CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
CONTENTS

Studies Of Demographic Variables
1. Sex
2. Socio-economic status
3. Age

Studies Of The Determinants Of The Interpersonal Attraction
1. Proximity
2. Similarity
3. Complementarity
4. Physical Attractiveness
5. Novelty

Latest Research On Interpersonal Attraction
In this chapter, the investigator takes a sojourn over various researches conducted in interpersonal attraction. The chapter throws light on the researches done on the determinants of attraction as well as the researches done on the various variables in context with interpersonal attraction.

**Studies Of The Demographic Variables In Interpersonal Attraction**

For her research, the investigator has taken into account the study of demographic variables in relation to attraction. These variables are sex, socio-economic status, and age. The consideration of these variables is detailed below.

1. **Sex**

In attraction research, the relevance of this variable may, hardly be over-emphasized as most studies in the area determine the effect of sex both on within and opposite sex attraction.

As early as in 1934, Moreno observed rightly that sex has remained as one of the earliest and the last factor of group differentiation in our society. Various researches were carried out regarding the effect of sex factor in relation to attraction theory.

Abel and Sahintaya [1962] & Moore & Updegraff [1964] reported that the tendency for within-sex attraction was significantly greater than opposite-sex attraction among nursery school children. The same result were found in the researches conducted on the elementary school children by Bonney, 1954; Grounlund, 1953; & Foch, 1957. Surprisingly, Faunce & Beegle, 1948; & Bjerstedt, 1958; in their researches on the teenager group found that the within-sex attraction was significantly greater than opposite-sex attraction. However, caution should be observed in interpersonal sex differences as cleavages [boys choosing boys & girls choosing girls] operated only in the middle class subjects as, advised by Kanous, Daughatu & Cohn [1962]. As reported by Moreno & others, the upper socio-economic status group did show cleavages. But the lower socio-economic status group was less likely to delimit their attraction to members of the same sex.

The researches were all concentrated on childhood, but as they progressed towards puberty, it was opposite-sex relationship and a growing tendency towards heterosexual interaction that becomes more prominent. These results were found out by various researches such as Byrne et al., 1968; Kulick & Harakiewic, 1979; & others. (24)

2. **Socio–Economic Status**

In attraction research, socio-economic status has been considered as an important determinant. The earlier research on interpersonal attraction authenticates the possibility of a positive relationship existing between socio-
metric choices and socio-economic status. This result was found out by Bonney, 1944; Grossman & Wright, 1948 & Lundberg, 1937.

However, similarity in socio-economic status has also been found to be a major determinant of interpersonal attraction. Byrne, Clore, & Worcel [1966] determined this effect of economic level on attraction. Results showed that the stranger with similar, economic level and that stranger with high socio-economic status were generally preferred. To verify Byrne et al.'s [1966] premise that socio-economic status is an important factor in attraction, Kureshi & Husain, 1980 administered social-distance scale to students of both gender in Aligarh along with the profile of socio-economic status, to determine the extent of attraction between them. The result that was obtained was in line with Byrne's observation that is; there is a greater preference for similar stimulus person rather than for the dissimilar one. In order to analyze the logical roots of accepting or rejecting behavior in members of one's own group and those of others, Kureshi & Husain [1985] carried out a study of attraction as a function of class - consciousness in primary school children. It was found that some similarity operated with USES subjects [upper socio-economic status]. That is the LST's subjects expressed significant positive attraction towards the dissimilar stimulus person, while USES attributed the reaction towards similar stimulus person. Joshi & Rai [1989] studied the effect of physical attractiveness and social status of stimulus person in interpersonal attraction by using photographs of different attractiveness levels and description of social status of the stimulus person. It was found that the low social status stimulus person was perceived as most attractive as compared to high social status subject, who was found to be least attractive. (24)

3. Age

Age as a variable assumes importance in attraction among children only after the age of 7 or 8. Studies on age similarity and attraction include those of Faunce & Beegle [1948] & Kochi [1957], that are already mentioned in the sex factor earlier.

Ellis, Rogott & Cramer [1981]; observe that we usually prefer friends of our own age. Sigelman & Sigelman [1982] reported that similarity in age; sex and race were determinants of attraction. The results indicated similarity factor in age, gender, and race. (24)

It is rightly observed that certain variables do affect in attraction process. Variables such as sex, socio-economic status, and age are found to be detrimental during the integration process. Attraction between within-sex is proved to be significant among nursery children. But as they grow, they are drawn towards opposite sex. In other words, after puberty, the attraction between opposite-sex is higher. This implies that there is no age bar in interpersonal attraction, though the ingredients of attraction are different for the
nursery children. Status of a person is also found to be reckoning during the integration process.

Studies Of The Determinants In The Interpersonal Attraction

There are many determinants in the interpersonal attraction theory such as proximity, similarity, complementarity, physical attractiveness, novelty, familiarity and reciprocal liking. But the present investigator undertook only five determinants for her research. These five determinants are proximity, similarity, physical attractiveness, complementarity, and novelty. Various researches as well as studies were undertaken on the following determinants. The highlights of such researches are presented in the section below.

1. Proximity

The factors of physical proximity have been investigated in many studies on attraction, which have generally included the samples of friends, couples, police and military personnel.

The earlier history of the proximity study shows that Bossard [1935] tried to study the relationship operating in marriages. He took large amount of samples that consisted of 5000 marriage license applicants. The study showed that 33% of the couples were those who lived within five blocks of each other and there was declining trend as physical distance increased. (24)

The most convincing evidence regarding proximity comes from a classic study undertaken by Festinger, Schachter and Back [1950]. They studied the development of MIT housing project for married students. They discovered that several architectural features relating to proximity between people had much to do with the development of friendship. Friendship choices and proximity of apartments were found to be closely associated. Repeated residential contact between Whites and Blacks reduced racial prejudices [Deutsch & Collins, 1951]. (24), (33), (8), & (19).

In the 1940s, three dormitory studies were carried out by Evans & Wilson, [1949], Lundberg & Beazley, [1948] and Lundberg, Hertzler, & Dickson, [1949]. Apart from the study of Festinger, Schachter & Back [1950] another study that was carried in 1950 on the married students housing was that of Caplow & Forman [1950]. The results of the above studies indicated that the proximity factor was found to be a deciding factor in acquaintance as well as in the friendship process. (3)

Although in some situations, proximity can intensify hostile feelings, it more often leads to attraction, because of the fact that familiarity seems to increase liking [rather than contempt]. Berschied & Walster, [1978] in their study suggested that most human interactions are rewarding. As a result, the more frequent contact brought on by physical proximity is liking to produce positive feelings. (8)
Darley and Berschied, 1967 & Knight and Vallacher, 1981 suggested that people expect to interact more often with those living nearest to them, whether or not they want to. This being the case, people tend to accentuate the positive and minimize the negative aspects of relationship so those future interactions will be pleasant and agreeable. On this phenomenon, Tyler & Sears [1977] titled their research study “Coming to like obnoxious people when we must live with them.” Monge and Kirste, [1980] carried out a study of workers at a California Naval Training Center. They found that the trainee enjoyed most talking to those co-worker whom they most often ran into. (5) & (33)

However, it was also found out that repeated exposure to new stimulus [frequent contact with that stimulus] leads to a more and more positive evaluation of that stimulus. Moreland and Zanjonc [1982] carried out such type of studies. Nuttin, [1987] found that because of repeated exposure effect, the alphabet that occurs in one’s own name is perceived to be more attractive than a letter not in one’s name. Bornstein and D’Agostine, [1992] proposed an attributional model. They suggest that the repeated exposure effect is stronger when the stimulus is not consciously perceived than when the individual is aware of it. (3)

Why is proximity important? The reason for this is:

a) Physical proximity reduces costs of interaction – it is easier to talk with somebody sitting next to you than it is to talk with somebody sitting across the room.

b) Repeated exposure can produce a more positive attitude; this is the mere exposure effect.

However, proximity is affected by:

a) Institutional structures. For example, the admission office of a school, school tracking policies, etc., help to determine who comes into contact with each other. Effects of school policies on interracial friendships have been a prominent strand of research.

b) Personal characteristics influence the choice of activities. Common interests can lead to people being in the same place at the same time. (38)

2. Similarity

Similarity is an important factor in determining liking, particularly similarity in attitudes and values.

A law of attraction which was proposed by Donn Byrne and his colleagues [Byrne, 1969; Clore and Byrne, 1974] stated that one’s attraction toward a person depends directly on the proportion of positive reinforcement received from that person. The law was first formulated to account for the strong evidence that similarity in attitudes and values can be a potent predictor of attraction and friendship. (5)

Byrne [1992] stated the same phenomenon. He stated that further steps towards a closer relationship depend on the two individual’s beginning to communicate
and on the content of that communication. The development of a friendship rests on the discovery of various kinds of similarity and on the indication of reciprocal positive evaluation. (3)

Singh [1973] tested the relevance of law of attraction in assessing the relative weighing power of similarity in attitudes and personality characteristics in determining attraction. The results showed that the attitude of similarity was found to be more important than the personality similarity as determinant of attraction. Another study of Singh [1974] on the effects of magnitude and proportions of positive reinforcement on attraction and self-rated feelings supported Byrne's reinforcement model of interpersonal attraction. Moreover, Aggarwal and Khatri [1978] also supported Byrne's reinforcement hypothesis. In their study extroverts and introverts expressed their liking for the stimulus person on two measures of "liking" and "interests". The extrovert stimulus person was preferred both by the similar and the dissimilar subjects. While, Sharma and Kaur [1994] studied the relationship of interpersonal attraction with regard to similarity and dissimilarity, and help or no help. The results showed the main effects of both similarity/dissimilarity and help/no help to be significant. (24)

Research has shown that each individual in the interaction responds to the other on the basis of the proportion of similar attitudes that are expressed. When people interact, their conversation often involves the expression of their attitudes about whatever topics come up. That is, each person, as he talks indicates his/her likes and dislikes [Hatfield and Rapson, 1992; Kent, Davis, and Shapiro, 1981]. (3)

Many social psychologists and sociologists have concluded that the similarity-attraction effect is an extremely solid and reliable one. Cappella and Palmer [1990, p.161] state that,

"Perhaps the most well-known and well established finding in the study of interpersonal relations is that attitude similarity creates attraction".

Nevertheless, several critics have questioned this concept. Rosenbaum [1986] completely rejected this concept. He proposed that similar attitudes have no effect on attraction [A pure repulsion hypothesis]. Sunnafrank [1992] indicated that attitude-similarity between partners may have little effect on relationships, and Brochner [1991] went even further by claiming that the attitude similarity-attraction relationship is "dead". Moreover, Singh and Tan [1992] used Rosenbaum's "no-information" control group and found that attraction decreases more in the totally dissimilar group. (3)

Several studies have been done on the importance of similarity in attraction with such varied groups as surgical patients, job corps trainees, and alcoholics. The results have been remarkably consistent: 'The more similar strangers' attitudes, the more a person like him'. (24)

Byrne in his evaluation of similarity-attraction relationship in terms of reinforcement theory express: "It is rewarding to have someone agree with you. Therefore, the more someone agrees with your attitudes [specifically, the higher
the proportion of agreement, the more that stranger will reinforce you, and the greater will be your attraction." (19)

It may be observed that attitude similarity, as evidenced by the western studies, comes out prominently as a consistent determinant of attraction. People respond positively to those who express similar attitudes, beliefs and values, and they respond negatively to dissimilarity.

4. Complementarity

The complementarity factor seems to be more important in attraction research than of the similarity factor.

Observing that opposites do produce attraction at time, some social scientists have asserted that intimate relationships may be based on pairs of complementarity needs. Seyfried and Hendrick [1977] claim that complementarity needs are the basis for friendship and love when people prefer partners who have qualities or characteristics they possess. (30)

Seyfried notes that complementarity needs can be the basis of intimate relationship in two different ways. First, two people might have very different needs of equal intensity and find their relationship can satisfy both their needs at the same time. He gives an example of a married couple in which one partner is neat and the other is messy. Their relationship will work only if the neat partner enjoys helping the other and the messy partner appreciates being helped. (30)

Levinger [1983] asserts that complementarity needs theory has much less research support than does the theory, which states that close relationships are fostered by similarity. He gives two reasons for this:

I. People change as they mature. A relationship that began because a couple had complementary needs may deteriorate if the partners develop skills and qualities they used to lack.

II. The sexual division of labor may better explain the complementary need theory. (30)

A critical question arises in the context of the complementary needs that if similarity is an important determinant of attraction, then how come complementary needs are also determinants of attraction? Psychologists and sociologists try to resolve this question in this manner: when two people have similar roles, as in most friendships, the dominant determinant of liking is generally similarity. When two people have different roles, as sometimes occurs in which one is superior to the other complementarity is important. (12)
However, research on complementarity hypothesis in attraction theory so far have been unsuccessful [Norwick and Manheim, 1991]. (3)

Here the investigator would like to show the differences between the similarity and complementary needs in relation to interpersonal attraction theory

One of the most widely accepted conclusions in social psychology – cited in virtually every textbook – is that similarity promotes interpersonal attraction and that complementarity – "Opposites attract" – does not. For example, the vast majority of married couples in the United States are of the same race and religion, and most are significantly similar in age, socio-economic class, educational level, intelligence, height, eye color, and even physical attractiveness [Feingold, 1990; Murstein, 1972; Rubin, 1973; Silverman, 1971]. In one study, dating couples who were the most similar were the most likely to be together a year later [Hill, Rubin, and Peplau, 1976]. In a longitudinal study of 135 married couples, spouses with similar personalities reported more closeness, friendliness, shared enjoyment in daily activities, marital satisfaction and less marital conflict than less similar couples [Caspi, and Herbener, 1990]. In contrast, attempts to identify cimplementarities that promote or sustain intimate relationships have not been very successful [Levinger, Senn, and Jorgensen, 1970; Strong et al., 1988]. Marital adjustment among couples married for up to five years was found to depend more on similarity than on complementarity [Meyer and Pepper, 1977].

But there is an obvious exception: sex. Most people choose members of the opposite sex to be their romantic and sexual partners. It is an indication of how unthinkingly heterosexuality is taken for granted that authors or articles and textbooks never seem to notice this quintessential complementarity and its challenge to the conclusion that similarity produces attraction. They certainly don't pause to ponder why we are not all gay or lesbian.

The key to resolving this apparent paradox is also a staple of textbooks: the distinction between liking and loving or between compassionate and passionate love [Berscheid and Walster, 1974; Brehm, 1992]. The correlation among dating or engaged couples between liking their partners and loving them is only .56 for men and .36 for women [Rubin, 1973]. Both fiction and real life provide numerous examples of exotic attraction between two incompatible people who may not even like each other. Collectively, these observations suggest that similarity may promote friendship, compatibility, and compassionate love, but it is dissimilarity that sparks erotic/romantic attraction and passionate love. (38)

Evidence suggests we be attracted to people who are similar to ourselves. *Attitudinal similarity* is especially important. Why? Cognitive consistency. If you have favorable attitudes toward certain objects and discover that another person has favorable attitudes toward those objects, your cognitions will be consistent if you like that person. Similar other reinforces our opinions. We expect that similar
others will approve of us—we prefer to develop friendships with those we think will evaluate us favorably.

There is little evidence that complementarity is important. Evidence suggests people often choose as mates those who have the same weakness they do. What we may need to do is look more at role compatibility—a traditional husband and a feminist housewife may not get along too well. (38)

5. Physical Attractiveness

Levels of physical attractiveness have the potential to influence others in powerful ways. Attributions based on perceptions of physical attractiveness can either add to one’s status or stigmatize them. Males and females have different cognitive schemas about the attractiveness of the opposite sex. One determines the type of attributions he/she will make about another person, and how the person will view his own attractiveness.

A variety of theories and studies on physical attraction that have been produced during the last few decades. First, three “facts” about attraction that most introductory psychology texts cite are proximity, similarity, and physical attraction. Since physical attraction is an important piece of the puzzle in the attraction game, much time has been devoted to studying its impact and implications.

Robert B. Cialdini [1984] an influential psychologist has named physical attractiveness as an important component in his weapons of influence. He noted that physically attractive people have a normous social advantage in our culture. They are better liked, more persuasive, more frequently helped, and seen as possessing better personality traits and intellectual capabilities. This advantage is earned due to the halo effect. This effect occurs when others view one positive characteristic of a person. Cialdini also mentioned that good-looking people are likely to receive highly favorable treatment in the legal system.

Stanley Schachter devised the two-factor theory of emotion that Dutton and Aron [1974] were studying when performing their naturalistic study of interpersonal attraction. They found that when a confederate in an arousing situation [a high and unstable suspension bridge] confronted individuals, the confederate was found to be more attractive than when in a non-threatening situation [stable low bridge]. This implies that external factors can influence our perceptions of attractiveness. The arousal experienced while on the high bridge could have been misplaceed as romantic love for the confederate, leading the individual to assume attractiveness. Another interesting theory that applies to physical attraction is the reinforcement theory. With this conditioning paradigm, when a person is paired with a stimulus that elicits a positive affect or reward, the result is increased liking of that person. You may begin to like a person that is physically attractive because it is pleasing to look at that person—your own personal reward. The attractive person may also reap the benefits of being
attractive, such as assumed intelligence. Attractive people experience a halo effect; one perceived positive quality favorably influences other attributions. Once a positive reward is associated with an individual, your liking of him will increase.

Females overlook male's physical attributions, seeking status, wealth, or power. In a study by David Buss [1988], this tendency for women to focus on their physical features when pursuing romantic relationships was evident. Buss asked his subjects [Newly weds] what they did when they first met their spouse to make himself or herself more appealing. While, men emphasized material resources such as gifts, money, possessions, and bragging about their importance at work, females tended to make physical changes such as dieting, buying new clothes, and getting a haircut or tan. A difference also exists in what quality women and men notice first, when looking at persons of the opposite sex. The findings show that women give more importance to physical attractiveness. (21)

Some other studies on physical attractiveness show that:

(a) Physically attractive people receive more assistance from others.

(b) Physically attractive people receive more co-operations in conflicting situations.

(c) Physically attractive people receive better job recommendations from experienced personnel consultants, even when personal appearance could have no conceivable relationship to actual job performance.

(d) Physically attractive people receive more self-disclosure from others.

Why looks do matter?

The answer for the above question is:

1. It is because of aesthetics.

2. Physically attractive people do indeed tend to have better self-concepts, probably because of treatment received from others.

3. A man with an extremely attractive woman attracts more attention and prestige than if he is seen with an unattractive female.

4. "What is beautiful is good" belief – we assume that a physically attractive person possesses other desirable qualities. One study showed that physically attractive people were thought to be more responsive than less attractive persons. (38)

6. **Novelty**

Duck and Miell [1986] found that another set of reasons why relationships break up is because there cease to provide stimulation for the partners. We tend to look to new relationships as a source of novelty and of new ideas about the world in general; the corollary is that existing relationships may not provide interest for the other person – or at least, may not seem to, by comparison. Duck and Miell found that many of the research participants whom they interviewed in an
investigation of courtship gave the fact that it 'wasn’t going anywhere' as the reason for breaking up. We expect those relationships to develop and to become closure and more satisfying as time goes on: if they don't, we feel justified in ending them. Since courtship represents a kind of 'experimental' phase for a deeper and longer-term commitment, perceiving the relationship as static may be considered sufficient reason to end it.

Physical circumstances such as distance may make a relationship difficult to maintain, although it is not at all certain that this is generally the case. Shaver et al. [1985] showed that 46% of pre-college attachments broke up in consequences of one partner’s moving away to college. However, given the general age of college students, the number of distractions and the fact that much of college life often centres on the formation of new friendships and relationships. What is probably more remarkable about this study is the 54% who didn’t break up rather than the 46% who did.

Rose and Serafica [1986] asked research participants to report on why their own relationships had broken up, but also to talk about why hypothetical relationships tended to break up. They found that two produced quite a different in emphasis. When people were speculating about the endings of hypothetical relationship, they identified distance or lack of effort as the causes. When they were describing the break up of real relationships, which they had experienced however, they identified interference from other relationships and a gradual decline of affection as causes. Duck and Sants [1983] found that people show a strong tendency to adjust their memoirs of relationship break ups until they fit with their own emotional experience, so a retrospective story of what happened is not all likely to be an unbiased and dispassionate account. (20)

Attraction is a result of various determinants such as proximity, similarity, complementarity, physical attractiveness, novelty, familiarity, halo effect, etc. It varies from individual to individual and also from male to female. The reason is because of the physical surrounding and the context of the situation in which a person is placed. Attraction is definitely an attitude, though a desires and motives of an individual becomes a basic elements in provoking certain kinds of behavioral tendency. To illustrate, a person who is submissive or poor would definitely desire and would be attracted towards a dominating or to a rich person [Complementarity fact].

The researches, illustrated in the above section, strengthen the facts that certain determinants of attraction do have reckoning effects during the integration process.
Dr. Bhalchandra Joshi and Dr. A. S. Patel [1999] carried out an explorative study in India. The hypothesis was to examine the determinants of attraction towards opposite sex among college students. Using photographs of full lengths and half-lengths of different attractive postures of both the genders carried out the research. The results showed no significant sex differences between male and female raters. But there were significant differences in rating of male and female persons. Females’ photos were rated higher than the males’ pictures. However, the colorful nature of the photos appealed more than the black-white pictures. Another interesting aspect revealed in this research was the size of the picture [half-length photo] attracted the subjects to a greater extent than the full size photo. (25)

An article published in GENTLEMAN Journal, November and December 1997 issues, carried out a survey of what an Indian man wants from a woman and vice versa. The survey was made in the form of questionnaire format that out-flanked to various topics such as from ideal boss to ideal husband including ideal lover and ideal friend. It was concluded that apart from physically attractiveness, other factors such as social and psychological do influence during our selection process. (15)

How to become attractive or to master the attraction process? It may look ridiculous but Thomas J. Leonard has proved it. Leonard developed 28 principles of attraction and argued that once we accept and try to implicate this principle we become more attractive and could enhance our self-esteem as well as our self-confidence. He argues that by adhering to these principles, we could develop certain quality attraction. For this purpose, he gives a list of 20 qualities of personalities that can be developed during the integration process.

However, Leonard’s attraction principles are not only limited to the adolescents to enhance their personal being, but it is also operable on a large scale at the global entrepreneur level. (38)

Andy DePew carried out a research on physical attraction on what quality women notice first. He quotes that, “Attracting flies is easier for many male students than attraction women.” DePew asserts that there are three main attractors: physical beauty, smiles, and eyes. (38)

On other hand, Jennifer Rummery, on her research of what quality men notice first, concludes that the past notion of a woman to be a house body no longer holds water. Men, of this century, are positively attracted towards dynamics independent and self-sufficient girls, though physical attractiveness factor is important but to a lesser degree. (38)

Another research was conducted on matching hypothesis regarding the selection of roommates. Carli, Ganely, and Pierce – Otay [1991] concluded that the similarity in physical attractiveness play a detrimental effect. The result consistently indicated that the more satisfied each person felt with the
relationship and the more likely he or she was to request the same roommate for the following year. (3)

Darly J. Bem [1996] of the Cornell University conducted a study of sexual orientation. In his study of Exotic Becomes Erotic: A Developmental Theory of Sexual Orientation, Darly relates the sexual attraction to the biological connection. He proposes that biological variables, such as genes, prenatal hormones, and brain neuroanatomy, do not code for sexual orientation but for childhood temperaments that influence a child's preferences for sex-typical or sex-atypical activities and peers. These preferences lead children to feel different from opposite — or same — peers — to perceive them as dissimilar, unfamiliar and exotic. (4)

Christ Hendricks et. al. [1998] conducted a research on physical attraction. They compartmentalised their research in to three aspects:

1) Physical attraction attributions
2) Gender differences in physical attraction
3) Cultural aspects of physical attraction.

They cited latest researches conducted on the above mentioned three aspects. These researches are detailed in the following section.

In physical attraction: Attribution aspects, Chris et ai., state that the levels of physical attractiveness correlate positively with degrees of sociability, intelligence, success, and self-esteem [Feingold, 1992; Jackson, Hunter, and Hodge, 1995]. These findings have helped to outline a physical attractiveness stereotype — the theorem that physically attractive people possess socially coveted traits. Additionally, researchers have found that unattractive individuals are perceived as more menacing, especially in cases regarding sexual proceding [Esses and Weber, 1988]. Another pertinent study, performed by Downs and Lyons [1991], discovered a pervasive tendency of Texas judges to distribute harsher, more severe punishments for their less attractive defendants. Additional research performed by De santis and Kayson [1997] demonstrated this effect cross — applies to group situations as well. They confirmed that the attraction level of the defendant was influenced in juror's decisions, with attractive defendant receiving lesser sentences.

In the second aspects of physical attraction: Gender differences, Feingold [1990] found that being physically attractive appears to be more important for females than males. This stress on females' physical attributes seems to be the trend in most of the attraction research [Townsend, 1990; Graziano, 1993; Cunningham, Barbe, and Pike, 1990]. Recent research done by Cash and Muth [1997] found compared to men, women had more negative body — image evaluations, stronger investments in their looks and more frequent body — image dysphoria. This study replicated earlier found that generally women are more discontent with their body appearance than men are.

Nigel Barbar [1998] recently studied the changes in the standards of bodily attractiveness in American females and the different masculine and feminine
ideals. He found that women determine the standard. According to Adam Drewnowski [1995], more men wanted to gain weight rather than lose weight. Hence, the use of steroids. Where as, women tend to find men of average size to be most attractive. Cunningham [1990], found tha women prefer men with moderately broad shoulders who are of medium height and have a chest slightly larger than average While, Devendra Singh [1995], examined the role of male body shape, as defined by their waist – to – hip ratio, in women's mate choice. Again men found in the typical size range were judged as more attractive, healthy, and possessing many positive personal qualities.

In the cultural aspects of physical attraction, Chirs et al., suggest that there is a vast difference between the culture of America, and other Western nations, and the more collectivist eastern countries. This sociological difference would create vast differences in what people consider attractive.

They also suggested that one difference between these cultures could be characterized using the Social Norms approach, researched by Clark and Mills, to define the rules of giving and receiving in different relationships. This is especially important when considering that collectivist cultures emphasize feelings of responsibility to others with no repayment expected. This contrasts with the more Western, individualized exchange relationship. (21)

Though many researches are being carried out on interpersonal attraction, majority of these studies are being done by the Western researchers, though there have been few studies carried out by Indian researchers such as, Sharma & Kaul; Joshi & Rai, Aggarwai & Khatn and Kureshi & Husain. But so far, no scientific scales or tools have been standardized.

The aim of the investigator is to:

1. To prepare Interpersonal Attraction scale in both language viz., English and Gujarati
2. To know what are the factors and determinants, and which factors and determinants predominates during the integration process
3. What type of differences are found between individual and between the groups

In attraction, the fundamental effects are of physical factors. This fact is corroborated by the various researches mentioned above. It would be a remiss on the part of the investigator, not to mention that psychological factors also play an important role during the integration process. In other words, both physical and psychological factors go hand in hand: two sides of the same coin.