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ADOLESCENCE

Adolescence is a very important period of one's life. It is a stage where the individual's physical, mental, social, moral, and spiritual outlooks undergo to a revolutionary change. Adolescence bridges the gulf between childhood and adulthood.

Adolescence represents a difficult developmental period in one's life. Many highly concentrated demands are made upon youth by society during this period for independence, for peer, and heterosexual adjustment, for educational, and vocational preparation, and for the development of a workable set of personal, and social values. In other words, at this stage, the road is paved for adulthood and the adolescent's identity is formed, developed, and crystallised. If the adolescent fails to meet the varied demands in a changing world, his personality development adversely affected.

The term adolescence comes from the Latin word, 'Adolescere' meaning 'to grow to maturity'. Primitive people – as was true also in earlier civilization – do not consider puberty and adolescence to the distinct periods in the life span. As it is used today, the term adolescent has a broader meaning. It includes mental, emotional, and social maturity as well as physical maturity.

Piaget has expressed this point of view when he said: "Psychologically, adolescence is the age when the individual becomes integrated into the society of adults, the age when the child no longer feels that he is below the level of his elders but equal, at least in rights.... This integration into adult society has many affective aspects, more or less linked with puberty.... It also includes very profound intellectual changes.... These intellectual transformations typical of the adolescent thinking enable him not only to achieve his integration into the social relationship of adults which is, in fact most general characteristics of this period of development." (14)

Adolescence has traditionally been considered a more difficult period in development than the middle-childhood years, for both adolescents and their parents. Some 300 years BC, Aristotle complained that adolescents, "...Are passionate, irascible and apt to be carried away by their impulses." [Kiel, 1967, p.p. 18-19]

Plato advised that boys not be allowed to drink until they were 18, because of their easy excitability. "Fire must not be poured on fire." [Plato, 1953, p.14]

In other words, Plato compared adolescents with fire.
While a 17th century clergyman compared youth to,
"A new ship launching out into the main ocean without a helm or ballast or pilot to steer her."
[Smith, 1975, p 497] (20)

Early in the present century, G. Stanley Hall, founder of the American Psychological Association, and father of the scientific study of adolescence, introduced his rather romantic notions of adolescence. In his 1905 text, 'Adolescence' Hall described the teenage years as, 'a period of storm and stress' in which,
"...Every step of the upward way is strewn with the wreckage of the body, mind, and morals."
[p. X iii]

This notion of Strum und Drang [German for 'storm and stress'] is quite consistent with many popular stereotypes. (12)

Honus Wagner, a famous baseball player of the early 20th century, quoted in context with adolescence as,
"Things ain't never gonna be the same again,
But we don't know how they ain't never be the same again."

His insight into human behavior was apparently greater than his grasp of grammar. (14)

Adolescence is the stage of life that begins at the onset of puberty, the age at which a young person starts to become sexually mature. The end point of adolescence is not easy to pinpoint, as there is no convenient physical marker; it tends to be determined by psychosocial factors such as the assumption of adult roles and, therefore, varies greatly from culture to culture. (7)

Apparently, Stanley Hall’s adolescence’s notion has become the traditional outlook of adolescence, but more recently many researchers have consistently shown that adolescence involves no more turmoil than do other periods of life. Certainly important physical and emotional changes do occur and adolescence is a challenging time, especially in the area of identity formation, but most young people get through it without too many traumas. (7)

However, when a girl is asked to recall her adolescence, she described it this way:
"It was a blur of intensity. There were so many peaks and valleys that I could not keep track of them. I was sad, I was confused. I wouldn't want to go through it again."

But another had this to say:
"I don't know, it was kind of pleasant, you know? I knew i had a lot ahead of me- college, marriage, and stuff. But I sort of relaxed and thought, hey, I better enjoy this while I can."

This seems to support observers such as Hill [1980], who question the storm and stress theory.
Adolescent period starts at the age of 12 or 13 years. But the dawn of adolescence is comparatively earlier in girls than in boys. This period of adolescence is categorized into three compartments viz., early, middle, and late adolescent period. The early adolescence starts roughly from 11 to 12 1/2 or 13 years in boys; while in girls, it covers from 10 to 11 years. Though early adolescence is usually referred to as 'the teens', sometimes even the 'terrible teens' because of their gawky attitude and abrasive behavior.

13 to 18 years in boys and 12 to 15 or 16 years in girls comes under the category of middle adolescence, whereas, the late adolescent period opens up from 18 to 21 years in boys and 17 to 20 or 21 years in girls. Thus, late adolescence lasts for a short duration. Although, the older adolescents are strictly speaking, 'teenagers' until they reach 20 or 21 years of age, the label teenager, which has become popularly associated with the characteristic patterns of behavior of young adolescents, is rarely applied to older adolescents. Instead, they are usually referred to as 'young men' and 'young women'- or even 'youth' – indicating that society recognizes a maturity of behavior not found in the early years of adolescence. In a sense, late adolescence is the period at which one is pulled away from childhood and into the adult role. (14)

As the present research is carried out on typical Indian adolescence, the investigator considered the stages of adolescence prescribed by an Indian author, S. P. Chaube in his book 'Adolescent Psychology'. He has categorized these stages in the following manners:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOYS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early adolescence</td>
<td>11 to 12 1/2 or 13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle adolescence</td>
<td>13 to 18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late adolescence</td>
<td>18 to 21 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GIRLS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early adolescence</td>
<td>10 to 11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle adolescence</td>
<td>12 to 15 or 16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late adolescence</td>
<td>17 to 20 or 21 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chronologically, adolescence ranges from age 12 to 18 or 19 years. Sociologically, adolescents are those who are trying to bridge the gap between dependent childhood and self-sufficient adulthood. Psychologically, it is terminating of a prolonged period of infancy and processor to adult personality in which one witnesses changes in nearly all aspects of life – physical, mental, social which requires lot of adjustment on part of adolescents, which lays the foundation stone for adult personality traits.

It is the period of psychological growing up. During this period, the child moves from dependence and restrictions of childhood to adult independence and freedom from parental restrictions. Adolescence is the period of storm and stress, a time when the individual is erratic, emotionally instable, unpredictable. This is the time when personality development is ascertained, the period of life between the boundaries of puberty and maturity, the period during which maturity is being attained. It is a marginal situation in which new adjustments have to be made, namely; those that distinguish child behavior from adult behavior in a given society.

Due to the physiological changes, both male and female becomes very conscious about their bodily changes. These changes create awareness between the gender, and magazines, books, website etc fill their curiosity. When a boy sees a girl with an hourglass figure, he is drawn towards her and in some cases, they may experience a sexual pang. Similarly, when a girl sees a boy with an adnos looks; she too is magnetically drawn towards him, and may feel her sexual vibes.

Adolescents are persons with specific qualities and characteristics, who have a participatory and responsible role to play, task to perform, skill to develop at that particular time of life. The degree or extent to which an adolescent experiences such responsible participation will determine and maximize his development.

A number of qualities or characteristics are peculiar to this period. The young are possessed of greater physical, mental, and emotional capacities and therefore, of a great thirst to try out these capacities. They have needed to experiment with their own strength and value systems, lead a group, tryout intimate relationships; engage in some form of adventure.

The drive to experiment is coupled with a mixture of audacity and insecurity, is related to uncertainty that accompanies inexperience and the lessening or withdrawal of protection. A deep sense of loneliness and a high degree of psychological vulnerability are two other specific qualities of adolescence. Every attempt at experimentation and reaching out is new and very intense. If the outcome is negative, it is exceedingly painful, because youth do not have a bank of positive experiences to draw from when defeat occurs.

Enormous mood swing is usual characteristic of adolescents. Many factors contribute to this swing. Physiological changes are related to emotional changes. The yearning to jump in the next stage of development coexists with the desire to have things stay, as they are the feeling of omnipotence tangoes with the feeling of helplessness and inadequacy. The cocksure conviction that “it will not happen to me” plays hide-and-seek with the fear that it will.
Adolescents have a strong peer group need. It is time when the developing individual is extremely anxious about his relationship with his age mates. They stress co-operation with that segment of the group with which they identify. The period of adolescence is a period of intellectual expansion and development. However, the effectiveness with which the adolescents operate, physically and intellectually, is influenced greatly by the type of the treatment and stimulation he receives during the adolescent years.

The period of adolescence is a time when values are being studied and evaluated. It is a time when the adolescent is reaching for the fundamental and eternal values on which he may build his life. One's philosophy of life consists basically of a set of values and concepts. The adolescent deliberately examines the concepts he has developed and analysed or less uncritically, he is beginning to develop philosophy of life. [18]

Thus, the adolescence is very important period; researches for in-depth study of this period are of great significant for growth of any society, nation as well as individual. Keeping this in view, the investigator ventured into studying psychology of this group of society through conducting and supervising researches covering following broad areas:

Effects of which determinants of attraction [proximity, similarity, complementarity, novelty, and physical attractiveness] are effective for adolescence.

Which factors [physical, social, and psychological] are more affective for adolescence in attraction process?

Effects of which variable [medium of language, gender, socio-economic status, and education levels] are, more effective for adolescents in their attraction process.

ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOR

In the early part of this century, psychologists and sociologists recognised the need for a construct to describe the organised quality of behavior and the fact that different people seem to attend to different aspects of a given situation.

For well over half a century, social psychologists have considered attitudes a central concept. In fact, one of the earliest scholarly books in social science [Thomas & Znaniecki, 1918] defined the entire field of social psychology as "the study of attitudes."

Allport [1935] aptly described the situation as:

'The concept of attitude is probably the most distinctive and indispensable concept in contemporary American Social Psychology.... This useful one might almost say peaceful, concept has established itself as the keystone in the edifice of American social psychology.'

Psychology has always needed a term to designate the internal control over behavior. From the very beginning, psychologists have recognised that the situation itself does not control behavior, since in a given situation some people respond one way and other in an entirely different way. Quite
obviously, some people see one thing in a situation, and others see it quite differently. A variety of terms have functioned to describe this individuality terms such as, 'sentiment', disposition', 'traits', 'habit', 'instinct', and now 'attitude'. (3) & (25)

Murphy, Murphy & Newcomb wrote:
Perhaps no single concept within the whole realm of social psychology occupies a more nearly central position that of attitude. (8)

We come to understand ourselves, other people and the complex social environment in which we live. One way of understanding the world around us is to form beliefs about the way it works and attitudes about what is good and what is bad in it. However, in our daily life, attitudes are often confused with such related concepts as beliefs, values and opinions. Yet, attitudes and beliefs help us organize the overwhelming information input we receive every waking moment of our lives. A belief differs from an attitude in that it is based more on fact and less on emotion, that is, belief is a perceptions of factual matters, of what is true or false. For instance, our ideas about how many teeth alligators have and whether artichokes grow on trees are beliefs. Attitudes can be defined as positive or negative evaluiations of people, objects, ideas, or events. For instance, a person's opposition to nuke or support for is an attitude. On the other hand, an opinion is the verbal expression of an attitude, belief, or values. An attitude adds and evaluative component to a belief: For instance, an artichoke is an herb [belief], and it has a wonderful taste [attitude]. (6) & (16)

Attitudes have long been a central topic in the field of social psychology and for good reason: They shape both our social perceptions and our social behavior [Pratkanis, Breckler, & Greenwald, 1989]. (2)

Various definitions have been forwarded for attitudes. Allport [1935] defined an attitude as:
A mental and neural state of readiness, organised through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.

Allport looked upon attitude primarity as a set to respond in a particular way. (7) & (17)

In contrast to Allport's definition, Doob [1947] defined as attitude as:
An implicit strive producing response considered socially significant in the individual society.
[P.138] (8)

An attitude is:
The disposition to behave in a particular way towards specific objects.
[Gergen, 1947:620]

An attitude is:
The degree of positive or negative affect associated with some psychological object.
[Edwards, 1957:2]
An attitude is:
The predisposition...to evaluate some symbol or object.
[Katz, 190:168]

An attitude is:
A delimited totality of behavior with respect to something.
[Guttman, 1950:51]

The lists of these definitions, of course, could be extended. (13)

Modern social psychologists, however, use the term ‘attitude’ as a rather stable mental position held toward some idea or object, or person. (11)

It is an enduring system that includes a cognitive component, a feeling [affective] component and an action tendency [behavioral component]. In other words, anyone of our dispositions is an attitude if it contains aspects of knowing, feeling, and acting. Zimbardo & Ebbesen define each of the three components as follows:

The cognitive component has been conceptualised as a person’s beliefs about, or factual knowledge of the object or person. The affective component consists of a person’s evaluation of, liking of, or emotional response to, some object or person. The behavioral component involves the person’s overt behavior directed toward the object or person.

Overall, it involves an emotional component. That’s why when an attitude is formed, it becomes resistant to changes; it does not generally respond to new facts. It involves beliefs as well as evaluation. It also gives some consistency to our thinking about social objects as well as our feelings towards them. People also tend to act consistently as a result of these consistent beliefs and feeling. (8), (17); (16), & (7).

As the concept of attitude is clear, a question is raised as; why are attitudes important? That is, why have social psychologists devoted great deal of research attention to people’s evaluative feelings toward various objects, groups, and issues?

The answers could be that:
It is generally assumed that attitudes are relatively enduring; that is, people’s feelings toward objects and issues are probably quite stable over time.

Attitudes are learned. For example, we are not born liking or disliking nuclear power plants; we learn to like or dislike them.

The most important facet of attitudes is that they are assumed to influence behavior; that is, people’s actions are believed to reflect their feelings toward relevant objects and issues. (23)

The forces that shape our attitudes are many and varied, but two of the most important are those towards our parents, peers, and institutions such as school. Parents and peers influence attitudes by providing information and reinforcement and by serving as figures for identification. People’s attitudes are also influenced by their own logic and reseasoning. McGuire showed that
if people changed one belief, they would also change logically related beliefs. Furthermore, the theory of cognitive dissonance predicts that people make their attitudes consistent with their behavior. (6)

Schneider, in his book 'Social Psychology' depicts attraction as feelings of liking, love, gratitude, and respect, which indicate an emotional component, which in turn leads to attitudes as defined by Bem & Edwards. However, most researchers define liking as an attitude, as such liking has cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. [Berscheid & Walster, 1969]. Therefore, it is not surprising that we feel positively toward people who reward or who can reward us [eg., Homan, 1961; Lott & Lott, 1974; Tedeschi, 1974]. The belief that another person can help you get something you want leads to positive affective feelings and you, in turn, behave positively towards that person. Thus, the belief, feeling, and behavioral components of liking are related in complex ways. (25)

Interpersonal attraction is a multifaceted phenomenon. In conceiving attraction, or liking as an attitudinal dimension, we have to measure the dynamics of its three known components namely: Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral. To put it in other words, someone’s liking for another is a function of what he knows about the person, how he feels about it and what he does about it. [Kelvin, 1970].

Insko & Schopler [1972] find similarity in the study of interpersonal attraction and the study of attitudes towards a person. Likewise, Tedeschi [1974] defines attraction as:
An attitude possessing cognitive, affective, and dispositional properties. [P. 197] (15)

In the present research, the investigator, therefore, concludes that attraction is an attitude. The reason is that when a person is attracted he/she obviously feels a positive emotion or rather he/she is magnetically driven towards the attractive person. In contrast, when a person shows a dislike towards another, he/she is displaying negative feelings; although the feelings may not be repulsive.

ATTRACTION

Throughout history, artists, songwriters, poets, and novelists have lamented and celebrated the delightful and frustrating differences in men and women that compel us to fall in love and mate. For some, the mystery of why we are drawn to mates has long been considered and infathomable puzzle which mere mortals were not meant to understand. But the age-old questions linger. Could we ever hope to discover what it is that determines who will become a friend or even a lover? What makes us fall into the irrational state that we know as love? Why, inspite of trends towards slimness or plumpness, are men attracted to curvaceous 'hour glass' feminine figures, while women generally prefer broad shouldered T-shaped male physiques? On the face of it, it seems hard to believe. For we have all been exposed to the romantic notions of our culture; we have all read and seen scores of novels and movies that show millionaires befriending tramps, princes marrying showgirls, and beauty enamored by the beast - each teaching the lesson that friendship and
most especially love are not ruled by reason. But we will see the factors and the determinants that tug the thread of attraction which humans have for each other are not all that obscure.

The story of interpersonal attraction is, indeed, the story of human relationships at large. Attraction forms a major aspect of our social lives: not just in terms of the intimate relationships that we form with other individuals, but also in our friendship and working companionship. We try to spend more time with people that we like, and we prefer to avoid people that we don’t like. We get into relationship with others, which are sometimes very intimate, and sometimes casual or formal friendship. And most of us do our best to get on with the people that we work or study with.

According to the lyrics of one old song, ‘Love makes the world go around’
Love is an intense emotional state involving attraction, sexual desires and deep concerns for another person [Hatfield & Rapson, 1993] (2)

Literally, attraction means to draw attention or it is an act of captivation. It has got a very deeper meaning. It can be between two opposite sexes or it can also be directed towards material object. Initially, attraction leads to friendship that may eventually lead the couples to the altar.

Though genetically speaking, sex attraction is a natural phenomenon, but apart from the obvious physical factor, other factors viz., psychological, social or enviromental as well as various determinants viz., proximity, similarity, complementarity etc., to name a few play a very vital role in attraction.

Newcomb’s definiton of attraction, ‘Attraction refers to any direct orientation [on the part of one person towards another] which may be described in terms of signs + or – and intensity’
[Newcomb, 1961, p.6]

has been widely accepted. Interpersonal attraction is also referred to as liking and loving. By attraction, we mean a positive attitude held by one person towards another. There are many kinds of attraction and many reasons for people to form an attitude of attraction or liking. Some people flatter us, and others earn our liking by being honest. Some may be the source of sexual gratification, while others are unattainable. We like some, because they are just like us, and others because they are different. (15)

Attraction invovles the issue of likeability – the belief that under the appropriate circumstances, a positive Sentiment could develop between a person and a target. Sentiment is a major theme in interpersonal relationship. It is clear that sentiment and attraction are closely allied – in fact, sentiment is the theme that is most relevant to liking and loving. Sentiment is defined as, ‘The attachment of positive [or negative] emotion to another person’.
Positive emotions are those that connote pleasantness or pleasure and as such, we are motivated to experience them. Emotions have a cognitive [thought] as well as a physiological [feeling] component. Attraction is the cognitive component of sentiment. That is, when another person evokes in us a positive emotional reaction, we judge that we are attracted to that individual. Conversely, we are inclined to associate those we like with the positive emotional reactions that we experience in their presence. (5)

Personal attraction is also defined as, ‘Positive sentiment or emotional feeling toward another person.’

Attraction is generated when another person furnishes rewards, and it decreases as one is punished. As George Homans [1974] has theorized, attraction thus depends on profit – that is, the rewards derived from the relationship minus the costs of the relationship. Because an action sometimes can produce reward and at other times cost most relationships exist in a precarious balance. Any given source of attraction can produce both positive and negative feelings. (9)

According to Schneider, interpersonal attraction is a broad, rather ill – defined term referring to feelings of liking, love, gratitude, and respect. However, most researchers [eg., Altman, 1974], have concentrated on liking as the major element of attraction, primarily because liking is easy to measure. (25)

By definition, attraction is the process of something drawing toward something else, whether it is by magnetics, vacuum, superconductivity: adhesion/cohesion or other physical laws/methods.

Thomas J. Leonard [1997] has forwarded many definitions of attraction. Some of these definitions are:

Attraction is a law of, and force in, Nature.

Attraction is a meme, an idea.

Attraction is simple, yet sophisticated, approach to living.

Attraction is the absence of resistance and the increasing occurrence of synchronicity.

It is a path of self – discovery and provides for an accelerated developmental process.

It is a filtering system.

Leonard has developed a 28 principles of attraction. He alleges that these principles will help in enhancing one’s own self – worth and esteem. He also forwarded attraction on broader areas such as: Global/Societal trend including the global entrepreneurism.
Leonard, however, coined a befitting description of attraction as, 'Attraction isn’t loud. It’s quite and personal'. (26)

Antonio Damasio, M.D. [Professor and the Head of neurology of University of IOWA, U.S.A.] claims that the instant of attraction, in fact, mimics a kind of brain damage. Damasio found that people with damage the connection between their limbic structures, and the higher brain is smart and rational — but unable to make decisions. They bring commitment phobia to whole new level. In attraction, we don’t stop and think, we react, operating on a ‘gut’ feeling, with butterflies, giddiness, sweaty palms, and flushed faces brought on by the reactivity of the emotional brain. We suspend intellect at least, long enough to propel us to the next step in the mating game — flirting. Flirting is negotiation process that takes place after there has been some initial attraction. The flirting, then becomes something that enhances the attraction. However, at the moment of attraction, and flirtation, bodies, minds, or senses are temporarily made hostage to the more ancient parts of the brain, the impulsive parts that humans share with animals. (24)

June Reinish of the Kinsey Institute, U.S.A, has expressed the same idea. According to her, although some elements of sexual attraction and preferences are learned from our environment, some are ‘built into our brains’. Scientists have verified that the brains of men and women are different in structure, chemical make – ups, and operation. Although understanding of the intricate workings of the central nervous system is a relatively new frontier, it appears evident that decoding the brain is key to explaining why sexual attraction is experienced so differently by males and females. The puzzle of how and why these differences have evolved appears to be falling into places. As unromantic and pragmatic as it may seem, nature’s programming of our brains to select out and respond to stimuli as sexually compelling or repelling simply makes good reproductive sense. [Donahue, 1985]

Attraction messages from the primitive part of our brains pushing us to pursue seemingly superficial traits and sometimes inappropriate partners often seem so right at the time. Ackerman [1990] expressed that evolution has merely provided us with only a blueprint for building a partnership with a mate. How we actually structure a relationship from the crude plan depends on many things:

The quality of materials available

The regulations and codes of our society

The skills and experiences we have learned from our environment

Random windfalls and disasters.

Recognizing and understanding the role of natural selection in the mysterious, wonderful, process of sexual attraction can perhaps help us to maintain more objectivity and to learn to land on our feet the next time we fall in love. (22)
Attraction, apparently, has either been viewed as unidimensional or multidimensional. Some researchers assume that attraction is unidimensional, holding the view that repulsion is a mirror image of attraction. Following this, one disliking someone would naturally like him less. This notion takes an extreme view, whereby someone may be attracted towards another or not. The multidimensional concept considers that negative or positive feelings towards another are not interdependent but independent of each other. That is, the same individual may be the target of extreme attraction and repulsion.

To Byrne [1969, 1971], attraction refers to initial responses to strangers and has been used as equivalent of liking, which may involve both encounter and affective response. Murstein [1971] treats more lasting relationships culmination in marriage under courting, though dating is fleeting in nature and of shorter duration.

Attraction research has generally revolved around certain chosen groups probably more for reasons of feasibility than their importance.

Most theories of attraction seem to make an implicit assumption that attraction is by and large a self – oriented phenomenon where promotion of self – interest is the main concern. Hence, attractive is attractive to the extent that he/she validated the self and serves the interest of the attracted by way of similarity, compatability, compementarity, exchange value, and the like, meaning thereby that attraction for the other and relationships in general can be explained in terms of their cost – effectiveness for the person and the benefits they promise to bring to the attracted. In fact, the unpredictability and intricacies of interpersonal relationships do not always follow set principles: exceptions to such rules in attraction process may involve some intriguing questions for enquiry ['Love' concept].

The positive aspects of interpersonal relationships have attracted greater attention of researchers, whereas the negative ones have not generally received a fair deal. As rightly observed, according to some researchers [Harre, 1977; Murscovici, 1972], a popular trend in social psychology in general, and studies on interpersonal attraction in particular, has been the focus on ‘nice behavior’ in specific relationships such as dating, friendship, courting, and marital choice. Equally important to human relationship and warranting further probing are the negative components i.e., hatred, malice, hostility, and enmity. Indeed, negative attitudes which may eventually culminate in strained or disrupted relationship are essential ingredients of any relationship and are likely to throw additional light on the dynamics of attraction just inhibition of mobility [eg., paralysis], has promoted understanding of the mechanism of human movement.

Moreover, knowledge about what people find attractive in their partners is important for two reasons. The first reason is obvious: we can predict what qualities an individual is likely to seek in a partner. The second reason is the knowledge of those features that are considered attractive, which can tell us about how people relate to themselves. The ability to attract sexual and romantic partners is probably of great importance to most people, particularly
during the emergence of adult sexuality [teenage years] and in its decline ["mid life crisis"].

Most attraction researchers in pursuance of their respective approaches and theories have deemed it wise to use simulated rather than real life conditions, because they are easy to manipulate and are amenable to greater control. Inappropriate pipeline strategies and artificial stranger techniques have no doubt yielded some useful empirical data, but they leave much to be desired when applied to actual interpersonal interactions. For a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of interpersonal attraction in its true form, a whole lot of variables operating in actual interpersonal communication would have to be considered. It is a difficult proposition in view of the constraints of manipulation and so less enthusiastically attempted so far.

However, attraction research has also been carried out in real life situations. A number of such studies on friendship and other forms of relationships exist. [Husain, 1990; Gupta & Husain, 1988; 1992; Husain & Gupta, 1987; Husain & Kureshi, 1983; 1984; Husain & Sharma, 1987, 1994; Sharma & Husain, 1991. 1992]. But one feels that the real work on attraction has to come through studies in real - life situations of which there is a dearth in literature. An extended and dilated version of interpersonal attraction, viz., 'love', has been a common pre-occupation of philosophy, literature, and religion, viewed and understood variously but always found to be inaccessible to objective study.

'Attraction' and 'love' if not identical are inextricably interwoven. Therefore, the entire spectrum of love with its myriad patterns, hues and shades opens up a multiplicity of dimensions yet to be looked into scientifically. Love, by virtue of its kinship to attraction and its richness of form and expression, deserves its rightful place in the agenda of attraction research which has so far been denied to it, barring passing references to some of its selective forms such as,'romantic' and 'metaphyscial' whereas, platonic, transcendental, compassionate, altruistic, passionate, erotic, non-conventional [sexual attraction] and so forth, may be some other dimensions of love along which attraction research can be extended.

Attraction and love are seen as synonymous in western thinking and difficult to discern on a temporal continuum, viz., which happens first, where as the Indian position seems to be that the two either coincide or take place in the order. As for western situation, affiliation possibly marks the beginning of the attraction process, whereas in the Indian context, it happens to be a later phase.

Attraction literature is frequented with phrases used as hypotheses to put across potential hypothesis embedded in the Indian and probably the oriental psyche, and which holds promise of generating useful research in cross-cultural perspective, may be: 'Lesser known and unkown is attractive.'Based as it is on the premise that attraction is a curvilinear function of the degree of the exposure, the lesser the attraction, it seems a conceptually tenable proposition in the light of our folklore. (15)
In summary, attraction is the response of the attracted to the stimulus value of the attractive, where the major deciding factor is the active participation of the former. The modification in behavior resulting from being attracted and the extent to which one is seen as attractive can be understood in terms of the intervention of the attracted and the fact that the attracted has been accepted. Attractiveness, therefore, is not inbuilt in the person seen as attractive but built by the attracted around the attractive by way of his/her vulnerability. It is not surrendering to the charm of the attractive but bestowing power on him/her. Tedeschi's [1974] observation viz., "One likes to be given power." aptly underscores the point.

However, as Cranzo & Messe state that attraction can be a belief that another person is worth exploring as a potential friend or loved one; as such, attraction is preliminary to Sentimental attachment. It also can refer to our understanding that we are attached to others, because we have formed a sentimental [liking or loving] relationship with them.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY OF INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION

Both implicit and explicit interplay of the dynamics and process of interpersonal attraction tend to shape the complexion of our social behavior. Hence, a study of interpersonal attraction has numerous practical justifications. To mention a few, these may be problems relation to marital discord and harmony, selection of effective and socially coherent work team to achieve maximum benefit, fairness of a judicial verdict, the attractiveness of the dependent, growing children's acquaintance with others and its effect on the psychological growth problems where social interaction is involved. Besides the pragmatic aspect of attraction research, there is ample academic justification to look into the problem. How acquaintance comes about and friendship formed are theoretical questions and there is no final answer to them. Although research on such aspects of attraction would not possibly produce guidelines and tips of utilitarian value they would still be contributing to understanding the complexities of interpersonal attraction.

The implications of attraction research would concern social and political issues, broaden human social perspectives and so also the smaller problems of social nature. There may be observations of consequences in themselves about attraction but they may lead to more important observations and be of great practical value. For example, in self-evaluations, one may use pejorative adjectives in relation to outgroup who may be positively evaluated. The lower socio-economic status subjects perceiving themselves as being evaluated positively by the high socio-economic status subjects, contrary to the observation that the two groups entertain no feelings of attraction for each other [Kureshi & Husain. 1985]. (15)

The general objective in carrying out studies of interpersonal attraction is of modest nature. The basic question, for example, may be about identifying the roles, processes, and empirical laws that operate in acquainting individuals. Although a major and significant part in interpersonal research is to find out why people like each other and what goes into one making attractive, this is
not the sole purpose of this research. Rather, this is to acquire knowledge of the dynamics of developing relationships not only in fixed situations but more in changing situations of likes and dislikes. Interpersonal attraction research is, therefore, directed towards analyzing how and under what circumstances relationships start and this happens to be the central theme of many a research [Byrne, 1971]. It is obvious that developing relationships have a starting point and one has to understand what it is. Three major directions of study are reflected in the studies of interpersonal attraction:

Identifying the factors that start attraction where none existed before – (when strangers meet)

The events which affect or maintain attractiveness level already established, continued attraction for the liked one, change of mind about the liked one, getting more strongly involved in already established relationships; and

Subtilities of non-verbal communication - eye movement, gestures, sitting position, etc.

Simply arriving at a theory and defining what is attractive does not take us very far unless the problems that emerge from there are empirically studied and a measure developed to assess the relevant features of any equation. Attraction, which normally operates in day to day interaction, is not easily brought to laboratory and may loose its natural compulsion. Attraction workers cannot invite strangers to the laboratory to form friendship with one another. Further, would a single theory of attraction explain the behavior of interacting individuals? Or, whether the observations would be a function of the susceptibility of the invited subjects to laboratory? What aspects of attraction are accessible to experimental analysis? These and similar questions have intrigued attraction workers who have been involved in research on interpersonal attraction. (15)

THEORIES OF ATTRACTION

Asked why they like one person and not another, or why they were attracted to their fiance or spouse, most people can readily answer, “I like her, because she’s warm, witty, and well-read.” What such explanations leave out – and what social psychologists believe most important – is ourselves. Attraction involves the one who is attracted as well as the attractor. Thus, a more psychologically accurate answer might be, “I like her, because how I feel when I’m with her.” We are attracted to those whom we find it satisfying and gratifying to be with. Attraction is in the eye of [and brain] of the beholder.

SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY

The theory credited to Thibaut & Kelley [1959] and Homans [1961] known as ‘Social Exchange Theory’, is as relevent to interpersonal attraction as to many other aspects of social behavior.

Thibaut & Kelley considered their viewpoint as a ‘frame work’ rather than a theory, adding that there was a method of looking at interpersonal relationships. We do not assess rewards and costs in absolute terms; we
compare them with what we had expected and with what alternatives are available.

The point can be expressed as a simple psychological principle: Those who reward us, or who are associated with rewards, we like. "Minimax" motive: Minimax costs maximize rewards. This implies that if a relationship rewards more than it costs us, we will like it and will therefore, wish to continue. Such will be especially true if the relationship is more profitable than alternative relationships [Burgess & Huston, 1971; Kelley, 1979; & Rusbult, 1980]. (15), (21), & (7)

Homans argue's that in all relationships we assess the rewards that can be gained and balance these against the costs: the profits are simply the rewards less than costs. Not surprisingly, people tend to stay in relationships that show an overall profit and withdraw from relationships that are perceived as too costly. People do not necessarily evaluate the profits [or outcomes as they are usually know] very consciously or systematically, but this assessment certainly takes place. (7)

The basic premise of social exchange theory is that interactions are a sort of bargaining and trading transactions. According to the social exchange theory, human behavior is a function of its returns, and depends on the amount and kind of reward and punishment, which it brings about. Having a predilection to economic concepts, social exchange theory, is however, on a firm footing within the behavioristic frame, as would be evident from Homan's assumption that social behavior can be rewarded or punished by the behavior of another person. Or, in Thibaut & Kelley's words: 'Most socially significant behavior will not be repeated unless it is reinforced, rewarded in some way' [1959, p.5] (15)

According to this theory, what matters most are a comparision of the costs as well as the benefits of establishing or maintaining a relationship. What this theory takes into account then are a number of comparative judgements those individuals make in social situations. Being attracted to someone else is not just a matter of, "Is this a good thing"? It's more a matter of, "Is the reward I might get from this relationship worth the cost and what other alternatives exist at the moment"?

**Evaluation**

This theory is intuitively convincing and explains the dynamic qualities of a relationship: since rewards and costs and constantly changing relationships are by no means stable. It can explain why friendships don't usually end, due to a single argument but because people 'drift apart' as rewards, costs and comparison levels change, partly because people themselves change.

Social exchange theory offers a very plausible explanation of how and why people move through the various phases of relationship.
EQUITY THEORY

Walster, Walster, and Berscheid [1978] derive this theory from social exchange theory, but introduce an extra dimension, that of investment. Where as costs and rewards are consequences of a relationship, investments are goods or abilities that one person brings with them to the relationship, such as, the capacity to earn a large salary. According to this theory, profits should be in proportion to the investment made, even if this means that benefits are not equally divided. This may account for the fact that an unattractive, older man who commands a large salary is far more likely to marry a younger attractive woman than a similar man with a much lower income.

Greenberg and Cohen [1982] found that partners who feel they are getting less aggrieved and angry; partners who are over benefited feel uncomfortable and guilty.

Considerations of fairness may be more important in the early stages of a relationship. If the relationship endures, people seem to monitor the relative inputs less closely. (21), (7), (10), & (3)

Homans developed the concept of distributive justice, describing the balance of rewards and costs for two people [p&o]. Distributive justice prevails when:

\[
\frac{P's\ \text{rewards} - P's\ \text{costs}}{P's\ \text{investments}} = \frac{O's\ \text{rewards} - O's\ \text{costs}}{O's\ \text{investments}}
\]

Basically, equity is present when each person receives the same relative outcome compared to how much each invested in the relationship. Equity theory proposes that self-interest motivates everyone, seeking to maximize rewards and minimize costs. However, society teaches us that if we constantly act selfish, seizing more benefits than we deserve, we will be punished.

"We soon learn that the most profitable way to be selfish is to be fair." [Walster et al., 1978, p.15]

The romantic choices of individuals are influenced by equity considerations. Yet individuals also persist in trying to form relationships with partners who are somewhat more desirable than themselves. Our romantic choices thus, seem to be a delicate compromise between the realization that we must accept what we deserve and our insistent demand for an ideal partner.

Equity theory asserts that individuals are most content when they are in an equitable relationship. An equitable relationship is defined as one that would lead an observer to conclude that the participants were receiving equal relative gains from the relationship; in other words, there is distributive justice. (3)
Evaluation

Social exchange and equity theories have been criticised for viewing people as essentially selfish and unwilling to give more than they get. These theories tend to ignore evidence suggesting that people are capable of unselfish and altruistic acts. (21), (7), (10), & (3)

BALANCE THEORY

Chronologically, Fritz Heider’s [1946] balance theory is the earliest and also the simplest. The central construct in this theory is the attitude organization that Heider considers in terms of triadic balance [P-O-X theory]. According to this theory, sentiments are crucial in interpersonal relations, the feelings that one person entertains for another’s – likes and dislikes. Love and hate, gratitude, anger, and trust have strong influences on the behavior of that person towards the other [Heider, 1946, 1958]. The P-O-X theory attempted to take care of the diversity of the possible situation’s and events where sentiments were involved. (15)

Heider focused on triads involving a person (P), another person (O), and an impersonal object or third person (X). A situation is balanced if the relationship among elements is harmonious and nonstressful. For example, if you (P) like Vikram (O) and you both like liberal political ideas (X), the situation is balanced. As a general rule, a triad is unbalanced when there are one or three negative relations [example, you like vikram and you like liberal ideas, but he is a strong conservative]. When there is imbalance, something has to give in. You could become negative in your attitude toward politics, or try to change Vikram’s viewpoint.

The same principles apply when X is a third person. Aronson and Cope [1968] demonstrated that research subjects were relatively willing to help a supervisor [left hand side of figure 1] when the supervisor had:

1. Praised an experimenter who had been pleasant to the subjects or
2. Criticized an experimenter who had been harsh to the subjects. In other words, “My friend’s friend is my friend”[all positive relations in the triad], and “My enemy’s enemy is my friend”[one positive relation in the triad].

When the situation was initially unbalanced, the subjects restored balance by disliking the supervisor and being less help to him [right hand side of figure 1]

The figure is shown on the next page.
In Heider's theory, the main thrust is that 'strive to make their sentiment relationships with their perception of unit relationship existing between objects.'

**Evaluation**

The theory seems to fulfill the basic criteria of a social—psychological theory and so has a moderate acceptability. It is logically consistent, simple, and matter-of-fact, and amenable to testing with other accepted theories of interpersonal attraction. The one strong point of the theory is that it has a heuristic value and provides a basis for the development of other attitude theories. But what seems to be the strong point of the theory turns out to be its weakness too. Most of Heider's hypotheses are in the form of X tending to produce Y. These do not consider to be important as far as experimental validation is concerned, because the uncontrolled factors may not be related to the hypothesis in question, and there might be the possibility that some factors that are relevant to the hypotheses might have been ignored.
However, the use of diagrams of triads and symbols such as P-O-X seems to be unwarranted for a simplistic theory of this kind. Apparently, the triads are testable empirically only under specific conditions. In Heider's proposition the relations proposed either exist positively or negatively without regard to their strength and extent. The extent to which a relation is positive or negative, which is an important determinant of balance is neglected in the theory. Osgood and Tennenbaum [1955] took up this point as also Cartwright and Harary [1956] proving for varying degrees of system's balance or imbalance with reference to the principle of congruity. (15)

DETERMINANTS OF ATTRACTION

Why we are differentially attracted to people is a question that has intrigued scientist and laymen alike. Social Psychologists have come up with some answers. Several factors determine whether people become attracted. In studying these factors, psychologists have tried to take some of the mystery and myth out of the factors that have been identified as influencing interpersonal attractions are proximity, similarity, complementarity, physical attractiveness, and novelty.

PROXIMITY

The term proximity, which can also be dubbed as 'Propinquity', means 'closeness' or 'from same geographical area'. We can only come to love or like those whom we have chance to meet and get to know.

Proximity is defined as,

"Physical accessibility to others"

Effects of proximity can be interpreted in many ways. Homans [1961] has suggested that since less energy is required to interact with that close by, interaction with closer people will be less costly and hence will reinforce attraction. Another variant is that since one presumably interacts more with people close by, there is greater opportunity to discover mutual similarity. Also Heider's balance theory proves that affective relations should be consistent with unit relations. One kind of unit relation is physical proximity. (25)

Why does proximity lead to attraction? One answer is that we can't like someone we have never met and the chances of meeting that some are much greater if he/she is nearby. Yet, this doesn't explain why the interaction leads to like rather than dislike. One reason may be simple that on the whole people tend to be pleasant rather than unpleasant to each other. Secondly, there probably is a basic tendency for humans to seek the company of other humans, regardless of who those others are. (11)
Proximity is related in a variety of ways to attraction. In addition to the indirect effect of proximity on attraction through similarity, physical closeness facilitated a number of processes that contribute to attraction. When interacting with those nearby, persons are likely to hit upon outcomes sufficiently satisfactory to discourage interaction with those at greater distance [Homans, 1961]. The interaction with those physically close is much more apt to produce initially favourable outcomes for a number of reasons such as:

1. People can obtain social rewards from others who are close with little cost, and so closer friends are likely to be rewarding than those who take more of our effort and time to be in their company.

2. We tend to acquire more information about those who are in closer proximity to us [Zajonc, 1968a].

3. Chance of discovering similarities and other rewarding characteristics of another person is increased by frequent interaction besides allowing for the operation of social influence processes that may produce similarity.

4. Early interaction brings in a variety of processes that help in providing a momentum suiting an already initiated relationship over other alternatives [Rosenburg & Turner, 1981] (1), & (15)

SIMILARITY

Do people like others who are similar to themselves, or do they prefer those who are very different? To put it in a different manner, which bit of folk wisdom is more nearly correct: 'Birds of a feather flock together', or – perhaps by analogy with magnets – 'Opposites attract'.

It appears that birds have more to teach us in this matter than magnets do, for the evidence suggests that in general, people tend to like those who are similar to themselves. (11)

"And they are friends who have come to regard the same things as good and the same things as evil. . . . We like those who resemble us, and are engaged in the same pursuits. . . . We like those who desire the same things as we, if the case is such that we and they can share the things together."

Aristotle, Rhetoric

As Aristotle suggests, similarity is an important factor in determining liking, particularly similarity in attitudes and values. In books and movies opposites may attract but in real life birds of a feather flock together. As Tennis Pro Bjorn Borg said of his new wife, “She's a great woman. She's just like me’. [Milestones, 1989]. (2), & (3)

Similarity can be defined as,

Shared qualities of interest or attitudes
Over the years, a number of explanations of the relation between similarity and attraction have been suggested:

1. Agreement with another leads the person to anticipate rewarding interaction, and where it actually facilitates joint pleasurable activities, it also can be expected to lead to attraction. Agreement in activity preferences, attitudes, and values not only ensures that person will hit upon mutually satisfying activities, but that they will be able to carry them out with a minimum of friction [Werner & Parmelee, 1979]

2. Persons are attracted to others who agree with their opinions, but dislike others whose views are divergent. Agreement is rewarding and disagreement punishing, either because liking one who is agreeing and disliking one who disagrees provides a balanced cognitive state – one that is psychologically pleasant and comfortable [Heider, 1958; Newcomb, 1961], or because agreement satisfies a person's affectance needs, the need to feel secure in dealing with the world [Byrne, 1971]

3. Persons tend to anticipate that individuals who are similar to them will like them [Aronson, & Worchel, 1966] (2), & (3)

Several studies have been performed with such varied groups as surgical patients, jobcorps, trainees, and alcoholics. The results have been remarkably consistent: The more similar a stranger's attitudes, the more a person expect to like him. (15)

Byrne, in his evaluation of similarity – attraction relationship in terms of reinforcement theory expresses: 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. (12)

There is an important distinction between actual similarity [how similar two people are] and perceived similarity [how similar two people think they are]. Most of the similarity studies [example, Byrne, 1971; Griffit, 1974] have not distinguished between the two, because the information on similarity is presented by the experimenter. These experimental studies can be interpreted as measuring the effects of perceived, rather than actual similarity. Recent studies suggest that perceived similarity is more important than actual similarity in determining liking [Hill, & Stull, 1981]. (3)

**PHYSICAL ATTRACTIVENESS**

Another important factor in the early stages of a relationship is appearance or physical attractiveness. People may not judge books by their covers, but they certainly do so with other human beings. There is little doubt that for a given time and culture, there is a considerable agreement as to how physcially attractive a given man or woman is. Nor is there in determining attraction – or at least initial attraction – to members of the opposite sex.
The concept of physical attractiveness can be termed as:

The combination of facial features, physiques, and grooming that is perceived as aesthetically appealing by members of a given culture at a given time period.

Both sexes respond strongly to the physical attractiveness of those they meet [Cash & Killcullen, 1985; Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986], though males are responsible to female attractiveness than females are to male attractiveness [Feingold, 1990; 1992b; Pierce, 1992]. Also individuals differ in the importance they attach to physical appearance [Cash, & Jacobi, 1992] (2)

A person who is very attractive is assumed to have positive qualities as well. People generally believe that attractive men and women are more poised, interesting, sociable, independent, dominating, exciting, sexy, well adjusted, socially skilled, and successful than the unattractive. [Dion, & Dion, 1987; Moore, Graziano, & Miller, 1987]. Analogous stereotypes apply to vocal attractiveness; the more attractive a person's voice is, the more positive the ratings of that individuals personality traits are [Zuckerman, & Driver, 1989]. Most of the studies of physical appearance have concentrated on late adolescents or young adults of dating age, but the effect is by no means limited to this group. Even newborn infants are assumed to have more positive characteristics - such as sociability - if they are attractive rather than unattractive. [Langlois, Roggman, & Rieser-Danner, 1990] (2)

Good looks are an obvious asset in attracting a romantic partner. But physically attractive people have further advantages. They benefit from a halo effect; the tendency to assume that people who have one positive characteristic must have others as well. (11)

Physical attractiveness is clearly a very desirable quality. But if we all set our sights on only those that occupy the very top of this dimension, the world soon be depopulated - there are simply not enough movie queens and matinee idols to go around. One would therefore, assume that people will behave in a more sensible fashion. They may desire the most attractive of all possible mates, but they also have a fairly reasonable perception of their own social desirability [which is determined in part by their own physical attractiveness]. In consequence, they seek partners of roughly comparable social assets; while aiming to get a partner who is most desirable, they also try to avoid rejection. This is the so-called matching hypothesis, which predicts a strong correlation between the physical attractiveness of two partners. This matching hypothesis is well supported by observations from everyday life ['They make a such a fine couple!'] (11)

Why people are attracted towards physical attractiveness? There are three possible reasons:

1. Attraction may result from the rewards of esthetic satisfaction. *
2. Persons may receive rewards from others as a result of their forming a relationship with an attractive other, either because this conforms with a cultural norm that the person toward whom one is attracted is supposed
to be physically attractive or because one's ability to form a relationship with an attractive other at leasts to one's own desirability in the eyes of others.

3. The powerful effect of the person's physical attractiveness on the attribution of others triats of similar value. (1)

**COMPLEMENTARITY**

Besides external appearance, people are attracted because they share similar interests [liking reading science fiction] or can do things for each other [such as fixing an appliance for some one who lacks mechanical skills]. Related to this, psychologists have asked whether similarity [shared qualities, interests, or attitudes] or complementarity [having a quality a partner lacks] are most important in the establishment of friendship and love relationships. As folk wisdom puts it, do 'birds of a feather flock together', or do 'opposites attract'? (19)

Complementarity can be defined as:

Tendency for people to be attracted to one another because they possess opposite qualities. For example, a dominant person may be attracted to a submissive person and vice versa.

There are times when real complementarity is important in determining liking. When the needs of one person satisfies the needs of another, the two tend to like each other. A dominant and a submissive person have complementary personalities, for the need of one [to dominate] satisfies the need of the other [to be dominated] and vice versa. Thus, they can form a stable relationship and should tend to like each other. However, the situation will be quite different when complementary attitudes do not satisfy each other. A music lover would probably not like a music hater or a person who likes discussion, and so on. In these cases, complementarity does not lead to mutual reinforcement and to liking.

**NOVELTY**

It is well known that an element of novelty draws our attention

Novelty can be defined as:

**Newness in appearance, or in behavior in general**

Novelty and complementarity are two sides of the same coin, because the definitions of both the terms are similar.

So far no scientific research could be found on novelty related to the interpersonal attraction. So it is an attempt on the part of the investigator to gauge to what extent the concept of novelty influences during the integration process as a determinant of attraction.
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