimacy. She also showed a willingness to face her own negative qualities. "As I accept myself and whatever I do that might hurt my friend or avoid my friend—as I accept those negative feelings in myself it's easier to express them (i.e. talk about them), know they'll be acceptable." She has learned to look at her own behaviour when problems occur and to make changes there instead of blaming the other. In the

case of her friend who had an affair she had great difficulty in not being angry and judgmental. However, she realized that although she did not condone his actions her lack of acceptance was her problem rather than his. "When I personally was feeling really angry at him I think what he was doing was bringing forth a lot of issues for me." She found that "the growth that everybody experienced in working through that with X was important for all of us and him."

With Subject 5 there was less of an openness to change in relationships or in himself and more of a tendency to cling to what was good in them. Although he expected problems and frustrations, ideally friendship was a relationship were they should be relatively scarce. Their occurrence, rather than being accepted as the means of developing the relationship, was seen as a hindrance or possible threat to it. This is shown in the following quote:

> There's a growth of that friendship until you feel
> secure in it. I think up to that point there's
> probably more frustration because in that period
> there may be periods more of doubt...There's
> demands in terms of time, in terms of priorities...
> If it becomes so unbalanced that the negative
> was predominant then probably you would grow away
> from seeing that as a friendship.

He was also less active and less effective in dealing with difficulties. This is shown in one friendship in which a large portion was often fruitlessly spent in discussing his friend's problems. Although he did not blame his friend for the situation, neither did he view it as one which could be affected by a change in his own behaviour. His response was frustration at his friend's self-deprecatory behaviour, at not seeing a means of dealing with the situation, and anxiety about the effect of the lack of balance on the future of the relationship.

Although he intellectually accepted that friends could grow apart he found the possibility a source of insecurity. "You may have seen them as a friend for certain things and if things change then are you still friends? And so if you want to keep them it's more secure to keep things the same." Not surprisingly the value of his closest friendship was based more on the opportunity for discussion of their separate lives with a caring yet relatively uninvolved listener than on the opportunity to overcome difficulties in the development of the relationship and themselves.

Some of the dynamisms characteristic of Level II-III are present in the above accounts of friendship. For example, for both subjects conflict was predominantly external. Subject 5 responded to difficulties as hindrances to his friendships coming from a source outside himself. There was minimal internal conflict although he had an intellectual awareness of the possibility of his having shortcomings in the relationship. Subject 6 initially responded to difficulties with impatience or by withdrawing from her friend. Upon realization of her own problem in the situation the conflict became somewhat internalized with a focus on changing her own behaviour. However, there was little evidence of feelings of shame or guilt or of dissatisfaction with herself, dynamisms which intensify internal conflict and are characteristic of Level III.

Ambivalence and ambitendencies, the major dynamisms of Level II are most clearly seen in Subject 5—in his desire to grow yet to hang onto friendship as it is; in his desire to be understanding and supportive of his friend yet his frustration with his behaviour. The result was a feeling of inability to influence a change in the relationship.

Subject 6 showed indications of some Level III dynamisms. For example, the creative instinct is expressed by her search for true spiritual values, her need to live them in her friendships, her almost active welcoming of the struggles which this entailed, and the focus on transcending the present level. There was an exclusiveness in her friendships reflected in her feeling that perhaps they were "meant to be" and that they were uniquely able to help each other develop. Although Subject 5 expressed an interest in personal growth this instinct was not as developed in him as shown by his tendency to avoid rather than jump into the opportunities which his friendships offered.

In summary, both subjects exhibited some of the dynamisms of Level II-III; those representative of Level III were more strongly shown in Subject 6. This supports the distinction made in the Verbal Stimuli test which suggested that Subject 6 was closer to Level III in development than Subject 5.

Level III

Level III is represented by Subject 7.

Subject 7

This subject is a male, 25 years old, single with no dependents.

For this subject there are different levels of friendship, varying in intimacy and each being important in its own way. The most intimate friendship is characterized by a spiritual connection and a deep acceptance of, caring for and commitment to the other person. Such

friends are rare and could be called spirit friends or kindred spirits.
Very special friendships incorporate almost all levels of intimacy.

For him, the spiritual connectedness between two friends is a
feeling an understanding or bond or commonality occuring on a level
deeper than personality characteristics, interests or lifestyles. Its
development is in some way related to having similar basic values such as
beliefs regarding the worth of people, what is important in life, how one
finds meaning and whether one has an appreciation of the spiritual side
of man. Such friends are like fellow travellers who are striving toward
similar goals and are guided by similar values. Each person's search,
however, is individual, taking him on his own journey with his own
experiences.

Friendship is also characterized by intimacy. This includes
feeling what the other is feeling; for example "being with the other
while they are disintegrating and experiencing it." It includes
commitment, a sense of "at some level really being for this person." It
also includes honesty and openness--letting each other know who they
really are, taking risks and confronting--but only as an outgrowth of
their caring, not as an end in itself. There is "enough trust and enough
knowledge of each other, genuine caring, that there's freedom for
honesty, even if at times it's difficult." It is through their intimacy
with each other that the spiritual connection is felt even though they
maybe very different people on other levels. "Because they allow
themselves to be human, to be real, to be vulnerable, even though their
experience and their journey may not be the same, there is a
commonality." He viewed it as an example of that which is the most
personal also being that which is the most universal.

A quality which this subject values in a friendship is an ability to share a number of different aspects of their lives and personalities and to relate on a number of levels of intimacy. Having some familiarity to the theory of positive disintegration, he referred to such friends as "multi-level friends."

> There's some very special friendships that I think
> bring a lot of those things together...We can at
> times be very frivolous, very childlike, just
> enjoy, have fun....You can go out and have a good
> time; you can sit down and have an interesting
> discussion about something and you can also at
> other times have a very deep personal exchange.
> And I really like that. It's like some people or
> some friends are there almost all the time sort
> of in one role or interact with me almost all
> the time in one role whereas some other people
> we share almost all, or a lot of different aspects
> of our lives and our persons. And I think they're
> much more balanced.

There are difficulties in friendship which are expected as part of the process of achieving intimacy. "If there's trust and honesty there, it's not going to be pleasant and easygoing 100 percent of the time." He said that there may be more hurts and difficult times in more intimate friendships but that they are also the most worthwhile. The difficulties which he encountered included negative reactions to each other's faults and differences and a tendency to forget that people change and grow. This has resulted in clashes of personality and lifestyle and in difficulties adjusting to changes in each other which have had to be confronted and worked through. He disliked intensely these conflicts, saying of one friendship, "Because we have to work so hard at being friends sometimes there's more hassle. Like I don't enjoy the confrontation and the crud that goes along with it." However, he did wish to avoid these situations even though they were difficult; dealing

with them was seen as an expression of caring about the relationship. Of his closest friends he said, "I see in them something which I really appreciate and that's the courage to both care and confront."

In an intimate friendship each person is an integral part of the life of the other, preferably on a day to day basis. They can be easily available to each other when needed although each has his own life and responsibilities. They do not abuse this availability, having the freedom to make known not only their need of the other but also the need to pursue separate aspects of their lives. Although there is the desire to see each other frequently, the relationship is such that it can weather infrequent contact. When the two get together they can quickly re-establish a depth of relating even though both partners may have changed.

According to this subject, friendship has as its motive a desire to give rather than to receive. There is a greater awareness of the other's needs than of one's own. In fact, in establishing friendships, if one is looking for them because of a need for intimate contact, they are less likely to develop than if one does not have this intention.

This subject has three friends whom he considers very good friends. Of the three the closest is a male, married, whom he has known for approximately six years. The friend contacted in regard to the study was a female, age 29, single with no dependents. She lives in another city and they see each other approximately six times a year. They have been friends to each other in many different ways from doing fun things together to being with each other through difficult times and hurts. They n some ways spirit friends and "fellow travellers". They share some common interests as well as having divergent ones. Some of their

important values are the same although their personal and life styles are quite different. Because their styles sometimes clash, they have had to work harder at being friends than others who are more similar. For example, an issue which they have had to deal with is his feeling of ben[manipulated when she becomes angry with him for not meeting expectations which he did not know she had of him. However, they have cared enough to discuss their problem honestly and without blame.

Analysis

The most outstanding aspect of this account of friendship is the caring for the other which the subject expressed in intimacy and in an awareness of the other's uniqueness and separateness from himself. The intimacy is shown in his knowing of the other based on an experience of him rather than on an intellectual conception or expectation of him. He shared in the other's interests and activities, felt what he was feeling emotionally, and experienced a connection with him on a spiritual level. It is shown in his awareness that the motivation in friendship, even in its imitation is to give rather than to have something in oneself fulfilled. "Rather than needing each other maybe it's that they both give to each other." His awareness of the other as unique is shown in his appreciation of the other's differentnes[from himself and his refusal to assure similarity where it was not warranted. "Even though we may see ourselves as going after the same goals, it's different for each...We may not be going about it the same way or experiencing, understanding it in the same way. For everyone it's different because everyone is separate." It is also shown in his appreciation of the

freedomo[feeling obligated to comply with every request made of him by the other. Although he was easily available to the other, he said that at any given time the question was, "Available for what?" He was free to respond according to the need which at the time was greatest, whether it be his, the other's or perhaps a third person's.

The high value he placed on caring for the other is also shown in his attitude towards honesty and confrontation. For him it was the caring which gave the freedom for honesty and the courage for confrontation. In its more general form as a belief in the worth of people, it contributed to the sense of spiritual commonality between himself and the other. In fact, he seemed to see it as an underlying motivation for all behaviour in the relationship.

His strong dislike of the difficulties of friendship seemed to be based on the fact that they were occasions when the caring was diminished. An example is his reaction of frustration regarding the issue of feeling manipulated by one of his friends. His dislike seemed not to be based so much on having to deal with these issues, for he appreciated being confronted when necessary, but more a dislike of the qualities within himself and the other which resulted in the difficulties.

An interesting aspect of this account was the hesitant nature in which it was expressed. The subject put forth his views and tentative ideas rather than as facts, basing them on his experiences of friendship and occasionally returning to a previously discussed point to add to or clarify the meaning. The following is one of many comments which illustrate this. "At a very deep, personal level and sharing with some people there's a commonality. I'm not sure what that is. Maybe there's

not but it feels like there is anyway." The overall impression they gave was that his concept of friendship was in the process of development.

There was some dynamisms of Level III shown in this account of friendship. One of these is empathy which is reflected in the subject's understanding and acceptance of the other as a unique person. There is evidence of a developing hierarchy of values shown in the high value he places on the worth of people and on caring for the other in the relationship. Contrasted with this is his dissatisfaction with the aspects in his own nature which were in opposition to these values and with behaviour in the relationship which did not manifest them. This is an example of the conflict between what is and what should be which is characteristic of the third level.

There are some indications of movement towards Level IV. For instance, the degree of clarification of the emerging hierarchy of values is suggestive of one for whom the conflict between what is and what ought to be was as much a working out of what ought to be in place of what is, as a struggle to decide what should be. Also, the hierarchy of values was becoming more universal and less individual in scope, reflecting an awareness of the worth of all people rather than of only particular individuals. Thus, his ability to refuse the request of a friend if it meant helping another in greater need.

Level IV

This level is represented by Subject 8.

Subject 8

This subject is a 71 year old woman, widowed, with two grown children. For her friendship "is a rare and beautiful experience." According to her, "I can have many happy acquaintances but very few special friends."

The unique and highly valued place in her life of a special friendship is illustrated in the following way. She described herself as a fairly private and cautious person who does not easily expose her feelings. However, with a special friend she can reveal the depth of her feelings and concerns, her innermost thoughts and her strengths and weaknesses.

> I have to know that I can confide in them, which
> doesn't happen too often, before I can really tell
> them anything that bothers me deeply. Or maybe I'm
> hurting and I don't want to tell anybody. If it's a
> real good friend I can do it. I don't think a
> person has many—if they're like me anyway—real good
> friends where they can just be truly themself.

She is also a very independent person, not naturally inclined to ask for help, although she thinks she could do so with a good friend. "I could do that with a special friend where I couldn't with the average person. For example, if I needed ten dollars and was desperate, I could ask for a little bit of money, or help with anything. But they would have to be special."

For her, friendship is based on a deep understanding of and love

for each other which allows them to know and to be known by each other. There is a freedom in realizing that the other is one who "knows all your faults and loves you just the same." The tendency to judge, criticize or blame is eliminated. "Mistakes you make that someone else might criticize you for, a good friend will try to understand why you did that--because they love you so much I supppose. And they're not going to be judgmental." They can also disagree or argue with each other knowing that it will not cause tension or anger. There is also a freedom in knowing that there is no fault or behaviour which the other would do which could cause one to withdraw from her. They like being with each other and so can have fun doing almost anything together. Boredom is nonexistent. They know that they would help and support each other in whatever way possible, although they do not abuse each other's willingness to do so. This is shown by the fact that this subject has never asked her good friend to do her a favour although she knows she could if her need was great. They can see in the way the other lives her life and deals with her own problems, an example for themselves and can draw strength from this. "You realize you're not the only one. They're handling it so you better smarten up too. You admire them and say, "If she can, I should be able to." You get strength from each other, a lot of strength.

Their love for each other is expressed not so much in words as in their actions and their manner of being, as illustrated in the following excerpt from the interview.

> It was a great feeling of deep friendship that we
> probably didn't put into words that much. 'I like
> you so much I want to do this for you,' is how you'd
> say it but you don't say it, you just do it. That's
> a thing about friendship I think is very important--
> you really want to do things for that person. It's
> not all take. You feel like giving to them. Not

just gifts but anything—not necessarily gifts at
all—but giving of yourself in many ways. If they're
in trouble you want to be there. Even if you don't
talk you want to be there to help them feel better.

The subject felt that there were few difficulties in a good
friendship. Although they may be aware of potentially annoying habits
and clearly perceive each other's faults they realize that these are not
very important and do not make an issue of them or become disillusioned
with each other. For example, she is bothered by sloppy people but
refuses to let this hinder a relationship by remembering the other's
positive qualities and by realizing that "this doesn't mean I'm any
better, it just means that we're different." She is aware that the
traits in the other with which she has difficulty may be those which
make the other a better person than herself. "Who's to say I'm not a
real bore and this person is a much greater person because they don't
fuss with things that don't matter." For her, the ability to "overlook
your faults because they think so much of you" is the test of a good
friendship.

This subject's closest friend is a 65 year old married woman with
three grown children. They have known each other since childhood and
grew up together. At present they live in different provinces, see each
other once or twice a year and have contact by phone or letter
infrequently. Her friend is treasured among all other friends and
acquaintances as a "special friend." She described their relationship as
follows.

...very special friend who I'm so comfortable with
that I can reveal myself, laugh with her, cry with
her or tell her my problems. We have the same
sense of humour so we enjoy each other a lot. We can
go places together and not be bored, we like to go
to the same places and we can discuss little family
things or things that are very personal. She's the

only person I can do that with.

Their friendship has deepened over the years as each has developed individually as a person, yet with a sense of having grown together. They are continually learning new things about each other thus increasing their love and understanding for each other. She appreciates her friend's flexibility of thinking and the fact that she is not curious abut the affairs of others and does not pry or gossip.

Of her friend's weaknesses she said, "I don't blame her for them at all. I just love her so much that I don't feel critical of her faults." She has no desire for her friend or the relationship to be different. "I like the kind of person [she is] and I wouldn't want [her] to change."

Analysis

This view of friendship is characterized by a focus on the other as one to whom one wants to give of oneself. There were two important ways of giving. The first was that of creating an environment in which the other could reveal who she was and become her best and most true self. The subject said that "a good friend makes you feel good about yourself—'gee, you're smart to do that', or they can give you credit." It was shown in her interested and uncritical attitude towards what she didn't understand in her friends. Her reaction was one of, "I wonder why she did that?" rather than of disgust or thinking her to be silly. The second way of giving was by trusting the other to meet the requirements for the maintenance of friendship in her own way rather than by placing expectations or demands upon her as to what she should

do. This is shown in her ability to look at her friend's shortcomings without disappointment and to see in them and the way the other handled her life, a strength and an example. Related to this is her strong personal sense of responsibility for her own life. She did not see her friend as in any way responsible for her as indicated by her tendency to be a somewhat private and independent person and "not much for asking for help."

In short, their giving was a privilege rather than an obligation and what was received was an unsought gift rather than something expected or deserved. Because they knew and loved each other well and were free to be their best self, they were uniquely able to meet each other's needs and what they gave to each other was of inestimable value.

There are some dynamisms of Level IV reflected in this account of friendship. One of them is the subject's ability to be objective and to critically evaluate herself yet also to experience uncritically the individuality of another. This is the antithesis of the egocentric point of view. It is shown in her negative evaluation of her tendency to be bothered by sloppiness and her ability to overcome it. She understood her friend's point of view on this issue to the extent of seeing in it something positive. It is also shown in her ability to distance herself from her tendency to form an immediate impression upon first meeting people. About this she said, "Some people I strongly dislike right away. I don't know why; I don't like myself for it and I don't think it's right." This awareness allowed her to appreciate the absence of this quality in others.

Although in her seventies, this subject was continuing in her personal development. She was open to new experiences and interested in

people different than herself, as expressed in her desire not to remain "in the same old rut and not change my thinking," and in her statement that "to be bored is foreign to me." There was a continual deepening over the years of her closest friendship. "You do develop from life and when we get together we find out things about each other that we didn't know before or maybe different things have happened to us. So in a way even that makes your friendship deeper because you've lived more and you feel more, you understand more...That is growing together even though you don't see each other much."

She showed a great deal of empathy for and discernment of others. In her closest friendship it is seen as a deep, enduring bond with another who has become irreplaceable in her life and whom she has come to know in her complexity. Her perceptiveness is shown in the fact that although she enjoyed people and tried "hard to understand people who think very different from myself," she was aware that those who view potential special friends were rare. The accuracy of her perceptions is borne out by the quality of her closest friendship.

Developmental Level of Friend

Level I-II

Subject 1.   Developmental level of closest friend was I-II.
Subject 2.   Developmental level of closest friend was I-II.
Subject 3.   Data on developmental level of a good friend was not available.
Subject 4.   Developmental level of closest friend was II-III.

Level II-III

Subject 5.   Data on the developmental level of a good friend
was not available.

Subject 6.   Developmental level of a good but not closest
friend was III-IV.

Level III

Subject 7.   Developmental level of a good but not closest
friend was III-IV.

Level IV

Subject 8.   Developmental level of closest friend was IV.

In all cases for which data was available, the friend was at the
same developmental level or not more than one level higher. For two of
the three cases in which the friend was at a higher level, this was not
the subject's closest friend. This information is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

COMPARISON OF DEVELOPMENTAL LEVELS OF SUBJECT AND FRIEND

	SUBJECT	FRIEND
#1	Level I-II	Level I-II
2	Level I-II	Level I-II
3	Level I-II	Not Available
4	Level I-II	Level II-III
5	Level II-III	Not Available
6	Level II-III	Level III-IV*
7	Level III	Level III-IV*
8	Level IV	Level IV

*This was a good friend but not the subject's closest friend.

Faces Test

The following data are the developmental levels of the persons when each subject most wanted to get to know (best liked) and least wanted to get to know (least liked) as well as the average developmental level of the five best liked and that of the five least liked people (average).

Level I-II

Subject 1.   Best liked - IV   Average - 3.6

These people were perceived as those with whom she thought she could feel comfortable; who were friendly, easy to get along with or accepting and fatherly.

Least liked - II   Average - 2.2

These people were perceived as untrustworthy, unfriendly or spiteful.

Subject 2.   Best Liked - IV   Average - 3.0

These people were perceived as warm, thoughtful, responsible and trustworthy.

Least liked - IV   Average - 2.2

These people were perceived as superficial, unfriendly or self-centered.

Subject 3.   Best liked - IV   Average - 4.0

These people were perceived as being warm, human, interested in others and interesting to be with.

Least liked - I   Average - 2.0

These people were perceived as superficial, selfish and closed to others.

Subject 4.   Best liked - IV   Average - 2.8

These people were perceived either as glamourous or as interesting.

Least liked - IV   Average - 2.6

These people were perceived as cold and unfriendly.

Level II-III

Subject 5.   Best liked - IV   Average - 3.0

These people were perceived as warm, genuine and open to experiencing life.

Least liked - I   Average - 2.4

These people were perceived as phoney, judgmental or unapproachable.

Subject 6.   Best liked - IV   Average - 3.4

These people were perceived as being wise and as having experienced life deeply.

Least liked - I   Average - 2.2

These people were perceived as phoney, unreal or distrustful and bitter.

Level III

Subject 7.   Best liked - II   Average - 2.8

These people were perceived as having depth, sensitivity, gentleness or as enjoying life.

Least liked - II   Average - 2.4

These people were perceived as phoney, superficial or as distant and unapproachable.

Level IV

Subject 8.   Best liked - IV   Average - 3.2

These people were perceived either as having experienced deeply and as

understanding life or as being in need of guidance and support.

<div align="center">Least liked - II   Average - 2.2</div>

These people were perceived as being selfish or inflexible.

Summary

All subjects except one chose as their best liked face, the same one—that of an older man, Level IV, perceived variously as warm, wise, fatherly or as having experienced and loved life. For all but two subjects the least liked face was at either Level I or Level II. In all cases the average developmental level of the best liked faces was higher than that of the least liked faces although the range and difference varied considerably. For example, Subject 3's best liked faces were all at Level IV and the difference between the averages of the best and least liked was a full two levels. For Subject 4 the difference was only 0.2 of a level. For Subject 7 every level from I to IV was represented in both the five best and the five least liked faces.

The subjects' perception of the faces they chose were quite similar. The most notable variation was a liking for those in need of support shown by the subject at Level IV. It was also noted that perceiving depth in those best liked occured at all levels except Level I-II.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Differences in the Characteristics of Friendship

From the descriptions of the characteristics of friendship in the previous chapter, it is clear that they differ according to level of development. These differences form distinct trends as one moves from level I-II to Level IV. The trends are in the areas of egocentricity, trust, knowledge, commitment, difficulties, reverence, and similarity and compatibility. They are outlined below.

Egocentricity. The focus in the relationship became increasingly less egocentric toward higher levels. At Level I-II subjects were aware only of their own perspective. They were more aware of themselves as givers than of the one to whom they were giving. As receivers they were aware of what was received more than of who was giving and evaluated it according to their own needs rather than in relation to the one who gave. With successively higher levels there was an increasing tendency to consider the perspective of the friend, first intellectually, and then experientially as well. At Level IV the subject showed great empathy for the friend while taking an objective, or at times, critical view of herself, an attitude almost completely opposite to that shown at Level I-II.

Trust. With higher levels trust in the other became increasingly more open ended and less dependent upon specific expectations. At level I-II the subjects had stereotypes of how a

friend should behave--for example, be available when needed; give sufficient notice when altering plans. A good friend was one whom they had found could be depended upon to meet their expectations. If a friend failed to do so in an important area or over a period of time then she could no longer be trusted. At Level IV the subject trusted the character and intentions of her friend and did not waver in this even when the friend's behaviour did not reflect what she knew her character to be. In looking to the future there was also a trust that the other would become more able to reveal and express herself. This quality of trust, rather than being an expectation of proof that one's friend can "meet the standards set for her, instead created an environment for her to develop and manifest her potential in her own way. Fromm refers to this as having faith in another person which means "to be certain of the reliability and unchangeability of his fundamental attitudes, of the core of his personality, of his love" (1956, p.123). It is the ability, as described by Thoreau (1906) to praise the other's aspiration rather than his performance. At the intermediate levels II-III and III the transition from a lower to a higher level of trust can be seen in the growing awareness of the need to allow the other to change and the struggle with the resulting insecurity and the tendency to assume that the other will remain the same.

Knowledge. As level of development increased, knowledge of the other became less depended upon preconceptions and assumptions about friends and of people in general and more dependent upon an in depth awareness and experience of the other as she revealed herself in the relationship.

At Level I-II knowledge of the other was superficial, rarely going

beyond an ability to predict the other's behaviour or attitudes. A good friend was one in whom one's predictions were usually accurate, resulting in an easy flowing, comfortable relationship—with the illusion of a real understanding of each other. The conflict which occured when predictions were unverified was hard to handle because they had no other means of knowing each other; the friend became in essence, a stranger. The basis for their knowledge of the other was either a similarity of interests and opinions by which they could make further assumptions about their similarity, or a lengthy acquaintanceship by which they had a knowledge of the other's background, past circumstances and patterns of behaviour which they could apply to the present and the future.

At Level IV knowledge was based on an ability to perceive the other in depth and to experience her anew at each meeting. The subject saw not only her friend's behaviour and attitudes but also her motivations. She knew something of the essence of the other, that which was true and unchanging and also potential in her character, as well as knowing her faults. Her experience of the other was related to her previous knowledge of her but was not distorted by it. Thus she was continually coming to know her but did not make the mistake of assuming a full knowledge of her. She saw her as a unique individual; yet in their experience of each other there was a oneness. Black (1911) describes the unique quality of this way of knowing in the following quote:

> The world thinks we idealize our friend, and tells
> us that love is proverbially blind. Not so: it
> is only love that sees, and thus can 'win the
> secret of a weed's plain heart.' We only see what
> dull eyes never see at all. If we wonder what
> another man sees in his friend, it should be the
> wonder of humility, not the supercilious wonder
> of pride. (p.30-31).

The transition to this level of knowing is most clearly seen at Level III. The subject was concerned about having an experiential knowledge of the other, was careful not to assume similarity where it was not warranted and was struggling with a tendency to expect people to remain as they were in the pasts which interfered with knowing them in the present.

It is interesting to note in this context that subjects at both Level I-II and Level IV mentioned having the tendency to get a fairly quick impression of others upon first meeting them. However, it is clear that the basis for these impressions was entirely different at each level. At Level I-II the basis was expectations of how others should behave while at Level IV it was a deep intuitive perception of the other. Ironically it was the former rather than the latter who were most willing to trust this knowledge and accurate.

Commitment. There was an increasing ability to as Subject 7 said, "be for the other" and to work toward the best for them in all circumstances, especially present difficulties and obstacles and when looking at a largely unforeseeable future. At Level I-II relatively little commitment was shown or even necessary for maintenance of good friendships. This is because conflict was generally avoided and difficulties which did arise were minor. However, friendships which terminated and other relationships which ended before becoming friendship occured because conflicts arose which the subjects did not wish to see through to a resolution. In the case of Subject 1 who did encounter a number of difficulties with her best friend her commitment was more that of an obligation with a view of herself as the good and patient friend, or a refusal to admit the death of a relationship that was supposed to be

permanent rather than a sense of being with and helping the other in a shared difficulty.

At Level II-III commitment was shown in a greater tolerance for conflict. With Subject 5 it was expressed by a refusal to blame the other. However he was ambivalent about dealing with problems and this resulted in an emotional distance, thus taking the effectiveness out of his commitment. With Subject 6 it was expressed in her willingness to persist in difficulties and in her success at overcoming them. Of all the subjects she emphasized most the role of difficulties, seeing them in a positive light and impressing the researcher as taking a certain amount of pride in her accomplishments. It is this inordinate focus on the difficulties and on herself which removed her to some extent from being for the other, thus weakening her commitment.

At Level III the subject showed an ability to be the other and to do what was best for her without a sense of pride or an unnecessary focus on the situation. There was a very determined quality to his commitment as he struggled not so much to deal with particular difficulties but for himself and the other to overcome the tendencies within themselves which caused them.

At Level IV there was no sense of struggle or of obligation. The subject's commitment was based on a knowledge that because they "knew each other's faults and loved each other just the same," they would not withdraw from each other and would do whatever they could to help the other. Mayeroff (1971) refers to this level of commitment as devotion and defines it as "a convergence between what I feel I am supposed to do and what I want to do" (p.6).

Difficulties. At higher levels difficulties in friendship became

increasingly inner oriented. At Level I-II difficulties were seen almost entirely as occuring outside of and in spite of oneself. However, few problems were encountered because the subjects had as friends those with whom they were compatible. At Level II-III this view was less pronounced. Subject 5 did not blame the other but neither did he see the problems as in some way caused by himself. Instead he seemed to view them as occurences unrelated to himself or the other and thus had no means of dealing with them. Subject 6 was more able to see difficulties in terms of her own behaviour and in fact it was only after she succeeded in doing so on each occasion that she was able to move toward resolving them. At Level III difficulties were almost exclusively in the form of inner conflicts. This is not to say that whenever problems arose in the relationship that the subject automatically blamed himself, but that what was considered a problem was not the behaviour of the other, but one's reaction to it which resulted in an emotional distance and an inability to help. The struggle to overcome the tendency to react in this way way intense. At Level IV there was little evidence of this inner conflict; there were, in effect, no difficulties in the relationship. At first glance this attitude might appear to be a romantic fantasy divorced from the realities of life; when in fact it is based on a clear perception of the other from the best in her to the worst. Although she neither condoned nor ignored the worst in either her friends or herself, she did not let it become the occasion for division and thus he was able to relate in a oneness with her at all times and in a way that was supportive of her best. This aspect of friendship is described in the following quote from Thoreau (1906):

> It may be impossible to say all that we think, even
> to our truest Friend. We may bid him farewell forever
> sooner than complain, for our complaint is too well

grounded to be uttered. There is not so good an under-
standing between any two, but the exposure by the one
of a serious fault in the other will produce a mis-
understanding in proportion to its heinousness. The
constitutional differences which always exist, and are
obstacles to a perfect Friendship, are forever a forbid-
den theme to the lips of Friends. They advise by their
whole behaviour. ...I have never known advice to be
of use but in trivial and transient matters. One
may know what another does not, but the utmost kind-
ness cannot impart what is requisite to make the
advice useful. We must accept or refuse one another
as we are.

<u>Reverence.</u>   At higher levels there was a greater reverence
for friendship and for the particular other who was the friend. At
Levels III and IV where it is most clearly seen, it was based on an
awareness that a close friendship was not a commonplace type of
relationship but special, rare and beautiful. Although the term
"friendship" was used in connection with relationships of varying
intimacy there was a distinct separation between, on the one hand, the
majority of those relationships, and on the other hand, the very few
close friendships. At Level IV reverence was also shown in a respect for
the friend as one who although known in depth, was also in some important
way unknown--a mystery. This quality of friendship is described by Black
(1911). "Human friendship has limits because of the real greatness of
man. We are too big to be quite comprehended by another. There is
always something in us left unexplained, and unexpected" (p.211). At
Level II-III there was an appreciation of the other and in the case of
Subject 6 a sense that her friendships were destined to be. At Level I-
II there was little trace of a reverence for the relationship or the
other. Although the subjects enjoyed their friendships and were aware of
their need for friends, they seemed almost to take them for granted.
Their friendships were easily formed and they were relatively

undiscriminating as to with whom.

Similarity and Compatibility.   At higher levels similarity and compatibility were viewed as less important dimensions in friendships. At Level I-II subjects stressed the importance of similar interests, personalities and ways of thinking. They also tended to be similar in age, sex and marital status. The one exception was Subject 1 who was married and whose closest friend was single. The importance of compatibility was shown in the high value placed on the relationship being comfortable, spontaneous and free from conflict. Since the subjects did not handle difficulties well, these two factors were heavily relied upon to make the relationships function. At Level II-III the trend away from this dependence is most clearly seen in Subject 6. She stressed more highly the value of a friend having similar personal issues and spiritual values than a similarity of interests. This was important more as a means of helping each other to grow rather than of ensuring a smoothly functioning relationship. In fact, compatibility was not sought after because the conflicts created by its lack were seen as opportunities for growth. At Level III similarity on a spiritual level was important. Beyond this the subject did not need or necessarily want similarity on more superficial levels or compatibility. He showed a desire to know the other in his uniqueness, in many ways different from and in some ways similar to himself, and a willingness to overcome whatever problems this created. At Level IV a similarity of what Dabrowski calls "higher values" was important. For the subject and her friend it was shown in an ability to love others. It was their similarity at this level which allowed them to enjoy and appreciate what they had in common in less important ways and to overcome with relative.

ease, areas of incompatibility.

Differences in Friendship as Related to Personal Development

In this section differences in the characteristics of friendship are compared with those found in the literature on friendship and discussed in terms of personal development, using Maslow's concepts of deficiency and growth motivation and Dabrowski's theory of positive disintegration.

Level I-II

Friendship at Level I-II functioned as a maintenance relationship; it was a source of gratification of the subjects' needs and of support for their present level of functioning. This type of arrangement is described by Wright's (1978) theory of friendship. The partners invest themselves in the relationship in order to have their needs met and the other becomes one in whom one has a vetoed interest. The types of rewards which the subjects received varied. For Subject 4 the friendship provided all of the rewards described by Wright—utility, ego support, self affirmation and stimulation value—whereas Subject 2's friendship provided mainly ego support value. This difference is probably related to the fact that Subject 2 was married and had some of these needs met by her husband whereas Subject 4 was single and depended more heavily upon her friendships. Similarly, reciprocity and compatibility, the dimensions of friendship emphasized by Lowenthal et al (1975) were important.

According to Maslow these subjects are deficiency motivated, that is, dependent upon others to meet their needs; they are not motivated to grow. According to the theory of positive disintegration their development is biologically and socially determined; they are moivate[by their own needs with little awareness of the needs of others, and by what others expect of them. Thus, their willingness to invest in or commit themselves to a relationship was minimal and was determined by the dependability and value of the forthcoming rewards and by the fact that this was expected of them by the other. It is in this light that the importance of similarity, reciprocity and compatibility can be understood. By having similar interests, by being able to count on the other to adequately fulfill her part of the relationship and by being able to get along comfortably with the other, the partners ensured not only that they received what they needed but that it was at minimal cost to themselves. In this way these relationships resemble what Kurth (as in McCall et al, 1970) calls friendly relations and his contention that people prefer them to frien ips is supported at this level. The lack of maturity of these relationships is highlighted by their similarity to Brenton's (1974) teenage friendships. He characterizes them as being based on dependency and egocentrism. When the friend does not fully serve one's own needs the response is a strong feeling of having been let down and if one of the partners changes then the friendship is likely to end unless both learn to appreciate the uniqueness of the other. However, for these subjects this would require a transition to Level II, which according to Dabrowski and Piechowski (1977, Vol. 1) is rare and difficult. "The environment must be particularly favourable in providing influences and models toward the development of feeling for others and

toward some, even if rudimentary evaluation of one's behaviour and its consequences" (p.103). For these subjects the particular part of the environment constituted by one's close friendships was not conducive to development.

Level II-III

The unique aspect of friendship at this level is the appearance of the growth function along with the maintenance function. The best friendships of both subjects were somewhat unusual in comparison to the literature. For example, Subject 6 had deep and involved relationships and had committed herself to a family group whereas most women at this stage of life are least interested in close friendships and tend to maintain extra-familial relationships through a sense of obligation (Lowenthal et al, 1975; Shulman, 1975). Subject 5's closest friendship functioned as a source of psychological support whereas according to the Lowenthal et al study most male friendships are based on a sharing of activities and interests. These characteristics may be an indication of the willingness of these subjects to stray from the social norm, a capacity which is necessary for growth.

The two friendships differed in their degree of growth orientation. Subject 5's closest friendship functioned more as a maintenance than a growth relationship in the sense that it helped him to cope with the frustrations of life; it reassured him that "what is" was satisfactory and did not provide motivation to search for something better. It is best described in terms of reward value: his closest friendship provided ego support and self affirmation while he turned to other friendships for

needs such as utility and stimulation. In contrast, Subject 6's close friendships were much more growth oriented. She wanted to develop and her friendships showed her the areas in which she needed to activate it. Her closest friend was one with whom she shared similar problems and with whom she worked them through. There also appeared to be a tendency in their relationship, at least on the part of the subject, to be interested in watching herself grow, to be satisfied with tackling each issue as it arose and to take pride in their track record—a tendency which, although giving the impression that the process of growth was well on its unfaltering way, actually took away from her dissatisfaction with what is and diluted her desire to transcend it.

According to Maslow these subjects would be considered deficiency motivated. According to the theory of positive disintegration, Level II-III is the transition for a unilevel to a multilevel phase of development. One is influenced by the social environment but there is also the desire to be free from this. Subject 5's closest friendship gave him the opportunity more to talk about personal growth than to practise it. His need was to experience the closeness and sharing of the relationship and to protect this than to develop to a higher level which would alter the relationship. The misleading sense of actually growing which occurs in such situations is rewarding, but for those who have the potential to develop further it could be considered a hindering influence. Subject 6's closest friendship also provided her with a much valued sense of growing, which hindered actual growth. If all her energies had been devoted to development, she would have lost the sense of accomplishment and satisfaction which she now had because this would move her to Level III which is the beginning of the opposition to lower

levels. It is as if she were trying to move from Level II straight to Level IV which, according to Dabrowski and Piechowski (1977, Vol. 1), is not possible. They state that "Level IV cannot be reached directly from Level II. The full phase of Level III must first unfold in all its intensity; it must replace and eliminate the a hierarchy of Level II before the precursors of higher levels can become truly dynamic forces of further development" (p.103).

Dabrowski and Piechowski also say that the Level II-III transition is "both the most crucial and the most unexpected developmental event...it cannot be readily explained" (p.66-67). Because there is an ambivalence about growth and an openness to influence from the social environment, it is likely that the quality of one's close friendships plays a significant role in promoting or hindering personal growth. The friendships of thee two subjects seemed to function to keep them in the transition phase without pressure to move beyond where they were comfortable. They gave the impression of being in limbo, wanting to and yet not wanting to grow, perhaps waiting for something to influence the not readily explained movement to multilevel development.

Level III

Friendship at this level functioned as a growth producing relationship. Because of this the theories which are based on a maintenance view of friendship cannot adequately describe it. For instance, it is misleading to talk about the reward value of friendship at this level because it is based on giving rather than receiving. Reciprocity was not a matter of giving in order to receive but of

accepting from another in order to be able to give better than one could otherwise do. This level of friendship is best described by the phenomenological view in which friendship is seen as growth producing. The seven essential elements of true friendship--joy, communion, freedom, truth, sacrifice, commitment and equality--were present, some in a more advanced form than others.

According to the theory of positive disintegration development at Level III is towards the clarification of higher values and an increasingly active opposition to what is; it is a movement towards taking control of one's own development. Although not yet at the place where the lower aspects of his personality were under control, he can be considered to be growth motivated to the extent that they were being overcome. Growth occured not as a result of a self-centered attention to one's own development but as a result of the struggle to overcome one's self-centered tendencies and to aid more effectively the growth of the friend. Here Black's statement that friendship involves "the miracle of the death of self" (1911, p. 19) begins to have meaning.

Subject 7's close friendships were characterized by openness and vulnerability; he allowed himself to be greatly influenced by the other, thus choosing for his friendships to play a significant role in his growth. Their value was twofold. First, it was here that his negative qualities were more readily apparent and his desire to care for the other the greatest, a situation which fueled his anger at what is and strengthened his determination to overcome it. Second, the opportunity to give in a deep way to another who trusted him motivated the expression of what was higher in his personality.

Level IV

From the point of view of the literature reviewed in Chapter II, friendship at this level differed little from that at Level III. It was a growth-producing relationship based on giving rather than on receiving; it is best described by the phenomenological view, containing all the elements essential to true friendship. It had characteristics in common with Maslow's description of the love relationships of self-actualizing people, such as absence of anxiety, defences or notes and striving, as a more complete honesty and an ability to be both one with and separate from the other.

This subject is considered by Maslow's theory to be self-actualizing and therefore growth motivated. According to the theory of positive disintegration it is at this level that that which is higher in one's personality takes control over and begins to replace that which is lower; development is no longer controlled by the environment or influenced by aspects of one's character which would otherwise hinder further development. For example, the subject's ability not to focus on potential negative aspects in her closest friendship was based on the fact that she had learned to love other people in spite of her own and the other's faults, and therefore the faults faded into insignificance.

Because she had overcome lower tendencies which resisted development and did not look to others to have her needs met, the means of growth was to give. Her close friendship was a relationship in which she not only gave of her best for the wellbeing of the other (something which people at this level tend to do in all relationships) but was able to give more free and complete expression to it than in almost any other

relationship. Here, she was able to give what is perhaps the greatest gift one person can give to another—her presence, not as one requesting something needed, or providing an external influence 'for the other's good', but as one choosing to be open and vulnerable and to give the other great power to influence her, an action which spoke louder than any words of her trust in the goodness of this person.

Summary

The above discussion of the differences in friendship as related to personal development reveals some interesting points. The literature differentiates friendship in terms of purpose. (Wright, 1969, 1978; Duck, 1973; Suttles, as in McCall et al, 1970; Becker, 1973; Sadler, 1970), reward value (Wright, 1978, Davis, 1973), important dimensions (Lowenthal et al, 1975; Arseniol, 1970), elements of true friendship (Becker, 1973; Sadler, 1970), effect of various demographic variables (Armstrong, 1969; Becker, 1973; Lowenthal et al, 1975; Shulman, 1975; Verbrugge, 1977), and stages of development of the relationship (Duck, 1973; Duck & Allison, 1978; Wright, 1978). The results of this study indicate that although these factors may describe and differentiate within developmental level, they do not, with the exception of the purpose of friendship, differentiate between them. The factor of the purpose of friendship makes a broad distinction between lower levels (Levels I-II and II-III) and higher level (Levels III and IV), the former being maintenance oriented and the latter being growth oriented. To consider any of the friendships in the study as essentially restricting would be misleading although from the perspective of growth

a maintenance relationship can be seen as restricting if it hinders further development. Although Duck's theory that the purpose of friendship is the support of each other's personality can be said to be true for all developmental levels, it would have to be interpreted differently for each. At the lower levels support was for what was presently being manifested in one's personality; at the higher levels support was for what was higher and emerging in one's personality.

The factors of reward value and dimensions of friendship are applicable at the lower levels but are irrelevant at the higher levels because they are based on a maintenance view of friendship. Likewise, the elements of true friendship which are based on an experiential and growth oriented view are relevant only to the higher levels. However, these two factors do not differentiate within either the lower or higher group. There is insufficient data in this study to determine the usefulness of the demographic variables as differentiating factors. The theory of positive disintegration subsumes adult life stages and sex related differences and, therefore, one would not expect these factors to have a significant effect. However, in light of the theory, the fact that the subject at Level IV was considerably older than the other subjects is noteworthy. Level IV represents a great deal of development which necessarily takes time but is not dependent upon it and, therefore, is not usually reached until later in life. Differences according to stage of development of the relationship are not applicable to this data because all the friendships in the study were well established. Also, Duck's contention that psychological similarity is important at this stage of friendship does not do justice to the results. The following section will suggest that the greatest support for one's personality

comes from a similarity of developmental level, that is, of the structure of personality. Similarity of this type is fundamental and incorporates all the similarities and differences occuring in other more superficial aspects of one's personality.

Relationship Between Developmental Levels of Subject and Friend

Dabrowski's motion that people choose as friends those who are at a similar level of development is supported by the results, at least for close friendships. Suggested reasons for this are discussed below.

Level I-II

Of the four subjects at this level, two had closest friends at the same level, one had her closest friend at Level II-III and for one this data was missing.

At this level the subjects were looking for another who would meet their needs and, ironically, tended to find their closest friend in one who was as self centered as themselves. People at this level are most likely to level criticism at or harbour disappointments with the other, yet they are, in a sense the most justified because the other is also the least likely to provide true caring and understanding or to be aware of her own shortcomings. However, the similarity of developmental level me the partners especially capable of helping each other to maintain their present level of functioning. They did this not only by meeting each other's needs but by not providing an unwanted influence to change. Being the least open to growth, they involved themselves in friendship which were least likely to place pressure on them to do so. As best or

close friends they could keep at a comfortable distance those who might otherwise have severed as examples of higher levels of development and refer to them as cold, snobbish, unfriendly or hostile (Maslow, 1970).

There was an exception to the similarity of developmental level. Subject 4's closest friend was at Level II-III, a full level higher than that of the subject. Although there is insufficient data to determine accurately how this difference affected their relationship, the subject stated that this friendship represented a level of relating that she had not experienced before. There was an absence of pettiness and backbiting that she had known previously and there was instead an ability to discuss directly their concerns and needs and to make compromises while still avoiding conflict and producing a comfortable flow between them. This is likely due to the higher developmental level of her friend for she would be more able to be aware of the subject's perspective. However the subject, although enjoying the greater rewardingness of this friendship, gave little evidence of a change toward a higher level. It would be interesting to study this friendship from the point of view of the friend to determine if her higher developmental level gave her a different perspective.

Level II-III

The data for the developmental level of a close friend of Subject 5 is missing. The developmental level of a close but not best friend of Subject 6 was III-IV. The difference in developmental level between Subject 6 and her friend is significant because it is a difference between a unilevel and a multilevel form of development. The fact that,

she is one of the subject's close friends suggests that the subject was aware of and drawn by higher levels of development. Her relationship with this friend was one in which they shared similar spiritual values and questions although they did not share similar problems. This friend would provide support for what was higher in the subject's personality, thus becoming a positive and perhaps crucial influence for the subject to complete if possible the transition to multilevel development.

Level III and Level IV

The development level of Subject 7's close friend was slightly higher at Level III-IV. The developmental level of Subject 8's close friend was the same at Level IV.

The quality of the friendships described at these levels would not have been possible without both partners being at similar levels. Because of the high degree of openness and vulnerability characteristic of these friendships and the resulting significant influence each partner was allowed to have on he other, the choice of a friend at a similar level was important. This was the basis for their careful choice of close friends and their discovery that such people were rare. According to the theory of positive disintegration, people at Level IV in particular have an understanding of all levels of development (up to Level IV) and can accurately perceive these differences in others, thereby intuitively recognizing those who are potential friends.

At Level III the partners' ability to really know each other was related to each other's willingness to be vulnerable; the depth of their trust in the other was related to the fact that the other was a

trustworthy person. Their ability to see the negative aspects of their own personalities was enhanced by the stark contrast offered by the caring and respect of the other. Their determination to overcome the negative aspects in themselves and to confront them (with care) in the other was supported by a similar dedication on the part of the friend. The statement made by Thoreau (1906, p.44) that "we have not so got a right to hate any as our friend" is perhaps more true at these levels than at lower ones because this is where the dearest and most complete perception of the other's faults accrue. Yet one does not hate the other but loves him and this is mutual.

In a friendship in which both partners are at Level IV there is no input from lower levels, no resistance to growth; there is maximum and unhindered freedom to help each other and the relationship to develop. As Black (1911) states, "we are called to be our best to our friend, that he may be his best to us, bringing out what is highest and deepest in the nature of both" (p.53) and when this occurs it is possible that what is highest and deepest is without limit. It is here that the phenomenological concept of friendship transcending space and time, or even as Black suggests, transcendence of the death of one of the partners, has the greatest potential for occuring.

Attraction to Strangers

The data revealed no discernable differences between the various developmental levels regarding attraction to strangers. All subjects were agreed in their greater liking for higher level faces than those of lower levels. However, the extent to which this data is applicable to

friendship initiation is questionable for the following reasons. First, friendship development is based on more information than that of facial characteristics as outlined in the theories of Wright (1978) and Duck (Duck & Allison, 1978). The effect of this piece of information alone is insignificant. Second, this study shows that, at least for close friendships, the subjects preferred those at similar developmental levels. The greatest discrepancy occured at Level I-II; in all cases the best liked face was at Level IV, that of a self actualizing person. Yet Maslow's research shows that such people are seen in negative terms by those at lower levels, definitely not as potential friends. It is interesting though to note that in the absence of all but minimal knowledge, there is a tendency for higher level people to be seen as very likeable. Third, in the administration of the Faces test the subjects were asked not to identify the faces of those whom they would most and least like as friends but simply to indicate those which they would most and least like to get to know. The fact that many of the faces were of people noticeably older than most of the subjects suggests that it would be more natural to think of them in terms of relationships other than friendship. Their responses might have been different had they been asked to respond in terms of friendship.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to describe the nature of friendship at different levels of personal development as outlined by the theory of positive disintegration. This was done by investigating eight people's concepts of friendship, relationships with a good friend, level of

development as compared to that of their good friends and level of development of those to whom they were most and least attracted to get to know.

The results showed that the word "friendship" is used to describe qualitatively very different relationships. At one end is a relationship similar to what Kurth (as in McCall et al, 1970) calls friendly relations and at the other end is one which contains all the elements of what phenomenologists call true friendship. What these relationships have in common is that there is a focus on the partners as unique individuals and that they are voluntary. Although they meet the criteria which are generally given on a definition of friendship, the extent to which they do so varies considerably from Level I-II to Level IV.

Characteristics of friendship differed greatly according to level of development. These differences formed trends from Level I-II to Level IV. The trends were a decrease in egocentricity, and similarity and compatibility, and an increase in trust, knowledge, commitment and reverence, and and increase in difficulties to a peak in the middle levels and their virtual disappearance at the highest level. The trends represented not only quantitative but qualitative charges. Egocentricity became empathy, difficulties became increasingly inner oriented, similarity took place on a spiritual level, trust became less dependent upon proof, knowledge became deeper and more intuitive, commitment became motivated more by desire than obligation, reverence replaced taking the other for granted. These trends reflect the direction of movement which underlies the transition from lower to higher levels of development according to the theory of positive disintegration. It is a movement

from less to more complex, from automatic and impulsive to reflective and deliberate, from external to internal, from less to more refined, from egocentric to allocentric and from scarcely to highly conscious.

At the lower levels (Levels I-II and II-III) friendship functioned primarily as a maintenance relationship whereas at higher levels (Levels III and IV) it functioned as a growth relationship. Subjects at lower levels chose as friends those who would most help them to be comfortable at their present level, whereas those at higher levels chose friends with whom a mutual aid to growth could occur. The results support Dabrowski's notion that this is best accomplished when both partners are at similar developmental levels.

The factors noted in the literature as having descriptive and differential significance, such as reward value, important dimension, elements of true friendship were found to be applicable only on a horizontal plane. That is, these factors did not differentiate vertically between levels of personal development and their descriptive relevance was limited in most cases to the lower levels. The exception was the phenomenological research whose relevance was limited to the higher levels.

Since close friends are a significant influence in times of trouble such times being conducive to development if the developmental potential is present, they are likely to play a role in promoting or hindering this development. The findings of this study indicate that at the lowest level a close friend hindered development by supporting the present level of functioning and because strong expectations about one's behaviour mitigated against change. However, people at this level are not motivated to grow even in a conducive environment as shown by

Subject 4 who enjoyed the benefits of a friendship with someone at a higher level but showed few signs of developing under this influence. Level II-III was perhaps the level where the role of a friend was most crucial because here one is open to growth (unlike lower levels) but not yet committed to it (as are higher levels), and is susceptible to environmental influence. Thus, the fact that Subject 6 had a close friend at a higher developmental level is probably a very important positive influence in her development. At higher levels where one's ability to grow in spite of one's environment was greatest and one was in control of the direction of one's development, friendship was chosen to be a significant means of promoting growth.

Contributions

The study provides the following contributions to the body of knowledge in the area of friendship and personal development.

First, is the addition of the vertical dimension to the study of differences in the nature of friendship and of friendship development. This dimension has been virtually absent in the literature except for Maslow's information on the unique characteristics of friendship at the level of self actualization. The results suggest that there are higher and lower forms of friendship, that they are qualitatively distinct and that they can be arranged in a hierarchy from lowest to highest which illustrates how successive levels of personal development are manifest in the friendship relationship.

Second, the differences noted above are clarified by giving them a theoretical basis in the theory of positive disintegration. They can be

explained according to differences in the underlying personality structure and changes from one level of friendship to another can be traced to changes in this structure.

The third contribution is to the understanding of the theory of positive disintegration. For example, the uniqueness of the multilevel nature of the theory is emphasized by the fact that the existing theories of friendship development are relevant only up to Level II-III, which is the transition to multilevel development. The study also shows, the structural differences between levels of development are manifested and what these levels mean in a practical and experiential sense in an area of life familiar to all people. In this way it aids in an intuitive understanding of the theory which is not readily gained from Dabrowski's writings.

For those who wish to help others to grow the above contributions are valuable. The study describes higher forms of friendship and of personal development and distinguishes them from lower forms, thus clarifying the direction and the goal of change, and providing knowledge of the intra-psychic conditions necessary for a change to occur.

Limitations of the Study

This research was of an exploratory nature, guided by broad, open ended questions with the purpose of studying the relationship between personal growth and friendship as a possible basis for more in depth research. The results are not intended to be representtive of the general nature of friendship at different levels of development. The reasons for this are the small sample size, the global measure of level

of development, and the generality of the interview questions. Also, the fact that the noted relationship between the developmental levels of subject and friend was based on six rather than eight subject-friend pairs, reduces its generalizability.

As mentioned at the beginning of this thesis, the results have been presented in such a way as to highlight friendship at the higher levels. Thus, the study is less useful as an indicator of the developmental aspects of the personality structure at the lower levels, which could be strengthened so as to promote development, than as a clarification of the goal of development.

Suggestions for Further Research

In view of the limitations mentioned above, it would be useful to determine the generalizability of the present findings. A larger and more varied sample at each level would clarify what is common within each level and what is more a function of other factors such as age or sex. The information on the trends identified as one moves from lower to higher levels could be used to probe more deeply the nature of friendship at various levels.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Spreng, L.F. & Lai, W.L. Research into the theory of positive disintegration. The verbal stimuli test interjudge reliability study. Unpublished manuscript, University of Alberta, 1971.

2. Dabrowski, K. Faces. Unpublished manuscript, University of Alberta.

3. Rankel, M. Personal communication, Winter, 1980.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armstrong, J.C.   Perceived intimate friendship as a quasi
    therapeutic agent.   _Journal of Counseling Psychology,_
    1969, _16 (2)_, 137-141.

Arsenian, S.   On Friendship. _Interpersonal Development,_ 1970,
    _1,_ 32-38.

Becker, C.S.   A phenomenological explication of friendship:
    as exemplified by most important college women friends
    (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University, 1973).
    Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, _34 (4-B),_
    1739. (University Microfilms No. 73-24,081).

Becker, H.S.   Problems of inference and proof in participant
    observation. _American Sociological Review,_ 1958,
    _23,_ 652-660.

Black, H.   _Friendship._ New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1911.

Brammer, L.M.   _The helping relationship._ New Jersey: Prentice-Hall,
    Inc., 1973.

Brenton, M.   _Friendship._ New York: Stein & Day, 1974.

Carkhuff, R.R. & Berenson, B.C.   _Beyond counselling and therapy_
    (2nd Edition). New York: Holt Reinhart & Winston, 1977.

Chasin, G.   A study of the determinants of friendship choice and of
    the content of the friendship relationship. (Doctoral dis-
    sertation, University of Iowa, 1968). _Dissertation_
    Abstracts International, 1968, _29 (2-A),_ 681.

Combs, A.W.   Florida studies in the helping professions.
        Gainsville: University of Florida Press, 1969.

Dabrowski, K.   Mental growth through positive disintegration.
        London: Gryf Publications, 1970.

Dabrowski, K. & Piechowski, M.M.   Theory of levels of emotional
        development: Volume II - From primary integration to self
        actualization. New York: Dabor Science Publications, 1977.

Dabrowski, K. & Piechowski, M.M.   Theory of levels of emotional
        development: Volume I - Multilevelness and positive
        disintegration. New York: Dabor Science Publications, 1977.

Davis, M.S.   Intimate relations. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Duck, S.W.   Personal relationships and personal constructs. A
        study of friendship formation. London: John Wiley & Sons
        Ltd., 1973.

Duck, S.W.   The study of acquaintance. Saxon House, 1977.
        Westmead.

Duck, S. & Allison, D.   I liked you but I can't live with you: a study
        of lapsed friendships, Social Behaviour and Personality.
        1978, 6(1), 43-47.

Duck, S.W. & Craig, G.   Personality similarity and the development
        of friendship: A longitudinal study. British Journal of
        Social and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 17(3), 237-242.

Fromm, E.   The art of loving. New York: Harper & Row Publishers,
        Inc., 1956.

Greenwald, J.A.   The art of emotional nourishment. Journal of
         Contemporary Psychotherapy, 1976, 8(1), 3-9.

Heine,R.W. A comparison of patients' reports on psycho-therapeutic
         experience with psychoanalytic, nondirective and Adlerian
         therapists. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1953,
         16-23.

Levinger, G. & Raush, H.L. (Eds.) Close relationships. Perspectives
         on the meaning of intimacy. Amherst: University of
         Massachusetts Press, 1977.

Lindzey, G. (Ed.)   Handbook of social psychology, (Vol. 1).
         Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc. 1954.

Linn, J.G. & McGranahan, D.A.   Personal disruptions, social
         integration, subjective well-being and predisposition
         toward the use of counselling services. American
         Journal of Community Psychology, 1980, 8(1), 87-100.

Lowenthal, M.F., Thurnher, M., Chiriboga, D. & Associates.
         Four stages of life. A comparative study of women and
         men facing transitions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,
         Inc., 1975.

Lowry, R.J. (Ed.)   Dominance, self-esteem, self-actualization:
         Germinal papers of A.H. Maslow. California: Brooks/Cole
         Publishing Co., 1973.

Maslow, A.   Motivation and personality. (2nd Edition). New York:
         Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1970.

Mayeroff, M.   On caring. New York: Harper & Row Publishers
         Inc., 1971.

McCall, G.J., McCall, M.M., Denzin, N.K., Suttles, G.D. & Kurth, S.B.

Social relationships. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1970.

Murstein, B.I., & Spitz, L.T. Aristotle and friendship. A factor-
analytic study. Interpersonal Development, 1973-74,
4(1), 21-34.

Paine, R. Approaches to friendship. Humanitas. Journal of the
Institute of Man, 1970, 6(2), 139-159.

Parham, W.D. & Tinsley, H.E. What are friends for? Students'
expectations of the friendship encounter. Journal of
Counseling Psychology, 1980, 27(5), 524-527.

Phillips, D.L. Knowledge from what? Theories and methods in
social research. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1971.

Rake, J.M. Friendship: A fundamental description of it's subjective
dimension. Humanitas. Journal of the Institute of Man,
1970, 6(2), 161-176.

Rogers, C.R. On becoming a person. A therapist's view of
psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.

Rose, S.M. Young adults' conceptions of hypothetical and actual
friendships. (Doctoral dissertation, University of
Pittsburgh, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International,
1980, 40(11-B), 5433-5434.

Sadler, W.A., Jr. The experience of friendship. Humanitas. Journal
of the Institute of Man, 1970, 6(2), 177-210.

Shulman, N. Life cycle variations in patterns of close relationships.
Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 37(4),
813-821.

Thoreau, H.D. Friendship. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1906.

van Vlissingen, J.F. Friendship in history. Humanitas, Journal
    of the Institute of Man, 1970, 6(2), 225-238.

Verbrugge, L.M. The structure of adult friendship choices.
    Social Forces, 1977, 56(2), 576-597.

Wright, P.H. A model and a technique for studies of friendship.
    Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5,
    295-309.

Wright, P.H. Toward a theory of friendship based on a conception
    of self. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4(3),
    196-207.

APPENDIX A

Guideline Questions for Interviews

(1) What comes to mind when you think of the word "friendship"?

(2) What would an ideal friendship be like?

(3) What are the qualities of a good friend?

(4) What are the difficulties, if any, in a good friendship?

(5) Think about someone that you would consider to be a very good friend. What makes this person a very good friend?

(6) What is your relationship with this person like?
- duration of friendship
- how often see each other
- positive aspects
- difficulties

(7) How does this relationship differ from the ideal?

(8) Think of a person you know but would not call a good friend. For what reasons do you not consider him (her) so?

Verbal Stimuli Test: Instructions, Stimulus Words & Sample Responses

On the following pages are some words. Please describe freely in relation to each word, your emotional associations and experiences. If you need more space, continue on the back of the page or on an additional piece of paper. If you do this, number your continued responses.

(1)   Great Sadness

(2)   Great Joy

(3)   Death

(4)   Uncertainty

(5)   Solitude and Loneliness

(6)   Suicide

(7)   Nervousness

(8)   Inhibition

(9)   Inner Conflict

(10)   Ideal

(11)   Success

(12)   Immortality

Following are excerpts from the subjects' responses to some of the stimulus words showing the difference in attitudes between developmental levels. The indicated level of development is that of the subject making the response. No responses of Subject 8 (Level IV) have been included because her developmental level was not assessed as part of this study.

Great Sadness

Level I-II - "a negative feeling, one I'd like to avoid and probably avoided all my life until my grandparents died"

            - "a loss of someone very special"

            - (referring to a time when her mother was ill) "all the pain she was going through made me very sad... thought it was very unfair"

Level II-III - "having the person I love leave me because of societal
pressures, having my dreams of togetherness crumble at
my feet"

- "any alienation or distancing between myself and
those close to me—especially if I've helped create
it".

Level II - "seeing pain, fear, loneliness and death in people;
experiencing contrast—the experience of beauty can
be very sad"

At level I-II sadness was based on the loss of someone who was the
source of something valued. It was not related, with the exception of
the third quote, to the awareness of the feelings of another. At Level
II-III it was based on the loss, even if temporary, of a relationship of
mutual give and take. At Level III empathy for others who are suffering
was shown as well as the creative instinct in the awareness that sadness
and joy can be felt simultaneously.

Great Joy

Level I-II - "seems like everything is right...when I see someone
that I like after I haven't seen them for awhile"

- "can come to the surface with an especially happy
event, eg. wedding day, graduation day, etc."

- "when my body feels like its full of bubblers
popping and releasing happy emotion"

Level II-III - "touching, holding the person I love and realizing
at that moment it's mutual"

Level III - "love, intimacy, acceptance freely given, childlike
simplicity"

At Level I-II joy was related to the satisfaction of physical or
companionship needs or the attainment of an external goal. At Level II-
III it was based on the mutuality of a supportive relationship. At
Level III it was based on an authentic relating to others.

Death

Level I-II - "sometimes I fear death, other times I am not afraid
because I believe in life after death...I like to
believe in what the people who have died for a few
minutes and who have been revived have described
about death"

- "when people I admire and respect die...I feel very
angry, hurt, sad, shaky and I usually cry. I think
that I fear death and that it's unfair for someone
who is good at heart to die."

Level II-III - "finality to a phase of life that gives birth to a
new phase"

- "I have little faith in life after death so I view
death as an end...I do not fear death but at the
same time I still have many aspects of my life I
want to test and develop."

Level III - "continuity, surprised joy, coming full circle, life
beginning, fear, sadness, mystery, clouded, paradoxi-
cal, process, puts into perspective what is important
...I feel like the more I know death, the more I know
life and vice versa."

At Level I-II there was ambivalence in one's attitues towards
death. The issue of death was avoided by means of a concept of life
after death or by not accepting it as part of the life cycle. At Level
II-III there was a greater acceptance of death as part of life. At
Level III "the sense and meaning of life are evaluated in relation to
death" (Dabrowski and Piechowski, Vol. 1, p. 172) and there was evidence
of the struggle to understand the problem of death in depth.

Suicide

Level I-II - "selfish, easy way out...I don't think I'd ever feel
that way"

- "scares me and I feel really worried when someone
I know talks about suicide...I feel very sad, unhappy,
angry, guilty, etc."

- "it's hard for me to believe someone would feel so
downcast...and have enough self pity and/or hatred
to commit suicide"

Level II-III - "seems the ultimate expression of loneliness...a
final act of desperation to gain some involvement
and attention from others"

- "a refusal to work through life's pain and despair
and give in to it instead"

Level III - "possibly a relief but not an escape...feeling
suicidal confronted me with life and seems like it
was a turning point toward living more fully"

At Level I-II there was either an inability to comprehend
suicide or great emotional tension regarding the possible suicide of
others. At Level II-III there was an attempt to understand the
motivation for suicide although it was not reflected upon in connection
with oneself. At Level III an ability to empathize with others was
shown as well as an overcoming of one's own suicideal tendencies.

Inhibition

Level I-II — "I know I will eventually be uninhibited but this knowledge still does not keep me from being uninhibited when I meet someone new...a fear of being hurt"

— "scared or have reservations about doing something whether you believe that it's wrong or just plain scared to try"

Level II-III — "I try to relate my actions to the situation I'm in so that my actions do not injure another person's being but do not restrict my equal rights"

Level III — "can be a cop-out (negative defence) or a positive, sometimes necessary defence...a way of keeping inner intensity from overwhelming people"

At level I-II inhibition was evaluated negatively and was viewed only from one's own perspective. At Level II-III there was still a tendency to see it as a negative influence although there was the beginning of a concern for others. At Level III there was an awareness of the positive aspect of inhibition based on empathy.

Ideal

Level I-II — "to feel really good about something, to have an idea that I just know its going to work"

— "ideal or perfect job that I am looking for... idealism gives me goals to reach and energy to reach them"

Level II-III — "that which makes us unsatisfied with what we presently are or have"

— "something I believe in and act upon and live with [eg] the possibility of relationship in marriage"

Level III — "what should be rather than what is. Ideals give direction and pull me more to what I can be."

At Level I-II ideal was understood in relation to external goals or circumstances. At Level II-III it was understood more in terms of one's personality or personal relationships. At Level III it was related to higher values and gave direction and motivation for growth.

Immortality

Level I-II — "never ending...eg. a friend who passed away--we thought he would always be there...a secure feeling"

— "a fairy tale...with immortality life might become really dull"

Level II-III - "we live on in each other's memories and deeds...
               life after death"

Level III   - "feeling of transcending the physical time-space
               dimension, of continuity which does not stop at
               death...eg. deeply encountering another person,
               seeing similar themes emerge in history, other
               people, nature"

    At Level I-II immortality was seen as a fantasy and in terms of
physical life. At Level II-III it was understood in terms of one's
effect on the lives of others. At Level III there was an awareness of
how the physical life can be transcended.