


university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
 

Date 3/9/2012 | 1

Social Goals and Adolescent Friendships

Do Power and Affiliation Motives Evidence Different Friendship Selection and Influence Processes?

Jelle J. Sijtsema & Tiina Ojanen


university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
 

Date 3/9/2012 | 2

Who do we befriend?



- > Friendships
 - Provision of critical benefits in social development
- > Similarity
 - Youth select friends who are similar
- > Social goals
 - Do these processes also hold for social goals?
 - In particular: agentic and communal goals


university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
 

Date 3/9/2012 | 3

Power and affiliation motives

- > Agency and communion fundamental in human life (Bakan, 1966)
- > Agency
 - Interest on the self, independence, dominance and mastery
 - Related to aggression, bullying (Sijtsema et al., 2009)
- > Communion
 - Relational needs, such as affiliation and intimacy
 - Related to peer acceptance and prosocial behavior (Ojanen et al., 2005)


university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
 

Date 3/9/2012 | 4

Relation to selection and influence?



- > Similarity attraction hypothesis (Barry, 1970; Kandel, 1979)
 - Shared values and social norms
 - Similarity in communion
 - Similarity or complementarity in agency (Dryer & Horowitz, 1997; Sullivan, 1953)
- > Socialization
 - Reinforced behavior
 - Visible benefits


university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
 

Date 3/9/2012 | 5

Hypotheses

- > Participants select friends with similar levels of communal goals
- > Participants select friends with either similar or dissimilar levels of agentic goals
- > Participants become more similar to their friends with regard to communal and agentic goals


university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
 

Date 3/9/2012 | 6

Data

- > Southeast Finland
- > 384 students (12 - 14 years; 53% girls)
- > Three assessment waves (March - October - March)
- > Friendship networks (within grade)
- > Social goals: IGI-C vector scores
- > Missing data imputation via SAS Proc MI

university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
Date 3/9/2012 | 7

Analyses

- > SIENA 3.1 – meta-analysis application (Boer, Huisman, Snijders, Wichers, & Zeggelink, 2007; Snijders & Baerveldt, 2003)
- > Actor-oriented models
- > Structural effects
- > Individual effects
 - Selection (or creation) of friendship ties
 - Effect from ties on development of social goals

university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
Date 3/9/2012 | 8

Findings Agentic Goals

| | M (SE) | Variance | χ^2 | df |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------|----------|----|
| Selection Effects | | | | |
| Gender | | | | |
| Nominations Received | 0.07 (0.04) † | <0.01 | 1.69 | 3 |
| Nominations Given | -0.00 (0.06) | 0.01 | 4.54 | 3 |
| Same gender | 0.28 (0.08)*** | 0.03 | 14.73** | 3 |
| Agentic Goals | | | | |
| Nominations Received | 0.00 (0.01) | <0.001 | 3.43 | 3 |
| Nominations Given | 0.01 (0.01) | <0.001 | 0.53 | 3 |
| Similarity Between Actors | 0.04 (0.51) | 1.04 | 10.75* | 3 |
| Socialization effects | | | | |
| Agentic Goals | | | | |
| Linear Shape | 0.29 (0.10)** | 0.01 | 0.20 | 3 |
| Quadratic Shape | -0.05 (0.02)** | <0.001 | 0.17 | 3 |
| Effect from Gender | -0.04 (0.05) | 0.01 | 2.57 | 3 |
| Similarity in Agentic Goals | -0.28 (4.74) | 76.74 | 1.78 | 2 |
| Similarity x Gender | -0.72 (1.26) | 6.71 | 3.31 | 3 |
| Similarity x Popularity Alter | 0.28 (0.47) | 1.69 | 2.82 | 3 |

university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
Date 3/9/2012 | 9

Differences between grades

| | School 1 – Grade 7-8 M (SE) | School 1 – Grade 8-9 M (SE) | School 2 – Grade 7-8 M (SE) | School 2 – Grade 8-9 M (SE) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Selection Effects | | | | |
| Agentic Goals | | | | |
| Nominations Received | -0.02 (0.02) | 0.02 (0.05) | 0.03 (0.02)* | -0.00 (0.03) |
| Nominations Given | 0.00 (0.02) | 0.01 (0.03) | 0.01 (0.02) | -0.01 (0.03) |
| Similarity Between Actors | 1.05 (0.47)* | 0.54 (0.55) | -0.24 (0.36) | -1.29 (0.61)* |
| Socialization effects | | | | |
| Agentic Goals | | | | |
| Linear Shape | 0.27 (0.12)* | 0.37 (0.28) | 0.30 (0.27) | 0.54 (0.88) |
| Quadratic Shape | -0.05 (0.02)* | -0.05 (0.05) | -0.05 (0.05) | -0.11 (0.17) |
| Effect from Gender | -0.08 (0.07) | 0.08 (0.10) | -0.05 (0.09) | -0.17 (0.15) |
| Similarity in Agentic Goals | -7.74 (9.38) | -9.70 (9.24) | 0.48 (6.05) | -11.12 (27.55) |
| Similarity x Gender | 1.03 (2.66) | 2.16 (2.49) | -2.94 (2.01) | -2.69 (3.50) |
| Similarity x Popularity Alter | -0.44 (1.26) | 1.65 (1.18) | -0.04 (0.58) | 2.25 (2.17) |

university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
Date 3/9/2012 | 10

Findings Communal Goals

| | M (SE) | Variance | χ^2 | df |
|------------------------------|----------------|----------|----------|----|
| Selection Effects | | | | |
| Gender | | | | |
| Nominations Received | 0.06 (0.07) | <0.01 | 0.23 | 2 |
| Nominations Given | 0.16 (0.07)* | <0.01 | 0.23 | 2 |
| Same gender | 0.22 (0.06)*** | 0.01 | 1.15 | 2 |
| Communal Goals | | | | |
| Nominations Received | -0.02 (0.01)** | <0.001 | 0.71 | 2 |
| Nominations Given | -0.04 (0.02)† | <0.01 | 5.47† | 2 |
| Similarity Between Actors | -0.30 (0.38) | 0.13 | 0.56 | 2 |
| Socialization effects | | | | |
| Communal Goals | | | | |
| Linear Shape | -0.26 (0.11) † | 0.04 | 5.96† | 2 |
| Quadratic Shape | -0.00 (0.00) | <0.001 | 1.05 | 2 |
| Effect from Gender | -0.05 (0.03)† | 0.01 | 4.10 | 2 |
| Similarity in Communal Goals | 8.01 (3.40)* | 0.35 | 0.01 | 2 |
| Similarity x Gender | -1.16 (2.30) | 0.40 | 0.05 | 2 |

university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
Date 3/9/2012 | 11

Conclusion

- > Selection
 - Communal: more active, but less popular.
 - Agentic: differences between grades.
- > Socialization
 - Adolescents grow more similar with regard to communion, but not agency

university of groningen / faculty of behavioural and social sciences
Date 3/9/2012 | 12

Future

- > Deselection processes
 - Dissolving of relationships
- > Who are the most influential and who are the most susceptible to influence?
 - Popular peers