

MAKING IT AND BREAKING IT: JAPANESE AND AMERICAN CULTURAL
PERSPECTIVES ON FRIENDSHIP

A THESIS

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Asian Studies

The Colorado College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Bachelor of Arts

By

Kiyomi L. Moore

May 2014

Honor Code Upheld

On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment.

Kiyomi L. Moore

Reader Approval

This thesis project, written by Kiyomi L. Moore, meets the required guidelines for partial fulfillment of the Bachelor of the Arts Degree in Asian Studies at The Colorado College.

PROFESSOR JOAN ERICSON

Signed: _____

Date: _____

PROFESSOR TAMARA BENTLEY

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Table of Contents

Introduction: <i>Tomodachi no Kizuna</i> – The Ties of Friendship	1
Chapter One: Literature Review	4
Chapter Two: Procedures	23
Chapter Three: Findings	28
Chapter Four: Discussion	50
Conclusion: To a Better Understanding of Friendship.....	73
Appendix I: Survey Questionnaire	77
Appendix II: Summary of Statistical Analyses of Survey Results.....	85
Bibliography	90

List of Tables

TABLE 1. PART B, QUALITIES LOOKED FOR IN POTENTIAL FRIENDS: QUESTION 1 – “SOMEONE WHO LISTENS TO ME”	29
TABLE 2. PART B, QUALITIES LOOKED FOR IN POTENTIAL FRIENDS: QUESTION 2 – “HAS A CALM PERSONALITY”	29
TABLE 3. PART B, QUALITIES LOOKED FOR IN POTENTIAL FRIENDS: QUESTION 3 – “IS PRETTY OR ATTRACTIVE”	30
TABLE 4. PART B, QUALITIES LOOKED FOR IN POTENTIAL FRIENDS: QUESTION 15 – “MANY CONTACTS”	30
TABLE 5. PART C, HOW DO YOU MAINTAIN YOUR FRIENDSHIP: QUESTION 1 – “BEING TOGETHER OFTEN”	31
TABLE 6. PART C, HOW DO YOU MAINTAIN YOUR FRIENDSHIP: QUESTION 3 – “SERIOUS CONVERSATIONS”	31
TABLE 7. PART A, HOW DO YOU FIND/MAKE FRIENDS: QUESTION 1 – “THROUGH FRIENDS”	32
TABLE 8. PART A, HOW DO YOU FIND/MAKE FRIENDS: QUESTION 4 – “THROUGH SCHOOL CLUBS”	32
TABLE 9. PART B, QUALITIES LOOKED FOR IN POTENTIAL FRIENDS: QUESTION 6 – “IS CHEERFUL OR SUNNY”	32
TABLE 10. PART B, QUALITIES LOOKED FOR IN POTENTIAL FRIENDS: QUESTION 7 – “IS CONSIDERATE”	33
TABLE 11. PART B, QUALITIES LOOKED FOR IN POTENTIAL FRIENDS: QUESTION 10 – “IS OF SIMILAR BELIEFS”	33
TABLE 12. PART C, HOW DO YOU MAINTAIN YOUR FRIENDSHIP: QUESTION 7 – “BRINGING EACH INTO THE FAMILY”	33
TABLE 13. PART D, GOOD FRIENDS: QUESTION 1 – “HOW MANY GOOD, STEADY FRIENDS DO YOU HAVE RIGHT NOW?”	34
TABLE 14. PART D, “HOW MANY GOOD, STEADY FRIENDS DO YOU HAVE RIGHT NOW?”: QUESTIONS 1 – 10	36

TABLE 15. PART E, BEST FRIENDS: QUESTION 1 – “HOW/WHERE DID YOUR WONDERFUL FRIENDSHIP COME INTO BEING?”	39
TABLE 16. PART E, BEST FRIENDS: QUESTION 2 – “WHAT SPECIAL QUALITIES HAVE MADE THE FRIEND ONE OF A KIND?”	40
TABLE 17. PART E, BEST FRIENDS: QUESTIONS 3 – 6 – “THE SEX AND AGE OF BEST FRIENDS”	41
TABLE 18. PART F, PLAUSIBLE CAUSES OF A FRIENDSHIP BREAKUP: QUESTION 1 – “HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED A BREAKUP?”	42
TABLE 19. PART G, INTERNATIONAL FRIENDS: QUESTION 1 – “FRIENDS FROM WHERE?”	44
TABLE 20. PART G, INTERNATIONAL FRIENDS: QUESTION 2 – “WHY ARE YOU INTERESTED IN HAVING SUCH FRIENDS?”	46
TABLE 21. PART G, INTERNATIONAL FRIENDS: QUESTION 3 – “MOST OF ALL, WHAT QUALITY/CHARACTER WOULD YOU EXPECT IN SUCH FRIENDS?”	48
TABLE 22. AMERICAN MEN AND WOMEN DIFFERENCES SUMMARY	71
TABLE 23. JAPANESE MEN AND WOMEN DIFFERENCES SUMMARY	71
TABLE 24. CULTURAL DIFFERENCES SUMMARY	72

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to thank Professor Joan Ericson, Professor Tamara Bentley, and Professor Paul Maruyama for all of their support and encouragement with my senior thesis. Secondly, this thesis would not have been possible without the financial support of the Gaylord Prize for Independent Study Research in Asian Area Studies (2012), and the Asian Language Prize (2012). Lastly, I would like to express tremendous gratitude to my parents and friends.

Introduction

Tomodachi no Kizuna – The Ties of Friendship

Friends matter. William James observed, “Wherever you are it is your own friends who make your world.”¹ Indeed, making friends was very important to me while I was studying at Waseda University in Tokyo, Japan, in 2012-13. To do so, I joined “Session,” a student-run dance club. This large club was organized into subgroups around different styles of hip-hop. I chose “Popping,” the smallest subgroup in which I was one of only a handful of women. Thus, my adventure with making Japanese friends began.

Membership in the Popping group involved not only steady attendance at dance practices and rehearsals but also participation in social events. At one party, our Popping group was seated all together. On this occasion, I was mostly ignored by the young men in my own group, and I felt like I was not fitting in well or being accepted. However, at a later Session party for newcomers across different subgroups, I wound up sitting with the members of the all-girl subgroup. They were very friendly and inclusive. I was baffled – why were these girls so friendly when members of my own, mostly male group were not? Were young men and women that different when it came to making friends?

Within my Popping group, I was also confounded by the *senpai* (senior) and *kohai* (junior) roles, which seemed to dictate interpersonal relationships. As an upperclassman, I would have been a *senpai*. But as a newcomer to the club, I was

¹ *William James: The Man and the Thinker*, ed. Max Carl Otto. (Madison, WS: University of Wisconsin Press, 1942, 17).

considered a *kohai* and placed among a group of Waseda freshman. However, when other freshman students in the dance group realized that I was an upperclassman, they immediately apologized for not using proper, formal speech with me as a *senpai*.

Despite these complexities and uncertainties, I somehow managed to make the transition from joining to belonging. As the year drew to a close, and I prepared to return to the U.S., the members of my Popping group seemed sad that I was leaving. They insisted we get together, and gave me a hand-made card with everyone's signature plus a nice farewell gift. Thus, to my surprise, I discovered that I had somehow managed to make friends without quite knowing it!

As my experience suggests, making friends in a different culture can be difficult and confusing. While friendship is a panhuman phenomenon, how it is expressed can differ greatly from person to person, men to women, and place to place. This study examines a number of contrasts among the dimensions of culture and sex. Using a questionnaire, I surveyed Japanese and American male and female students studying at Waseda University. The questions explored three major themes: how college students make friends, how they maintain these friendships, and how they experience the dissolution of a friendship. The survey was originally written in English and, after the IRB review and approval at Colorado College, Japanese translation was added. It included 75 response items and was designed to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. A total of 64 college students – 32 Japanese students and 32 American students – participated in the study.

The first chapter of this thesis introduces the research questions, and reviews the relevant research on friendship, focusing on studies of college students and cross-cultural

comparisons. Chapter Two presents the survey instrument, and the procedures of data collection and analysis. The participants and hypotheses are also introduced. The third chapter reports the findings of the study, and Chapter Four discusses the meaning and implications of the results. In the concluding chapter, the limitations of the study are identified and some possibilities for future research are suggested.

While childhood and adult friendships have been widely studied, college-age friendships have received comparatively lesser scrutiny. Cross-cultural research on friendship is also relatively limited. Therefore, this study focuses on young adults from two different cultures, studying at the same institution of higher education. It also investigates several little-researched dynamics, such as factors involved in friendship dissolution. Although based on a relatively small sample, my exploration augments the scope of anthropological research on friendship and provides some insight into the differing dynamics of friend relationships among American and Japanese college students.

Chapter One

Literature Review

Relationships of all kinds – kinship, romantic attachments, work and leisure associations – enrich and define human lives. Of these many ties, friendship occupies a position of particular importance. As Risseuw notes, friendship is “often described as the ‘highest’ form of relationship between people, as a refuge or sanctuary from society, even a family at times” (2003, 89). Friendships blossom in all parts of the world. They begin in childhood and continue across the lifespan, connecting people of different sexes and cultural backgrounds (Argyle 1992). The study of friendship illuminates how humans develop and relate to one another, and how these relationships change throughout life.

While friendship as a *type* of relationship appears to be universal, personal and social conditions influence its meanings and functions (Keller, 2000). The nature of friendship may vary from person to person, men to women, culture to culture. By investigating friendship, similarities and contrasts regarding male-female relations as well as cultural values can be unveiled.

My study thus surveys and compares notions of friendship among American and Japanese college students of both sexes. I examine the process of making friends, characteristics of friendship, and what causes a friendship to dissolve. The research questions were as follows:

- 1) Within a given culture, either American or Japanese, are there differences between men and women in the dynamics of their friendships?

2) Are there any cultural contrasts in the nature of friendship between Americans and Japanese?

3) If there are indeed some differences of either variety, what is the nature of the disparities?

For respondents, I drew upon fellow college students at Waseda University in Tokyo while I was studying there during 2012-13. I utilized a paper-and-pencil questionnaire to collect responses from 64 undergraduates, 32 Japanese (18 women and 14 men) and 32 Americans (17 women and 15 men). Survey questions covered the following topics: a) how they make friends, b) the qualities sought in their friends, c) how they maintain friendship, d) the number of friends they have, e) the feelings about their best friends, f) the causes of a friendship breakup, if any, and g) their interest in having international friends.

The Scope of Studies on Friendship

Over the years, researchers in many different fields have examined friendship in all parts of the world. Disciplines involved include anthropology, sociology, psychology, biology, health sciences, social work, education, area studies, communication studies, theatre arts, and even computer science. Studies have been reported from North and South America, Europe, Asia, and many other places, reflecting the universal nature of this human experience.

A few pioneering experts are easy to highlight. For instance, Michael Argyle (1992, 1994), a British social psychologist, has addressed friendship broadly, while Merry White (1994), an American educator, has been known for her studies of childhood friendships in the United States and Japan. Hayao Kawai (2008), a prominent clinical

psychologist of Japan, examined the relationship in adult contexts. It is thus clear that friendship has been a popular, extensively examined research topic.

However, it is a quite multifaceted phenomenon. In addition to the examination of friendships among different age groups, existing studies address the varied structure and meaning of friendship, identifying several factors such as the following:

- the rules of friendship
- the levels of friendship (best friend, good friend, acquaintance)
- male/female differences regarding expectations of friendship
- differences between friendship and kinship relationships
- friendship networks
- the quality, length, and purpose of friendship
- the dissolution of friendship
- intimacy in friendship

Naturally, despite all the investigations into this subject, a number of research foci have been relatively under examined. Friendship in young adults has been one of those, particularly from the cross-cultural perspective. Thus, the present study explores college students' notions of friendship from the American vs. Japanese viewpoint.

Defining Friendship

Quite a few American scholars have tried to construct a definition of friendship. For instance, Wright identified friendship as “relationships involving voluntary or unconstrained interaction in which participants respond to one another personally, that is, as unique individuals rather than as packages of discrete attributes or mere role occupants”

(1984, 119). Rybak and McAndrew characterized friendship with words such as “voluntary, intimate, trust, respect, commitment, support, generosity, nonromantic, loyalty, acceptance, caring, liking, and confiding” (2006, 148). Further, “friends help and share with each other” (Berndt 2002, 7).

Meanwhile, Matthews, in her book on friendship throughout life, discusses the difficulties of defining friendship and comes to the conclusion that “it is what it is to the respondent” (1986, 173). Similarly, French et al. (2006) defines friendship as voluntary connections between individuals that routinely take place within a cultural context. All that said, “there is still no generally accepted definition of friendship!” (Rybak and McAndrew 2006, 147).

European scholars seem to approach the definition of friendship from a slightly different angle. For instance, Alberoni describes friendship as “a relationship between equals” that “has taken on different forms in different eras and societies across the centuries.” He continues, “the word ‘friendship’ never has one single meaning but always multiple ones – and this has been true for centuries” (1984, 1-3).

He goes on to say that there are four kinds of friendship. First, acquaintances, “most of the people that we consider as friends are in reality only acquaintances, who are only partly distinguishable from the non-descript mass of others surrounding us.” Second, “when we use the word friendship, we are calling our friends all those who we feel are on our side, as in the case in war, where if you are not our friend you are our enemy.” In other words, friendship is a sort of collective solidarity between individuals who like and support each other. Third, “role-related relationships” that are based on “utility” can be between any two individuals including “politicians and business partners.” Lastly, the

fourth type of friendship, “the category made up of those individuals we get on swimmingly well with – in other words, those whom we are drawn to and admire.” To Alberoni, “friendship conjures up a peaceful, pure feeling of trust and confidence” (ibid.).

Argyle claims that friends can be characterized simply as “those people whom we like and can trust, and whose company we enjoy” (1994, 142). Similarly, Argyle and Henderson believe that, “the rewards which are commonly provided by friends consist of companionship in leisure activities, emotional and social support, and actual help, though the proportions of these may be different in different kinds of friendship” (1984, 214).

Japanese scholars note that friendship involves two traits: depth and width (Ochiai and Satoh, 1996; Oshio, 1998). Depth signifies the amount of intimacy in a friendship, while width illustrates the number of friends one has (Maeda and Ritchie, 2003). Further, Enomoto (1999) detects four kinds of activities in Japanese friendship: 1) increased mutual comprehension, 2) verification of a close relationship, 3) focus on fun, and 4) the establishment of a closed or exclusive relationship. Additionally, she identifies various types of emotions towards friends including dependence, security, apprehension, independence, competition, and conflict.

In their high-context culture,²

Japanese people may have stronger expectations that their friends understand them in relation to the larger social framework and treat them accordingly, resulting in a greater emphasis on sensitivity and attentiveness enacted in their friendships. (Maeda and Ritchie 2003, 582)

Similarly, Kawai (2008) states that, in Japan, friendships are not based on self-interest or calculation of stakes, but instead on liking someone and supporting them as a friend. Likewise, Kosaka (2010) notes that college students have different expectations

²According to E. Hall and M. Hall (1990), high context cultures tend to see situations and people as interrelated within a particular social structure.

for same-sex friends, opposite-sex friends, and lovers. Specifically, expectations for all three types of relationships include trust and support, outward attractiveness, consideration, active exchange, and mutual improvement. Lastly, Tanno and Matsui (2006) say that most undergraduate college students have two kinds of friends, high-interaction and low-interaction. High interaction friends serve to create comfort, support and enjoyment in the present, while low-interaction friends appear to provide a stabilizing influence across time.

Types of Friendship

One of the main topics explored in the field of friendship is the different kinds of friends. For example, Hays (1988) claims that the word “friend” may signify multiple types of friendship that differ in terms of relationship intensity and quality. According to Bryant and Marmo, three common types of friendship have been identified: close friends, casual friends, and acquaintances. Close friendships “involve high levels of interaction, self-disclosure, intimacy, involvement, and interdependence” (2012, 1016). Also, close friendships are often described by terms such as “love, trust, commitment, caring, stability, attachment, one-ness, meaningful, and significant” (Berscheid and Peplau 1983, 12).

Casual friendships “exist between people who are in the early stages of relationship development and have not yet achieved the intimacy, closeness, and communal bonds present in close friendships.” In addition, casual friends “engage in joint activities and possess low to moderate levels of closeness, yet typically avoid disclosing extremely intimate information.”

Finally, acquaintance relationships “involve individuals who vaguely know each other, yet rarely interact and experience little or no sense of intimacy.” Further, acquaintances know each other from casual social encounters, yet lack a sense of personal connection and shared relational history” (Bryant and Marmo 2012, 1016-17).

Similarly, McEwan and Guerrero theorize that, “for casual friendships, the association between maintenance and the perceived availability of resources is mediated by the quality of one’s casual friendship network.” However, “for close friendship networks, reported maintenance behavior was both directly and indirectly associated with the perceived availability of resources” (2012, 421).

The type of friend definitely changes the nature of the friendship and how the friend is treated. The inquiry of Rybak and McAndrew into levels of friendship also reported comparable findings. First, “people perceive relationships with best friends as more intimate than other friendships,” and second, people see “other friendships as more intense and intimate than acquaintanceships” (2006, 147). From all these studies, it is clear that people are inclined to identify different kinds of friends and friendship. Consequently, the characteristics of friendship vary greatly by the type of relationship.

Friendship Dissolution

As with the types and definitions of friendship, research literature identifies several causes of friendship breakups. For example, Rose discovered four factors in friendship dissolution: “physical separation, new friends replace old, growing to dislike the friend, and interference from dating or marriage” (1983, 3). She further states:

First, one’s friends may do or say something that suddenly meets one’s “dislike criteria,” that is, may violate some expectancy strongly associated with the

friendship. Lying might be in this category. Or second, our “like criteria” may change; we may begin to look for different things in friends, or friends may change and no longer meet our like criteria. Third, a friend may be displaced. A new acquaintance may meet more of one’s like criteria or meet them better than an old friend and gradually displace the friend. Last, termination may also occur when the pleasure/cost ratio deviates too far from an ideal point, either through reduced pleasure, as in the case of boredom, or through too little or too great a cost. (ibid., 5)

Concerning opposite-sex friendships, Bleske-Rechek and Buss found that “men and women also concurred that distrust and betrayal were the most important reasons for terminating an opposite-sex friendship” (2001, 1315). They also noted that “having an opposite-sex friend try to turn others against them or lie to them were two of the most important reasons for opposite-sex friendship dissolution” (ibid., 1319). Likewise, according to Reis, Clark, and Holmes (2004), people have higher expectations of their close friends, making that friend’s failure to respond to an emergency, for example, more obvious than a casual acquaintance’s mistake, possibly leading to termination of the relationship. In contrast, Hays (1989) thinks that the existence of intimacy and interdependence seems to make close friendships safer than other friendships.

Men, Women, and Friendship

As has been previously noted, the term “friend” can be used in different ways according to different people. Specifically, dissimilarities between men and women in the use and meaning of the term “friend” have been recognized. For instance, according to Argyle (1992), men see friends as people with whom they can spend time doing activities, while for women, friends are confidants who will be emotionally supportive. Likewise, Rybak and McAndrew (2006) claim that women tend to differentiate between “friends” and “close friends” more keenly than men. Therefore, it appears that sex may be a

significant variable in adult friendship. In addition, Demir and Orthel uncovered that, among college students, “the real and ideal best friendships of women were higher in quality and lower in conflict when compared to those of men.” Also, “men’s discrepancy scores for friendship quality were significantly higher when compared to women” (2011, 173).

Meanwhile, in looking at gender relations in friendship between girls and boys in grades 3, 6, 9, and 12, McDougall and Hymel discovered that there are “gender differences across friendship expectations” (2007, 373). To begin with, “boys...placed greater emphasis on common activities and companionship in both same- and cross-gender friendships” (ibid.). Girls, on the other hand,

More commonly stressed the importance of intimacy and loyalty/commitment in their friendships (relative to boys), emphasizing the need for friends to be open and honest. Thus, boys and girls do endorse different features in their friendships with others, both cross-gender and same-gender. (ibid.)

These authors also noted that, when their participants were asked to talk about what made their same-and opposite-sex friendships similar or different, “the same three features were emphasized in both cases: shared activities, intimacy, and trust” (ibid.).

Meanwhile, in her investigation of teenagers’ friendships in the U.S. and Japan, White observed that Japanese teenage boy friendship groups cohere around “mutual interests and similarities” (1994, 148). In contrast, Japanese teenage girls’ groups are not “founded on common activities.” Rather, girls gravitate towards other girls who are “similar to themselves in personality and habits” (149). A similar tendency has been noted among American teenagers, wherein the girls seem more focused on “emotional merging,” while boys become friends by doing things together (146).

Conversely, Kosaka researched Japanese college students' same-sex and opposite-sex friend expectations and found that men and women anticipated "trust and support, consideration, active exchange, and mutual improvement in same-sex friends." While both men and women looked for "trust and support, consideration, and active exchange" in opposite-sex friends, males also expected "outward attractiveness," but women wanted "mutual improvement" (2010, 151). Lastly, Enomoto examined the socio-emotional development of friendship among junior high, high school, and college students. She discovered that the male choice of friendship activity changed from "play" to "mutual understanding," and that females' preferences altered from "intimacy" to "closed relationships" and finally changed to "mutual understanding" (1999, 180). Evidently, girls and boys, or men and women, have slightly varied, yet still somewhat shared, ideas and expectations of friendship, particularly for same-gender vs. cross-gender friends.

Friendship among College Students

American studies. A range of research exists concerning friendship quality, intimacy, and types of friends among American college students. In a follow-up study specifically on the friendship of women who attended "a residential, coeducational college, Aleman noted "the salience of female friendship in college for women."

The participants in her study disclosed that,

Their friendships with women while in college have an enduring impact on their cognitive development. They describe these friendships as relationships in which and through which their intelligence and increasingly advanced thought is nurtured and tested. (2010, 577)

McEwan and Guerrero argue that friendships established at the college freshman stage are important in creating social networks that provide valuable resources for success. In order to build such relationships, certain “maintenance behaviors” like “positivity, banter, and routine contact” are required to facilitate a high quality friendship network (2012, 428). That network can serve as a vital resource. In other words, the authors interpret these so called “maintenance behaviors” as “investments” people make in relationships as the friendship develops and hypothesize its significance during the freshman year in particular. Of course, all friendships, regardless of the level of closeness, need some kind of maintenance. However, casual friend relationships require less effort to maintain as opposed to close friendships. For example, casual relationships entail less intimacy but may include activities such as “banter, social networking, computer-mediated communication, and joking around.” In contrast, close friendships involve more time-consuming or commitment-oriented behaviors like “task sharing,” wherein the friends “share” chores or homework in order to gain reciprocal rewards from one another (433).

Nevertheless, McEwan and Guerrero (2012) emphasize the significance of “positivity” and “routine contact” in sustaining even casual friendship networks in the first year of college, since they are the basis for developing new friendships (434). Positivity entails keeping social interactions light by behaving in a happy and positive manner around friends. Routine contact like calling and spending time with someone does help, and is a central concept in the authors’ study. Finally, it is posited that the “investment” in the maintenance of both casual and close friendship networks pay off in securing the availability of resources.

McEwan and Guerrero used a pencil-and-paper questionnaire, given to 150 freshmen. They claimed support for all hypotheses, and concluded that maintenance behaviors are related to the relationship quality of friendship and the perceived accessibility of resources in at least close friendship networks. However, whether their use of the term “investment” was appropriate as a way to describe friendship relations in terms of reward and cost benefits is debatable.

Japanese studies. Okada’s study on Japanese university students follows a different line of investigation from the American research discussed above. He developed a scale to measure friendship motivation, and found that a strong intrinsic motivation to make friends (which he calls “self-determined friendship motivation”) promoted “adaptive behaviors and positive interactions” among college students (2012, 7).

Okada also investigated the relationship between self-determined friendship motivation and maladaptive behaviors during adolescence. His study focused on four facets of maladaptive behavior: “physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger and hostility” (8). He was interested in two potential relationships: 1) the strong motivation to make friends and maladaptive behaviors, and 2) aggressive tendencies and self-esteem.

Participants in the study were 262 Japanese university students. Okada utilized his own *Friendship Motivation Scale* to assess “the reasons for forming friendships and interacting with friends” (8). In addition, he used the Japanese version of the *Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire* to assess aggression, and the Japanese version of the *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale* to measure self esteem (8-9).

Okada found that students with higher levels of friendship motivation were likely “to act less aggressively in their relations with friends” (9). The results did not show

aggressive tendency to be significantly related to the level of self-esteem. Consequently, his conclusion was that a strong motivation for friend-making “not only promotes adaptive behavior but also suppresses aggression and hostile behavior” (10).

Tobita, Hirabayashi, and Tamura studied the developmental changes in the concept of friendship from childhood to late adolescence among students at the elementary school, junior and senior high school, and college levels – 463 in all. A questionnaire revealed that the respondents valued six different traits, “considerateness, responsiveness, easy communication, serious communication, resemblance, and straightforwardness” (1997, 25). However, the comparative values placed on these traits changed over time. From elementary school through high school, girls and boys expressed the same degree of appreciation of considerateness. In college, however, women placed a higher value on this trait than men.

While considerateness and easy communication were consistently rated highly as the desirable elements of friendship, college students also valued straightforwardness and serious communication among friends. Thus, Tobita, Hirabayashi, and Tamura’s study in 1997 replicated/anticipated some findings of other research, including my study.

Cross-Cultural Comparisons at the College Level

Polish-American comparisons. In a study of college students in Poland and the U.S., Rybak and McAndrew examined the levels of intimacy and intensity (defined by factors such as viability, support, understanding, and enjoyment of the relationship) among “best friends,” “friends (buddies or companions),” and “casual acquaintances” (2006, 153). Using a questionnaire, they first ascertained how the respondents rated the

level of intimacy between two people in nine hypothetical situations. They also utilized the 22-item *Friendship Intensity Scale*, administering it three times in reference, respectively, to “a best friend,” “a friend,” and “an acquaintance.”

Rybak and McAndrew found both differences and similarities. For example, the variance and correlational analyses revealed that American students ranked all three types of relationships as more intense/intimate than the Polish students. On the other hand, in spite of the initial predictions, these researchers did not find that Poles were more discriminating about the intensity of different friendships than Americans, or that women were more discerning than men. However, both Polish and American students (regardless of sex) made clear differentiations among best friends, friends, and acquaintances.

From these findings, the authors deduced that “one’s culture appears to have a more powerful influence on the nature of one’s relationships than does one’s sex,” and that Americans may not, as stereotypically perceived, so generously apply the term “friend” to relationships with little intensity (2006, 160). This was an interesting cross-cultural comparison, which could have been bolstered with an initial assessment of cultural stereotypes held by the two groups of participants.

Indonesian, Korean, and American Comparisons. In another study, French et al. examined characteristics and patterns of friendship interactions among college students in Indonesia (N=56), South Korea (N=35), and the United States (N=61), intending to compare collectivist³ vs. individualist⁴ cultures. Using inventories, the researchers

³ Collectivist cultures stress group membership over the individual. Thus, people have to balance their social/group identity with personal/individual identity, particularly when they are part of a group or in a relationship that they highly value (White 1994).

⁴ Individualist cultures value the individual and independence. As such, people in individualist countries view over-dependence in a relationship as a personal weakness (Maeda and Ritchie 2003).

discovered that South Korean students noted more disclosure in interactions than U.S. students, and they also displayed more “exclusive friendship” interactions than Indonesians and Americans (2006, 77). Conversely, Indonesian students exhibited more friendships of shorter duration, displayed less intimate disclosure, had more interactions every day, and interacted with more people than U.S. students. In addition, the authors said that students in all three countries reported roughly the same number of close friends, similar amounts of time spent interacting daily with friends, a comparable number of same-sex friends, and “approximately the same percentage of friend interactions that were with members of their same sex” (79).

The researchers contend that the models of friendship and peer interaction in collectivist cultures should be expanded to include individuals who seek extensive integration within a peer network, but attach less significance to close friendships. Such orientation may be common in collectivist societies wherein the in-group extends beyond relationship networks and immediate friends to a larger group, where economic, ideological, or social connections exist among members.

They also insist that studies of cross-cultural patterns of college friendship “provides a comparable context across countries, and students in these environments are able to develop friendships without constraints that may exist at other points in the lifespan” (79). Nevertheless, the complex interactions between kinship relations and friendship networks require a closer look. Also, stereotyping of the “collectivist–individualist”⁵ cultural dichotomy may not necessarily be productive. In other words, the differentiation between collectivist and individualist cultures is a matter of focusing on

⁵ Collectivist cultures tend to refer to Asian or Eastern countries, while individualist cultures are supposedly European/Western countries.

the “group” versus on the “individual.” As Maeda and Ritchie remind us, “the fact that people in Japan value their group identity does not mean they lack autonomy” (2003, 582). Consequently, the terms “collectivist” and “individualist” are generalizations of cultures that are not completely exclusive of each other when applied to a certain place or group of people.

Japanese-American Comparisons. In her cross-cultural study, White (1994) examined the coming of age in America and Japan. Her study focused on children and adolescents, but touched briefly on college students as well. One difference White highlighted was participation in college clubs. She described these activities in Japanese universities and observed that, “the most serious part of college life [in Japan] may indeed be participation in clubs (or “circle”) activities, where *senpai/kohai* relationships continue to train a young person to the demands of adult life.”⁶ White continued:

Relationship training within college clubs is very important. If you compare the yearbook of an American university with that of a Japanese university, you will see that the typical “popular” American student will have after his or her name and picture a long list of clubs, athletic teams, and student government positions. His or her Japanese counterpart will have only a few, often only one club or activity... [What this signifies is the emphasis on] the much valued ability to engage deeply, to commit oneself to one group, one activity. And it *is* more the group, the human relationships, than the activity itself. (ibid., 99)

However, White cautions that the substantial differences between American and Japanese school experiences “should not blind us to the fact that in both, the adolescent is learning how to be a member of society” (1994, 100). This certainly includes how to be a friend.

⁶ *Senpai*, in the school context, refers to “senior students,” or students who are often older and have participated in the club for many years. *Kohai* are “junior students” who are younger and have not been a part of the club activity for as long as the *senpai* and are seen as lower or below the *senpai* in the club hierarchy.

Cave (2004) also explored the educational role of Japanese school clubs. He utilized participant observation, survey questionnaires, and interviews with junior and senior high school students and teachers, as well as college students, to study the club experience. He found that “almost all students only belonged to one club” (399). Students acknowledged that club membership was demanding and reduced their free time. However, “there seemed to be a feeling that the friendships made in the club...were well worth the free time given up” (402). Thus, White’s and Cave’s studies both indicate that Japanese student clubs play a significant role in friendship formation. This role is linked to their unique membership demands, which differ in nature and intensity from the membership in American student clubs.⁷

All told, despite the various dissimilar concepts, definitions, and notions of friendship, a number of similarities between friendship in America and in Japan have been observed. For example, features such as “understanding, enjoyment, similarity, respect, authenticity, acceptance, helping behavior, intimacy, and self-disclosure” have been discovered in both cultures (Maeda and Ritchie 2003, 582). These authors go on to say that such commonalities imply that there are some shared characteristics, worldwide, in friend relationships that go beyond any given cultural milieu. Furthermore, they believe that, across cultures, all people wish to know, support, and have fun with their friends.

⁷ The observations of both Cave and White on the differences in membership demands agree with my own experiences, belonging to college-level student clubs in both the U.S. and Japan.

Summary

A review of the research on friendship indicates that the field of study itself is quite broad. Scholarship incorporates a variety of disciplinary approaches, with study participants of different ages, drawn from a number of countries and cultures. The research collectively provides definitions of friendship, and delineates differing types of friends, based upon, for instance, the degrees of intimacy and mutual support. Some studies examined what causes friendships to dissolve. Others focused on comparing and contrasting male and female friend relations. Accordingly, studies of friendship vary greatly in the participants studied, research foci, methods of inquiry, and findings. To date, friendship among young adults, including college students, has been relatively under-researched. Therefore, cross-cultural studies of this age group have also been few in number. The present study aims to help fill in this gap by comparing friendship experiences among American and Japanese college students.

Definitions for this Study

For the purposes of this study, specific descriptions were selected for key terms so as to avoid confusion. Specifically, friendship, culture and sex were defined.

Friendship:

A voluntary relationship that creates a level of intimacy between two individuals who like each other, care about the well-being of one another, and enjoy each other's company.

Culture:

Patterns, explicit or implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts. The essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas/beliefs and, especially, their attached values. (Kroeber and Kluckhohn 1952, 181)

Sex:

“Sex” is a physiological classification variable (man/woman or male/female). [In contrast, any characterological and behavioral variations in humans are the result of “Gender”– a “cultural creation” or “social/cultural attribute.” Thus, gender reflects “social expectations about how males and females ought to act and their respective rights and duties.” (McIntyre 2011, 258; Robbins 2009, 212)

Chapter Two

Procedures

According to Goss, “friendship appears to be a worldwide concept” (2000, 40). However, Argyle (1992) notes demographic variations in friendship between men and women and between cultures. Therefore, I decided to study two dissimilar countries to explore Argyle’s claim further. My year of study abroad in Japan provided the perfect opportunity to conduct a comparative study of friendship. Accordingly, prior to departing for Japan, I planned a study and created a survey questionnaire in English and Japanese about how people make and maintain friendships, and also experience friendship breakups.

Since this study involved human subjects (college students), the survey instrument was examined and approved by the Colorado College IRB.⁸ In addition to questions about friendship, the survey included a consent form at the beginning, and provided the option for participants to decline taking the survey. The form made it clear that the respondent’s name and personal information would be kept confidential.

⁸The IRB, or Institutional Review Board, approves student’s research on human participants so that (a) the study does not cause harm to the participants, (b) involves a consent process, (c) does not include deception, (d) allows for confidentiality or anonymity of participants, and (e) focuses on the correct participant sample group.

Data Collection and Analysis

Survey Instrument

The questionnaire, attached as Appendix I (pp. 77-84), was composed of seven parts (A to G), with 75 response items. The preliminary part asked for the basic demographics from the respondents, such as nationality (country), sex, age, and year in college. In the following pages, most questions ask participants to mark a response on a Likert scale⁹ of two to five categories.

Part A: “How Do You Find and Meet Potential Friends?” This part included eight response items inquiring about how participants make friends in various scenarios such as “at parties,” “in school classes,” “on-line contacts,” and “by sheer chance.” The response categories for this question were: (1) always, (2) often, (3) sometimes, (4) seldom, and (5) never.

Part B: “What Qualities Do You Look for in Potential Friends?” There were 15 response items here, focusing on what qualities one wants in a friend, and used the categories, (1) decisive, (2) important, (3) moderate, (4) trifle, and (5) insignificant.

Part C: “Once Becoming Friends, How Do You Maintain Your Friendship?” With eight response items, this part asked about the ways in which the respondents sustained their friendships, based on a variety of choices such as “sharing the same interests” and “exchanging gifts, letters, etc.”

⁹ A Likert scale is “a scale often used in survey research in which people express attitudes or other responses in terms of several ordinal-level categories (e.g., agree, disagree) that are ranked along a continuum” (Neuman 2012, 396).

Part D: “How Many Good, Steady Friends Do You Have Right Now?” The 10 response items in this part turned to the respondents’ current friends, their sex and age, and the duration of the friendship.

Part E: “Now, Please Think of Your ‘Very Best’ Friend.” This section asked about the “best friends” of the participants (two open questions) and included four yes-no response items about the traits of that special friend.

Part F: “Have You Ever Experienced a Breakup of Friendship with Someone?” This part looked at the loss of friendship with 18 response items. The categories of the Likert scale here for potential factors contributing to a breakup were: (1) clearly, (2) probably, (3) perhaps, (4) unlikely, and (5) decidedly not.

Part G: “Finally, Are You Interested in Having Some International Friends?” The last section, Part G, involved 10 response items. The first part asked the participants eight yes-no response items about whether the respondents’ wanted international friends, and if so, from where and of which sex and age. It also examined their attitudes on the choice of friends from places other than their home country in two questions.

Participants

The respondents were American and Japanese undergraduate college students. They numbered 64 people in total, 32 Americans (17 female, 15 male) and 32 Japanese (18 female, 14 male). The sample¹⁰ was one of convenience,¹¹ since a college was the location of the study, and the survey was completed in Japan in order to get Japanese

¹⁰A sample is “a selected small collection of cases or units that closely reproduces features of interest in a larger collection of cases” (Neuman 2012, 146).

¹¹A convenience sample is a way of choosing cases that are “easy to reach, convenient, or available” (ibid.,147).

participants. All of the students taking part in the study were attending Waseda University – a large, long-standing, private institution in Tokyo – during the 2012-13 academic year. The American students were mostly from small American liberal arts colleges, studying abroad at Waseda. The Japanese students were all enrolled at Waseda University in various departments. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 26, and, in college class, from freshman to senior.

Hypotheses

In order to discern whether there are male-female or American-Japanese differences in the notions of friendship, two null hypotheses¹² were posited. One hypothesis asserted that there is no difference between men and women within each cultural group in their views on friendship. The second hypothesis postulated that there is no difference between Japanese and American respondents in their perspectives on friendship.

Data Analysis

Since the survey used a Likert scale, the variables were ordinal,¹³ therefore requiring non-parametric statistical methods for analysis. The data were first examined part-by-part, on each question, for the possible male/female contrasts within each cultural

¹² Null hypothesis is “a hypothesis that says there is no relationship or association between two variables, or no effect” (Neuman 2012, 397).

¹³ Ordinal-level measurement is “a level of measurement that identifies a difference among categories of a variable and allows the categories to be rank-ordered” such as letter grades, or opinion measures (strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree) (ibid., 398, 129). For details about statistical analysis, see Siegel (1956).

group. When no difference was detected in both men and women, the analysis proceeded to the comparison between Americans and Japanese.

For examining the frequency distributions of the Likert-scale responses in Parts A, B, C, and F, the Pearson Chi-square (X^2) test of independence was used. For the enumerative responses (how many, how long, etc.) in Part D, the descriptive statistics of central tendency (the mean, median, and mode)¹⁴ and variability (range and standard deviation)¹⁵ were figured out first, then student's *t*-tests were run on the means to detect any contrasts of significance. Finally, for answers to the dichotomous yes-no questions of Parts E, F, and G, the binomial z-score test was applied to the proportion differences.

When a noticeable divergence was discovered, its statistical significance¹⁶ was judged at the probability level of five percent (i.e., $p < .05$). In three borderline cases, however, the judgments were made at slightly higher levels (two at $p < .07$ and one at $p < .10$) for discussion.

To avoid a voluminous listing of the Excel system enumerations and SPSS statistical calculations of the raw data in their totality, the summary of the overall analyses were compiled and attached as Appendix II (pp. 85-89). Chapter Three reports only the significant findings for each part of the survey, and Chapter Four presents the interpretation and discussion.

¹⁴ Central tendency is “the measures of the center of the frequency distribution” which includes the Mean “the arithmetic average, or sum of all scores divided by the total number of scores,” Median “the point or score at which half the cases are higher and half are lower,” and the Mode “the most frequent or common score” (Neuman 2012, 265, 396, 397).

¹⁵ Variability consists of the Range “a measure of dispersion for one variable indicating the highest and lowest scores,” and Standard Deviation “a measure of dispersion for one variable that indicates an average distance between the scores and the mean” (Neuman 2012, 399, 401).

¹⁶ Statistical significance is when a “statistical relationship in a sample is due to the random factors rather than due to the existence of an actual relationship in the entire population” (ibid., 401).

Chapter Three

Findings

This chapter reports the statistically significant responses to the questions in each part of the survey. The results are based on the data analysis scheme mentioned in Chapter Two. First, the male-female comparisons are made for the American (US) respondents, followed by those for the Japanese (JP) respondents. When no male-female differences were detected for a given question, both sexes were combined for the cultural comparisons between the US and JP participants.

Male/Female Contrasts

US Respondents

Three statistically significant results were only discovered for Part B under the categories of “Listens to me,” “Has a calm personality,” and “Is pretty/attractive” between American men and women. The answers for these questions are summarized below in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Part B: Qualities Looked for in Friends.

Table 1. Part B, Qualities Looked for in Potential Friends:
Question 1 – “Someone Who Listens to Me”

	Response Choices					Total
	Decisive	Important	Moderate	Trifle	Insignificant	
Men	0	9	5	1	0	15
Women	6	10	1	0	0	17
Total	6	19	6	1	0	32

Chi-square = 9.63 (df = 4) p <.05

Table 1 shows that women feel someone who can “listen” is much more important than men.

Table 2. Part B, Qualities Looked for in Potential Friends:
Question 2 – “Has a Calm Personality”

	Response Choices					Total
	Decisive	Important	Moderate	Trifle	Insignificant	
Men	0	3	11	1	0	15
Women	2	4	5	6	0	17
Total	2	7	16	7	0	32

Chi-square = 10.20 (df = 4) p <.05

This table illustrates that, similar to their responses to Question 1, women said someone with a “calm personality” was rather decisive, while men felt it was moderate. Thus, having a “calm personality” seems to be more important to American women than to men.

Table 3. Part B, Qualities Looked for in Potential Friends:
Question 3 – “Is Pretty or Attractive”

Response Choices						
	Decisive	Important	Moderate	Trifle	Insignificant	Total
Men	0	0	7	5	3	15
Women	0	0	0	7	10	17
Total	0	0	7	12	13	32

Chi-square = 11.02 (df = 4) p < .05

American men noted that being “pretty or attractive” is of moderate concern when looking for a potential friend. In contrast, women held that feature to be an insignificant quality in possible friends.

Japanese Respondents

In comparison to the U.S. findings, three contrasts of statistical significance were uncovered in the Japanese responses. The first of these differences is seen in the last question of Part B: “Has many contacts.” The final two differences were detected in Part C in questions 1 and 3.

Table 4. Part B, Qualities Looked for in Potential Friends: Question 15 – “Many Contacts”

Response Choices						
	Decisive	Important	Moderate	Trifle	Insignificant	Total
Men	0	5	3	3	3	14
Women	2	2	6	8	0	18
Total	2	7	9	11	3	32

Chi-square = 9.20 (df = 4) p ≈ .056

The findings for this question suggested that a friend with “many contacts” was a more positive and decisive attribute for Japanese women than for Japanese men.

Table 5. Part C, How Do You Maintain Your Friendship:
Question 1 – “Being Together Often”

Response Choices						
	Decisive	Important	Moderate	Trifle	Insignificant	Total
Men	0	9	5	0	0	14
Women	0	2	11	5	0	18
Total	0	11	16	5	0	32

Chi-square = 11.38 (df = 4) p ≈ .02

The above answers showed that men noted this factor to be more important in maintaining a friendship than did women.

Table 6. Part C, How Do You Maintain Your Friendship:
Question 3 – “Serious Conversations”

Response Choices						
	Decisive	Important	Moderate	Trifle	Insignificant	Total
Men	3	6	4	1	0	14
Women	10	8	0	0	0	18
Total	13	14	4	1	0	32

Chi-square = 8.69 (df = 4) p < .07

For this question, women found “serious conversations” to be decisive and far more important than men.

Cultural Contrasts

American and Japanese Participants

Various dissimilarities were uncovered between American and Japanese respondents: two in Part A, three in Part B, one in Part C, and two in Part F, eight in total. All of these statistically significant contrasts are summarized in the following tables.

Table 7. Part A, How Do You Find/Make Friends: Question 1 – “Through Friends”

Response Choices						
	Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Total
American	1	26	5	0	0	32
Japanese	2	16	12	2	0	32
Total	3	42	17	2	0	64

Chi-square = 7.60 (df = 4) p \approx .10

The results suggest that Americans use their current friends more routinely than their Japanese counterparts in expanding their friendship circles.

Table 8. Part A, How Do You Find/Make Friends: Question 4 – “Through School Clubs”

Response Choices						
	Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Total
American	3	16	12	1	0	32
Japanese	13	11	4	3	1	32
Total	16	27	16	4	1	64

Chi-square = 13.18 (df = 4) p \approx .01

In this instance, Japanese respondents more frequently resorted to “school club” contacts than Americans in search of friendship.

Table 9. Part B, Qualities Looked for in Potential Friends: Question 6 – “Is Cheerful or Sunny”

Response Choices						
	Decisive	Important	Moderate	Trifle	Insignificant	Total
American	1	15	12	3	1	32
Japanese	8	19	5	0	0	32
Total	9	34	17	3	1	64

Chi-square = 12.80 (df = 4) p <.02

While Japanese participants thought the quality of being “cheerful” was decisive and important, Americans were less emphatic here.

Table 10. Part B, Qualities Looked for in Potential Friends:
Question 7 – “Is Considerate”

Response Choices						
	Decisive	Important	Moderate	Trifle	Insignificant	Total
American	4	24	2	1	1	32
Japanese	10	13	9	0	0	32
Total	14	37	11	1	1	64
Chi-square = 12.30 (df = 4) p <.02						

Japanese respondents again found “considerateness” to be quite an important factor in potential friends, while Americans attached less value to this quality.

Table 11. Part B, Qualities Looked for in Potential Friends:
Question 10 – “Is of Similar Beliefs”

Response Choices						
	Decisive	Important	Moderate	Trifle	Insignificant	Total
American	0	6	11	6	9	32
Japanese	5	6	7	10	4	32
Total	5	12	18	16	13	64
Chi-square = 8.81 (df = 4) p <.07						

Once more, Japanese participants reported this trait to be of consequence in a potential friend. American respondents noted this quality to be moderate.

Table 12. Part C, How Do You Maintain Your Friendship:
Question 7 – “Bringing Each into the Family”

Response Choices						
	Decisive	Important	Moderate	Trifle	Insignificant	Total
American	1	5	15	9	2	32
Japanese	0	3	7	9	13	32
Total	1	8	22	18	15	64
Chi-square = 12.48 (df = 4) p <.02						

Americans noted here that “bringing a friend into the family” like a brother or sister was relatively important, while Japanese participants for the most part thought that this was quite an insignificant way of preserving a friendship.

Part D: Good Friends. This portion of the survey examined the number of perceived good friends whom the respondents believed they had. The length of the friendship in addition to the sex and age of the friends were also investigated.

Table 13. Part D, Good Friends: Question 1 – “How Many Good, Steady Friends Do You Have Right Now?”

		Range	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation ¹⁷
US					
Men	(N = 15)	4 – 20	10	10.9	5.3
Women	(N = 17)	3 – 15	7	7.6	3.7
Student's $t = -2.01$ $df = 30$ $p \approx .10$					
JP					
Men	(N = 14)	0 – 150	24	45.9	49.2
Women	(N = 18)	0 – 200	6.5	28.9	51.4
Student's $t = -2.06$ $df = 30$ $p \approx .10$					

The results indicate that men possessed more “good steady friends” than women on average in both cultural groups. In fact the range numbers given by the Japanese participants exceeded those of the Americans. In both cultures, the difference between men and women in the means was significant at about the 10 percent level. The Part D

¹⁷ Standard deviation is “a measure of dispersion for one variable that indicates an average distance between the scores and the mean” (Neuman 2012, 401).

questions, numbers 2 – 10, about the demographics of the above “good, steady friends,” are summarized in Table 14.

As seen in Table 14 on the next page, Japanese participants expressed radically different numbers of friends compared to the Americans and on average had more friends in general. Nevertheless, all respondents, regardless of sex and culture, thought that most of their friends were of the same age. Both American men and women had much fewer friends of either younger or older ages than did the Japanese. Japanese participants noted longer friendships with people of varying ages. Women in both groups tended to have more same-sex friends as opposed to men. Additionally, American males believed they had many more friends than American females.

Table 14. Part D, “How Many Good, Steady Friends Do You Have Right Now?”: Questions 1 – 10

Questions	American				Japanese			
	Men (N = 15)		Women (N = 17)		Men (N = 14)		Women (N = 18)	
	Range	Median (M)	Range	Median	Range	Median	Range	Median
1. Number of good friends	4 – 20	10	3 – 15	7	0 – 150	24	0 – 200	6.5
2. Same-sex		4 (40% of M)		4 (57%)		13 (54%)		5 (77%)
3. Longest friendship (years)	2 – 24	10	0 – 16	9	0 – 18	12	7 – 18	11
4. Same-age	0 – 15	4	1 – 14	3	0 – 100	9.5	0 – 100	5.5
5. Older	0 – 8	0.8	0 – 3	0.1	0 – 25	2.5	0 – 50	5
6. Younger	0 – 13	0.7	0 – 3	0.3	0 – 40	3.7	0 – 50	2
7. Number of opposite-sex friends	0 – 14	8	0 – 20	3	0 – 18	5	0 – 10	4
8. Opposite-sex, same-age	0 – 7	3	0 – 6	1	0 – 50	3.5	0 – 100	4
9. Opposite-sex, older	0 – 8	0.5	0 – 2	0.3	0 – 15	1.8	1 – 50	2
10. Opposite-sex, younger	0 – 3	0.3	0 – 1	0.1	0 – 15	1.6	0 – 50	4.5

Part E: About Best Friends. In this section, inquiries were made into the participant's very best friend with two free-form questions on friendship formation and three yes-no questions on the demographics of the friend.

Table 15, summarizes the spontaneous answers presented, delineating the sources for finding best friends among American and Japanese respondents. Three similar sources for best friends appeared between the two cultural groups: “in school,” “talking,” and “school clubs.” Nevertheless, overall, more differences than similarities were noted in the answers of the two cultural groups.

While both Japanese and Americans said “in school” was the primary place where they met their best friends, “school clubs” played a significant part in the friendship formation process for the Japanese. In contrast, “similar interests” was more important to the Americans.

Furthermore, men and women in both cultures varied in their thoughts on how and where they met their best friends. Both American men and women felt “similar interests” led to their wonderful best friend, but the proportional difference between the sexes was sizeable (men 40%, women 12%).

In a similar way, both Japanese males and females remembered “school clubs” and “spending time together” as playing an integral part in the formation of their best friend relationships. As regards “talking,” “shared experiences,” and “classmates,” the dissimilarities in percentages between the sexes were noticeable. “Talking” was important to Japanese men, but not to women. “Shared experiences” and being “classmates” mattered to Japanese women, but not to men. The second question in Part E

of the questionnaire had to do with the special qualities that made a friend “one of a kind” or unique. Table 16 shows the summary of the responses.

In this question, both Americans and Japanese, and men and women in the respective cultural groups, noted “shared interests” as an essential feature. However, only the Americans of both sexes mentioned “supportive” qualities. In general, men in either culture listed fewer traits than women. Women in both cultures mentioned the qualities of “listens” and “understanding,” unlike the men. While American women chose “easy to talk to” as an important feature, “gives advice” and “sharing” mattered more to Japanese women. Further, Japanese men exclusively reported “calm personality,” whereas American men noted “loyal” as a special characteristic of their best friend.

The next four questions on sex and age of the best friend elicited very parallel answers from both cultural groups, and the z-score statistics exhibited no significant dissimilarities. Americans and Japanese claimed that best friends were of the same sex and age. As shown in Table 17, men reported male friends of about the same age, as did women, regardless of culture.

Table 15. Part E, Best Friends: Question 1 – “How/Where Did Your Wonderful Friendship Come into Being?”

Responses	US Respondents			Japanese Respondents		
	M (N = 15)	W (N = 17)	M+W (32)	M (N = 14)	W (N = 18)	M+W (32)
In school (pre-school to college)	60%	76%	69%	57%	72%	66%
Through similar interests	40%	12%	25%	0	0	0
Childhood friends	13%	0	6%	0	0	0
Shared Japan-related interests	13%	0	6%	0	0	0
School clubs	0	18%	9%	43%	22%	31%
Talking	0	18%	9%	21%	0	9%
Spending time together	0	0	0	36%	39%	38%
Shared experiences	0	0	0	0	22%	13%
Classmates	0	0	0	0	22%	13%

Table 16. Part E, Best Friends: Question 2 – “What Special Qualities Have Made the Friend One of a Kind?”

Responses	US Respondents			Japanese Respondents		
	M (N = 15)	W (N = 17)	M+W (32)	M (N = 14)	W (N = 18)	M+W (32)
Same/similar interests	33%	29%	31%	29%	22%	25%
Supportive	20%	24%	22%	0	0	0
Loyal	13%	0	6%	0	0	0
Sense of humor/funny	13%	41%	28%	0	17%	19%
Listens	0	24%	13%	0	22%	13%
Understanding	0	18%	9%	0	22%	13%
Easy to talk to	0	18%	9%	0	0	0
Calm personality	0	0	0	14%	0	6%
Gives advice	0	0	0	0	17%	9%
Sharing	0	0	0	0	11%	6%

Table 17. Part E, Best Friends: Questions 3 – 6 – “The Sex and Age of Best Friends”

	US Respondents			Japanese Respondents			US and JP
	M (N = 15)	W (N = 17)	M+W (32)	M (N = 14)	W (N = 18)	M+W (32)	
Question 3 Is the best friend of the same sex?							
Yes	10	12	22	13	18	31	
z (M vs. W)*		0.24			1.15		0.68
Question 4 Is the best friend about the same age?							
Yes	12	12	24	13	18	31	
z (M vs. W)*		-0.61			1.15		-0.06
Question 5 Is the best friend older than you?							
Yes	3	3	6	1	0	1	
z (M vs. W)*		-0.62			-1.15		-1.04
Question 6 Is the best friend younger than you?							
Yes	0	2	2	0	0	0	
z (M vs. W)*		0.49			-0.18		0.25

* All z values: $p > .05$

Part F: Friendship Breakups. This section, which asked for the participants' consideration of 18 plausible causes of a friendship dissolution, rendered two totally unexpected results. The revealing facts did *not* occur due to the contrasting frequency counts of the Likert scale ratings of the sexes and/or cultures, but instead, from the significant differences in the breakup experience itself between the two respondent groups.

Table 18. Part F, Plausible Causes of a Friendship Breakup:
Question 1 – “Have You Ever Experienced a Breakup?”

		Yes	No	
American	Men	14 (93.3%)	1 (6.7%)	Sex Difference z = 0.09 (ns)
	Women	16 (94.1%)	1 (5.9%)	
	Total	30 (93.8%)	2 (6.2%)	
Japanese	Men	6 (42.9%)	8 (57.1%)	Sex Difference z = 0.55 (ns)
	Women	6 (33.3%)	12 (66.7%)	
	Total	12 (37.5%)	19 (59.4%)	
American	Total	30 (93.8%)	Cultural Difference	
Japanese	Total	12 (37.5%)	z = 4.74 (p <.001)	

As the above table shows, while the responses of male and female participants within a given group were in close agreement with each other, the contrast between the two cultural groups was strikingly clear. Among the Americans, 94 percent acknowledged having personally experienced a friendship breakup, while the number of Japanese experiences was less than 38 percent. This difference was highly statistically significant.

The ironic secondary effect of this stark contrast was that 72.2 percent of Japanese women and 57.1 percent of Japanese men gave no response across the 18 potential causes

of friendship dissolution. On the American side, the non-response rates were 5.9 percent for women and 13.3 percent for men. While the proportion difference within each group did not reach the statistical significance level ($z = 0.72$ for Americans; 0.75 for Japanese), the contrast between the two cultural groups was highly significant (9.4 percent for the Americans vs. 65.6 percent for Japanese; $z = 4.68$, $p < .001$). Under such circumstances, no fair question-by-question cultural comparisons were feasible.

Part G: International Friends. The last segment of the questionnaire focused on the respondents' attitudes toward international friends. The leading question about their interest in having such friends, elicited an affirmative response from 100 percent of the Americans and 97 percent of the Japanese.

The following questions then inquired about participants desired international friends: 1) from which country respondents wished to have international friends, 2) why they desired to have such friends, and 3) what types of attributes are attractive in an international friend.

Table 19 illustrates the responses to the first question. Overall, the figures show that respondents, regardless of country or sex, felt that making friends from anywhere would be nice. However, Americans felt this way a bit more than the Japanese participants did. Friends from "East Asia" (Japan, Korea, and China) were popular with the American group. Conversely, Japanese subjects were more drawn to friends from "Europe" and the "West" (U.S.A. and England).

Table 19. Part G, International Friends: Question 1 – “Friends from Where?”

Responses	US Respondents			Japanese Respondents		
	M (N = 15)	W (N = 17)	M+W (32)	M (N = 14)	W (N = 18)	M+W (32)
Anywhere	80%	82%	81%	50%	56%	53%
Japan	27%	24%	25%	0	0	0
Korea	13%	18%	16%	0	0	0
China	13%	12%	13%	0	0	0
France	0	12%	6%	0	0	0
U.S.A.	0	0	0	14%	0	6%
England	0	0	0	0	11%	6%

Table 20 on the next page, gives the results for the second question. American respondents indicated their main motivation was to “learn about places and peoples different from themselves.” A rather parallel response was given by the Japanese, but with a concrete expression of interest in “learning a foreign language.”

Table 20. Part G, International Friends: Question 2 – “Why Are You Interested in Having such Friends?”

Responses	US Respondents			Japanese Respondents		
	M (N = 15)	W (N = 17)	M+W (32)	M (N = 14)	W (N = 18)	M+W (32)
To learn about different cultures/beliefs/perspectives	53%	29%	41%	0%	39%	22%
Likes having friends, more friends	33%	0	16%	0	0	0
To meet people from different places & backgrounds	0	24%	13%	50%	0	22%
To learn another language	0	0	0	21%	11%	16%
Because of interest in sports	0	0	0	14%	0	6%

The third question on international friends elicited the responses shown in Table 21 on the following page. In terms of the qualities expected in an international friend, Japanese participants listed more traits than Americans. However, “open-mindedness” seemed to be significant to both cultural groups, along with a “willingness to transcend any language barriers” in social interactions.

Table 21. Part G, International Friends:
Question 3 – “Most of All, What Quality/Character Would You Expect in such Friends?”

Responses	US Respondents			Japanese Respondents		
	M (N = 15)	W (N = 17)	M+W (32)	M (N = 14)	W (N = 18)	M+W (32)
Open-mindedness	33%	41%	38%	29%	22%	25%
Willingness to work with/through language barriers	13%	0	6%	0	11%	6%
Patience	0	18%	9%	0	0	0
Kindness	0	12%	6%	0	0	0
Friendliness	0	0	0	14%	0	6%
Sense of humor	0	0	0	14%	11%	13%
Fun	0	0	0	0	17%	9%
Active/energetic	0	0	0	0	17%	9%
Calm personality	0	0	0	0	11%	6%

Summary

This study has collected a large amount of information relevant to comparative friendship research in a college context. A survey questionnaire, written in both English and Japanese and composed of seven parts, derived written responses from young adult male and female participants in two cultures (the United States and Japan). In order to identify statistically significant contrasts in the responses between the two sexes and between the two cultures, differing statistical analysis techniques were applied to the voluminous data. The data were first examined for possible dissimilarities between men and women's responses within each culture. Only when the participants in each cultural group were found speaking in one voice, that is, when no sex differences were detected, the analysis proceeded to search for cultural contrasts.

All told, 14 statistically significant results were discovered. Six differences in the dimension of sex were found (three each for the U.S. and Japanese groups), and eight cultural contrasts were noted. A very large total number of analyses were conducted on the extensive data from the 75 response items in the seven parts of the questionnaire. The number of statistically significant findings, as substantially meaningful as they may be, account for only a small proportion of the 75 items analyzed. Consequently, these findings allow only a partial rejection of either of the two null hypotheses respectively on the variables of sex and culture. A thorough discussion of these results and their implications is presented in the following Chapter Four.

Chapter Four

Discussion

Obviously, friendship is a complex social phenomenon comprised of many colors and textures, and also a sometimes-vexing personal experience. As indicated in the previous chapter, sex and culture turned out to be significant in many ways in the responses of the participants in this study. However, “speaking with one voice” in the limits of a particular type of classification such as sex or culture, does not seem to translate well. In other words, the participants’ responses were not consistent or the same based on their sex or culture in either group. Therefore, a deeper investigation of the findings follows.

Sex as a Factor

Differences in the American Voice

Qualities Sought for in Potential Friends [Tables 1–3]. To begin with, the desired features in a friend for American women included personality types and supportive behavior. Various scholars have previously observed these factors. For instance, Argyle claimed that “women form closer, more intimate relationships (with other women); they talk a lot, and provide one another with social support” (1992, 65). Similarly, Rubin stated that, “women’s friendships with each other rest on shared intimacies, self-revelation, nurturance and emotional support” (1985, 61). In other words, women tend to want more intimate and supportive relationships with friends than men. Conversely,

American males noted physical appearance as an important trait in a friend. This finding was also supported by prior studies such as the one by Bleske-Rechek and Buss, who reported that, “both single men and mated men judged sexual attraction as a more important reason than did women” (2001, 1313). Naturally, then, “men preferred sexual attractiveness in an opposite-sex friend more than did women” (1314). These parallel results suggest that men are more apt to place value on sexual attraction in friendship relations than women, and that other specific attributes are not necessarily required in a friend (Felmlee, Sweet, and Sinclair 2012, 520).

Good, Steady Friends [Table 14]. In terms of the number of current good friends, American men listed more (range, 4 – 20; median 10) than American women (range 3 – 15; median 7). The difference here ($t = -2.01$, $df = 30$, $p \approx .10$) may be due to contrasting friendship expectations. As J. Hall describes, “the most important aspects of friendship are expected more in females’ than males’ same-sex friendships” (2011, 742). Accordingly, men might require less in a friendship. In this way, “it may be easier for males than females to meet same-sex friends’ expectations of self-disclosure and intimacy” (742). Or, as Rubin observed, the reason men report having larger numbers of friends than women may have

more to do with men’s propensity for naming as a friend anyone with whom they have some ongoing association – co-workers, neighbors, tennis partners, members of the bowling team – while women tend to use the term “friend” more selectively. (1985, 61)

Origins of Best Friends [Table 15]. Six out of ten (60%) of American men reported having met their best friends in some type of school, while 40 percent pointed to “similar interests.” “Childhood friends” and “shared interest in Japan” followed with 13

percent each. On the female side, “school” was an overwhelming answer at 76 percent. “Similar interests” dropped to 12 percent, and no one mentioned “childhood friend” or “shared interest in Japan.” Instead, “school clubs” and “talking” appeared in their place with 18 percent each for American women.

Given the central position schools occupy in most young people’s lives, the predominance given to school by both sexes is quite understandable. As Argyle (1994) noted, school and college are places where people find friends. Also, there,

Friends whose cognitions and behaviors are closely linked seem more likely to remain close. Either time invested in the friendship or inherent similarity may build such interdependence, which in turn leads to friends that stand the test of time. (Ledbetter, Griffin, and Sparks 2007, 349)

Meanwhile, the noticeable contrast shown by men and women in their early friendships is puzzling. It may be that, as MacEvoy and Asher (2012) speculate, boys may not be as troubled as girls by typical, trivial transgressions by their young friends. Thus, boys could have an easier time maintaining friendships from early childhood than girls.

While none of the men mentioned them, women identified “school clubs “ and “talking” among the noticeable sources of their very best friend. Argyle and Furnham (1983) found that doing things with each other and working on a shared project together are extremely satisfying for close friends of the same sex. Thus, school clubs can be seen as something women do together, or an undertaking they work on with each other, making club activities a key part of creating best friendships. Argyle and Furnham (1983) also noticed that talking about things of mutual concern is central to a rewarding, close same-sex friendship. Since “women expect more of their friends than do men, especially when it comes to rules governing emotional support and disclosure” (Felmlee, Sweet, and

Sinclair 2012, 519), discussing and talking about problems with each other is essential to women.

Special Qualities of Best Friends [Table 16]. The characteristics identified by American men were “same/similar interests” (33%), “supportive” (20%), “loyal” and “sense of humor” (both 13%). Since supportive and loyal qualities have been recognized as being present in best friend relations anywhere (Sapadin 1988; Wright 2006; J. Hall, 2011), this was to be expected. However, the surprise was the total absence of “loyal” on the list from the female side. Instead, the most noticeable trait there was the major emphasis on “sense of humor” (41%), followed by “same/similar interests” (29%) and “listens” (24%), plus “understanding” and “easy to talk to” (18% each). In contrast, the last three of these features were not mentioned at all by the men.

The “same or similar interest” component was recognized as important by the respondents of both sexes.

People like others who are similar to themselves in certain respects. They like those with similar attitudes, beliefs and values, who have similar jobs or leisure interests – but not necessarily those who have similar personalities. (Argyle 1994, 131)

However, it is likely that the interpretation of the “what” and “how” of that commonality differs somewhat between men and women. As noticed earlier by Rubin, “men’s relationships are marked by shared activities. What they do may differ by age and class, but that they tend to *do* rather than *be* together is undeniable” (1985, 61). This observation was repeated by J. Hall a quarter of a century later: “males’ friendships have been characterized as more activity focused” than females’ (2011, 726).

Similarly, the nature of humor is likely to vary between the two sexes. For example, when Rubin interviewed men about their friendships, she discovered that they

“*spoke* about problems on the job; they *joked* about marriage and its hardships...But it was an abstract discussion, held under cover of an intellectual search for understanding rather than a revelation of their lives and feelings” (1985, 66 – 67). McEwan and Guerrero (2012) found that, in close and casual friendships, having “inside jokes” and “gossiping” is important. And bantering is used quite frequently in male friendships, because men try to avoid showing vulnerability and their true feelings by joking around with each other. Since “banter” is “low in intimacy and more easily performed,” this type of behavior would be appealing to men who do not like to display emotion (433).

According to Bell and Coleman, “women prefer to share *feelings* with female friends” (1999, 13). They expect support from their best friends, since talking and sharing personal/emotional information is central to their friendship. Moreover, general sex differences discussed by Argyle include the observation that, “woman are co-operative and supportive,” meaning that they behave in that way in a friendship, especially a close one (1994, 78). Also, Argyle explains that being funny

makes social encounters more enjoyable and signals a positive attitude to others. Humor breaks down social barriers, reduces tensions, increases joy and produces shared feelings and attitudes. (70)

This shows the importance of humor in female friendships since it allows for positivity and also creates mutual feelings and outlooks. Additionally, the traits of “listening,” being “understanding” and being “easy to talk to” are all related to self-disclosure and good communication. So, these are all excellent reasons why these qualities were mentioned by a fair proportion of women respondents as important qualities for making someone into a best friend.

Sex and Age of Best Friends [Table 17]. Regardless of the sex and age of the participants, Americans' "best friends" tended to be of the same sex and same age as themselves. One explanation for this may be that men and women "similarly regard self-disclosure and expressiveness as the routes to intimate and supportive relationships" (Sheets and Lugar 2005, 132). Thus, the same age-sex combination appears to make such interactions much easier.

Where and Why of International Friends [Tables 19 and 20]. There were no striking distinctions between American men and women in terms of the locations from which they wished to have international friends. Anywhere was fine for four-fifths (80%) of them. Roughly a quarter (27%) indicated Japan, and Korea and China followed in the number of responses. The only notable exception came from the women, whose mention of France matched that of China (12%).

Furthermore, since the respondents were all studying abroad in Japan at the time, it stands to reason that they indicated Japan and East Asia as places from which they wished to have international friends. But, obviously, the specific origin of the potential friend(s) was much less important to them than just having the international friends themselves.

Differences in the Japanese Voice

Qualities Sought for in Potential Friends [Table 4]. Comparatively, Japanese women noted "having many contacts" as a more positive feature in a potential friend than did Japanese men. A possible reason for this response may be that women have lower status and less power than men throughout the world (Fiske, 2009). Thus, women are

more restricted in life and cannot afford to be as carefree as men in their choice of friends. Accordingly, making a friend who has “many contacts” would be valuable for accessing resources and achieving personal success (Felmlee, Sweet, and Sinclair 2012). As previously investigated by J. Hall (2011), men have lower expectations of friends – especially in symmetrical reciprocity – than women, thus allowing for more effortless friendship selections.

Maintaining Friendship [Table 5]. However, when it came to the participants’ ways of maintaining friendships, Japanese males declared that “being together very often” is key. One explanation for this may be that Japanese men think playing together with friends is crucial to a friendship (Enomoto, 1999). Sharing interests and having fun together is important in making friendships “agentic and instrumental” and in forming, through shared activities, “side-by-side” relationships (Felmlee, Sweet, and Sinclair 2012, 519).

Maintaining Friendship [Table 6]. Conversely, Japanese women thought “serious conversation” was critical to continuing a friendship. Okamoto described this phenomenon in his study on the psychology of adolescents. He found that, in contrast with men, women felt that talking or discussing things together was imperative (1961). Furthermore, unlike men, women wished to build an intimate bond or connection with their friend (Enomoto, 1999). Other factors detected in female friendships are serious conversation, enlightenment/development, sincerity, and seriousness (Tobita, Hirabayashi, and Tamura 1997). It is evident that deep conversation plays a central role for young Japanese women in preserving their friendships. Similarly, female friendships are “characterized by more intimacy, self-disclosure, and emotional support” than male

friendships, making women's relationships "face to face" instead of "side-by-side" (Flemlee, Sweet, and Sinclair 2012, 519).

In the words of Argyle (1992), men see friends as people with whom they can spend time doing activities, while women see friends as confidant(e)s who will be emotionally supportive. Likewise, Rybak and McAndrew (2006) claimed that women tend to differentiate between "friends" and "close friends" more than men. White (1994) also noted sex disparities in the friendships of Japanese high school students: boys found other boys who shared common interests and hobbies, while girls grouped together with other girls who had parallel personalities and attitudes.

Good, Steady Friends [Table 13]. Analogous to the American responses about the number of steady friends, Japanese men, on the average, listed more friends than Japanese women (even though the latter claimed a larger range). This may be due to the differing principles involved in the process of making a friend. For instance, female friends were "held to higher standards than were their male counterparts" (Flemlee, Sweet, and Sinclair 2012, 525). Therefore, in this sense, men can easily make more friends than women.

Origins of Best Friends [Table 15]. On another note, Japanese males and females differed in their descriptions of how and where they met their best friends. Like among the American respondents, both Japanese men and women named "school" as the main locale. Also similar to the Americans, the proportion of Japanese women giving that response (72%) far outweighed that of men (57%). On top of that, almost a quarter (22%) of the Japanese women mentioned finding their best friends among "classmates." Further, the centrality of school in the friend-

making dynamics seen here, was also acknowledged in a large study by the Japanese Government. In that study, Japanese youth, ages 18 – 24, stated that going to school “improved my friendship with others” (2009, 12). Additionally, “school clubs” were mentioned by nearly half of the men but by slightly less than a quarter of the women in this study. Likewise, in Okamoto’s research (1961), clubs were acknowledged as vital to good same-sex friendships for college men more than for women.

“Spending time together” as a way of becoming best friends approached the 40 percent level of responses by both sexes in this study. Enomoto (1999) found analogous results about Japanese men in terms of spending time together. For women, Oshio (2010) reported that female college students might be using their time on public transportation as one of the means of making friends. “Shared experiences” in women and “talking” in men were further entries at about the 25 percent level. A parallel finding about communication among Japanese males was noted by Oshio (2010) who detected a positive correlation between how frequently male college students contacted each other via cell phone, online, or letters with their degree of closeness and intimacy. Unlike in Oshio’s study (2010), wherein male and female college students mentioned meeting their friends from their babyhood on, no one here listed “childhood friend” as the source of the current best friend.

Special Qualities of Best Friends [Table 16]. The Japanese male responses for this section consisted of only two answers: “similar interests” (29%) and “calm personality” (14%). Hobbies, lifestyles, and club activities, which are all centered around mutual interests, were described as important to men by Okamoto (1961). Thus, it seems that having anything in common with one’s friend is vital in men’s best friendships. Having a

“calm personality” was also described by Okamoto as a positive trait in a best friend for men.

In contrast, Japanese women noted “similar interests,” “listens,” and “understanding,” as qualities in their best friends, all three at the 22 percent level. They also added “sense of humor” and “gives advice” at 17 percent, plus “sharing” at 11, as other special features of their best friend. Likewise, Kosaka (2010) observed the trait of giving mutual advice about improvement between friends in his study. Finally, “sharing” reminds us of the quality of reciprocal support/assistance identified by Tobita, Hirabayashi, and Tamura in their research on friendship (1997).

Sex and Age of the Best Friends [Table 17]. Only a single man reported having an older best friend. Otherwise Japanese men and women were in complete agreement with each other – their best friends were of the same sex and age as themselves. These similarities may foster intimacy. As Kito reported, “for both men and women, self-disclosure is higher in same-sex friendships than in cross-sex friendships between Japanese participants” (2005, 130).

Where and Why of International Friends [Tables 19 and 20]. Parallel to the American results for this section, Japanese men and women did not differ greatly in the country from which they desired to have international friends. About half of both sexes said that friends from anywhere would be nice. While 11 percent of females also mentioned England, 14 percent of males chose the United States. Although, historically, in Japan, English has been studied from seventh grade and continued throughout high school and college, students do not have many chances to practice speaking it. So,

making friends with people from English-speaking countries appears to be quite appealing to the Japanese participants (E. Hall and M. Hall 1987, 106).

Meanwhile, the reasons for why Japanese respondents wished to have international friends were rather different between the two sexes. Thirty-nine percent of women indicated their interest in learning about different cultures, while one half (50%) of men wanted to meet people of differing backgrounds. “Learning another language” was mentioned by both sexes, but the proportions were 21 percent (men) to 11 (women). Almost predictably, only young men (14 percent) noted their sports interest as a reason for making international friends!

Culture as a Factor

Finding/Making Friends: Through Friends [Table 7]. Argyle and Henderson observed that, “friendship is a pancultural relationship, although the form it takes and the obligations attendant upon it may differ between cultures” (1984, 214). Consequently, Americans reported meeting their friends “through other friends” more frequently than did the Japanese. As Reed-Danahay suggests, “it is rare for a stranger to become a friend. Both kin and friend are placed in opposition to the category of outsider, who is by definition neither kin nor friend” (1999, 144). Unfortunately, this part of the survey did not allow for me to see the potential function of kin/family in the formation of Japanese friendships, so the results only suggest that Japanese students do not make friends through other friends like Americans do.

Finding/Making Friends: Through School Clubs [Table 8]. Conversely, to the Japanese, “school clubs” played a central role in the friend-making process. One reason

for such a strong emphasis on student clubs in Japanese universities is that “extracurricular activities are a primary focus for many Japanese students.” Further, participating in a group at college is a “valuable source of Japanese friends” making these clubs invaluable to the Japanese (DeCoker 2013, 29). Moreover, because clubs place “stress on routines and participation, and the promotion of mutual attachment and shared responsibility within the group,” they are a good place to meet people with similar interests and goals. “In general, there seemed to be a feeling that the friendships made in the club, and the satisfaction from self-improvement, were well worth the free time given up” (Cave 2004, 384). Further, “for many, the demands of a club appeared acceptable provided that friendships or an inspiring teacher made them significant” (ibid.) Students noted the challenges of club life, but found that “hardship often seems to be instrumental in deepening club friendships” (402). Cave continues:

Several students said that they had closer relationships in the club because it was there that people’s real feelings (*honne*) came out. It seems that many thus come to feel that relationships can be deeper when people go through hardships in a shared endeavor. (403)

Accordingly, the intensity and expectations of Japanese university student clubs are quite different from those in the U.S., creating this divergence regarding where people meet and create friendships between the two cultures.

Qualities Sought for in Potential Friends [Tables 9 – 11]. The next important distinctions noticed between the two cultures were in the types of qualities looked for in a friend. The Japanese rated “cheerful/sunny,” “considerate,” and “similar beliefs” much more strongly than the Americans. In a study done by the Japan Youth Research Institute (2006), Japanese participants thought that their friends were bright/active people. Also, Japanese men and women mentioned cheerfulness as one of the top three traits wanted in

a friend (Okamoto 1961). Furthermore, Kasumi and Kano (1986) uncovered that, from junior high school to college, notions of friendship/friends included being bright or cheerful and outgoing.

The next attribute sought by the Japanese was “considerateness.” This quality was found to be important and expected in a friend/friendship by Japanese males and females (Kosaka 2010). Likewise, since Japanese culture emphasizes the importance of empathy, an individual cannot speak without considering the other, making consideration of others vital to friendships (U.S. Library of Congress 1994). Someone who consistently pays attention to another person’s feelings was recognized as the kind of person Japanese people valued as a friend (Japan Youth Research Institute 1976).

Finally, Japanese respondents mentioned “similar beliefs” as important in a friend. An analogous result was reported by Kasumi and Kano (1986) – good friends mutually confirm what they share and appreciate the presence of that commonality in their friendship. Kawai (2008) also says that there are friends who often share goals and ideals with each other. Moreover, people who think in the same way are also recognized as potential friends by the Japanese (Japan Youth Research Institute, 1976). This study and others indicate that Japanese people often want or desire friends who share the same beliefs.

Maintaining Friendship [Table 12]. Americans felt that treating a friend like a sibling or bringing him/her “into the family” is quite important in maintaining a good friendship. Japanese students did not consider this behavior to be as vital. A possible explanation for this finding comes from Cole and Bradac, who found that “being family oriented” is seen as positive in creating satisfaction in a close friendship because many

people believe that it is a characteristic “which ultimately produces satisfying outcomes” (1996, 75). Another explanation may be found in Reed-Danahay’s study on friendship and kinship. She claims that friendship is auxiliary to kinship and family, while it also works to balance the “burdens or emotional shortcomings of kin and family roles” (1999, 138). In a study by Rybak and McAndrew (2006), Americans noted that their friendships are more plentiful and intense/intimate than relationships with relatives. Consequently, for Americans, friends seem to become a kind of new family. According to Rybak and McAndrew “friendships provide more feelings of freedom, closeness, and pleasure and higher levels of self-disclosure and also seem able to meet a wider variety of needs than other relationships” (2006, 149). By bringing a friend “into the family,” Americans are able to experience what an ideal “kin relationship” could be, and also to gain what may be lacking in their actual family network.

In contrast, family relationships in Japan are set and cannot easily be entered. As E. Hall and M. Hall state: “because of the Japanese hierarchical system, which integrates many Japanese into close-knit networks of schoolmates and relatives, it is extraordinarily difficult for a foreigner to break in.” Further, they note that, “in Japan personal relationships and friendships tend to take a long time to solidify” (1987, 107). Accordingly, bringing a friend “into the family” is a slow process and not particularly easy. Since Japanese kin networks are so tight-knit, only really good close friends can become “a part of the family,” or like a sibling. Such observations on Japanese family and friend relationships might account for the significant differences detected here in friendship maintenance.

Good, Steady Friends [Tables 13 and 14]. In the range of the number of “good friends,” listed by the participants, the Japanese far exceeded the Americans. The median figures for each group were close to each other, but the Japanese men’s median number was more than twice everyone else’s. Further, in both cultures, the median for women was a couple of figures lower than the men’s. In the other categories of good friends, Japanese men recorded the highest median figures, except in “older friends,” the “number of opposite-sex friends,” “opposite-sex same-age friends,” and “opposite-sex older friends” (older friends, opposite-sex same-age friends, and opposite-sex older friends were higher for Japanese women while the number of opposite-sex friends was higher for American men). The longest friendship was about a decade in the median across the board. Japanese women listed more friends of the same-sex in a wider range of friends than the Americans who noted more opposite-sex friends (males in particular), but fewer friends of varying ages.

In the study conducted by the Japan Youth Research Institute (2006), 41.1 percent of Japanese students thought they had five or more good friends, as opposed to 38.5 percent of American students. On the other hand, in Okamoto’s study (1961, 28), American male college students stated having “108 male and 153 female friends,” while their female counterparts listed “173 male friends and 148 female friends.” Obviously, the idea of who constitutes a “close,” “good,” and “steady” friend varies between men and women in both cultures, adding complexity to the seemingly simple question about the number of current friends in the survey.

Origins of Best Friends [Table 15]. Cultural dissimilarities are evident throughout the survey findings, and this divergence continued with the qualitative section on “best

friends.” Close to 70 percent of both Americans and Japanese said that they met their best friends “in school.” However, precisely which level or type of school was left unclear. Also, while American men mentioned “childhood friends,” only Japanese women listed “classmates.” Additionally, only the Americans mentioned “similar interests” as the origin of their best friends. Interestingly, a study by the Japan Youth Research Institute (2006) reported that, in the opinion of Japanese respondents, “someone who thinks in the same way” or “has an analogous personality” was not a critical factor in a good friendship. This study reveals similar findings.

It can be seen that Japanese participants in the present study, men and women alike, emphasized “spending time together” and “school clubs.” It is likely that we see here a reflection of the cultural emphasis on *ningen kankei* (human relationships). E. Hall and M. Hall (1987) discuss this concept as involving “closeness and cooperation between people in mutually beneficial relationships which spring from a variety of sources.” Furthermore, this relationship includes “former classmates,” and “people who come from the same town or who are working for the same company.” The authors continue,

All of these shared experiences create special bonds between people that are part of *ningen kankei*. These relationships are carefully tended over long periods of time. *Ningen kankei* furthers the goals of those involved and is reinforced by feelings of duty and obligation and sometimes genuine friendship. (ibid., 58)

Special Qualities of Best Friends [Table 16]. Americans and Japanese showed some overlap here in their emphasis on “same/similar interests.” Also, at least between the women of the two cultures, “sense of humor,” “listens,” and “understanding” were the commonly recognized features. As Cole and Bradac (1996) noted, satisfaction with a best friend involves the idea that “best friends should do things together, share common

beliefs and values, and respect each other's privacy" (60). Also, "sharing similar interests" and "having good communication skills" are seen as sources of satisfaction among such friends (75).

Rather surprisingly, "supportive" (both sexes), "loyal" (men), and "easy to talk to" (women) were exclusive to the Americans as special qualities in their best friends. Analogous to these traits mentioned by the American participants, J. Hall says, "loyalty, trust, and support are the prototypical behaviors in producing intimacy" (2011, 725). Similarly, being approachable by "talking about pleasant events" also helps in friend relationships (Argyle 1994, 70). On the Japanese side, the additions of "calm personality" (men), "gives advice" (women), and "sharing" (women) combined, facilitate the process of self-development and cooperation, both of which are aspects central to Japanese values and beliefs (U.S. Library of Congress 1994).

Friendship Breakup [Table 18]. Decidedly, reflecting the low incidence of the reported dissolution experience among the Japanese participants (38% in contrast to 94% among Americans), the high Japanese non-response rates made it impossible to draw any fair comparisons between the two cultures regarding causes of friendship dissolution.

However, the remarkable cultural contrast in the reported breakup rates calls for some contemplation. As reported in Chapter Three, friendship dissolution took place in 93.3 percent of American male students and 94.1 percent of American female students (thus, in 93.8% of the total). On the Japanese side, the rates were 42.9 percent for men and 33.3 percent for women (i.e., 37.5% of the total).

Among others, La Gaipa (1982) discusses the function of disengagement rituals in dissolving friendships. He argues that, because friendship occurs within the context of social networks, group and cultural norms work to restrict the breakup process. In order for someone to validate severing a friendship, the individual must deal with the problems of minimizing the amount of commitment to the abstract ideals of the relationship. Accordingly, it is necessary to present satisfactory public reasons for the termination. Consequently, the severance is generally attributed to a breach of cultural values such as trust and loyalty, instead of the failure to supply explicit or implicit rewards and benefits. Thus, the Japanese participants in this study may have avoided dissolving friendships because they could not provide “acceptable” cultural reasons for doing so. This may particularly be the case because Japan has a more “collectivist culture,” focused on group relations, rather than the more “individualist” perspective of the United States.

The low incidence of friendship breakups reported by the Japanese could be due to other cultural factors. As E. Hall and M. Hall observe, Japanese culture emphasizes “building a reputation for dependability, taking responsibility when something goes wrong, and keeping one’s word.” These traits are “all sacred to the Japanese.”

Additionally,

Acknowledging responsibility includes making a public statement that one is truly sorry when a mistake has been made. Contrition is not only valued but is an absolute necessity under certain conditions. Japanese can be very forgiving but not in the absence of contrition. (1987, 70-71)

Thus, being openly contrite, admitting mistakes, and subsequently forgiving mistakes may serve as social safety valves that minimize the need to terminate friendships.

Where and Why of International Friends [Tables 19 and 20]. The last part of the survey on international friends showed parallel results between the Americans and

Japanese. To begin with, both groups said that friends from anywhere would be nice, but Americans (81%) more so than Japanese (53%), regardless of their sex. Further, about one-quarter of Americans named Japan, and Korea and China were each in the low-teen percentile. The only other nominee by Americans was France. On the Japanese side, the secondary choices were for the two representative Western countries, the U.S. (men 14%) and the U.K. (women 11%).

Why respondents wanted international friends varied. More than half of American men (53%) and roughly one-third of American women (29%) gave the reason for desiring international friends as “to learn about different cultures.” “Meeting people from different backgrounds” was mentioned by around one-quarter of American women (24%). Also, “likes to have more friends” was noted by one-third of American men (33%).

One possible basis for these findings is that America is a heterogeneous society, wherein “people do not share the same cultural and linguistic backgrounds” (Itoh 1991, 103). This heterogeneity may result in curiosity and the desire to know and understand people from different places. Americans also have “a worldwide reputation for being able to form only superficial, informal friendships that lack exchange of deep confidences” (E. Hall and M. Hall 1987, 107). Accordingly, American students may simply want to have as many friends as possible, valuing quantity over quality.

As noted above, Japanese students were also eager to make international friends. Their motivations were both similar to those indicated by American students and slightly different. For instance, “meeting people from different backgrounds” was mentioned by one-half of Japanese men (50%). Four-tenths of Japanese women (39%) gave the reason for desiring international friends as “to learn about different cultures.” However, close to

one-fifth of Japanese men (21%) and one-tenth of Japanese women (11%) added “language learning” to the list. Finally, roughly one tenth of Japanese men (14%) included “sports interest” as the reason to form international friendships.

In contrast to the United States, Japan is a homogeneous society where “people share basically the same values, beliefs, language and customs” (Itoh 1991, 103). This may explain why gaining knowledge about another culture or people appeals to Japanese college students. Furthermore, given that homogeneity, the opportunity to speak and practice a foreign language is rather rare in Japan. This perhaps explains the appeal of having international friends, particularly from countries where English is spoken. Third, in terms of the sense of personal fulfillment, devoting oneself to sports and hobbies is very important to Japanese people of both sexes (Japanese Government, 2009). Thus, sports are a big part of life in Japan, and international sports seem to be popular to college students who can access them through their international friends.

Expected Features of International Friends [Table 21]. The features expected were essentially “open-mindedness” and “willingness to work through language barriers” for both the Japanese and Americans. Since language barriers can cause miscommunication and discord, it is easy to see why “willingness to overcome such barriers” was valued by both groups. For the Japanese in particular, “self-images are based on group memberships,” and “Japanese subjects see the self as interdependent with others, so that self-esteem is based on maintaining harmony with other people” (Argyle 1994, 203). In contrast, Americans are more focused on the individual and can be “self-assertive, frank and talkative” (Itoh 1991, 105). Open-mindedness suggests greater tolerance for cultural differences. Perhaps this is why both the Japanese and American students, despite their

differing traits, view “open-mindedness” as the primary necessity for forming international friendships.

The other two characteristics American women expected in international friends were “patience” and “kindness.” Certainly, people do not want friends who are abusive, and approachability is central to satisfaction with good friends (Cole and Bradac 1996). Therefore, someone who is patient and kind would be more approachable than a person who is abusive or mean, thus explaining the U.S. women’s answers. Conversely, Japanese men and women both listed “sense of humor.” In addition, Japanese men listed “friendliness,” while Japanese women mentioned “fun,” “active/energetic,” “calm personality,” and, finally, “willingness to work through language barriers.”

The Japanese are often perceived as being “reserved, formal, silent, cautious, evasive, and serious” (Itoh 1991). Because the Japanese are inclined to be silent and cautious, they may wish for an international friend to be friendly and outgoing. The element of humor is important to many relationships, especially in friendships, since it “breaks down social barriers and reduces tensions,” thus creating the possibility for cross-cultural understanding and friendship (Argyle 1992, 22). Additionally, having a sense of humor can add to “sheer sociability,” and “jokes, casual chat about recent activities, and simply enjoying each other’s company,” all of which appeal to everyone, especially, it seems, to the Japanese (23).

As Oshio (1998) revealed, one aspect of friendships in Japan consists of everyone having fun together, while another, deeper aspect involves reciprocal caring and shared intimacy. Kosaka also talks about “having fun together” as being a “strong expectation of friendship” to the Japanese (2010, 149). Finally, the “calm personality” element was

mentioned in Okamoto's study (1961, 29) as being one of the "liked points in a friend" for both Japanese men and women, thus corroborating the present finding.

Summary

This research revolved around the expressed opinions of participating college students, men and women, Japanese and American. The survey results were analyzed along the two variables of sex and culture. The following tables give a schematic summary of the noticeable contrasts or statistically significant findings.

Table 22. American Men and Women Differences Summary

Qualities in Potential Friends	
Men	Women
Friend who listens is less important	Friend who listens is very important
Friend with a calm personality is only moderately important	Friend with a calm personality is important
Attractiveness is moderately important	Attractiveness is relatively unimportant

Table 23. Japanese Men and Women Differences Summary

Qualities in Potential Friends	
Men	Women
Relatively unimportant that friend has many contacts	Important that friend has many contacts

How Do You Maintain a Friendship	
Men	Women
Very important to be together often	Less important to be together often
Serious conversation is less important	Serious conversation is very important

Table 24. Cultural Differences Summary

How Do You Meet New Friends	
American	Japanese
Usually not through student clubs	Mostly through student clubs
Often met new friends through existing contacts	Seldom met new friends through existing contacts
Desirable Qualities in Friends	
American	Japanese
Less important to be cheerful and sunny	Important to be cheerful and sunny
Less important to be considerate	Important to be considerate
Less important to share similar beliefs	Important to share similar beliefs
How Do You Maintain Friendship	
American	Japanese
Important to bring a friend into the family like a brother or sister	Unimportant to bring a friend into the family like a brother or sister
Friendship Breakup	
American	Japanese
Very common experience	Relatively uncommon experience
May be for various reasons	Did not mention many reasons

Conclusion

To a Better Understanding of Friendship

Friendship is one of the most important and valuable human relationships. Friends are the people who accept, support, guide, and enjoy each other's company. As a type of relationship, friendship appears to be panhuman. Nevertheless, as Risseuw notes, "borders of gender, age, caste, class, (in)-equality can and do facilitate or inhibit the emergence of forms of friendship" (2010, 1-2).

This study has investigated two borders: sex and culture. Utilizing a survey research approach, this study explored the outlooks and opinions of young American and Japanese adults. The male and female participants were all studying at Waseda University in Tokyo, Japan, either as regularly enrolled or visiting international students. The results of the study indicate that both sex and culture influence how friendships are made and maintained and what may cause a friendly relationship to dissolve.

Results of the Study

Previous studies have found many differences between males and females notions of friendship. Similarly, this study found several instances in which young men and women, despite belonging to the same cultural group, did not speak of friendship in the same voice. For example, American male and female college students looked for different qualities in potential friends, as did Japanese male and female students. In

addition, the Japanese men and women diverged in what they did to maintain and deepen friendships.

This study also detected differences between American and Japanese friendship practices. These included how students in each cultural group met new friends and the qualities they desired in their friends. Nearly all of the American students reported having experienced the dissolution of a friendship, while only a fraction of the Japanese students either reported or commented on such an experience.

While childhood and adult friendships have been widely studied, college student friendships have received little scrutiny. Cross-cultural research on friendship is also relatively rare. This cross-cultural study fills out what is known by focusing on young adults. It also investigates some little-researched dynamics, such as factors involved in friendship breakups. Although based on a small sample, overall the findings of this study suggest that culture, more than sex, is the variable more closely related to differences in friendship dynamics.

Limitations of the Study

The current study has two limitations: sample size and methodology. The sample was one of convenience, and thus not large in size. Hence, the representative value of the findings is too limited to allow any grand generalizations.

Furthermore, the total dependence on the paper-and-pencil questionnaire presents built-in weaknesses. The root issue here is the matter of two contrasting anthropological approaches. As Pike (1967) explains the issues:

The *etic* viewpoint studies behavior as from outside of a particular system, and the *emic* viewpoint results from studying behavior as from inside the system. Roughly, then, *emic* is to the inside as *etic* is to the outside. (1967, 37)

Thus, as an outsider, I was able, at best, to get an “etic” view of Japanese ideas of friendship, allowing for only a partial understanding of such a relationship in that culture.

To complicate the matter further, as Saito and Fujii (2009) described, Japanese young adults appear to possess both inner/internal and surface friendships. Accordingly, as an American, I may have only been aware of the surface relations and not the internal ones, creating a half picture of friendship notions in Japan. As a consequence, the “emic” perspective could not be revealed as easily or analyzed as correctly as desired.

Moreover, although questions in the survey were phrased in both English and Japanese, no translations can carry an exact identical meaning. Without conducting personal interviews to seek elaboration/clarification of what the respondents wrote in their respective “emic” answers, the interpretation of the questionnaire responses remains limited in scope (Headland, Pike, and Harris 1990).

Future Research

Despite its limitations, my study indicates that culture is a variable closely related to friendship dynamics. As Risseuw aptly noted:

Extensive cultural scripts of friendship do exist, even though they are not easily articulated. In addition, languages worldwide differ substantially in their degree of idiom to express a variety in meaning and practice in friendship relations. (2010, 2)

Future friendship research should aim to articulate these cultural scripts. Inquiry can be extended in two ways, by working with a larger sample and by incorporating additional research methodologies. College-aged students and non-students (those already working

shakai-jin) should be studied to a deeper level, combining both “etic” and “emic” approaches. Such extensions have the potential to enhance understanding of a universal, uniquely human, yet complex relationship – friendship.

Appendix I

Survey Questionnaire

研究参加承諾書

始めまして。私は ムーア キヨミ(清美)と申します。米国コロラド州のコロラド スプリングスという街に有ります、コロラド カレッジの三年生です。此のたび、下のような研究に ご援助を仰ぎたいと存じまして、あなた様の ご承認を求める次第です。

研究者： Kiyomi Moore, Colorado College [kiyomi.moore@coloradocollege.edu]

指導主事： Paul Maruyama, Department of Asian Studies, Colorado College
[pmaruyama@coloradocollege.edu]

表題： **友達になるのと、絶交するのと：日本とアメリカでの 友情についての観点**
(Making It and Breaking It: Japanese and American Cultural Perspectives on Friendship)

ここに 付随します、短い、友情に関するアンケートの質問に答えて頂ければ 幸いです。全部で約二十分ほど かかると思いますが、別に危険や不快な可能性は有りません。色々と違った文化が どう友情を扱っているのかを知るのは 人々の相互理解に役立つと思います。それに、将来の交換学生の方々の助けにもなるはずで。

勿論、ご協力は 全く自発的な ご援助ですので 何も強制的な理由はございません。万が一、ご回答の中絶等が必要になりましたら、あなた様の コロラド カレッジとのご関係には 全く 影響はございません。

あなた様のご返答は 終始 機密に取り扱われ、デジタル データは 電算機の安全な記録として保存されます。この研究の結果が公表される場合でも お名前や 個人的な詳細は 一切除外されます。

もし ご質問が おありでしたり、この研究の要約/結果に興味を お持ちでしたら、なにとぞ、上述の研究者迄 お申し越し下さい。また、非合法的、あるいは 非倫理的な 待遇を受けたとお感じでしたら下記に ご連絡下さい： Amanda Udis-Kessler, chair, Colorado College Institutional Research Board [audiskessler@coloradocollege.edu].

アンケートの質問にお答え下さることをもつてご承諾と判断致します。どうぞ、このページをはがして、記録にお持ち下さい。アンケートは 次のページから始まります。

どうも有難うございます。

Researcher: Kiyomi Moore, Colorado College [kiyomi.moore@coloradocollege.edu]
Supervisor: Paul Maruyama, Department of Asian Studies, Colorado College
[pmaruyama@coloradocollege.edu]

**Making It and Breaking It:
Japanese and American Cultural Perspectives on Friendship
Consent Form**

You are requested to take part in a research survey on friendship, examining cultural perspectives on the making, keeping, and losing of friends. Your participation in responding to a brief, written questionnaire will require 15-20 minutes. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this survey. Learning more about friendship in various cultures can add to the mutual understanding between different peoples. Besides, the results may prove useful to future exchange students doing study abroad.

Taking part in this study is totally voluntary. If you choose to help in the research, you may withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with anyone at Colorado College. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and digital data will be stored in secure computer files after it is entered. Any report of this research that is made available to the public will not include your name or any other individual information by which you could be identified. If you have questions, or want a copy or summary of the study's results, please contact the researcher at the e-mail address above. If you have any questions about whether you have been treated in an illegal or unethical way, contact the Colorado College Institutional Research Board chair, Amanda Udis-Kessler [audiskessler@coloradocollege.edu].

Completing the survey questionnaire indicates your consent to participate in the research. Please separate this top sheet to keep as your record. The questionnaire follows on the next page.

Thank you!

Survey Questionnaire
[研究調査]

Making It and Breaking It:
[友達になるのと、絶交するのと]
Japanese and American Cultural Perspectives on Friendship
[日本とアメリカでの友情についての観点]

Where applicable, kindly circle the appropriate category.
「必要に応じて適当な分類を丸で囲んで下さい。」

Your Nationality: Japan U.S.A. Other (please specify) _____
[あなたの国籍] [日本] [アメリカ] [他] [国籍を指摘して下さい。]

Your Sex: Female Male Your Age: _____ College Class: 1 2 3 4 Graduate
[性別] [女] [男] [年齢] [学年] [大学院生]

For Questions (a)-(c) and (f), please choose one of the five response choices for each line and mark it with an X.

[質問の (a)-(c) と (f) には一行ごとに五つある返答から一つを選んで、Xで記して下さい。]

(a) How Do You Find and Meet Potential Friends?

[普通、友達になりたいと思う人をどう探しますか?]

	<u>Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Never</u>
	[常に]	[しばしば]	[ときどき]	[めったに無い]	[絶対ない]
Through friends [友達を介して]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
At parties [パーティーで会う]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
In school classes [授業で会う]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Through school clubs [クラブ活動を通して]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Through sports/hobbies [同じスポーツや趣味から]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
On-line contacts [オン ラインで]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Through family contacts [家族を介して]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
By sheer chance [偶然の出会いから]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other ways _____ [他の方法] [幾つでも書いて説明して下さい。日本語でも 英語でも 結構。]					

(b) What Qualities Do You Look for in Your Potential Friends?

〔どんな性格や個性を、友達候補に求めますか?〕

	<u>Decisive</u> 〔不可欠〕	<u>Important</u> 〔重要〕	<u>Moderate</u> 〔まあまあ〕	<u>Trifle</u> 〔些細〕	<u>Insignificant</u> 〔無意味〕
Someone who: 〔誰か〕					
Listens to me 〔話を聞いてくれる人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Has a calm personality 〔穏やかな人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Is pretty/attractive 〔奇麗で魅力的な人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Is a good student 〔優秀な学生〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Has similar interests 〔趣味が同様な人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Is cheerful, sunny 〔陽気で楽しい人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Is considerate 〔思いやりのある人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Is like a sister/brother 〔兄弟姉妹のようなひと〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Is strong and healthy 〔丈夫で健康な人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Is of similar beliefs 〔同じ信念を持つ人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Has a sense of humor 〔愉快な人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Is well-to-do 〔富裕な人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Is bright and talented 〔頭が良くて才能の有る人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Is fond of kids 〔子供が好きな人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Has many contacts 〔交際の広い人〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other qualities like _____ 〔他の 性格や個性〕	_____〔説明して下さい〕				

(c) *Once Becoming Friends, How Do You Maintain Your Friendship?*

〔一度友達になったら、どのようにして友情を保ちますか?〕

	<u>Decisive</u> 〔不可欠〕	<u>Important</u> 〔重要〕	<u>Moderate</u> 〔まあまあ〕	<u>Trifle</u> 〔些細〕	<u>Insignificant</u> 〔無意味〕
Being together very often 〔なるだけ一緒に過ごす〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sharing the same interests 〔同じ趣味を分か合う〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Having serious conversations 〔親密に話し合う〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Exchanging gifts, letters, etc. 〔贈り物や手紙を交換する〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Trips, shopping, etc., together 〔一緒に買い物や旅行をする〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sharing personal problems 〔個人的な問題を分か合う〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Bringing each into the family 〔それぞれを家族に含み入れる〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Helping each's homework, etc. 〔お互いの宿題等を助け合う〕	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other ways like 〔他の方法や活動〕	_____				
	〔説明して下さい〕				

(d) *How Many Good, Steady Friends Do You Have Right Now?* _____

〔現在 何人ぐらい良い、安定した友達が いますか?〕

How many of those are of the same sex as you? _____.

〔その良いお友達の中で 何人が あなたと同じ 性別ですか?〕

And of those, the longest friendship has been over how many years? _____

〔そのかたがたの中で、一番長い交友は、連続何年に なりますか?〕

How many are about your age? _____ older? _____ younger? _____

〔同年代の方は 何人ぐらい? 年上の方は? 年下は?〕

Of those of the opposite sex, your longest friendship has been for _____ years.

〔性別が違う友達で、一番長い交際は 何年になりますか?〕

How many are about your age? _____ older? _____ younger? _____

〔同年代の方は 何人ぐらい? 年上の方は? 年下は?〕

(e) Now, Please Think of Your Very Best Friend.

[ここで、あなたの 一番の親友について考えて下さい。]

When and how did your wonderful friendship come into being?

[いつ、どう言う風にして、そんなに素晴らしい友達になったのですか?]

What special qualities have made that friend truly “one of a kind” to you?

[どんな特別な性格や特徴が この人を かけがえのない友達にしたのですか?]

Is your *very best* friend

[この素晴らしい 親友は]

of the same sex as you?	Yes	No
[あなたと同じ性ですか?]	[はい]	[いいえ]
about the same age as you?	Yes	No
[あなたと同じ年代 ですか?]	[はい]	[いいえ]
older than you?	Yes	No
[あなたより年上ですか?]	[はい]	[いいえ]
younger than you?	Yes	No
[あなたより年下ですか?]	[はい]	[いいえ]

(f) *Have You Ever Experienced a Breakup of Friendship with Someone? ..Yes No*
 [今までに 友達との友情を 絶交したことが ありますか?] [はい [いえ]

If yes, what, in your opinion, caused such an end of friendship?

[もし 絶交の 経験が あったなら、理由 は何だったと 思いますか?]

Clearly Probably Perhaps Unlikely Decidedly Not
 [たしかに] [凡そ] [多分] [あるまい] [全然無関係]

Boastfulness [自慢ばかり]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Inconsiderateness [思いやりがない]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Personality clashes [性格が合わない]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Disease/Death [病気/ 逝去]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Impatience [短気]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Divergent beliefs [信念が違う]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Possessiveness [独占欲が強い]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
No intimate sharing [親密さが無い]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Disloyalty [不忠不実]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Unreliability [信頼出来ない]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
No romance [ロマンスに欠ける]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Arguments/fights [喧嘩、口論]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Competitiveness [競争心が強い]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Financial difficulty [財政的困難]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Spatial distance [地理的に遠隔]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Lying [嘘をつく]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Self-centeredness [自己中心]	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other Possible Causes [他の理由]	_____ [説明して下さい]				

(g) *Finally, are you interested in having some international friends? ...* Yes No
 [最後に -- 外国人と友達になりたいと 思いますか] [はい] [いいえ]

If yes, friend(s) from where (continent, region, country, etc.)?
 [もし“はい” だったら、どの 国からの友達に 興味がありますか?]

Friend(s) of the same sex? Yes No
 [同じ性の 友達?] [はい] [いいえ]

Does not matter?..... Yes

No
 of the opposite sex?.... Yes No [どちらでも良い] [はい] [いいえ]
 [違う 性の人?] [はい] [いいえ]

Friend(s) of about the same age?.... Yes No
 [同じ年代の 友達?] [はい] [いいえ]

Younger ones? Yes No Does not matter?..... Yes No
 [年下の人?] [はい] [いいえ] [どちらでも良い] [はい] [いいえ]

Older ones?..... Yes No
 [年上の人?] [はい] [いいえ]

Why would you be interested in having such friend(s)?
 [なぜ そのような友達に 興味がありますか?]

Most of all, what quality/character would you expect in the international friend(s)?
 [どんな 性格や特徴 を 国際的なお友達に 最も期待しますか?]

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!
 御協力に心から感謝いたします!

Appendix II

Summary of Statistical Analyses of Survey Results

A. How Do You Find and Meet Potential Friends?

	<u>Sex Differences</u>	<u>Culture Differences</u>
1. Through friends	ns* for US or JP	$X^2 = 7.60$ (p \approx .10)
2. At parties	ns for US or JP	ns
3. In school classes	ns for US or JP	ns
4. Through school clubs	ns for US or JP	$X^2 = 13.18$ (p \approx .01)
5. Through sports/hobbies	ns for US or JP	ns
6. On-line contacts	ns for US or JP	ns
7. Through family contacts	ns for US or JP	ns

B. What Qualities Do You Look for in Your Potential Friends?

Someone Who:

1. Listens to me	US $X^2 = 9.63$ (p <.05)	--
2. Has a calm personality	US $X^2 = 10.20$ (p <.05)	--
3. Is pretty/attractive	US $X^2 = 11.02$ (p <.05)	--
4. Is a good student	ns for US or JP	ns
5. Has similar interests	ns for US or JP	ns
6. Is cheerful/sunny	ns for US or JP	$X^2 = 12.80$ (p <.02)

*“ns” stands for “statistically non-significant” at the probability level (p) of 0.05.

7. Is considerate	ns for US or JP	$X^2 = 12.30$ ($p < .02$)
8. Is like a sister/brother	ns for US or JP	ns
9. Is strong and healthy	ns for US or JP	ns
10. Is of similar beliefs	ns for US or JP	$X^2 = 8.81$ ($p < .07$)
11. Has a sense of humor	ns for US or JP	ns
12. Is well-to-do	ns for US or JP	ns
13. Is bright and talented	ns for US or JP	ns
14. Is fond of kids	ns for US or JP	ns
15. Has many contacts	JP $X^2 = 9.20$ ($p \approx .05$)	--

C. Once Becoming Friends, How Do You Maintain Your Friendship?

1. Being together very often	JP $X^2 = 11.38$ ($p \approx .02$)	--
2. Sharing the same interests	ns for US or JP	ns
3. Serious conversations	JP $X^2 = 8.69$ ($p < .07$)	--
4. Exchanging gifts, letters	ns for US or JP	ns
5. Trips, shopping together	ns for US or JP	ns
6. Sharing personal problems	ns for US or JP	ns
7. Bringing each into the family	ns for US or JP	$X^2 = 12.48$ ($p < .02$)
8. Helping with each other's homework	ns for US or JP	ns

D. How Many Good, Steady Friends Do You Have Right Now?

1. The mean numbers	US $t = -2.01$ ($p \approx .10$)	--
	JP $t = -2.06$ ($p \approx .10$)	

E. The Best Friend

1. Is of the same sex?	ns for US or JP for "Yes"	$z = 0.68$ (ns)
2. Is of the same age?	ns for US or JP for "Yes"	$z = 0.06$ (ns)
3. Is the best friend older?	ns for US or JP for "No"	$z = 1.04$ (ns)
4. Is the best friend younger?	ns for US or JP for "No"	$z = 0.25$ (ns)

F. Have You Ever Experienced a Breakup of Friendship with Someone?

The experience itself?

“Yes”	Men	93.3%	Sex difference $z = 0.09$ (ns)
	US	Women	
JP	Men	42.9%	Sex difference $z = 0.55$ (ns)
	Women	33.3%	
US vs. JP	US	93.8%	Cultural difference $z = 4.74$ ($p \ll .001$)
	JP	37.5%	

No response to the ratings of the plausible causes

US	Men	13.3%	Sex difference $z = 0.72$ (ns)
	Women	5.9%	
JP	Men	57.1%	Sex difference $z = 0.75$ (ns)
	Women	72.2%	
US vs. JP	US	9.4%	Cultural difference $z = 4.68$ ($p \ll .001$)
	JP	65.6%	

G. Are You Interested in Having some International Friends?

	“Yes”	US 100% JP 96.9%	US+JP 98.4%
1. Does the sex of the friend matter?		For “No” ns for US or JP	$z = 0.47$ (ns)
2. Friends of a similar age? for “yes”		For “Yes” ns for US or JP	$z = 0.56$ (ns)
3. Younger?		For “Yes” ns for US or JP	$z = 1.39$ (ns)
4. Older?		For “Yes” ns for US or JP	$z = 0.73$ (ns)

Bibliography

- Alberoni, Francesco. 1984. *L' Amicizia [Friendship]*. Milano: Garzanti.
- Aleman, Ana M. Martinez. 2010. "College Women's Female Friendships: A Longitudinal View." *Journal of Higher Education* 81 (5): 553-82.
- Argyle, Michael. 1992. *The Social Psychology of Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.
- _____. 1994. *The Psychology of Interpersonal Behavior*, 5th ed. London: Penguin Books.
- Argyle, Michael, and Adrian Furnham. 1983. "Sources of Satisfaction and Conflict in Long-term Relationships." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 45: 481-93.
- Argyle, Michael, and Monika Henderson. 1984. "The Rules of Friendship." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 1: 211-37.
- Bell, Sandra, and Simon Coleman. 1999. "The Anthropology of Friendship: Enduring Themes and Future Possibilities." Chap. 1 in *The Anthropology of Friendship*, edited by Sandra Bell, and Simon Coleman, 1-20. Oxford, U.K.: Berg.
- Berndt, Thomas J. 2002. "Friendship Quality and Social Development." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 11 (1): 7-10.
- Berscheid, Ellen, and Letitia A. Peplau. 1983. "The Emerging Science of Close Relationships." In *Close Relationships*, edited by Harold H. Kelley, Ellen Berscheid, Andrew Christensen, John H. Harvey, Ted L. Huston, George Levinger, Evie McClintock, Letitia Anne Peplau, and Donald R. Peterson, 20-67. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.
- Bleske-Rechek, April L, and David M. Buss. 2001. "Opposite-Sex Friendship: Sex Differences and Similarities in Initiation, Selection, and Dissolution." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27: 1310-23.
- Branlund, Dean C. 1975. *Public and Private Self in Japan and the United States: Communicative Styles of Two Cultures*. Tokyo: The Simul Press.
- Bryant, Erin M, and Jennifer Marmo. 2012. "The Rules of Facebook Friendship: A Two-stage Examination of Interaction Rules in Close, Casual, and Acquaintance Friendships." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 29 (8): 1013-35.
- Cave, Peter. 2004. "Bukatsudō: The Educational Role of Japanese School Clubs." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 30 (2): 383-415.

- Cole, Tim, and James J. Bradac. 1996. "A Lay Theory of Relational Satisfaction with Best Friends." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 13 (1): 56-83.
- DeCoker, Gary. 2013. *Japan Study Handbook*. Richmond, IN: Earlham College.
- Demir, Meliksah, and Haley Orthel. 2011. "Friendship, Real-Ideal Discrepancies, and Well-Being: Gender Differences in College Students." *The Journal of Psychology* 145 (3): 173-93.
- Enomoto, Junko. 1999. "Socio-Emotional Development of Friendship among Adolescents: Activities with Friends and the Feeling for Friends." (in Japanese). *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology* 47: 180-90.
- Felmlee, Diane, Elizabeth Sweet, and H. Colleen Sinclair. 2012. "Gender Rule: Same- and Cross-Gender Friendship Norms." *Sex Roles* 66: 518-29.
- Fiske, Susan T. 2009. "Interpersonal Stratification: Status, Power, and Subordination." In *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 5th ed., edited by Susan T. Fiske and Daniel T. Gilbert.
- French, Doran C., Alyx Bae, Sri Pidada, and Okhwa Lee. 2006. "Friendships of Indonesian, South Korean, and U.S. college students." *Personal Relationships* 13: 69-81.
- Goss, Blaine. 2000. "Friendliness Does Not Make Friends in Japan." *Intercultural Communication Studies X* 1: 39-46.
- Hall, Edward T. 1990. *Understanding Cultural Differences*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Hall, Edward T, and Mildred Reed Hall. 1987. *Hidden Differences: Doing Business with the Japanese*. New York: Doubleday.
- Hall, Jeffrey A. 2011. "Sex Differences in Friendship Expectations: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 28: 723-47.
- Hays, Robert B. 1988. "Friendship." In *Handbook of Personal Relationships* edited by Steve W. Duck. Chichester, U.K.: John Wiley & Sons.
- _____. 1989. "The Day-to-Day Functioning of Close versus Casual Friendships." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 6: 21-37.
- Headland, Thomas, Kenneth Pike, and Marvin Harris, eds. 1990. *Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Holcomb, Zealure C. 2009. *SPSS Basics: Techniques for a First Course in Statistics*, 2nd ed. Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.
- Itoh, Youichi. 1991. "Socio-cultural backgrounds of Japanese Interpersonal Communication Style." *Civilisations* 39: 101-28.
- Japanese Government. 2009. "The Japanese Youth in Comparison with the Youth of the World: A Summary Report of the Eighth World Youth Survey." Tokyo: Japanese Cabinet Office.
- Japan Youth Research Institute. 2006. "Friendship and Life Attitudes of High School Students in Japan, U.S.A., China, and South Korea." (in Japanese). Japan Youth Research Institute.
- Kasumi, Sachiko, and Motoaki, Kano. 1986. "Factor Analytical Research on the Development of Concepts of Friendship." (in Japanese). *Kyushu University Education Bulletin* 31: 97-104.
- Kawai, Hayao. 2008. *Adult Friendship* (in Japanese). Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha.
- Keller, Monika. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Perspective on Friendship Research." *ISBBD Newsletter* 46 (2): 1-4.
- Kito, Mie. 2005. "Self-Disclosure in Romantic Relationships and Friendships Among American and Japanese College Students." *Journal of Social Psychology* 145 (2): 127-40.
- Kosaka, Yasumasa. 2010. "A Comparative Study of University Students' Expectations for Same-Sex Friends, Opposite-Sex Friends, and Lovers." (in Japanese). *The Japanese Journal of Personality* 18 (2): 140-51.
- Kroeber, Alfred Louis, and Clyde Kluckhohn. 1952. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. In *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology*. Vol 47 (1). Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum.
- La Gaipa, John J. 1982. "Rules and Rituals in Disengaging from Relationships." In *Personal Relationships 4: Dissolving Personal Relationships* edited by Steve W. Duck, 189-209. London: Academic Press.
- Ledbetter, Andrew M, Em Griffin, and Glen G. Sparks. 2007. "Forecasting "Friends Forever": A longitudinal Investigation of Sustained Closeness between Best Friends." *Personal Relationships* 14: 343-50.
- MacEvoy, Julie Paquette, and Steven R. Asher. 2012. "When Friends Disappoint: Boys' and Girls' Responses to Transgressions of Friendship Expectations." *Child Development* 83 (1): 104-19.

- Maeda, Eriko, and L. David Ritchie. 2003. "The Concept of Shinyuu in Japan: A Replication of and Comparison to Cole and Bradac's Study on U.S. Friendship." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship* 20 (5): 579-98.
- Matthews, Sarah H. 1986. *Friendship through the Life Course*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McDougall, Patricia, and Shelley Hymel. 2007. "Same-Gender versus Cross-Gender Friendship Conceptions: Similar or Different?" *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 53 (3): 347-80.
- McEwan, Bree, and Laura K. Guerrero. 2012. "Maintenance Behavior and Relationship Quality as Predictors of Perceived Availability of Resources in Newly Formed College Friendship Networks." *Communication Studies* 63 (4): 421-40.
- McIntyre, Lisa. J. 2011. *The Practical Skeptic: Core Concepts in Sociology*, 5th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Neuman, William L. 2012. *Basics of Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Ochiai, Y, and Y. Satoh. 1996. "The Developmental Change of Friendship in Adolescence." (in Japanese). *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology* 46: 354-63.
- Okada, Ryo. 2012. "Friendship Motivation, Aggression, and Self-Esteem in Japanese Undergraduate Students." *Psychology* 3 (1): 7-11.
- Okamoto, Keisoku. 1961. "Some Psychological Studies on Adolescence." (in Japanese). *Research Bulletin of Ritsusho Junior College* 5: 18-30.
- Oshio, Atsushi. 1998. "Relationships among Narcissistic Personality, Self-esteem, and Friendship in Adolescence." (in Japanese). *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology* 46: 280-90.
- _____. 2010. "Relationship between the Remembered Characteristics of Friends and current Friendship Relational Functions among College Students." (in Japanese). *Waseda University Literature Research Bulletin* 1 (58): 5-19.
- Pike, Kenneth. 1967. *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*, 2nd ed. The Hague: Mouton.
- Reed-Danahay, Deborah. 1999. "Friendship, Kinship and the Life Course in Rural Auvergne." In *The Anthropology of Friendship*, edited by Sandra Bell and Simon Coleman, 137-56. Oxford, U.K.: Berg.

- Reis, Harry T., Margaret S. Clark, and John G. Holmes. 2004. "Perceived Partner Responsiveness as an Organizing Construct in the Study of Intimacy and Closeness," Chap. 12 in *Handbook of Closeness and Intimacy*, edited by Debra J. Mashek, and Arthur Aron, 201-25. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Risseuw, Carla. 2003. "On Family, Friendship and the Need for 'Cultural Fuss': Changing Trajectories of Family and Friendship in the Netherlands." *Sozialersinn* 1: 81-93.
- _____. 2010. "The Contemporary Context: Approaches to Themes of Friendship in East and West," in *Conceptualizing 'Friendship': Its Meaning and Practice in Time and Place Conference*. Leiden, The Netherlands.
- Robbins, Richard H. 2009. *Cultural Anthropology: A Problem-Based Approach*, 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Rose, Suzanna M. 1983. "Friendship Termination Patterns of College Men and Women." Paper presented at the 91st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim, CA. (August 26-30, 1983).
- Rubin, Lillian B. 1985. *Just Friends: The Roles of Friendship in Our Lives*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Rybak, Anna, and Francis T. McAndrew. 2006. "How Dow We Decide Whom Our Friends Are? Defining Levels of Friendship in Poland and the United States." *Journal of Social Psychology* 146 (2): 147-63.
- Saito, Marie, and Kyoko Fujii. 2009. "Pattern Feature by 'Closed Friendship' and 'Superficial Friendship' in Young Moderns." (in Japanese). *Aichi Pedagogical University Research Report* 58: 133-39.
- Sapadin, Linda A. 1988. "Friendships and Gender: Perspectives of Professional Men and Women." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 5: 387-403.
- Sheets, Virgil L, and Robyn Lugar. 2005. "Friendship and Gender in Russia and the United States." *Sex Roles* 52 (1-2): 131-40.
- Siegel, Sidney. 1956. *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tanno, Hiroaki, and Yutaka Matsui. 2006. "The Functions of Friendship in Undergraduates." (in Japanese). *Tsukuba Psychological Research* 32: 21-30.
- Tobita, Satomi, Hirabayashi Hidemi, and Tamura Michiyo. 1997. "Changes in the Concept of Friendship from Childhood to Adolescence." (in Japanese). *Bulletin of Fukushima University Educational Research* 32: 25-29.

U.S. Library of Congress. January 1994. "Country Studies: Japan, Section 1 – Values and Beliefs." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Library of Congress.

White, Merry. 1994. "Friendship: Best Friends and Group Training." Pp, 141-67 in *The Material Child: Coming of Age in Japan and America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Wright, Paul H. 1984. "Self-referent Motivation and Intrinsic Quality of Friendship." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 1: 115-30.

_____. 2006. "Toward an Expanded Orientation to the Comparative Study of Women's and Men's Same-sex Friends." In *Sex Differences and Similarities in Communication*, 2nd ed., edited by Kathryn Dindia and Daniel J. Canary, 35-53. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.