

leaving behind the private sphere, has thrust the importance of close relationships to the forefront of "scientific" attention.

Just who are these most intimate others? Do such relationships remain stable throughout life? If not, how and why do they change? What are the differences between the personality structures and intimate networks of men and women? Is it possible to obtain reliable and generalizable information about phenomena which until late have been the preserve of novelists and essayists, poets and therapists? In fact, the affective and elusive nature of intimacy has made it the province of poets and novelists par excellence. Not only has the hard rational perspective of "objective" science until recently ignored the phenomenon of closeness, but the very tools of science, so admirably suited to the observable world are questionable for handling issues of human emotion (beyond measurable physiological changes) without distortion.

McClelland (1986) has recently situated difficulties in the study of intimate relationships within the context of the biological functions of the brain. Because left-brain, cognitive reasoning is essentially separate from associative right-brain affect, requests for "logical explanations" of an individual's own non-verbal emotional state may elicit honest answers that are far off the mark. This points up the necessity for constructing right-hemisphere compatible measures for intimacy. It is

into this hardly explored territory that the present study has rather tentatively sought to venture.

Until the publication of Hinde's overview in 1979, the field of personal relationships was diffuse and scattered across many disciplines. Students of close relationships often seemed like the fabled blind men and the elephant, each discovering a separate part of the whole and declaring that to be its essence. Psychologists looked at interpersonal attraction, sociologists and anthropologists at family and kinship structures. Therapists and social reformers were concerned with mental and public health and thus with "normalcy" and "deviance," sometimes with overtly conservative and repressive implications. Network theorists who concentrated on mathematical relations between "ties" disaggregated the individuals involved into indices of different structural matrices.

The author of the present study, both fascinated with and convinced of the importance of close relationships, was yet dissatisfied with the limited goals and methods and the theoretical incoherence of interpersonal attraction studies. Hinde's (1979) summation of the results of years of effort in the field only substantiated these doubts. Initially, then, the powerful theoretical scope of psychoanalytic approaches, especially the "Tavistock" and feminist schools, had great appeal. The problem with the psychotherapists lay with their methodology, of

course. How can one generalize reliably from observations on patients who are admittedly under stress and in no way randomly selected? Furthermore, how is it possible to replicate methods of study which are so personal and idiosyncratic?

On the other hand, the "scientific" methodologies of conventional social psychology seemed almost as weak. While attraction studies are certainly replicable -- and indeed have been plentifully replicated -- they were grounded on samples of college students, hardly random and certainly not representative of the wider population. No doubt biological models were the origin of these methodological blinkers. Assumptions of universality in human relations, however, have long since been invalidated by anthropological investigations (cf. Brain, 1976, for examples of cross-cultural variety in friendships). In addition, "scientific" study of personal relationships has tended to impose the researchers' views of the matter on their subjects by setting up questions in ways which can be easily scored and statistically manipulated in sophisticated ways.

The present study attempted to avoid these many pitfalls by devising an open-ended questionnaire (even though that meant sacrificing ease and the sophistication of analysis that accompanies integral data), and collecting supplementary life histories from a rigorously random sample which was both cross-cultural, cross-gender and

representative of age groups across the life-course. The large number of calculations in the statistical analysis certainly necessitated computer technology. However, the study chose to gather nominal data without demur precisely because these make possible much greater sensitivity to the subjects' understandings of their own experiences within social and cultural settings.

The "objective" nature of the Closeness questionnaire is itself open to debate, however, since the selection of questions any researcher chooses to probe is an issue of human judgement. Hence with another set of questions, one might discover somewhat different parameters to "closeness," even for the same sample. Yet it is perhaps safe to hazard that with a fairly comprehensive array of questions, one could expect dimensions and sub-dimensions that closely approximate those outlined in this study. However, the shape of the Continuum might well vary given a different sample.

The results of the study suggest advances on several fronts. In the first place, a method has been devised which arrives at a taxonomy of closeness -- for the Grahamstown population, at least. This technique retains the distinction between familiar and friendly (ascribed and voluntary) relationships -- perhaps between attachment and affiliation -- while not imposing a formal dichotomization between kin and nonkin.

As a result, secondly, it was possible to develop a moderate critique of feminist psychoanalytic approaches to intimacy. The data suggest that the feminist analysis of gender differences look beyond the break from the mother on the part of males to the shift from attachment to care-giving on the part of females. These conclusions, which seek to move away from a middle-class feminist bias, were confirmed by data from the more traditional black and white South African respondents.

Thirdly, then, it was found that much of the popular psychological language of personal individuation and relationship analysis which is endemic among American women, and indeed which is found to an extent among white South African men and women, is foreign to African males and females alike. In fact, one of the most fascinating findings of this study is a uniquely African slant on the idiom of closeness. It is a mistake and smacks of cultural imperialism to view African perceptions of relationship as "heteronomous" or "primitive" rather than to plumb them for their own particular integrity and richness.

Finally, the analysis of closeness across the life course confirms the suspicion that studies based on one or another particular life stage cannot be generalized to all individuals --even in a single culture or class-grouping. Studies of children and adolescents have long recognized this rather obvious truth, but articles on

adult "dyadic" relationships, developed out of questionnaires to the ubiquitous (and totally non-random) introductory psychology class, still appear with generalizations about seemingly "generic" relationships. If this study helps lay to rest that particular psychological practice and its underlying assumptions, it will have served a useful purpose.

The more ambitious objectives of this study were essentially two-fold: to develop a method by which close relationships might be studied with as little distortion as possible, and using that method, to map out the intimacy terrain for the two major populations of a small South African city. The extent to which the method has succeeded can be established only by replication in different cultural contexts. Meanwhile, to the author's best knowledge, there exists no comparable empirically based account of the various dimensions of intimacy. Similar studies in other social settings are certainly needed. This work seeks only to point a way.

REFERENCES

- Acitelli, L.K., 1988. "When Spouses Talk to Each Other about their Relationship." Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5, 185-199.
- Allan, G. A., 1979. A Sociology of Friendship and Kinship. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Altman, I. & D.A.Taylor, 1973. Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Barnes, J.A., 1954. "Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish." Human Relations, 7, 39-58.
- Bernard, J., 1981. The Female World. New York: Free Press.
- Berscheid, E., and E.H.Walster, 1978. Interpersonal Attraction (2nd Edition). Reading & Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley.
- Bott, E., 1971. Family and Social Network. New York: Free Press (first edition 1957).
- Bowlby, J., 1971. Attachment and Loss, Volume I: Attachment. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books (first published 1969).
- Bowlby, J., 1975. Attachment and Loss, Volume II: Separation: Anxiety and Anger. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books (first published 1973).
- Brain, R., 1976. Friends and Lovers. London: Hart-Davis, MacGibbon.
- Byrne, D., 1971. The Attraction Paradigm. New York: Academic Press.
- Chelune, G.J., J.T.Robison & M.J.Kommor, 1984. "A Cognitive Interpersonal Model of Intimate Relationships" in V.J.Derlega, Communication, Intimacy and Close Relationships. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Chodorow, N., 1978. The Reproduction of Mothering. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cock, J., 1980. Maids and Madams. Johannesburg: Raven Press.
- Derlega, V., 1984. Communication, Intimacy and Close Relationships. Orlando: Academic Press.

- Dickens, W.J. & Perlman, D., 1981. "Friendship over the Life-cycle" in S.Duck & R.Gilmour, Personal Relationships, 2. London:Academic Press.
- Dinnerstein, D., 1977. The Mermaid and the Minotaur. New York: Harper & Row.
- Douvan, E. & J.Adelson, 1966. The Adolescent Experience. New York: Wiley.
- Duck, S., 1977. Theory and Practice in Interpersonal Attraction. London: Academic Press.
- Duck, S., 1986. Human Relationships. London: Sage.
- Duck, S. & R.Gilmour, 1981. Personal Relationships, Volumes 1 & 2. London: Academic Press.
- Duck, S. & H.Sants, 1983. "On the Origin of the Specious: Are Personal Relationships Really Interpersonal States?" Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1,1,27-41
- Elifson, K.W., 1982. Fundamentals of Social Statistics. Reading & Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley.
- Elkind, D., 1970. Children and Adolescents. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Emerson, J., 1970. "Behavior in Private Places: Sustaining Definitions of Reality in Gynecological Examinations" in H.P. Dreitzel (ed) Recent Sociology, No. 2. New York: Macmillan.
- Erikson, E.H., 1959. "Identity and the Life Cycle." Psychological Issues, Vol I, #1
- Erikson, E.H., 1977. Childhood and Society. London: Triad/Granada (first published 1950, second edition 1963).
- Falbo, T. & Peplau, L.A., 1980. "Power Strategies in Intimate Relationships." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 4, 618-628.
- Ferriera, A., 1960. "Family Myth and Homeostasis" in N.W. Bell & E.F. Vogel, Modern Introduction to the Family. New York: Free Press.
- Fischer, C.S., 1982. "What Do We Mean by 'Friend'?" Social Networks, 3, 287-306.
- Fischer, C.S. & S.L.Phillips, 1982. "Who is Alone? Social Characteristics of People with Small Networks" in L.A.Peplau & D.Pearlman, Loneliness: A Sourcebook of Current Theory, Research and Therapy. New York: Wiley & Sons.

- French, D.C., "Children's Social Interaction with Older, Younger, and Same-Age Peers," Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4, 63-86.
- Freud, S., 1963. "On Narcissism: An Introduction" in General Psychological Theory. New York: Collier-Macmillan (first published 1914).
- Freud, S., 1977. "A Special Type of Object Choice made by Men" in On Sexuality. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books (first published 1910).
- Furman, E., 1974. A Child's Parent Dies. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Furman, W. 1985. "Compatibility and Incompatibility in Children's Peer and Sibling Relationships" in W.Ickes, Compatible and Incompatible Relationships. New York: Springer Verlag.
- Gelles, R.J., 1972. The Violent Home. Beverley Hills: Sage.
- Gelles, R.J. & C.P.Cornell, 1985. Intimate Violence in Families. Beverley Hills: Sage.
- Gilligan, C., 1982. In a Different Voice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Goethals, G.W., R.W.Steele & G.J.Broude, 1976. "Theories and Research on Marriage: A Review and Some New Directions" in H.Grunebaum & J.Christ, Contemporary Marriage: Structure, Dynamics and Therapy. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Hatfield, E., 1983. "What Do Women and Men Want from Love and Sex?" in E.R.Allgeier & N.B.McCormick, Changing Boundaries: Gender Roles and Sexual Behavior. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Hatfield, E., 1984. "The Dangers of Intimacy" in V.J. Derlega, Communication, Intimacy and Close Relationships. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Hatfield, E., J.Traupmann, S.Sprecher, M.Utne, & J.Hay, 1985. "Equity and Intimate Relations: Recent Research" in W.Ickes, Compatible and Incompatible Relationships. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Helgeson, V.S., P.Shaver & M.Dyer, 1987. "Prototypes of Intimacy and Distance in Same-Sex and Opposite-Sex Relationships." Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4, 195-233.

- Helson, H., V.Mitchell & B.Hart, 1985. "Lives of Women who became Autonomous" in A.J.Stewart and M.B.Lykes, Gender and Personality. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hendrick, C., S.Hendrick, F.H.Foote, M.J.Slapion-Foote, 1984. "Do Men and Women Love Differently?" Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 1, 177-195.
- Hinde, R.A., 1979. Towards Understanding Relationships. London: Academic Press.
- Hodge, N., 1984. To Kill A Man's Pride and Other Stories from Southern Africa. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
- Homans, G.C., 1961. Social Behaviour: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Howard, J.A, P.Blumstein, & P.Sc artz, 1986. "Sex, Power and Influence Tactics : Intimate Relationships." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1, 102-9
- Hunter, M., 1961. Reaction to Conquest. London: Oxford University Press (first published 1936).
- Huston, T.L., 1974. Foundations of Interpersonal Attraction. New York: Academic Press.
- Ickes, W., 1985. Compatible and Incompatible Relationships. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Johnson, M.P., 1982. "Social and Cognitive Features of the Dissolution of Commitment to Relationships" in S.Duck, Personal Relationships, 4. London: Academic Press.
- Jourard, S.M., 1971. Self-Disclosure: An Experimental Analysis of the transparent Self. New York: Wiley (Interscience).
- Kanter, R.M., 1977. Women and Men of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- Kelley, H.H., E.Berscheid, A.Christensen, J.Harvey, T.L.Huston, G.Levinger, E.McClintock, A.Peplau, and D.R.Peterson, 1983. Close Relationships. San Francisco: Freeman
- Kerkhoff, A.C., 1974. "The Social Context of Interpersonal Attraction" in T.L.Huston, Foundations of Interpersonal Attraction. New York: Academic Press.

- Kerkhoff, A.C. & K.E.Davis, 1962. "Value Consensus and Need Complementarity in Mate Selection," American Sociological Review, 27, 295-303.
- Kohlberg, L., 1974. Intimacy, Family and Society. Boston: Little, Brown (first published 1966)
- Kon, I.S., 1981. "Adolescent Friendship: Some Unanswered Questions for Future Research" in S.Duck & R.Gilmour, Personal Relationships, 2. London: Academic Press.
- La Gaipa, J.J., 1981. "A Systems Approach to Personal Relationships" in S.Duck and R.Gilmour, Personal Relationships 1. London: Academic Press.
- Levinger, G., 1974. "A Three-Level Approach to Attraction: Toward an Understanding of Pair Relatedness" in T.L.Huston, Foundations of Interpersonal Attraction. New York: Academic Press.
- Lickona, T., 1974. "A Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Interpersonal Attraction" in T.L.Huston, Foundations of Interpersonal Attraction. New York: Academic Press.
- Lips, H.M. & A.Morrison, 1986. "Changes in the Sense of Family among Couples having their First Child," Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 3, 393-400.
- Lowe, G.R., 1972. The Growth of Personality. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Lynch, J.J., 1979. The Broken Heart: The Medical Consequences of Loneliness. New York: Basic Books (first published 1977).
- McAdams, D.P., 1984. "Human Motives and Personal Relationships" in V.Derlega, Communication, Intimacy, and Close Relationships. Orlando: Academic Press.
- McClelland, D.C., 1986. "Some Reflections on the Two Psychologies of Love." Journal of Personality, 54, 2, 334-353
- Marris, P., 1982. "Attachment and Society" in C.M.Parkes & J.Stevenson-Pinde, The Place of Attachment in Human Behavior. New York: Basic Books.
- Matthews, S.H., 1986. Friendships through the Life Course. Beverly Hills: Sage
- Mayer, P., 1961. Townsmen or Tribesmen. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

- Mayer, P. & I., 1970. "Socialization by Peers" in P.Mayer, Socialization: The Approach from Social Anthropology. London: Tavistock.
- Minuchin, S., 1984. Family Kaleidoscope. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mitchell, C., 1969. Social Networks in Urban Situations. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Montagu, A., 1986. Touching. New York: Harper & Row (first published 1971).
- Mower White, C.J., 1982. Consistency in Cognitive Social Behaviour: An Introduction to Social Psychology. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Norman, D.K., J.M.Murphy, C.Gilligan, & J.Vasudev, 1982. "Sex Differences and Interpersonal Relationships: A Cross-Sectional Sample in the U.S. and India." International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 14, 4, 291-306.
- O'Connell, L., 1984. "An Exploration of Exchange in Three Social Relationships: Kinship, Friendship and the Marketplace." Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 1, 333-35.
- Parkes, C.M., 1975. Bereavement. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books (first published 1972).
- Pauw, B.A., 1963. The Second Generation. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Perlmutter, M.S. & E.Hatfield, 1980. "Intimacy, Intentional Metacommunication and Second Order Change." American Journal of Family Therapy, 8, 17-23.
- Pike, G.R. & A.L.Sillars, 1985. "Reciprocity of Marital Communication." Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2, 303-324.
- Rawlins, W.K. & M.R.Holl, 1988. "Adolescents' Interaction with Parents and Friends: Dialectics of Temporal Perspective and Evaluation." Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5, 1, 27-46.
- Reisman, J.M., 1981. "Adult Friendships" in S.Duck & R.Gilmour, Personal Relationships 2. London: Academic Press.
- Rubin, L.B., 1983. Intimate Strangers. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rubin, L.B., 1985. Just Friends. New York: Harper & Row.

- Rubin, Z., 1973. Liking and Loving. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Rubin, Z., 1980. Children's Friendships. Glasgow: Fontana Paperbacks, William Collins.
- Salzinger, S., J. Antrobus and M. Hammer, 1988. Social Networks of Children, Adolescence and College Students. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Selman, R.L., 1981. "The Child as a Friendship Philosopher" in S.R. Asher and J.M. Gottman, The Development of Children's Friendships. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaver, P., C. Hazan & D. Bradshaw, 1987. "Love as Attachment: The Integration of Three Behavioral Systems" in R.J. Sternberg & M.L. Barnes, The Psychology of Love. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sherrod, D., 1987. "The Bonds of Men: Problems and Possibilities in Close Male Relationships" in H. Brod, The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies. Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Shulman, N., 1975. "Life-Cycle Variations in Patterns of Close Relationships." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37, 813-821.
- Spiegel, A.D., 1980. "Rural Differentiation and the Diffusion of Migrant Labour Remittances in Lesotho" in P. Mayer, Black Villagers in an Industrial Society. Cape Town, Oxford University Press.
- Stack, C.B., 1974. All Our Kin. New York: Harper & Row.
- Stone, L., 1979. The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800. New York: Harper & Row (first published 1977).
- Straus, M.A., R.J. Gelles, & S.K. Steinmetz, 1980. Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family. New York: Anchor/ Doubleday.
- Sullivan, H.S., 1953. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: Norton.
- Suttie, I.D., 1960. The Origins of Love and Hate. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books (first published 1935).
- Taylor, J.V., 1963. The Primal Vision. London: SCM.
- Thibaut, J.W. & H.H. Kelley, 1959. The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: Wiley.

- Truu, M.L. and J.L. Wallis, 1985. An Economic Survey of Grahamstown. Grahamstown: Chamber of Commerce.
- Tschann, J.M., 1988. "Self-Disclosure in Adult Friendship: Gender and Marital Status Differences." Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5, 1, 65-81.
- Walster, E., G.W. Walster & E. Berscheid, 1978. Equity: Theory and Research. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Walling, E.M., M.P. Tillman, L. Frelick, L. Russell & S. Weis, 1980. "Concepts of Intimacy in the General Population." Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 168, 8, 471-474.
- Wegner, D.M., Giuliano, T., and P.T. Hertel, 1985. "Cognitive Interdependence in Close Relationships" in W. Ickes, Compatible and Incompatible Relationships. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Weiss, R.S., 1982. "Attachment in Adult Life" in C.M. Parkes and J. Stevenson-Hinde, The Place of Attachment in Human Behavior. New York: Basic Books.
- Wellman, B., 1984. "Domestic Work, Paid Work and Net Work" in S. Duck and D. Perlman, Understanding Personal Relationships: An Interdisciplinary Approach. London: Sage.
- Williams, R., 1977. Marxism and Literature. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilsworth, M.J., 1980. Strategies for Survival. Grahamstown: Rhodes University Institute of Social & Economic Research.
- Winch, R.F., 1958. Mate Selection: A Study of Complementary Needs. New York: Harper.
- Winnicott, D.W., 1965. The Family and Individual Development. New York: Basic Books.
- Woolf, V., 1929. A Room of One's Own. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Wright, P.H., 1982. "Men's Friendships, Women's Friendships and the Alleged Inferiority of the Latter." Sex Roles, 8, 1-20.
- Young, M. & Willmott, P., 1962. Family and Kinship in East London. Harmondsworth: Penguin (first published 1957).

Zietlow, P.H. & A.L.Sillars, 1988. "Life-Stage Differences in Communication during Marital Conflicts." Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5, 223-245.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Explanation:

This project is trying to find out how alike, or how dissimilar, are the experiences people have of others they are close to. We want to see to what extent people who are your age and male/female would answer these questions the way you might.

In answering these questions, please say what comes to mind first. If you were asked these questions say tomorrow or next week, some of your answers might be slightly different. That is all right, because everyone would undoubtedly answer somewhat differently on a different day.

If you are asked to name someone, please give first name only. We need a last initial only if more than one person you mention has the same first name.

Name:
Gender:

Age:
Occupation:

Item 1

Who are the people you feel very close to?

<u>Name</u>	<u>Length of</u> <u>Acquaintance</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Relationship</u>	<u>Occupation</u>

Item 2

Please remember that there is no right or expected answer to any of these questions. Simply give whatever answer you think is most nearly accurate for you.

1. If you suddenly won a lot of money, whom would you tell first?
2. Whom do you think knows most how you feel about your [past]* life? *omit for children
3. Outside of work/school, whom do you talk to most?

4. Whom do you think knows most about your deepest secrets? (For children: Whom do you like to share secrets with?)

5. Last time you were very upset or depressed about something, whom did you tell first? How much did you share with them? a lot? somewhat? a bit?

6. Who most agrees with you about what best friends should be? (For children: Whom do you think is your really best friend?)

7a. For pupil or student:

Who pays your school/training college/university fees?

7b. For full-time worker:

Who really got you your present job?

7c. Who is responsible for meeting your material needs? If self: employment? pension? insurance? independent income? (For children: Who works to get the money for the things you need?)

8. What was the most special day for you in the past year? Whom did you spend it with?

9. Who supports you financially?

10. Whom do you know who wants the same things [out of life]* that you want? *omit for children

11. Whose dying would upset you most deeply? (For children: Whose being very, very sick would upset you most?)

12. Whose looking nice and dressing smartly is most important for you?

13. Whom do you have most disagreements [or squabbles] with? -question of quantity

14. Who most agrees with you about what a family should be ideally? (children not asked)

15. If/when you go to church [Sunday school],* who usually goes with you? *for children

16. Whom would you choose to pick out a big surprise present for yourself -- assuming everyone had same amount of money?

17. Whom do you worry or pray about most?

18. Last holiday you had, whom did you spend it with?

19. Whom can you get most angry or upset with? -question

of intensity

20. Who likes most to do the kinds of things you enjoy?
21. If you could make a wish come true for anyone you know, whom would you make that wish for?
22. Last time you needed someone helping you [with a special project or task, not on the job],* who helped you? *omit for children
23. If you were to be far away from everyone you know for a long time, whom would you most want to send messages to?
24. If you went to a concert, who would most likely go with you?
25. Under whose name is the house you live in registered or rented?
26. Whom would you most want to share a bank account with? [have in your burial society? have in your stokfel?] (For children: Whom would you let open your money box if you were not there?)
27. Whom do you know whose experiences are most like yours? (children not asked)
28. Who could (but not necessarily would) hurt you the most? (children not asked)
29. Outside of school/work, with whom do you spend most time?
30. Who prepares your food ordinarily?
31. Who could make you feel most embarrassed or ashamed?
32. Whose ideas about God are most like your own? (children not asked)
33. If you had R1 000 to spend with someone, who could most easily agree with you on how to spend it?
34. Who reacts to life most nearly the way you do? (children not asked)
35. When you have a free day [from school],* whom do you usually spend it with? *add for children
36. How much do you long for time alone by yourself? often? sometimes? never/almost never?

37. When you do things and make choices every day, whom do you keep most in mind?

Person: a. _____ b. _____ c. _____

(Check one)

Because (s)he

needs you more: _____

Because you
need him/her
more: _____

You need each
other about
the same: _____

38. If you couldn't wash yourself without help from someone else, whom would you prefer to have helping you?

39a. Whom do you need most emotionally? (For children: Whom do you need most for comfort?)

39b. Whom do you need most financially/for money?

39c. Whom do you need most for personal services/taking care of your clothing, food, household?

40. Whom would you least mind have use your very favorite coat?

41. Is there anyone you wish you were closer to? If yes, to whom? How? (For children: Is there anyone you wish were nicer to you? Whom?)

42. Who needs you most? (children not asked)

a. _____ b. _____ c. _____

In what ways do they need you?

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

43. Would you like most to sleep alone in your own bed? share a bed? With whom?

44. How do you express affection to a person who is the same age and gender as yourself? (For children: How do you show your best friend you like him/her?)

45. Whose dying would change your life most?

46. How do you greet a very close friend you haven't seen in a long time?

47. Insert the first three entries under Item 1 below,

then ask: (but not of children)

(more/as much/less)
Do you get _____ from _____ than/as you give?

(more/as much/less)
Do you get _____ from _____ than/as you give?

(more/as much/less)
Do you get _____ from _____ than/as you give?

48. Whom would you like to have rub your back if you were very ill?

49. Who usually sleeps in the same room as you? in the same bed?

50. If you could change any relationships you have right now, which ones would you change? How? (children not asked)

51. Whom would you most like to go with if you were going to a party?

52. Do you feel lonesome often? somewhat? never/almost never?

53. (Insert names of three most close others on left lines.) When do you feel closest to

name

situation

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

54. (For those working) Do you have a real community of friends on the job?

55. (For those with income) Whom do you spend most of your money on?

a. _____ b. _____ c. _____

56. (For those with live-in spouse or liaison) What would it mean to you if your husband/wife/girlfriend/boyfriend didn't make love to you for a long while?

Item 3 -- Autobiography

How long have you lived in Grahamstown?

How long have you lived in this house/site?

How long have you held your present job/been in your present school?

Who were the important people around you when

then ask: (but not of children)

(more/as much/less)
Do you get _____ from _____ than/as you give?

(more/as much/less)
Do you get _____ from _____ than/as you give?

(more/as much/less)
Do you get _____ from _____ than/as you give?

48. Whom would you like to have rub your back if you were very ill?

49. Who usually sleeps in the same room as you? in the same bed?

50. If you could change any relationships you have right now, which ones would you change? How? (children not asked)

51. Whom would you most like to go with if you were going to a party?

52. Do you feel lonesome often? somewhat? never/almost never?

53. (Insert names of three most close others on left lines.) When do you feel closest to

<u>name</u>	<u>situation</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

54. (For those working) Do you have a real community of friends on the job?

55. (For those with income) Whom do you spend most of your money on?

a. _____ b. _____ c. _____

56. (For those with live-in spouse or liaison.) What would it mean to you if your husband/wife/girlfriend/boyfriend didn't make love to you for a long while?

Item 3 -- Autobiography

How long have you lived in Grahamstown?

How long have you lived in this house/site?

How long have you held your present job/been in your present school?

Who were the important people around you when

- you were a very little child?
(How were they important to you?)
(If siblings, what is/was the age spread?)
- you were school-age?
- you were a young adult? etc.
(Were there any special gains, losses, or
transformations in relationships?)

APPENDIX B

ALL RELATIONSHIP CATEGORIES MENTIONED BY RESPONDENTS

Individual Familial Relationships

MALE	Female
GRANDFATHER (called FATHER)	mothers' mother (called mother)
	FATHER'S mother (called mother)
PATERNAL GRANDFATHER	maternal grandmother
maternal GRANDFATHER	PATERNAL grandmother
GRANDFATHER (unspecified)	grandmother (unspecified)
FATHER	mother
STEP-FATHER	step-mother
FATHER-IN-LAW	mother-in-law
FATHER'S BROTHER (UNCLE)	mother's sister (aunt)
FATHER'S sister's HUSBAND (UNCLE)	mother's BROTHER'S wife (aunt)
mother's sister's HUSBAND (UNCLE)	FATHER'S BROTHER'S wife (aunt)
mother's BROTHER (UNCLE)	FATHER'S sister (aunt)
UNCLE (unspecified)	aunt (unspecified)
FATHER'S FATHER'S BROTHER (GREAT-UNCLE)	GRANDFATHER'S sister (great-aunt)
mother's FATHER'S BROTHER (GREAT-UNCLE)	
FATHER'S mother's BROTHER (GREAT-UNCLE)	grandmother's sister (great aunt)
mother's mother's BROTHER (GREAT-UNCLE)	
GREAT-UNCLE (unspecified)	
CLAN-UNCLE	clan aunt
UNCLE "IN-LAW"	
BROTHER	sister
STEP-BROTHER	step-sister
CLAN BROTHER	clan sister
BROTHER-IN-LAW	sister-in law
MALE COUSIN	female cousin
MALE CLAN COUSIN	female clan cousin
SON	daughter
STEP-SON	step-daughter
SON-IN-LAW	daughter-in-law
GRANDSON OF SON	granddaughter of daughter
GRANDSON of daughter	granddaughter of SON
	clan granddaughter
NEPHEW	niece
	clan niece
GRANDNEPHEW	grandniece
GREAT-GRANDSON	great-granddaughter
HUSBAND	wife
EX-HUSBAND (separated)	ex-wife (separated)
EX-HUSBAND (deceased)	ex wife (deceased)

Group Familial Relationships

PATERNAL Grandparents
 maternal Grandparents
 maternal Grandparents and mother
 Grandparents (unspecified)
 GRANDFATHER and great-aunt
 grandmother and great-aunt
 grandmother and mother
 grandmother, mother, aunts and Siblings
 grandmother, mother, aunts and Cousins
 grandmother and aunts - her daughters
 grandmother, aunts, Siblings and Cousins
 grandmother and Siblings
 grandmother and Cousins
 grandmother, Siblings and Cousins
 great-aunt and Cousin
 FATHER and Extended Family
 FATHER & BROTHER(S) -- AS BREADWINNERS
 mother and UNCLE
 Mother and aunt(s) and uncle (s)
 mother and BROTHER(S)
 mother and sister(s)
 mother, sister(s) and Cousins
 Parents
 Parents-in-Law
 Parents and Grandparents
 Parents, Grandparents and Siblings
 Parents and Siblings
 Parents, Siblings, UNCLES, aunts and Cousins
 Parents, Siblings and Cousins
 UNCLE and aunt (maternal)
 Siblings
 Siblings and Cousins
 sister(s) and cousins
 Siblings and Children
 Children
 Grandchildren
 HUSBAND and mother-in-law
 HUSBAND and Sibling(s)
 wife and FATHER
 wife and mother
 wife and grand-daughter
 wife and GRANDSON
 Spouse, Children and Grandchildren
 Spouse, Children and Parents (-in-law)
 Spouse and Extended Family
 Spouse, Children and Extended Family
 Self and Siblings
 Self and Spouse
 Self, Spouse & Parents
 Self, Spouse and Children
 Self and Children

Individual Friend Relationships

MALE FRIEND	female friend
"BOYFRIEND"	"girlfriend"

Group Familial and Friend Relationships

GRANDFATHER and Peer Friends
 Parents and Peer Friend
 Parents, Siblings and Peer Friends
 mother and girlfriend
 Siblings and Peer Friends
 Cousins (same-gender) and Same-Gender Peer Friends
 Cousins (opposite gender) and Same-Gender Peer Friends
 Spouse and Peer Friends
 Spouse and Peer Couples
 Spouse, Children and other Families
 Self and Peer Friend

Other Relationships

Ego, Self
 Neighbour
 Boss, Employer
 Work Mates or Associates
 Work Subordinates
 Spiritual Adviser
 "The Church"
 Church Mates
 School Teacher
 University Teacher
 Teacher (unspecified)
 Doctor, Nurse, Psychiatrist
 Witch-doctor
 DOMESTIC SERVANT - "BOY"
 domestic servant - "maid"
 Pet dog
 No-one
 Anybody

Where a subject named more than one person for any of the above categories (as, for instance, more than one daughter), each person was given a separate code (as, for example, "daughter 1" and "daughter 2"). Two or more persons mentioned in the same individual category also received separate codes (as, for example, "both nephews"). Hence there were 235 relationship code categories in all.

APPENDIX C

GOODNESS-OF-FIT TABLES

The following tables illustrate goodness-of-fit (by non-parametric chi square test) scores for response patterns (Family, Friends, Other) to all relevant questions. A Cramer's V Test of Association value is included in brackets after the non-parametric chi square score in all cases where the parametric chi square is significant below the .05 level.

 Q1: BIG WIN

Dying-Upset (Q11)	Messages (Q23)	In Mind Choosing (Q37)
.114 [V=.490]	.131 [V=.398]	.114 [V=.489]

 Q2: KNOWLEDGE OF PAST

Gift (Q16)	Shame (Q31)	R1000 (Q33)
.621 [V=.432]	.386	.316 [V=.293]
Holiday (Q18)	Most Angry (Q19)	Disagreements (Q13)
.282 [V=.207]	.205 [V=.159]	.190
Confidant (Q5)	Wish Closer (Q41)	Garment (Q40)
.169 [V=.375]	.089	.076 [V=.268]
Hurt (Q28)	Help (Q22)	
.071 [V=.289]	.051 [V=.189]	

 Q3: MOST TALK

Same Joys (Q20)	Contact Hours (Q29)
.420 [V=.240]	.335 [V=.448]

 Q4: SECRETS

Religion (Q32)	Wants Same (Q10)	Free Day (Q35)
.841 [V=.302]	.400 [V=.183]	.121 [V=.268]

 Q5: CONFIDANT

Help (Q22)	Gift (Q16)	Know Past (Q2)
.210 [V=.186]	.134 [V=.246]	.124 [V=.374]
Disagreement (Q13)	R1000 (Q33)	
.124	.070 [V=.267]	

 Q6: BEST FRIENDS

Concert (Q24)	Same Joys (Q20)	Most Talk (Q3)
.717 [V=.215]	.521 [V=.251]	.053

Q7c: SUPPORT

Fin. Anchor (Q39b)	House (Q25)	Per. Needs (Q39c)
.593 [V=.788]	.100 [V=.356]	.069

Q10: WANTS SAME

Religion (Q32)	Secrets (Q4)	Free Day (Q35)
.744 [V=.196]	.316 [V=.183]	.204 [V=.199]
Same Joys (Q20)	Best Friends (Q6)	
.066 [V=.384]	.061 [V=.214]	

Q11: DYING -- UPSET

Death-Change (Q45)
.105 [V=.339]

Q12: APPEARANCES

Washing (Q38)	Worry/Pray (Q17)	Needs You (Q42)
.074 [V=.253]	.068 [V=.210]	.059 [V=.335]

Q13: DISAGREEMENTS

Help (Q22)	Confidant (Q5)	Wish Closer (Q4)
.780 [V=.213]	.343	.288 [V=.169]
Holiday (Q18)	Know Past (Q2)	
.083	.233	

Q15: CHURCH

Change Other (Q50)	Garment (Q40)
.628 [V=.254]	.097 [V=.294]

Q16: GIFT

R1000 (Q33)	Know Past (Q2)	Emot. Anchor (Q39A)
.835 [V=.297]	.551 [V=.432]	.201 [V=.349]
Hurt (Q28)	Shame (Q31)	Ideal Family (Q14)
.174 [V=.341]	.164 [V=.259]	.093 [V=.494]
Confidant (Q5)	Needs You (Q42)	
.089 [V=.246]	.051 [V=.182]	

Q17: WORRY/PRAY

Washing (Q38)	Messages (Q23)	Needs You (Q42)
.447 [V=.256]	.391 [V=.372]	.297 [V=.233]
Rub Back (Q48)	Big Win (Q1)	Hurt (Q28)
.127 [V=.284]	.109 [V=.219]	.057
In Mind Choosing (Q37)		
.454 [V=.178]		

Q18: HOLIDAY

Most Angry (Q19)	Garment (Q40)	Shame (Q31)
.848 [V=.120]	.638 [V=.205]	.586 [V=.184]
Know Past (Q2)	Wish Closer (Q41)	Gift (Q16)
.435 [V=.207]	.340 [V=.197]	.171 [V=.335]
Change Other (Q50)	R1000 (Q33)	Disagree (Q13)
.081 [V=.146]	.076 [V=.289]	.060 [V=.063]
Hurt (Q28)		
.053 [V=.175]		

Q19: MOST ANGRY

Garment (Q40)	Holiday (Q18)	Shame (Q31)
.901	.839	.798 [V=.372]
Know Past (Q2)	Gift (Q16)	Change Other (Q50)
.289 [V=.159]	.167 [V=.227]	.137 [V=.254]
Hurt (Q28)	Wish Closer (Q41)	R1000 (Q33)
.125 [V=.459]	.111	.095
Fin. Anchor (Q39)		
.057		

Q20: SAME JOYS

Best Friends (Q6)	Most Talk (Q3)	Concert (Q24)
.516 [V=.251]	.433 [V=.240]	.184 [V=.336]

Q21: WISH

Trust (Q26)
.137 [V=.241]

Q22: HELP

Disagreement (Q13)	Confidant (Q5)	Same Reaction (Q34)
.781 [V=.213]	.351 [V=.186]	.252
Contact Hrs. (Q29)	Know Past (Q2)	Wish Closer (Q4)
.107	.085 [V=.189]	.077 [V=.161]

Q23: MESSAGES

In Mind Choosing (Q37)	Big Win (Q1)	Worry/Pray (Q17)
.723 [V=.360]	.495 [V=.398]	.182 [V=.372]
Dying-Upset (Q11)	Needs You (Q42)	Death-Change (Q45)
.080 [V=.370]	.059 [V=.308]	.054 [V=.280]

Q24: CONCERT

Best Friends (Q6)	Same Joys (Q20)
.633 [V=.215]	.160 [V=.336]

Q25: HOUSE

Support (Q7c)	Fin. Anchor (39b)
.099 [V=.356]	.082 [V=.367]

Q26: TRUST

Support-Fees (Q7a)
.121 [V=.252]

Q27: SIMILAR EXPERIENCE

Party (Q51)
.115

Q28: HURT

Rub Back (Q48)	Emot. Anchor (Q39)	Needs You (Q42)
.861 [V=.334]	.859 [V=.325]	.691 [V=.338]
Washing (Q38)	Ideal Family (Q14)	Shame (Q31)
.510 [V=.360]	.186 [V=.230]	.144 [V=.262]
R1000 (Q33)	Worry/Pray (Q17)	Gift (Q16)
.117 [V=.313]	.092	.062 [V=.341]

Q29: CONTACT HOURS

Most Talk (Q3)	Help (Q22)	Same Reactions (Q34)
426 [V=.448]	.122	.597 [V=.274]

Q30: FOOD

Personal Needs (Q39c)

.348 [V=.542]

Q31: SHAME

Most Angry (Q19)	Garment (Q40)	Holiday (Q18)
.767 [V=.372]	.590 [V=.272]	.544 [V=.184]
Know Past (Q2)	Gift (Q16)	Hurt (Q28)
.367	.327 [V=.259]	.287 [V=.262]
R1000 (Q33)	Emot. Anchor (Q39A)	Rub Back (Q48)
.229 [V=.168]	.178 [V=.215]	.085 [V=.367]
Needs You (Q42)		
.064		

Q32: RELIGION

Secrets (Q4)	Wants Same (Q10)	Free Day (Q35)
.810 [V=.302]	.730 [V=.196]	.128 [V=.254]

Q33: R1000

Gift (Q16)	Emot. Anchor (Q39A)	Ideal Family (Q14)
.813 [V=.297]	.319 [V=.394]	.218 [V=.422]
Hurt (Q28)	Know Past (Q2)	Needs You (Q42)
.199 [V=.313]	.189 [V=.293]	.093 [V=.222]
Rub Back (Q48)		
.063 [V=.294]		

Q34: SAME REACTIONS

Contact Hrs. (Q29)	Help (Q22)	Most Talk (Q3)
.629 [V=.274]	.203	.138 [V=.212]
Disagreement (Q13)		
.066		

Q35: FREE DAY

Best Friends (Q6)	Wants Same (Q10)	Concert (Q24)
.210 [V=.165]	.178 [V=.199]	.175 [V=.279]
Religion (Q32)	Similar Exp. (Q27)	
.098 [V=.254]	.053	

Q37: IN MIND WHEN CHOOSING

Messages (Q23)	Big Win (Q1)	Needs You (Q42)
.759 [V=.360]	.439 [V=.489]	.246 [V=.426]
Worry/Pray (Q17)	Washing (Q38)	
.215 [V=.178]	.125 [V=.381]	

Q38: WASHING

Needs You (Q42)	Rub Back (Q48)	Hurt (Q28)
.884 [V=.336]	.794 [V=.567]	.532 [V=.360]
Worry/Pray (Q17)	Emot. Anchor (Q39A)	In Mind Choosing (Q37)
.527 [V=.256]	.272 [V=.306]	.285 [V=.381]
Messages (Q23)	Ideal Family (Q14)	
.116 [V=.274]	.068 [V=.258]	

Q39A: EMOTIONAL ANCHOR

Hurt (Q28)	Rub Back (Q48)	Needs You (Q42)
.855 [V=.325]	.668 [V=.392]	.640 [V=.400]
Washing (Q38)	Ideal Family (Q14)	R1000 (Q33)
.349 [V=.306]	.314 [V=.523]	.259 [V=.394]
Gift (Q16)	Shame (Q31)	Worry/Pray (Q17)
.132 [V=.349]	.080 [V=.215]	.052 [V=.345]

Q39B: FINANCIAL ANCHOR

Support (Q7c)	Pers. Needs (Q39c)	House (Q25)
.761 [V=.788]	.495	.111 [V=.367]

Q39C: PERSONAL NEEDS

Fin. Anchor (Q39b)	Food (Q30)	Support (Q7c)
.544	.326 [V=.542]	.265

Q40: GARMENT

Most Angry (Q19)	Shame (Q31)	Holiday (Q18)
.901	.669 [V=.272]	.612 [V=.205]
Change Other (Q50)	Hurt (Q28)	Know Past (Q2)
.305 [V=.213]	.137 [V=.210]	.134 [V=.268]
Gift (Q16)	R1000 (Q33)	Emot. Anchor (Q39a)
.089 [V=.364]	.056 [V=.269]	.056 [V=.306]

Q41: WISH MORE CLOSE

Disagreement (Q13)	Holiday (Q18)	Know Past (Q2)
.392 [V=.169]	.386 [V=.197]	.190
Most Angry (Q19)	Help (Q22)	Garment (Q40)
.156	.141 [V=.161]	.091 [V=.214]
Shame (Q31)	Confidant (Q5)	
.067 [V=.334]	.056	

Q42: NEEDS YOU MOST

Washing (Q38)	Hurt (Q28)	Emot. Anchor (Q39a)
.844 [V=.336]	.662 [V=.338]	.524 [V=.400]
Worry/Pray (Q17)	In Mind Choosing (Q37)	Ideal Family (Q14)
.310 [V=.233]	.277 [V=.426]	.168

Q45: DEATH -- CHANGE

Dying-Upset (Q11)
.368 [V=.339]

Q48: RUB BACK

Needs You (Q42)	Hurt (Q28)	Washing (Q38)
.902 [V=.275]	.885 [V=.334]	.813 [V=.567]
Emot.Anchor (Q39a)	Worry/Pray (Q17)	Ideal Family (Q14)
.651 [V=.392]	.230 [V=.284]	.149 [V=.353]
In Mind Choosing (Q37)		
.132 [V=.296]		

Q50: CHANGE OTHER

Church (Q15)	Garment (Q40)	Most Angry (Q19)
.598 [V=.254]	.409 [V=.213]	.231 [V=.254]
Holiday (Q18)	Shame (Q31)	
.119	.112 [V=.335]	

Q51: PARTY

Concert (Q24)	Free Day (Q35)
.086 [V=.482]	.066 [V=.322]

APPENDIX D

TABLE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 42 (PART II):
 "WHO NEEDS YOU MOST -- WHY DO THEY NEED YOU?"

<u>Type of Need</u>	<u>Frequency of Mention</u>
Financial Support	3 (1.5%)
Emotional Support	43 (21.5%)
Practical Assistance	31 (15.5%)
All the Above	20 (10%)
Financial & Emotional	14 (7%)
Financial & Practical	5 (2.5%)
Emotional & Practical	41 (20.5%)
No One	2 (1%)
Unknown	1 (.5%)
Missing*	40 (20%)
TOTAL	200 (100%)

*includes all the children, who were not asked
 this question

APPENDIX E

TABLES FOR AGE GRAPHS

Graphs of Family Mentions by Age Groups and Friend Mentions by Age Groups (Figures 1 & 2) are based upon data in the following tables. All significances were obtained by analysis of variance tests on each row. Percentages were rounded up.

"Ultimate Loss" by Age

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	80 100%	79 99%	70 88%	77 96%	76 95%	382 96%	.0128 (p=.01)
Friends	0 0%	1 1%	10 13%	1 1%	2 3%	14 4%	.0004 (p<.001)
Other	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 3%	2 3%	4 1%	.1923
Total	80 100%	80 100%	80 101%	80 100%	80 101%	400 101%	

Network Center" by Age

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	114 95%	110 92%	90 75%	116 97%	114 95%	544 91%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	5 4%	9 8%	27 23%	3 3%	5 4%	49 8%	.0000 (p<.001)
Other	1 1%	1 1%	3 3%	1 1%	1 1%	7 1%	.7726
Total	120 100%	120 101%	120 101%	120 101%	120 100%	600 100%	

"Permeability/Vulnerability" by Age

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	223 93%	279 87%	210 66%	280 88%	271 85%	1263 83%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	10 4%	37 12%	106 33%	28 9%	24 8%	205 13%	.0000 (p<.001)
Other	7 3%	4 1%	4 1%	12 4%	25 8%	52 3%	.0113 (p=.01)
Total	240 100%	320 100%	320 100%	320 101%	320 101%	1520 99%	

"Shared Resources" by Age

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	106 88%	96 80%	68 57%	100 83%	96 80%	466 78%	.0001 (p<.001)
Friends	14 12%	22 18%	49 41%	15 13%	18 15%	118 20%	.0000 (p<.001)
Other	0 0%	2 2%	3 3%	5 4%	6 5%	16 3%	.2426
Total	120 100%	120 100%	120 101%	120 100%	120 100%	600 101%	

"Contact" by Age

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	53 66%	68 57%	50 42%	93 78%	83 69%	347 62%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	23 29%	50 42%	67 56%	25 21%	34 28%	199 36%	.0000 (p<.001)
Other	4 5%	2 2%	3 3%	2 2%	3 3%	14 3%	.9223
Total	80 100%	120 101%	120 101%	120 101%	120 100%	560 101%	

"Common Attitudes" by Age

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	69 43%	92 46%	72 36%	132 66%	133 67%	498 52%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	89 56%	100 50%	118 59%	58 29%	56 28%	421 44%	.0000 (p<.001)
Other	2 1%	8 4%	9 5%	10 5%	11 6%	40 4%	.25
Total	160 100%	200 100%	199 100%	200 100%	200 101%	959 100%	

"Shared Experiences" by Age

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	61 51%	32 27%	28 24%	88 74%	68 59%	277 47%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	56 47%	85 71%	88 74%	29 24%	44 38%	302 51%	.0000 (p<.001)
Other	2 2%	3 3%	3 3%	2 2%	3 3%	13 2%	.9812
Total	119 100%	120 101%	119 101%	119 100%	115 100%	592 100%	

"Finances" by Age

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	120 100%	120 100%	80 67%	48 40%	38 32%	406 68%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	0 0%	0 0%	3 3%	0 0%	2 2%	5 1%	.2157
Other	0 0%	0 0%	37 31%	72 60%	80 67%	189 32%	.0000 (p<.001)
Total	120 100%	120 100%	120 101%	120 100%	120 101%	600 100%	

"Personal Services" by Age

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	71 90%	59 74%	30 38%	37 46%	39 49%	236 59%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	0 0%	0 0%	6 8%	0 0%	1 1%	7 2%	.0032 (p<.01)
Other	9 11%	21 26%	44 55%	43 54%	40 50%	157 39%	.0000 (p<.001)
Total	80 101%	80 100%	80 101%	80 100%	80 100%	400 100%	

Sub-dimensions of "Permeability/Vulnerability" by Age

"Dependence"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	75 94%	106 88%	82 68%	111 93%	106 88%	480 86%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	1 1%	13 11%	35 29%	7 6%	9 8%	65 11%	.0000 (p<.001)
Other	4 5%	1 1%	3 3%	2 2%	5 4%	15 3%	.5394
Total	80 100%	120 100%	120 100%	120 101%	120 100%	560 100%	

"Physical Closeness"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	79 99%	76 95%	53 66%	71 89%	62 78%	341 85%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	0 0%	3 4%	27 34%	7 9%	10 13%	47 12%	.0000 (p<.001)
Other	1 1%	1 1%	0 0%	2 1%	8 10%	12 3%	.0170 (p<.05)
Total	80 100%	80 100%	80 100%	80 99%	80 101%	400 100%	

"Ambivalence"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	69 86%	97 81%	75 63%	98 82%	103 86%	442 79%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	9 11%	21 18%	44 37%	14 12%	5 4%	93 17%	.0000 (p<.001)
Other	2 3%	2 2%	1 1%	8 7%	12 10%	25 4%	.0258 (p<.05)
Total	80 100%	120 101%	120 101%	120 101%	120 100%	560 100%	

Sub-dimensions of "Common Attitudes" by Age

"Mutual Values"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	26 33%	41 51%	33 41%	57 71%	59 74%	216 54%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	54 68%	38 48%	45 56%	22 28%	19 24%	178 45%	.0000 (p<.001)
Other	0 0%	1 1%	2 3%	1 1%	2 3%	6 2%	.6678
Total	80 101%	80 100%	80 100%	80 100%	80 101%	400 101%	

"Intimate Beliefs"

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Years</u>					Total	Sig.
	9-11	16-17	22-25	36-46	62+		
Family	43 54%	51 43%	39 33%	75 63%	74 62%	282 50%	.0000 (p<.001)
Friends	35 44%	62 52%	73 61%	36 30%	37 31%	243 43%	.0000 (p<.001)
Other	2 3%	7 6%	7 6%	9 8%	9 8%	34 6%	.3439
Total	80 101%	120 101%	119 100%	120 101%	120 101%	559 99%	

Author Aldrich Meredith J

Name of thesis Intimacy: A Developmental Perspective. 1988

PUBLISHER:

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.