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Abstract

Identity, Intimacy and Sex Differences
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Major Professor: Dr. Gerald R. Adams
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Ego identity and intimacy statuses were determined for 88 college students, 44 men and 44 women, and related to each other and to measures of intimacy-isolation, loving and liking. Sex differences were also investigated. Identity achievement subjects were more likely to be engaged in intimate relationships. Students having foreclosure, moratorium, and diffusion identities were variable in their intimacy statuses. A stronger association exists between intimacy and loving than intimacy and liking. While no significant sex differences were found on the overall ego identity and intimacy comparisons, subscale differences were noted. The evidence suggests identity achievement status is predictive of highly intimate relations, while foreclosure, moratorium, and diffusion identities are highly variable.

(59 pages)
Introduction

In Erikson's (1968) theory of ego development, each individual at various stages in their life time, is faced with particular dilemmas that must be resolved to acquire a strong ego identity and mature personality structure which enables one to deal effectively with the social environment. Each stage in Erikson's theory delineates specific crises. In clarifying what is meant by crisis, Donovan (1975) has defined crisis as "a deductive turning point which is followed either by greater health and maturity or by a greater weakness" (p. 38). Therefore, successful resolution of each stage, prior to adolescence, increases one's psychosocial strength and capacity to establish a positive identity. Hence, ego identity, as a specific outcome in human development, is formed through a process of psychosocial development.

Each adolescent faces a specific and difficult crisis—a psychosocial struggle to establish an identity which, according to Erikson, is a prerequisite for making adult decisions. Acquisition of an identity involves the awareness of one's individuality and the achievement of a continuity between the past and the present.

Ego identity then...is the awareness of the fact that there is a selfsameness and continuity to the ego's synthesizing methods, the style of one's individuality and the sameness and continuity of one's meaning for significant others in the immediate community. (Erikson, 1968, p. 50)
Adolescents reflect upon and observe how they perceive others judging them in relation to their own self-perceptions. Significant others, parents, teachers, and friends are used to help provide a sense of stability and continuity between that which has to be during the long years of childhood and that which promises to become in the anticipated future. An adolescent’s awareness of her/his individuality and continuity of self-image is abetted by continuity and stability in the immediate environment.

The major psychosocial dilemma during extended adolescence is reflected in identity resolution or identity diffusion. This psychosocial crisis is resolved when the adolescent not only experiences physical changes, genital growth and cognitive development but is also under social pressure to face responsibility of approaching adulthood (Erikson, 1968). An adolescent in search of an identity is not yet psychosocially mature (Maier, 1969). In a successful resolution of this stage the adolescent makes decisions concerning ideological issues of religion, vocational choice, and politics. The future is based on past and recent crises or experiences. Through these experiences an adolescent acquires a coherent sense of being—a knowledge of who one is and what one wishes to become. If the crisis fails to become resolved, the outcome will be identity diffusion, "a split of self images" (Erikson, 1968, p. 212), a lack of inner unity or oneness.

In Erikson’s theory, young adulthood likewise requires a resolution of interpersonal relations. Can one commit oneself to a significant
other in a meaningful way? Abstractly speaking, a successful resolution would be the fusing of one's identity with another. The antithesis is an individual who refrains from establishing any type of interpersonal relationships for fear of identity fusion.

Further, Greenberger and Sorensen (1974) have proposed a theory of psychosocial maturity which unlike Erikson's model is more typological than developmental. However, both theoretical positions suggest a relationship between identity and the development of intimacy. The basic assumptions being, that one must know oneself before one is able to understand another. Specifically, Greenberger and Sorensen have integrated the concepts of identity and intimacy into their model of psychosocial maturity, implying that a self-made identity and ability to communicate and interact warmly with another are essential to the development of a healthy personality. Therefore, one who has an identity and is capable of an intimate relationship would, according to their theory, be a psychosocially mature adult. In summary, both models would suggest the stronger one's identity, the more likely an individual will be capable of attaining a deep interpersonal commitment.

Problem

Carlson (1971) in a review of personality research, has noted several deficiencies in available research. First, the ratio of male to female subjects in personality research is 2 to 1. Second, males and
females are infrequently used in the same study. Thirdly, numerous studies neglect to report sex variations or the proportions of males and females sampled. Limited curiosity in sex differences is evidenced by the neglect of more than 50% of the research to test for such differences despite evidence of significant sex differences found in 74% of 51 studies examined (Carlson, 1971).

In general, personality research, including investigations on identity and intimacy formation, fail to examine sex differences in a systematic manner. To date, there has been no research utilizing both males and females to test for sex differences in identity and intimacy formation. Further, little is known about the relationship between identity formation and intimacy—although a number of theoretical speculations have been formulated in past years.

**Purpose**

Erikson asserts that all adolescents eventually face an identity crisis but in spite of his inclusive statement there has been a dearth of studies utilizing both male and female subjects. Erikson has inferred that identity precedes intimacy but little is actually known about this proposed interrelationship, especially for females. We lack a comparable basis from which to compare the sexes in terms of how personal resolutions of identity and intimacy differ between the sexes. Little empirical evidence can be found to support the belief that identity resolution must precede intimacy formation, in particular for females. Little is known
about the developmental process of achieving an identity and forming intimate bonds.

Theoretical conceptualizations are in disagreement. Josselson (1973) hypothesizes identity formation for women is merged with intimacy while for men, Erikson (1963) contends identity is a precondition for intimacy. Therefore, the intent of this investigation is to substantiate and to describe the existence of possible sex differences.
Review of Literature

This review of the ego identity research specifically deals with (a) what is meant by ego identity, (b) at what time in a person's life ego identity formation takes place, (c) how the concept has been operationa-

lized for research purposes and (d) an examination of research findings which lead us to suspect sex differences in ego identity formation. Further a delineating of (e) the importance of intimacy as a theoretical construct in Erikson's theory of development, (f) implications of intimacy for attaining a psychosocially mature adulthood, (g) its operational definition and relationship to identity formation, will be completed. From these two reviews specific testable hypotheses are advanced.

Ego Identity

Erikson (1963) has defined his construct of ego identity as "the accrued confidence that the inner sameness and continuity prepared in the past are matched by the sameness and continuity of one's meaning for others, as evidenced in the tangible promise of a career" (pp. 261-262). In essence, the adolescent faces a critical development task to establish an ego identity. Successful completion of the task gives the individual "a sense of knowing where one is going and an inner assuredness of anticipated recognition from those who aren't" (Erikson, 1959, pp. 118-119). In other words, a person who has acquired a sense of
identity sees themselves as a separate being, has an integrated self
definition, is consistent in dealing with the world, is committed to a
career and ideology, and has a definite way of perceiving the world.

Marcia (1966) has operationalized Erikson's ego identity forma-
tion into four identity statuses: identity achievement, moratorium, fore-
closure, and identity diffusion. Two criteria, crisis and commitment,
determine the location of an individual in a particular identity status.
"Crisis refers to the adolescents period of engagement in choosing
among meaningful alternatives; commitment refers to the degree of
personal investment the individual exhibits" (Marcia, 1966, p. 551).
According to these criteria, identity achievement individuals have gone
through a period of crises and have made commitments to an occupation
and ideology based on their own evaluations (see Table 1). Moratorium
individuals are currently undergoing a period of crisis and are in the
process of making formal commitments and values. Individuals in the
foreclosure status have encountered no crisis but have adopted parental
commitments and values. Identity diffusion individuals have made no
commitments and are not struggling with any crisis. With age, one
gains a greater sense of ego identity by progressing developmentally,
along a continuum from the identity diffusion status to the identity
achievement status.

Research indicates that the college years are critical years of
identity formation, where reevaluation of ideas, attitudes and beliefs
Table 1
A Conceptual Summary of Identity Statuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crisis</th>
<th>Commitment Yes</th>
<th>Commitment No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Moratorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

occur. Waterman and Goldman (1976) evaluated male students in their freshman and senior years. Overall, significant changes in identity statuses were found, indicating a shift towards identity achievement during the four years of college. Other longitudinal research supports this developmental trend (Waterman & Waterman, 1971).

Research using males and females report some striking sex differences. Constantinople (1969) has reported significant differences in identity resolution for men from their freshman to their senior years, but not for women. At the end of 4 years of college, more men have resolved their identity than females. Perhaps, the motivating force differs according to sex—for men it is an occupation, for women it is social action (Douvan & Kay, 1962). It seems likely, that for most women identity is not a function of occupation. They are likely to go through a longer period of identity diffusion. Most women eventually see themselves as having to make a choice between a career and marriage which may defer identity achievement until time of marriage.
Josselson's (1973) study of senior college women gives support to Constantinople's findings. Results showed that identity in women is not primarily dependent upon occupational or ideological choices but rather upon interpersonal relationships and intimacy considerations. The data suggested that intimacy is a more important component of a woman's identity than a man's. In reporting her findings, she states "few of them [women] are deeply committed to ideological or political values, the center of Erikson's concept of identity. The ideologies they have are primarily interpersonal..." (p. 11). Similarly, LaVoie (1976) has recognized sex differences in the components of identity. "Vocational identity seems to play a more central role in identity formation in males...whereas identity formation is more aligned with affiliation in females" (p. 382).

Sex differences in identity formation have also been suggested by Toder and Marcia (1973). They contend that in our society, it is expected that a woman will derive her identity from her husband. This implies (1) that identity formation in a woman takes a longer period of time to formalize than men and (2) until a woman finds a husband she defines her identity in terms of parental values and expectations. Males are required to form "a sense of separate identity" (Schenkel, 1975, p. 75) and are expected to go through an identity crisis (Marcia & Freedman, 1970) unlike women who are expected to maintain a flexible identity (diffusion) for a longer period of time.
In conclusion, according to Erikson's developmental framework, by late adolescence, one has faced the crisis of identity achievement versus identity diffusion and has hopefully resolved the dilemma successfully. This means knowledge about the past will become integrated with the present while future commitments are made to a career and ideology. For most, the resolution of the identity crisis occurs during the college years although this may not be the case for females. Women seem to have an extended period of identity diffusion; achieving their identity by deriving it from their husband's status.

It has been suggested that the female identity is primarily associated with establishing interpersonal or intimate relationships. However, male identity seems to be largely a function of occupational choice. This evidence leads the author to expect sex differences in the identity formation process.

Intimacy

After adolescents achieve an identity, they face another crisis—intimacy versus isolation. Intimacy is defined by Erikson as "a fusing of identities..." (1968, p. 135) It is "the capacity to commit [oneself] to concrete affiliations and partnerships and to develop the ethical strength to abide by such commitments even though they may call for significant sacrifices and compromises" (Erikson, 1963, p. 263). If intimacy is not achieved, impersonal or superficial interpersonal
relationships form. Such an individual is fearful that a fusion of his identity with that of another will result in loss of identity even with close peer affiliations.

A psychosocially mature adolescent is one who has achieved an identity and has established intimate relationships. Adulthood is attained not only through commitment to a specific career but also by a commitment to a person of the opposite sex as a marriage partner. This commitment consists of the partners sharing in each other's life and the ability to contribute to the development of each other's potential. "Ego identity acquires its final strength in the meeting of mates whose identity is complimentary in some essential point and can be fused in marriage without the creating of a dangerous discontinuity of tradition..." (Maier, 1969, p. 69).

Orlofsky (1969) has operationalized the intimacy crisis into five outcomes: intimate, preintimate, stereotyped, pseudointimate, and isolate relationships styles. Each are ways of coping with interpersonal relationships. According to Orlofsky (1969):

The intimate individual forms deep (open, close) relationships with male and female friends and is involved in an enduring committed love relationship with a girl friend or wife. The peer relationships of the preintimate resemble those of the intimate with the exception that the former has not entered into an enduring heterosexual love relationship. He is ambivalent about commitment and tries to develop what he may call "pure" love relationships devoid of ties and obligations. The stereotyped relationship individuals maintain relationships with male and (sometimes) female friends. However these relationships tend to be superficial. The pseudointimate has entered into a somewhat permanent heterosexual love relationship, but this like other relationships lacks closeness and depth. The isolate withdraws from
social situations and with the exception of a few casual acquaintances with whom he talks after class, lacks personal relationships with peers" (p. 75).

The criterion Orlofsky (1975) used to identify the subjects intimacy status in his interviews were the following three categories: (1) presence of close relationships with peers, (2) commitments to an enduring love relationship, and (3) depth versus superficiality of relationships. Ratings were based on Orlofsky's et al., (1973) manual.

Orlofsky's interview data indicated that for males the depth of relationship is a more important component of intimacy than heterosexual commitments (contacts).

Further, Orlofsky (1976) compared the intimacy status of 66 male college students. Fifty had male partners and 16 had female partners, with a partner perception task and found that intimate and preintimate subjects were more perceptive of their partner's needs than pseudointimate and stereotyped relations subjects. More intimates and pseudo-intimates brought with them female partners who were similar to them on their intimacy status. The results supported the hypothesis that intimate and preintimate individuals are open, sensitive, and understanding of their friends. The results also indicate that intimates are more likely to be involved with heterosexual relationships than those of lower intimacy statuses.

There is research to suggest a relationship between identity and intimacy. Orlofsky et a., (1973) found important relationships between
identity and intimacy statuses for 53 junior and senior college students. Identity achieved and moratorium individuals were significantly higher in their intimacy status than foreclosure and identity diffusion subjects. Identity diffusion males received the lowest score on the intimacy-isolation scale. Intimate plus preintimate subjects scored the highest on the scale with pseudointimate and stereotyped relationships scoring higher than isolate subjects. Results suggest that identity achievement subjects are more likely to have intimate relationships. Suggesting, identity achievement may be a prerequisite for heterosexual attachment in young adulthood for males.

Further, Donovan (1974) has found an added relationship between identity status and the type of interpersonal relationships attained. The results from a followup study of 30 males (Marcia, 1975) showed a relationship between current identity status and intimacy status. The intimate plus preintimate status had significantly more identity achievement subjects. Those that were high in identity were high in intimacy. Once again, data suggests identity may be an antecedent to intimacy, at least for men, as hypothesized by Erikson. Although identity and intimacy seem to be related, sex differences seem likely. Erikson (1968) does suggest the existence of sex differences in his developmental framework. Schenkel and Marcia (1972) have evidence which indicates that intimacy is a more important component to females than males identity. "Identity as a process or state does not differ for men and women, but
the issues around which this process occurs may differ for both sexes and across time within sexes" (p. 481). Schenkel and Marcia (1972) suggest that the female identity may include components different from those of men. Indeed, their data suggest girls are more interpersonally oriented. Females tend to estimate their work in terms of interpersonal acceptence and by the evaluation of others (LaVoie, 1976). The identity of males is centered around vocational choice while identity for females is more dependent on affiliation, (Douvan & Adelson, 1966) and being a mother and wife (Constantinople, 1969).

**Hypotheses**

The next crisis after identity versus identity diffusion to be faced by the young adult is intimacy versus isolation. Five resolutions are possible: intimate, preintimate, stereotyped relations, pseudointimate and isolate. Research suggests a relationship between identity and intimacy. Those high in their identity status tend to score higher on the intimacy-isolation scale. Those having low identity status tend to score low on the scale. This leads the author to hypothesize the higher the identity status the more likely one will have intimate relationships.

Sex differences have also been implied in regards to the relationship between identity and intimacy status. The male's identity seems to be independent of intimate relationships. For females, on the other hand, intimacy plays a more important role in their identity. This leads the author to hypothesize that a male's ego identity is separate
from but related to his intimacy status. Therefore, it would seem to follow that a male's identity is predictive of his intimacy status. A female's identity is more closely related to her intimacy status, which is indicated by previous research. Therefore the author hypothesizes that a female's identity is not predictive of her intimacy status because of the necessary fusion of identity and intimacy, in our culture, which requires an extended commitment between a female and male, such as in marriage.

Summary

Identity and intimacy are important constructs in Erikson's theory of ego development. They are also crucial to the development toward a psychosocially mature adulthood. Such a person has made convictions of their own choosing and has also made a commitment to an enduring love relationship. Men establish their identity earlier than females, an indication of sex differences in regards to identity formation.

The literature suggests a relationship between identity and intimacy; however, sex differences are also indicated. Intimacy seems to be a more vital component of a female's identity while a male's identity is more closely associated to occupational choice. Identity and intimacy, for men, seem to be separate conceptualizations while being more closely related for females.
Methods

Instruments

Marcia's (1966) 15-30 minute semistructured interview was used to determine the subject's identity status (See Appendix A). The questions pertain to crisis and commitment in three areas: occupation, religion and politics. Marcia's (1964) scoring manual was used to evaluate each of the three areas.

The Ego-Identity Incomplete Sentence Blank (EI-ISB) scale consists of twenty-three incomplete sentence items which require the subject to complete each sentence "expressing his real feelings" (See Appendix B). Each sentence item was rated on a 1-3 scale which revealed an identity score. The EI-ISB assesses the overall measure of identity achievement.

Orlofsky's Intimacy Interview is a 20-30 minute semistructured interview to determine intimacy status. It was used to evaluate (1) "the presence or absence of close relationships with peers; (2) the presence of commitment to an enduring heterosexual love relationship; (3) depth versus superficiality of relationship" (Orlofsky, 1976, p. 78) (See Appendix C). Intimacy ratings were scored by using the Orlofsky et al., (1973) rating manual. Each subject was assigned a rating based on depth of female relationships using the depth of relationships and
heterosexual commitment criteria (Intimate, Stereotyped, Isolate, Pseudointimate, Preintimate).

Yufit's (1956) Intimacy Isolation Questionnaire was used as a second assessment of interpersonal relations. This scale consists of 20 items to differentiate between two types of individuals--the intimate and the isolate (See Appendix D).

Rubin's Love Scale consists of a 13 item measurement device. His 13 item liking scale was also included (See Appendix E and F). The purpose of the love scale was to score a summed measure of three components of love: attachment (a need or desire to be in the other person's presence); caring (a concern for the other's happiness and welfare); and intimacy (self-disclosure) with respect to one's dating partner. Once again, this assessment allowed for an added measure of depth in interpersonal relations.

Sample

Eighty-eight (88) junior and senior college students, 44 males and 44 females were obtained as volunteer subjects from the East and West High Rise Dorms, the housing facilities for men and women at Utah State University and from classes offered in the Department of Family and Human Development. Predominantly, the ages ranged from 19-25. These participants were approached for participation. A 97% agreement to participate was achieved. See Table 2 for demographic data.
Table 2
Demographic Characteristics of the Sample Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classrank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24+</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure

This study is a replication and extension of the Orlofsky et al., (1973) study. Orlofsky et al. limited themselves to male college students, while this study is an extension of their procedure using both male and female subjects. Additional instruments have also been included. The instruments administered were as follows: Marcia's Identity Status Interview (1966), the Ego-Identity Incomplete Sentence Blank (EI-ISB) (Marcia, 1966), Orlofsky's Intimacy Interview (1976), Yufit's Intimacy and Isolation Scale (1956), and Rubin's Loving and Liking Scale (1970). The first three measures were previously used by Orlofsky (1976). The latter two measures have been added to provide additional predictive validity.
Results

Interrater Reliability

While one individual rated all 88 interview protocols, a random sample of 15% of these protocols were rated independently by two raters. On the Orlofsky Intimacy Interview (1976) an 82% agreement rate was obtained on the five intimacy stage categorizations. The Marcia (1966) Ego-Identity Status interrater reliability reached a 100% rate of agreement on the overall placement of students into one of four identity statuses. Percentage of agreement on the subscales of occupational, religious and political ego-identity ranged from 73% to 100%, with a mean interrater agreement of 91%. A correlation between the two independent ratings on the Marcia Ego-Identity Incomplete Sentence Blank scores, reached an acceptable level of significance, $r = .86$, $p < .001$.

Furthermore, students in the four ego-identity statuses varied as expected on their ego-identity incomplete sentence blank scores, $F(3.84) = 33.28$, $p < .001$. Simple effects analyses indicated diffused students ($M = 32.11$, $sd = 3.02$) were the least likely to have a stable identity, while identity achievement students ($M = 39.52$, $sd = 3.23$) were the most stable identity group. Foreclosed ($M = 37.50$, $sd = 1.95$) and moratorium ($M = 36.58$, $sd = 2.08$) students did not differ from each
other but were significantly more ego-identity stable than their diffused peers but less so than the identity achievement youth. Collectively, these data were considered to be evidence of an acceptable level of interrater reliability.

Identity and Intimacy

The relationship between ego-identity and intimacy was assessed in several ways. The overall measure of ego-identity achievement (EI-ISB) was not significantly associated with the Yufit intimacy measure ($r = .07, p < .26$), or the Rubin liking ($r = -.01, ns$) or loving ($r = .02, ns$) scores. However, the stage measures of ego-identity and intimacy present a somewhat different picture. The four identity statuses were compared on the five intimacy levels, with the isolated, pseudo-intimate and stereotyped categories combined into a low intimate group while the preintimate and intimate categories were treated as a high intimate comparison group. Although nonsignificant, $X^2 (3) = 6.60, p < .08$, there was a trend toward an identity and intimacy relationship on the total interview status score. Subcategory comparisons revealed, in particular, that identity achievement status youth were more inclined to be in the high (75%) than low (26%) intimate category, $X^2 (1) = 5.26, p < .05$. This evidence supports the hypothesis that identity achievement is likely to precede and potentially be predictive of intimacy formation. Further, a comparison of uncommitted (Diffusion and Moratorium) and committed (Foreclosure and Identity Achievement) identity status groups
within the low and high intimacy categories revealed important differences. Uncommitted students were more inclined than their committed peers to be low intimates, $X^2(1) = 5.24, p < .05$. No significant differences were observed between these two groups in the high intimate category, $X^2(1) = .02, ns$. When categories are collapsed, into a committed versus uncommitted comparison, diffusion and moratorium students were found to be more likely in low than high intimate categories. These findings suggest an unresolved identity crisis may be as predictive of low intimacy as identity achievement is of highly intimate relations.

Inspection of frequencies and proportions of each identity status within each intimacy category in Table 3 indicate the results of this study are generally consistent with those reported by Orlofsky et al., (1973). The Orlofsky et al., (1973) data shows that identity achievement individuals were found to be higher in intimacy status than those of the low identity statuses (Moratorium, Foreclosure, Diffusion). Uncommitted individuals (Diffusion) were more likely to be found in the low intimacy statuses (Pseudointimate, Stereotyped, Isolate).

Similar trends were found in this study with the combined male and female data. Identity achievement students were more likely to be the most intimate. Those low in identity (Diffusion) were more likely to be lower in intimacy than achievement individuals. However, diffusion or moratorium status did not necessarily preclude the student to
Table 3
Frequencies and Proportions of Identity-Statuses in Intimacy Statuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Intimate (intimate and preintimate)</th>
<th>Stereotyped relationships (pseudointimate and stereotyped relationships)</th>
<th>Isolate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orlofsky et al., (1973)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>(9) .82</td>
<td>(2) .18</td>
<td>(0) .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moratorium</td>
<td>(7) .64</td>
<td>(1) .27</td>
<td>(0) .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
<td>(2) .18</td>
<td>(7) .64</td>
<td>(2) .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>(0) .00</td>
<td>(8) .67</td>
<td>(4) .33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Data (Males &amp; Females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>(17) .74</td>
<td>(4) .17</td>
<td>(2) .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moratorium</td>
<td>(11) .46</td>
<td>(7) .29</td>
<td>(6) .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
<td>(6) .42</td>
<td>(4) .29</td>
<td>(4) .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>(11) .41</td>
<td>(6) .22</td>
<td>(10) .37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Data (Males)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>(8) .73</td>
<td>(1) .09</td>
<td>(2) .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moratorium</td>
<td>(5) .42</td>
<td>(2) .16</td>
<td>(5) .42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
<td>(4) .57</td>
<td>(1) .14</td>
<td>(2) .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>(6) .43</td>
<td>(3) .21</td>
<td>(5) .36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Data (Females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>(9) .75</td>
<td>(3) .25</td>
<td>(0) .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moratorium</td>
<td>(6) .50</td>
<td>(5) .42</td>
<td>(1) .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure</td>
<td>(2) .29</td>
<td>(3) .42</td>
<td>(2) .28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>(5) .38</td>
<td>(3) .23</td>
<td>(5) .38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses are frequencies while those in percentage form represent proportions in each identity status and the corresponding intimacy categories.
a specific level of intimacy. Therefore both studies suggest a theoretically meaningful relationship between identity and intimacy.

The overall identity status score, however, consists of three subscales. Therefore, further analyses were completed on the relationship between occupational, religious, and political ego-identity statuses and intimacy formation. Occupational identity was significantly associated with level of intimacy $X^2(3) = 9.10, p < .03$. Diffusion status students were more likely to be in low (77%) than high (23%) intimate categories, $X^2(1) = 4.9, p < .05$. In comparison, identity achievement students were more inclined toward high (65%) than low (35%) intimacy formation stages, $X^2(1) = 2.94, p < .08$. Once again these data confirm the hypothesis that individuals with an unresolved identity are unlikely to form intimate relationships while identity achievement is predictive of intimacy formation. Further, no significant relationship was observed between political identity status and intimacy, $X^2(3) = 2.61, ns$. [However, uncommitted identity status students (Diffusion and Moratorium subjects) were significantly more likely to be low in intimacy than committed students, (foreclosure and achievement persons) $X^2(1) = 5.23, p < .05$.] Finally, although religious identity was not directly associated with intimacy, $X^2(3) = 2.85, p < .10$, committed identity status (Achievement and foreclosure students) were more inclined toward high intimacy stage formation than their uncommitted peers, (Diffusion and Moratorium individuals) $X^2(1) = 3.74, p < .06$. 
A comparison of the three identity subscales revealed occupational identity was related to intimacy. Identity achievement individuals were more likely to be higher in intimacy than diffusion students. For the religious and political identity, more committed than uncommitted students were high in intimacy. These findings support the hypothesis. Those students in a high or committed identity status were higher in intimacy in comparison to those of lower or uncommitted identity statuses. It should be noted, however, that due to the small sample size that for some of the measures significance was not found until diffusion and moratorium students were collapsed into an uncommitted group while foreclosure and identity achievement students were combined into a committed group. Nonetheless, the findings were in the expected direction.

Sex Differences

While no significant sex differences were observed on the overall ego-identity status comparison for male and female students, certain differences were found on the identity status subscales. A significant interaction between sex and religious identity status, $\chi^2(3) = 19.04, p < .007$, revealed more males (21%) than females (4%) were in a state of moratorium, while more females (50%) than males (18%) were in a state of identity achievement. Religious identity disregards religiousity and affiliation and refers to a self perception framework. A nonsignificant trend, $\chi^2(3) = 7.06, p < .07$, toward an interaction between sex
and political identity status revealed more diffused females (68%) than males (45%), with more moratorium males (16%) than moratorium females (2%). No significant interaction was observed on the occupational identity subscale, $X^2(3) = 1.35$, ns. Surprisingly the same proportion of males to females were found on the occupational identity subscale. However, more females had acquired a religious identity, while more males than females had, at the time of this study, been searching for a political identity. This may reflect a cultural bias toward religion being viewed as a female world, while politics may be viewed as a male role.

The relationship between identity status and intimacy was assessed separately by sex. First, sex differences were tested on the overall identity status measure. No significant interaction was observed with the male, $X^2(3) = 2.95$, ns, or female, $X^2(3) = 4.98$, $p < .20$, student samples. However, uncommitted males were more inclined than committed males toward low levels of intimacy, $X^2(1) = 3.72$, $p < .06$. Second, sex differences were assessed on the three subscales of the ego-identity status measure and intimacy formation. While there was no significant relationship for females between occupational identity status and intimacy formation, a nonsignificant trend emerged for males, $X^2(3) = 6.54$, $p < .08$. More diffused males were observed in the low (80%) than high (20%) intimate groups, while more achieved males were in high (67%) than low (33%) intimate stages. No
significant interaction was observed for males or females on religious identity, however, committed females were more inclined than their uncommitted peers in the high intimacy category to maintain a strong intimate relationship, $X^2(1) = 6.54, p < .02$. Finally, for males only, a nonsignificant, but meaningful trend, was observed between political identity and intimacy formation, $X^2(3) = 5.98, p < .10$. More political diffused males were observed to be low (60%) than high (40%) intimates, while achieved students were more likely to be high (86%) rather than low (14%) intimates. For males occupational and political identities were predictive of specific intimacy levels. However, for females, religious identity was associated with a high level of intimacy.

Again, an inspection of frequencies and proportions of each identity status within the intimacy categories in Table 3 individually for males and females, suggests a relationship between identity status and intimacy. Although no significant sex differences were found, some trends were evident. In keeping with results found by Orlofsky et al., (1973), identity achievement males were higher in intimacy in comparison to those of lower identity statuses. Generally, the majority of diffusion males were found to be in the lower intimacy statuses but diffusion males are more spread out in the intimacy statuses than Orlofsky's males. Foreclosure males were found to be in higher intimate categories than males in Orlofsky's study. Further, moratorium males were found to be equally as likely to be intimate as isolated.
Identity achievement and moratorium females were more likely to be found in the high intimacy statuses, similar to the pattern of Orlofsky's males. Foreclosure and diffusion females were more spread out among the intimacy statuses compared to the males in Orlofsky's study. However, the majority of foreclosure (70%) and diffusion (61%) females were observed to be in the lower intimacy status categories.

Finally, the relationships between sex, identity status, and intimacy was assessed through a series of multivariate analysis of variance computations on the Yufits and Rubin measures. No significant main effects or interaction was observed between sex and identity status on the Yufit measure. While no significant main effects or interaction was found on the Rubin liking scale, a significant sex by identity status interaction was observed on the Rubin love scale, \( F(3.80) = 2.58, p < .05 \). Simple effect analyses revealed moratorium males were the least likely of the four statuses to be reportedly intimately in love, with foreclosure males the most likely to be intimately involved. In comparison, females who were categorized as diffusion or foreclosure youth were reportedly less intimately involved than moratorium and identity achieved female students. Further, identity achievement females were the most inclined of the four identity status female students to be in love. Therefore, foreclosure males and achievement identity status females were the most inclined toward a high self-reported state of being in love.

Overall, identity achievement individuals were more likely than the remaining identity groups to be found in higher intimacy statuses.
Uncommitted (Moratorium and Diffusion) individuals were found to be lower in intimacy than committed (Achievement and Foreclosure) individuals. These findings support the hypothesis that suggests identity formation precedes intimacy attainment.

On the overall ego-identity comparison, no significant sex differences were found. However, sex differences were observed on the subscales. While commitment to a specific religious perspective was found more often among female students, more females were found to be politically diffused. In comparison, males tended to be more often in political and religious moratorium, searching for a commitment.

In the overall measure of identity no significant sex differences were found between identity status measures and intimacy level (see Table 4). However, sex differences emerged when the relationship between the three subscales of the ego identity status measure and intimacy were assessed. Religious identity was related to level of intimacy for females; occupational and political identity were associated with intimacy level for males.

**Intimacy Measures**

Intercorrelations of the Yufit's and Rubin measures of intimacy provide some evidence that these measures are collectively assessing certain individual dimensions of interpersonal involvement. As would be expected the Yufit correlated positively with the Rubin love, $r = .20, p < .04$, but not liking scale, $r = .08, ns$. Intimacy and love
Table 4
A Summary of Sex Differences Related Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Status Measure</th>
<th>High Intimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: An X in a given all implies a significant relationship between the two dimensions or variables.

are conceptually more closely attached theoretically and practically than intimacy and liking.

Further, three oneway analysis of variance, calculation were completed on the five intimacy stages for the related interpersonal involvement measures of intimacy (Yufit), love and liking (Rubin). No significant difference was observed on the Yufit measure, but the means were in the expected direction with low intimacy categories showing lower mean intimacy scores than high intimacy categories, $F(4, 83) = .78$, ns. For both the Rubin loving, $F(4.83) = 8.10, p < .001$, and liking scales, $F(4.83) = 3.20, p < .02$, significant associations with intimacy stages were found. On both measures isolated individuals scored significantly lower than preintimate and intimate persons. The remaining two groups (Pseudointimate and Stereotyped) did not, however,
significantly differ from the former groups and fell in between the isolated and preintimate-intimate intimacy persons.
Identity and Intimacy

According to Erikson's theory of human development, the psychological stage of identity versus identity diffusion must be successfully resolved before one can be truly intimate with another. This suggests individuals have to know themselves before they can give themselves to another. This theoretical proposition received only partial support in this sample. In general, identity achievement and moratorium subjects were more likely to be in advanced intimacy statuses. These findings are consistent with the results by Orlofsky et al., (1973). However, diffusion and foreclosure status persons were found to be almost equally divided amongst the intimate and isolated categories, a finding discrepant with Orlofsky et al. This suggests that foreclosure and diffusion individuals are potentially capable of intimate relations. However, the descriptive data found here are inadequate to account for the explanation behind these findings.

Therefore, the premise (Orlofsky et al., 1973) that one has to establish a sense of identity before one can be capable of intimate relations must be qualified. Although our data suggest there is some probability that diffusion and foreclosure individuals were capable of having intimate relationships, the identity achievement status individuals were
the most likely to have such depthful and committed relationships.

Given identity achievement individuals have completed earlier developmental commitments in their lives, it follows they may be ready to make heterosexual commitments. It seems likely that individuals who have not made commitments, nor readily understand the directions they wish to take in life, are more likely to develop superfician relationships void of any depthful commitments. Although partially supportive of this perspective, the data in this investigation suggest low identity persons may be able to achieve an intimate relationship, but these data likewise indicate the probability is not high.

One might speculate that certain diffused persons may find their meaning through life not in self-made directions, but through their relations with another. Hence, for some, identity may evolve out of a form of "symbiotic togetherness." This suggests that some individuals derive a sense of self from a relationship that is in some way mutually advantageous and satisfying to both partners.

Erich Fromm (1963) refers to a symbiotic union as an immature form of love. Those involved in such a relationship are totally dependant upon each other to such an extent they become a part of each other, whereby individual integrity is surrendered. Life is impossible without the other partner. Their need for each other and desire to escape loneliness holds the symbiotic relationship together. Such a relationship, therefore, may limit more than facilitate individual growth and development.
These data only give partial support to Orlofsky's et al., (1973) premise. The data obtained from the Orlofsky's et al., male sample showed a direct relationship between identity and intimacy. Identity achieved and moratorium individuals were higher in their intimacy status than foreclosure and identity diffusion subjects. However, the data obtained from the combined sample of males and females in this thesis, as well as data from the breakdown of the sample by sex, suggests that only the identity achievement status is predictive of intimacy. Moratorium, foreclosure and diffusion individuals in the thesis sample were dispersed among the intimacy categories. Therefore, a more correct theoretical proposition might read that "identity achievement may be a sufficient but not necessary precondition to the formation of an intimate relationship."

**Sex Differences**

Sex differences in the identity formation process have been advanced theoretically in several circles (e.g., Erikson, 1963; Douvan & Adelson, 1966). Further, Josselson's (1973) research indicates that the identity of males and females are different in quality and focus. For males it is occupational decisions; while for females it is interpersonal issues, personal satisfaction and concerns of becoming a better person.

Although no significant differences were found in the present study on the overall ego identity comparison, sex differences were found in the status subscales. More females than males had made a religious
commitment. More males were undergoing religious exploration. These findings are consistent with previous research findings (Schenkel & Marcia, 1972). Further, females were more diffused in political identity while more males were again in moratorium. Perhaps this is an indication that politics are a more important factor in a male's than a female's identity. Such an interpretation would be in agreement with Schenkel and Marcia's (1972) evidence that few women internalize political issues into their identity makeup. Therefore, sex differences on religion and political subscales infer that the components of identity formation are different for men and women.

No significant differences were found in the predictiveness of identity stage development for intimacy formation. However, an assessment of the subscales of identity and the intimacy statuses revealed some trends supportive of previous research conclusions. Occupational identity was found to be more related to intimacy formation for males than for females. That is, for males, commitment to an occupation was likely to be predictive of higher intimacy statuses. Further, political commitments were likewise predictive of higher intimacy stages for males, however not for females. In contrast, for women, achievement of a religious identity was associated with higher levels of intimacy status. Therefore, religion seems to be more relevant to the lives of females while politics are more relevant to the lives of males.

In a comparison of samples, identity achievement and moratorium women in this study were more similar to the identity achievement men
in the Orlofsky et al., (1973) data. A comparison of males and females in this study revealed more identity achievement and moratorium males than females were isolates. This finding is not surprising. It has been suggested by the results of this study that occupation is an important factor in identity for males. Therefore, we might suspect that for males actively pursuing an occupational goal, especially in an academic setting, will lead to sacrificing heterosexual commitments over occupational aspirations. This may indicate for some males, that commitment to a heterosexual relationships comes after achieving their occupational goal. Subscale measures on occupational identity and intimacy formation support this interpretation.

Identity, Intimacy and Love

This study included additional intimacy measures to determine if intimacy status is predictive of other affective intimacy measures. The intimacy statuses were confirmed by the Rubin measure of love. The data suggest a stronger association between love and intimacy than intimacy and liking. Individuals in higher versus lower intimacy statuses were found to have higher self-reported feelings of being in love.

These findings have implications for the affectional quality of relationships identity achievement individuals maintain. Since more identity achievement have intimate relationships, and intimacy is closely related to love, it follows that love would be an essential component in intimate relationships for identity achievement individuals. Thus,
identity achievement individuals are likely to have intimate relationships based on a self-reported feeling of love.

Summary

Orlofsky's et al., (1973) premise "...that genuine intimacy generally occurs only after a reasonable sense of identity has been established" (p. 218) received only partial confirmation. Those high in identity status were found in both studies to be more likely to have intimate relationships. However a discrepancy does exist between the thesis data summarized here and Orlofsky's et al. findings. Orlofsky's findings suggest that identity is predictive of intimacy status. However, this study has evidence which suggests that only the identity achievement status is predictive of specific intimacy formation. Further, foreclosure, moratorium and diffusion individuals are capable of intimate relationships. It seems then, for some, an intimate relationship with another is possible without first establishing a sense of identity. The causal and explanatory reasons for this conclusion are yet to be explored.

Implications

This study has several limitations and therefore requires additional research. First, Orlofsky et al., used students enrolled in an introductory psychology course. The sample for this study consisted of juniors and seniors who were residents of two housing facilities on the campus of Utah State University. Hence this sample was more representative but small and not a true random sample. However,
it does represent a wide range of students (See Table 2). To confirm the reliability of the results presented in this study a replication of this study is needed consisting of a larger and more representative sample. Secondly, although this study was not developmental in design, it has developmental implications. Longitudinal research is needed to find if a developmental trend exists between identity and intimacy which has been implied by this investigation. Lastly, sex differences have been reported in this study but they are descriptive in nature. Longitudinal research should attempt to concentrate on the underlying process of identity and intimacy formation for both sexes.
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APPENDIX
Appendix A

The Marcia Identity Status Interview

Occupation

You said you were majoring in ____________________________

What do you plan to do with your degree? ____________________________

When did you come to decide on this area? ____________________________

Did you ever consider anything else? ____________________________

What seems attractive about ________? ____________________________

Most parents have plans for their children, things they'd like them to go into or do--did yours have any plans like that for you? ____________

How do your folks feel about your plans now? ____________

How willing do you think you'd be to change this if something better came along? (If subject responds: "What do you mean by better.")--

Well, what might be better in your terms? ____________

Religion

Do you have any particular religious affiliation or preference? ______

How about your folks? ____________________________

Ever very active in church? _______ How about now? ________

Get into many religious discussions? ____________________________

How do your parents feel about your belief now? ____________________________

Are yours any different from theirs? ____________________________

Was there any time you came to doubt any of your religious beliefs? ____________
How did you resolve your questions? 

How are things for you now? 

Politics
Do you have any particular political preference? 
How about your parents? 

Ever take any kind of political action--join groups, write letters, participate in demonstrations--anything at all like that? 

Any issues you feel pretty strongly about? 

Any particular time when you decided on your political beliefs? 

What did you think of the past election? 

Ego-Identity Status-Interview Rating Sheet

Occupation ________________________
Religion ________________________
Politics ________________________  --Ideology ________________________
IDENTITY STATUS ________________________
Appendix B

Marcia's Incomplete Sentence Blank

Please respond to the following partially completed sentences. Again, we would appreciate knowing your feelings and thoughts.

1. For me, success would be

2. When I consider my goals in the light of my family's goals

3. I'm at my best when

4. Sticking to one occupational choice

5. When I let myself go I

6. I chose to come to this college after

7. I know that I can always depend on

8. (Choose one of the following)
   a. I am
   b. I am not
9. It seems I've always

10. I wish I could make up my mind about

11. Getting involved in political activity

12. What happens to me depends on

13. As compared with four years ago, I

14. I belong to

15. To change my mind about my feelings toward my faith or religion

16. If one commits oneself

17. Ten years from now, I

18. It makes me feel good when
Appendix C

Intimacy Interview

Is there anybody (guy or girl) who you're pretty close with up here? ____________________________ (at home?) ____________________________

Do you see him/her frequently outside of school? ____________________________

How close do you feel with him/her? ____________________________

What does being close with someone mean to you? ____________________________

Do you have a lot in common with him/her? What kinds of things ____________________________

What kinds of things do you talk about with him/her? ____________________________

Can you discuss your problems with each other? ____________________________

Why would (do) you discuss your problems with him/her in the first place? ____________________________

Are there any matters that you couldn't or wouldn't share with him/her about yourself? ____________________________

Do you find that you go out of your way to help each other out (lending car, money)? ____________________________

Do you generally prefer to be with friends or by yourself? ____________________________

The guy-girl that you spend the most time with: What in particular do you like about him/her? ____________________________

(dislike about him/her?) ____________________________

What does friendship mean to you? ____________________________

Do you date much? _______
If no-

Have you ever dated (or spent time with a girl/guy)? _________
Would you like to date (more)? _________
Are there any particular reasons why you haven't dated much up to now? ____________________________________________

Have you ever dated one girl/guy exclusively? _________
If no-

How often do you date? _______________________________________
What kinds of things about a girl/guy would prompt you to ask her/him out again? ______________________________________

Do you usually date several persons at the same time? _________
In the course of your dating, have you ever met a girl/guy with whom you would like to have an enduring relationship? _________
(What happened)? ___________________________________________
What do you think has prevented you from doing this up to now?

What in particular do you like or find attractive about her/him?

People sometimes get on each other's nerves in some way or another.

Is there anything about him/her that you dislike? ______________________

Are you able to discuss it with him/her? _________

Do you ever fight? _________
About any particular things, or around any particular themes?

Do you feel you function well as a couple? (like working, playing together?) ________________________________ (any competition between you?)

How about the sexual side of the relationship ... is it good? _________
How important a part does sex occupy in the relationship? _________
...Are you in love with him/her? ________________________________
Is one of you more in love or more involved in the relationship than the other? ________________________________________________________________

Which of you is more jealous or possessive in general? ________________

Where do you want this relationship to go in the future? ________________

______________________________________________________________

Have you discussed future plans with him/her? ________________________

Do you foresee any long-term commitment to each other? ______

What do you see as the main problem that the two of you have to work out as a couple? ______________________________________________________

Had you been with any other boys/girls previous to her/him?          

How does the intensity of feeling in this relationship compare with previous experiences? ________________________________

Could your relationship be improved in any ways? ____________________

What kinds of changes? ______________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Are you happy in the relationship? ________________________________

How crucial is this relationship to your present and future happiness? _______________________________________________________

For all Ss

What is a meaningful or good relationship as you see it? ________________

______________________________________________________________

How much of that do you feel you've attained? ________________________

______________________________________________________________

What kinds of changes would you like to see in the way you relate with others? ______________________________________________________

Name __________________ Age _____ Grade _____ Major __________

Name of parents _______________ Home Address ____________________

Last grade father completed ________ Last grade mother completed ___
Appendix D

Yufit's Intimacy Isolation Questionnaire

This checklist is part of a program which attempts to find what people enjoy, what things they like to do or have happen to them, and what things they dislike. The following activities have been collected from a great many different persons. By checking this list you will indicate a variety of things which you like and dislike.

DIRECTIONS: Before each statement there are three choices. Circle the one that best describes how you feel about the item.

3 - if the item describes an activity or event which you like or would enjoy
2 - if the item describes an activity or event which you are indifferent to
1 - if the item describes an activity or event which you dislike or would find unpleasant

Please answer all questions.

3 2 1 1. Suffering for a good cause or for someone I love.
3 2 1 2. Talking about how it feels to be in love.
3 2 1 3. Conquering my fears and doubts and attacking a problem head on.
3 2 1 4. Trusting people.
3 2 1 5. Trying to describe my innermost feelings to others.
3 2 1 6. Having someone who is very emotional for a friend.
3 2 1 7. Discussing with younger people what they think or feel about things and what they like to do.
3 2 1 8. Falling madly in love.
3 2 1 9. Being constant in my affections.
3 2 1 10. Enjoying the company of anyone I'm with.
3 2 1 11. Being with people who are always fun-loving, gay, and amusing.
3 2 1 12. Searching with ways of getting along with someone even after it seems he's impossible.
3 2 1 13. Running something very soft against my skin.
3 2 1 14. Feeling intensely about someone or something.
3 2 1 15. Seeking solutions to inner conflicts, moral problems, and spiritual dilemmas.
3 2 1 16. Leading an active social life.
3 2 1 17. Comforting someone who is feeling low.
18. Seeking to explain the behavior of people who are emotionally unstable.
19. Lending things I value to a friend.
20. Talking with people about their innermost feelings and difficulties.
Appendix E

Rubin's Liking Scale

DIRECTIONS: Read the following statements, filling in the blanks with a person of the opposite sex in mind. Circle the number which most strongly agrees with how you feel about the statement. Use the following scale:

5 - strongly agree  
4 - mildly agree  
3 - undecided  
2 - mildly disagree  
1 - strongly disagree

1. When I am with ________, we are almost always in the same mood.  
2. I think that ______ is usually well-adjusted  
3. I would highly recommend ______ for a responsible job.  
4. In my opinion, ______ is an exceptionally mature person.  
5. I have great confidence in ______'s good judgement.  
6. Most people would react very favorably to ______ after a brief acquaintance.  
7. I think that ______ and I are quite similar to each other.  
8. I would vote for ______ in a class or group election.  
9. I think that ______ is one of those people who quickly wins respect.  
10. I feel that ______ is an extremely intelligent person.  
11. ______ is one of the most likable people I know.  
12. ______ is the sort of person whom I myself would like to be.  
13. It seems to me that it is very easy for ______ to gain admiration.
Appendix F

Rubin's Loving Scale

DIRECTIONS: Read the following statements, filling in the blanks with a person of the opposite sex in mind. Circle the number which most strongly agrees with how you feel about the statement. Use the following scale:

5 - strongly agree
4 - mildly agree
3 - undecided
2 - mildly disagree
1 - strongly disagree

1. If ______ were feeling badly, my first duty would be to cheer him (her) up.
   SA MA U MD SD
   5 4 3 2 1
2. I feel that I can confide in _____ about virtually everything.
   SA MA U MD SD
   5 4 3 2 1
3. I would find it easy to ignore _____'s faults.
   SA MA U MD SD
   5 4 3 2 1
4. I would do almost anything for ______.
   SA MA U MD SD
   5 4 3 2 1
5. I feel very possessive toward ______.
   SA MA U MD SD
   5 4 3 2 1
6. If I could never be with _____, I would feel miserable.
   SA MA U MD SD
   5 4 3 2 1
7. If I were lonely my first thought would be to seek ______ out.
   SA MA U MD SD
   5 4 3 2 1
8. One of my primary concerns is _____'s welfare.
   SA MA U MD SD
   5 4 3 2 1
9. I would forgive _____ for practically anything.
   SA MA U MD SD
   5 4 3 2 1
10. I feel responsible for _____'s well-being.
    SA MA U MD SD
    5 4 3 2 1
11. When I am with _____, I spend a great deal of time just looking at him (her).
    SA MA U MD SD
    5 4 3 2 1
12. I would greatly enjoy being confided in by ______.
    SA MA U MD SD
    5 4 3 2 1
13. It would be hard for me to get along without ______.
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