

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

**INTIMATE FRIENDSHIP AMONG PRIMARY,
SECONDARY AND PREPARATORY SCHOOL
STUDENTS IN CHEHA WOREDA**

By
ISRAEL ATRIF



June 2009
Addis Ababa University

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
P.O. BOX 1176
ADDIS ABABA ETHIOPIA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

**INTIMATE FRIENDSHIP AMONG PRIMARY,
SECONDARY AND PREPARATORY SCHOOL
STUDENTS IN CHEHA WOREDA**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE
STUDIES OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY**

BY
ISRAEL ATRIF

June 2009
Addis Ababa University

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

**INTIMATE FRIENDSHIP AMONG PRIMARY,
SECONDARY AND PREPARATORY SCHOOL
STUDENTS IN CHEHA WOREDA**

BY
ISRAEL ATRIF



APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

NAME

SIGNATURE

Thomas Fawcett

Israel Atrif

CHAIRPERSON, DEPARTMENT OF GRADUATE COMMITTEE

Belay Tefre

[Signature]

ADVISOR

Sentauphu Tadesse

[Signature] July 06/09

EXAMINER, INTERNAL

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Dr.Belay Tefera for his constructive comment and advice in writing my thesis.

I have to express my sincere appreciation to my sponsor organization Bonga College of Teacher Education (BCTE), for its all rounded support.

I am also indebted to all teachers and students of Emdiber primary and High school, for their cooperation in my research work. I am also grateful to Dr.Seleshi Zeleke and my friends for their cooperation in my thesis work.

Table of Content

	Page
Acknowledgment.....	i
Tables of content	ii
List of tables	iv
Abstract	v
I.INTRODUCTION	
1.1Background	1
1.2 Statement of the problem	4
1.3 Research Questions	4
1.4 Specific objectives	5
1.5 Operational Definition	5
1.6 Significance	7
1.7 Delimitation	7
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	
2.1 Intimacy and its components	8
2.2 Theoretical Background	10
2.2.1 Sullivan’s Theory of Interpersonal Development	10
2.2.2 Erickson View of Intimacy	13
2.3 Relationship between intimacy and other aspects of development.....	15
2.4 Factors affecting development of intimate friendship	16
2.4.1 Age-related Changes in Friendship and its implication for intimacy	16
2.4.2 Friendship Intimacy during Preadolescence, early Adolescence and Late Adolescence	18
2.4.3. Sex Difference in Friendship and its implication for Intimacy	20
2.4.4 Gender difference in intimate friendship	21
2.5. Summary and Implications	23

III. METHOD

3.1. Study Area	25
3.2. Population and sampling.....	25
3.3. Instrument.....	27
3.4. Procedure.....	28
3.4.1. Item selection.....	28
3.4.2. Pilot test.....	29
3.4.3. Administration	30
3.4.4. Analysis	31

IV. RESULT

4.1. Characteristics of Respondent	33
4.2 Existence of intimate friendship	34
4.3. Age pattern in intimate friendship	34
4.4. Sex difference in intimate friendship	40

V. DISCUSSION

43

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

49

References

Appendices

A. The instrument given for Judges

B. Questionnaire

Lists of Table

Table1: Interpersonal need associated with different development eras...	11
Table2: Number of Respondent by Education level and Sex.....	26
Table3.Instrument Used in this Study	28
Table 4: Judges who participated in the evaluation of items.....	28
Table5: Participants in the pilot study	30
Table 6: Characteristics of Respondents.....	33
Table 7: One sample T-test for the existence of intimacy among the sampled respondents (N=237).....	34
Table 8: Means and standard deviations for the intimate friendship of students in primary, secondary, and preparatory school (N=237).....	34
Table 9: Summary ANOVA for the difference in intimate friendship of primary, secondary and preparatory students (N=237)	35
Table 10:Post-hoc comparison for the mean difference in the intimate friendship of primary, secondary and preparatory students (N=237).....	35
Table 11: Means and Standard deviation for primary secondary, and Preparatory students in the eight components of friendship Intimacy (N=237).....	36
Table12: Summary ANOVA for the difference in the components of friendship intimacy among primary, secondary and preparatory students (N=237).....	37
Table 13: Post -hoc comparison for the mean difference in the components of friendship intimacy(N=237).....	38
Table 14: Means and Standard deviations for the intimate friendship of male and Female (N=237).....	40
Table 15: Sex difference in the intimate friendship(N=237)	40
Table 16: Means & standard deviation for male and female in the eight components of friendship intimacy (N=237).....	41
Table 17: Sex difference in the eight Components of friendship Intimacy (N=237).....	42

Abstract

Forming intimate friendship is an important developmental milestone among young persons including children and adolescents. This study attempted to examine the nature and patterns of intimate friendship among primary, secondary and preparatory school students (this include dimensions of intimacy, age and sex variables).

A total of 237 participants (136 male and 101 female) were randomly selected from grade 5,6,9 and 12 .Data were collected through a questionnaire consisting of issue pertaining intimate friendship: self-disclosure, loyalty and trust, imposition, common activity, supportiveness, exclusiveness, attachment and understanding. T-tests and one way ANOVA were used to test out the presence of intimacy and to determine age and sex difference on the different mean scores on the different dimensions of intimate friendship.

The result generally indicated the existence of intimate relationship among the participants and that there was a significant statistical difference among primary, secondary and preparatory school students in intimate friendship. But, no significant difference was observed between the two sexes.

Recommended that other sources of variations related to the intimacy of primary, secondary and preparatory school students should be taken into account for future studies.

I. Introduction

1.1. Background

Friendship exists in all age of human development, but it's always in transformation. As children grow older, the quality of their friendship changes. The transformation of friendship is marked by the development of intimacy. The development of intimacy transforms friendship from simple to deep level of friendship.

It is important to point out that not all friendships are intimate and that not all intimate experiences occur in a friendship. According to the Jones (1986), someone who experiences, with friend issue of self-disclosure, trust and loyalty, attachment, common activities, supporting, imposition and understanding considered intimate. These factors are interdependent in the sense that one factor leads to the formation of the other. For example, Chapman and Smith (1980) said that due to the increase of self-disclosure and discussion in older children the friendship of older children is characterized by high intimacy than younger children. But, it doesn't mean self disclosure is the sufficient factor for the formation of intimate friendship. Clear distinctions between intimate and non-intimate behaviors are elusive and likely to remain so, due to the subjective nature of the experience, and a sort of "relativity" problem. Fehr (2004) said that it is rather like trying to define the point at which a growing person stops being "short" and begins to be to "tall". For this reason it is assumed that best friendships are intimate, and intimacy is in a continuum from "low intimate" to "high intimate".

Research into the nature and development of intimacy has traditionally centered on late adolescents and early adults who have passed through Erikson's psychology crisis of identity vs. identity diffusion while little attention has given to intimacy among children (Jones, 1986).

There are studies in the literature which support Erikson's contention that identity precedes intimacy. Jones (1986) said that many of the studies typically employed subjects who, according to the theory, should have formed their identity and began to deal with the Erikson "intimacy Vs isolation" crisis. In general the previous research fails even to acknowledge the possibility that at least some part of adult intimacy may have been learned priority or concurrent with, the formulation of identity. Thus most of the studies concentrate on showing that young adults high in Erikson identity are, also high on Erikson intimacy (Seifert and Hoffnung 1994).

However, now the emerging picture is that intimate friendships can be part of a person's experience beginning somewhere around middle childhood. There are more recent studies that show intimacy precede identity. Also, Sullivan (1953) believed that the need for intimacy first arises in preadolescence in same-sex friendships. Due to this, recent literature has reflected a growing interest in the nature and quality of intimate friendship, with more of this interest centering on the relationships among children and adolescents. They focus on its developmental aspect, which studied in terms of age-related change in friendship and intimacy.

-) Research focusing intimacy in preadolescence period tends to prove that possibility intimacy can develop in this stage and intimacy increase with age (Jones, 1986). According to Maccoby (1974), the increases intimacy of friendship reflects their cognitive development. They are now better able to express their private thoughts and feelings. They can also more readily consider another person's point of view, and so it is easier for them to understand private thoughts and feelings. Also friendships by itself can make distinct contribution to development especially in interims of perspective taking, empathy and pro social behavior.

In line with the above findings, other researcher also found that during the course of preadolescence and adolescence, relationships are gradually transformed from the friendly but activity centered of childhood to the more self-conscious, analytical, and intimate relationship (William and Berndt

cited in Laursen, 1996). Moreover, self-interest become, relatively less important with age as sharing and other important qualities important for intimacy increase. (Berndt et al. cited in Bukowiski, 1996)

Also different researchers found that the presence of different patterns of friendship and intimacy between male and females. In explaining gender differences in the development of relationship Chodorow (cited in Berndt, 1977) proposed that in fact boys and girls become attached to their mother but later follow different development path ways. Boys are encourage to separate themselves from their mother and establish autonomy, where as girls are encouraged to develop further their close relationship with their mother consequently the self concept of girls, but not boys, is based on a sense of relatedness that direct the child to ward interpersonal relationships.

In addition, Gilligan (cited in Roberts, 1994) view morality in terms of responsibility toward individual and willingness to sacrifice help a specific individual within the context of a particular relationship. Compassion for individual is more salient factor in moral behavior for women than it is for men. The difference in the pattern of friendship intimacy between male and female could be traced to the different path way they follow in their moral development.

The study conducted by Maccoby and Jacklin (cited in Jones, 1986) also found out that at all levels of development, females' rate higher than males in intimacy and have more friendships characterized as intimate.

Burhmester & Furnman (1987) believe that the change in the pattern of intimate friendship could be linked with moral, cognitive, and psychological changes that take place at different stages of developmental and also they show they are culture sensitive.

The development of friendship and intimacy seem culturally affected. Some "ethnographic" studies on friendship and intimacy conducted mainly by sociologist have shown that children's friendship and intimacy is a rich and

manifold cultural phenomena. This research indicates that children's friendship and intimacy are responsive to the culture of their natural setting (Bukowski et al, 1996).

Thus, it is important to study nature and pattern of friendship and intimacy among children and adolescence in Ethiopia.

1.2. Statement of the problem

As stated in aforementioned section intimate friendship can become part of a person's experience beginning somewhere around middle childhood. It seems like that intimacy like other personality features, develop over a long period of time, and that is not a single dynamic, but a collection of components that can be broken down and evaluated separately (Chapman and Smith, 1980). However, as it is indicated in the background part, friendship is a social and human process which is shaped in cultural and contextual scripts (Britt, 2008). All of the researches were conducted in America and European children. Perception with regard to components of intimacy is expected to be different as it is treated in the cultural context of Ethiopia. Economic and social backgrounds of children and adolescents are highly governed by collectivist type of cultural system in which high level involvement in social affairs is encouraged. This motivates the researcher to investigate the nature of intimate friendship and the development of its components age and gender wise in Ethiopia context particularly among Emdiber primary, secondary and preparatory schools students. To accomplish these, the following questions are raised.

1.3. Research Questions

- Does intimate friendship exist among sampled participants?
- Is there significant difference in intimate friendship across education level?
- Is there significant difference among primary, secondary and preparatory students in the components of intimate friendship?

- Is there significant difference between boys and girls in intimate friendship?
- Is there significant sex difference in component of intimate friendship?

1.4. Specific Objectives

- To assess the prevalence of intimate friendship among the participants of the study.
- To examine the level of intimate friendship among primary, secondary, and preparatory students.
- To determine the components of intimate friendship those are important for primary, secondary and preparatory school students.
- To examine sex difference in intimate friendship.
- To find out the components of intimate friendship which are important in male and female friendship.

1.5. Operational Definitions

Intimate friendship: in the present study is defined as closeness to a best friend, as reflect in individual self- described knowledge of that friend; self-disclosure, loyalty and trust, willingness to share, attachment, enjoyment of companionship, imposition and attachment.

a. Self-Disclosure

Manifested when respondents make themselves explicit through rating scales on the levels of revealing very confidential information with feeling of freeness to their friends (hope, plans, weakness, problem and other information)

b. Attachment

Demonstrated on respondents when make themselves explicit through rating scale on the level of closeness & liking with their friend.

c. Common activity/sharing activities

Manifested when respondent disclose themselves through rating scale on the level of doing task, & engaging on different activity together.

d. Giving & Sharing (Support)

Giving and sharing can be demonstrated as respondents make explicit about themselves through rating scales on the level of caring to each other, & exchanging material & ideas between them.

e. Understanding

Identified when respondent make themselves explicit through rating scales on the level of sensing & knowing each other

f. Trust & Loyalty

Demonstrated on respondents, when they reflect thorough rating scales on the level of faithfulness, dependability & openness.

g. Exclusiveness

Shown as respondents reflect themselves through rating scales on the level of identification to each other in their relationship.

h. Imposition

Understand when respondent disclose themselves through rating scale on the level of freeness to use the thing of their friends, and to enforce to do something without the consent of their friend.

Primary students –in this study it refers to students in grades five and six and who are supposed to be found in preadolescence period.

Secondary students-in this study it refers to students in grade nine and who are supposed to be found in early adolescence.

Late adolescence -in this study it refers to students in grade twelve and who are supposed to be found in late adolescence

1.6. Significance of the study

Development processes are embedded in relationship transactions. Considerable evidence and theoretical support exist for that intimate friendship has a unique and significant impact on the development of children and adolescents. However, less emphasis was given for the friendship of children and adolescents. Hence, understanding when the intimate friendship start to emerge in children and adolescent friendship and knowing the components includes in the development of intimate friendship would help parent, teacher and significant other to promote the healthy development of children and adolescence. Also this study will supplement to the existing knowledge and would commence other research in this area. Finally, findings of the study may provide insight to others who have interest on studying the friendship of children and adolescents.

1.7. Delimitation

The present study delimits to study intimate friendship of students in primary, secondary and preparatory school. The subjects of the study were students of 5&6, 9, &12 grades. The students in this grades were assumed to be found in preadolescence, early adolescent and late adolescent. The intimate friendship in this study was based on Sharbany eight components of intimate friendship. Emdiber was selected as an area of this study, because to make the study manageable and minimize the problem of intervening variables.

II. Review of the Related Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to present a definition and components of friendship intimacy, a comprehensive review of theories on development of intimate friendship, the relation between intimacy and other aspects of developments, age related changes and sex difference intimate friendship. At the end of this chapter summary and implication will be present.

2.1. Intimacy and its components

Erickson (cited in Camarena and Petersen, 1990) described intimacy as the capacity to make full commitment emotionally to another person. Intimacy, which can occur in both friendship and romantic relationships, requires openness, courage, ethical strength and usually some compromise of one's personal preference.

Intimacy is the most difficult of the friendship criteria to infer from observations of behavior; however, when researcher of friendships in adolescence uses the construct of intimacy, they define it as self-disclosure, closeness, and the sharing of feeling (Fehr, 2004). Many theorists agree that intimacy is a multidimensional concept consisting of several specific components: love and affection, personal validation, trust, and self-disclosure.

The first feature of intimacy most theorists identify is the presence of love and affection. As Berscheid (cited in Lawrence & Misty, (2003) pointed out, when friends are aware that they are loved and liked, the risks associated with self-expression decrease, and they become more willing to open up and share their ideas and feelings. They know that friends who show them love and affection will be much more receptive to their feelings and ideas than are people who do not care for them. Therefore, they rarely, if ever, confide in people who appear unconcerned or indifferent to them.

The second component of intimacy involves personal validation. One of the most exhilarating features of a loving relationship is the knowledge that

someone loves, understands, and approves of you (Berscheid cited in Lawrence & Misty, 2003). Within such an atmosphere of acceptance, an individual feels free to open up. Thus, personal validation gives the person who is disclosing a sense of acceptance both of what is being said and of who they are. A third element of intimacy is trust. People have to know it is safe to disclose personal secrets. They have to be assured that their disclosure will remain confidential and their inner selves will not be laid bare before an uncaring world (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993).

A fourth ingredient of intimacy is self-disclosure. An intimate relationship cannot exist if the participants refuse to reveal parts of themselves. Self-disclosure encourages love, liking, caring, trust, and understanding (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993). The level of *intimacy* reached within a given relationship seems to depend on the kind of information disclosed. Descriptive self-disclosure, for instance, occurs when people tell the facts of their lives. This usually happens at the beginning of a relationship. In contrast, evaluative self-disclosure occurs when people reveal their deepest feelings. This becomes more prevalent as people begin to know each other well. Because it is the expression of feelings that is crucial for friendship satisfaction. Another important aspect of self-disclosure involves the quality of disclosure each person contributes to the relationship. Friends tend to match each other in how intimate their disclosures are.

Although researchers agree that intimacy is a multi dimensional concept, research and theory on the growth of intimacy in friendship has typically privileged the self-disclosure of personal thoughts and feelings as the means, or pathway for attaining intimacy. Burhmester & Furman (1987) proposed, for example that intimacy is an interpersonal process that occurs When a person disclose inner feeling and experiences to a receptive responsive listener. However , self-disclosure alone may not be sufficient to produce enduring feeling of intimacy among friends it is also coupled with other components of intimacy to produce an enduring effect on friendship relationship Berndt (1982).

In addition to the above-mentioned components of intimacy, Sharbany (1981) identified the following as the components of intimacy in friendship of children and adolescents: exclusiveness, understanding, sharing activities, and attachment. The components of intimacy can be collapse into expressive (i.e. self-disclose, support, trust and loyalty, exclusivities, and understanding and instrumental (i.e. sharing activities and non-emotional helps). (Prager, 1995) ✓

2.2. Theoretical Background

The area of social development in children generally suffers from lack of integrative theorizing. This is particular true in the study of intimate friendship development in children and adolescents. However, the theories of Sullivan and Erikson help to overcome these short comings. Their hypothesis and perception with respect to the development children's friendship are extremely enlighten and still influence the thinking of contemporary developmentalist. So looking at their theory can help to explain intimate friendship in children's and adolescents. A discussion of their theories now follows.

2.2.1. Sullivan's Theory of Interpersonal Development

In his theoretical discussion, Sullivan cited in Chapman and Smith (1980) ✓ postulated that throughout the development sequence, children have a need for their personal relationship which varies from one period to the next. The need for personal relationship begins in infancy and continue throughout adulthood. However, Harry Stack-Sullivan's interpersonal approach to development emphasized the interpersonal needs that emerge through the course of middle childhood and adolescence.

Sullivan (1953) believed that the need for intimacy first emerge during preadolescence period (8-10 to 12-14). This period is characterized by either Piaget, or Kohlberg and Gilligan as the development of new types of thinking and moral reasoning respectively, this facilitates the formation of intimate relationships. According to Sullivan (cited in Steinberg 2000) pointed out

that these periods are characterized by relatively high level of closeness and intimacy within the friendship of children and Adolescences.

Sullivan's theory focus on transformation of friendship. Sullivan's charted a developmental progression of needs; begin in infancy and continuing through adolescence. This is shown under table 1.

Table 1. INTERPERSONAL NEED ASSOCIATED WITH DIFFERENT DEVELOPMENT ERAS: SULLIVAN'S THEORY ,1953

Development epoch	interpersonal needs
Infancy	
(0-1 to 2-3 years)	Needs of contact with people Needs for tenderness form the mothering one
Childhood	
(2-3 to 6-7 years)	Need for adult participation in the child's play
Juvenile era	
(6-7 to 8-10 years)	Need for playmates Need for acceptance into peer society groups
Preadolescence	
8-10 to 12-14)	Need for intimacy
Early adolescence	
(12-14 to 17-18 years)	Need for sexual contact
Late adolescences	
(17-18 years. To adult)	Need for Intimacy with an opposite-sex Need for integration into adult society

Looking back at the progress of interpersonal need that Sullivan mapped out, we see that intimacy surface during preadolescence-precedes the development of heterosexual relationship-which doesn't emerge until adolescence. In other words, Sullivan believe that the capacity for intimacy first develop in preadolescence period. (Buhrmester and Furman, 1987)

Sullivan (cited in Steinberg, 1989) show that children have different friends and with whom they share activity. According to him this pattern of friendship end in preadolescence period and they develop a new type of relationship with just one particular friend, almost always of the same sex. Also in the above table we can see that before they come to the preadolescence era children seek out different forms of input from their relationship which is more focus in self interest. For example, Sullivan (1953) theorized that juvenilia era occurs between 4&9 years old and is uniquely characterized by need for playmate. The Childs social interest during this period is quit general and self-oriented.

Despite the self-orientation of the juvenile era, Sullivan (cited in Chapman & Smith, 1980) proposed that the development of social accommodations is a positive outcome of this period. By this term, he referred to the children ability to learn and grasp how may slight difference in interpersonal style and cognitive perspective there are. This is a critical element for the development of early friendship.

Sullivan believed that the need for intimacy first satisfied with chums during preadolescence period. The young person learns to disclose and receive intimate and private information to build a close, mutual friendships this is based on, honesty, loyalty and trust. Sullivan felt that the forming intimate friendship during preadolescence is prerequisite for forming close relationships as adolescence and adult.

According to Sullivan (cited in Anthony, 1980) in preadolescence, intimate interpersonal adjustment become the crucial challenge of life. Because as it is explained by him intimacy develops through maturation and experience.

He stated that a new type of interest evolves in which a member of the same sex become a 'chum' or close friend.

2.2.2. Erikson View of Intimacy

Unlike the theory of Sullivan which attempts to provide a systematic account of the development of companionship and intimacy, the theory of Erikson focuses on the different types of psychosocial crisis that an individual come across at different stages of development. However, Erikson was one of the first theorists to take seriously the notion of development after adolescent. Erikson describes the development task confronting young adult as intimacy versus isolation. Thus Erikson discusses on his theory about intimacy after the crisis of identity. Erikson believes that intimacy doesn't become preoccupying issue before this time. Intimacy for Erikson means establishing enduring, committed relationships (Floyed, 1997). ◊

According to Erikson (1968) people don't become capable of intimate relationship until their sense of personal identity is well established. That is, one must have a sense of who one is before he/she can fuse identity with that of another person in appreciation of the other uniqueness & separateness. Erickson set the condition for the establishment and maintain of intimate relationship among friends.

As Erikson view intimacy, it is the capacity to reach out & make contact with other people to fuse one's own identity with that of other. Intimacy find expression in deep friendship. Central to intimacy is the ability to share with & care about another person without fearing out losing oneself in process on the other hand if an individual has fear he/she will not form intimate relationship. One knows better who he/she is when getting old. Thought Erikson use age as criteria for another explanation for experiencing of intimate relationship but it is possible in the old age (Radmacher and Asmith, 2006). ◊

Erikson's psychosocial view of human development posits that adolescence is the pivotal developmental period of figuring out who you are and what you can become (identity versus identity diffusion). Once this psychosocial crisis has been handled successfully, the young person is capable of entering into a truly intimate relationship during young adulthood (intimacy versus isolation). In Erikson's view one cannot be truly intimate until he or she has a sense of identity (Steinberg, 2000).

Erikson feels that in a truly intimate relationship, two individual identities become fused in such way that neither person's identity is lost. It follows, Erikson reason, that adolescents must establish a sense of identity before they are capable of real intimacy. Without a secure sense of identity, people are afraid and unwilling to make serious commitments to other. They fear that they will lose their identity in the relationship.

Erikson (cited in Westen, 2002) suggests that relationships between individuals who have not yet established a sense of identity may look intimate, but generally they are not. Adolescents who throw themselves into going steady often display a sort of "pseudo intimacy" on the surface, their relationship may seem to be close, but a more careful examination usually reveals a shallow superficial intimacy. They may say they are open with each other, but they may not disclose what they are really feeling, for fear of losing the relationship. According to Erikson, this type of pseudo intimacy is to be expected during adolescence. After all, it is difficult to commit yourself to someone else before you know who you are.

It appears that Sullivan and Erikson are saying different things about development of intimacy and identity. Sullivan suggested that development of intimacy precedes the development of identity. Erikson, on the other hand, theorized that identity formation comes before intimacy. Empirical investigations into the question suggest that the two psychosocial processes of intimacy and identity are intertwined and it is more accurate to say that their development overlaps. Hence, the development of one does not clearly come before or after the development of the other (Steinberg, 1989).

Sullivan's concern was primarily with adolescent need and capacity for intimacy, Erikson has been with expression of intimacy & commitment. Close relationships are used as a safe context in which adolescence confronts different questions of identity. Yet at the same time, the development of self disclosure is the foundation upon which adolescents build and strengthen intimate relationships with others (Berndt, 1977).

2.3. Relationship between intimacy and other aspects of development

According to Buhrmester (1996) the substance of children's need and the timing of their emergence are controlled by the full array of factors that influence children's concerns, for example, as the emergence of the need for intimate confidants seems linked to a number of factors, including pubertal maturation, the growth of formal operational cognitive abilities to reflect on the self more abstractly, and culture values that encourage individual identity exploration through conversation with others.

2.3.1. Morality and Intimacy

As Turiel (1983) indicates in the previous year's many psychologists suggest that friendship and morality as two separate domains of development, each with its own set of issues and processes. However, different empirical research evidences indicate that friendship and morality are interrelated. Both morality and friendships are an interpersonal construct in the sense that moral issues frequently arise in relations with friends and the significant portion of experiences with others consists of moral struggles, involving issues of loyalty, trust, friendship and honesty. These are among the most basic features of the friendship relation. That is, the development of the process of responsiveness, reciprocity, and commitment to others that occur within the context of particular relationships such as friendships may be a fundamental marker of moral maturing (Bukowski and Iorrie, 1983) ?

2.3.2. Cognitive Development and Intimacy

The children's idea about friendship change with age, Children's friendships tend to be activity based and not focused on concerns like honesty and self-disclosure. As the emphasis on the peer group grows in adolescence, so does the emphasis on close relationships with both same sex and opposite sex peers. This increasing emphasis on intimacy in relationships is supported by the adolescent's social cognitive capabilities and the young person's growing independence (Steinberg, 2002).

The growth of social cognition reflected in the young person's sophisticated conception of social relationships and improvements in personal understanding and communication. These changes permit to establish and maintain for more mature relationships, and responsiveness to each other's thoughts and feelings. Before the development of ability to look at things from other person's point of view, may make intimate interpersonal relationships cognitively impossible. (Selam[?] et al cited in Steinberg, 1989).

2.3.3. Psychological Change and Intimacy

Being independence that often accompanies the transition from childhood into adolescence provide greater opportunities for adolescents to be along with their friends' and to engage in intimate discussion. Adolescents spend more time talking to their friendship than any other time. Intimate friendship becomes more common as individual enter adolescence because they feel as it is safe to reveal thins to their friends. Adolescents seek approval from adults; therefore, they are less inclined to reveal things because they fear being looked up on as childish. This thing triggers intimate relationship among adolescence (Westen, 2002).

2.4. Factors affecting development of intimate friendship

2.4.1. Age-related Changes in Friendship and its implication for Intimacy

Selaman (1989)^a reported that the experience of intimacy remains stable across development whereas the behaviors that lead to this change with age,

as the ability to understand and take another person's perspective develops age related shift in intimacy.

Biological changes have relationship with many of our behavior. The biological changes that are manifested at different stages of human development lead to the development of certain unique behavior to that particular stage. That is why different psychologist use biological changes to describe the behavior of human beings.

For example, puberty and its attendant changes in sexual impulses often raise new issues and concerns requiring serious, intimate discussion. At this time some young people feel hesitant to discuss sex and dating with their parents and turn instead to relationship outside the family. Therefore the changes have immediate impact the developing individual with their associates. Biological change shape the relationship of the growing child with his/her parent and peer (Kandel & Lesser cited in Steinberg, 1989).

When viewed from a developmental perspective, it appears that there are changes over the life course in the salience of different needs, especially during late childhood and adolescence each preoccupying issue motivates children to seek out particular outcomes or forms of feedback that bear on issue at hand.

Children's and adolescent friendships are played out within nested sets of context. As different stage children as well as adolescents face a series of developmental tasks or issues, each of which serve as a context of for friendship. To explore how friendship feed in to, grow out of, for the children at different ages is important to consider some developmental issues that they come across. Donvan and Aderson(1966)

Many of the important theories of psychology argue that human behavior is organized around striving to fulfill a number of basic needs. Sullivan (1953), in particular, argued that social needs for tenderness, companionship,

acceptance, and intimacy organized interpersonal relationships and individual personalities. According to Sullivan people need certain forms of social input or social interaction to remain happy and psychologically healthy. Like positive regards, loving affection, entertaining interaction and assistance in coping with stress Donovan and Aderson (1966).

Gottman and his colleagues (1986) study nicely illustrates the link between friendship and developing concerns and needs. During each stage of development, the central features and interaction qualities of friendship change in tandem with the issues and concern tend at the fore front of individual development. Since children who are friends are typically preoccupied with similar development issue, the friendships provide them with a unique appointment to wrestle with the issue of most central concerns to them.

2.4.2. Friendship Intimacy during Preadolescence, early Adolescence and Late Adolescence

Studies have identified three general changes in description of friends and thinking about friendship from childhood to adolescence; (1) a shift from thinking about friendship interims of playing together and giving each other goods to more abstract attributes such as caring for one another, sharing feeling and thoughts, and providing comfort to one another; (2) a change from having the friends satisfy one's own desires to the idea of mutual sharing; (3) a progression from a focus on concert behavior toward greater emphasize on ending relations in spite of occasional conflicts (Colmen, 1974).

Likewise, Gottman & Mettetal (1986) found that the presence of developmental changes in the themes and concerns of children friendship. During middle childhood, the social concerns about self-exploration and self-definition lead to considerable self-disclosure and supportive problem solving among friendship. It is interesting that these finding closely parallel, in many respects, Sullivan's account of emerging social needs. The progression, to inclusion by peers, to self-exploration is very similar to

Sullivan's description of the margining needs for, peer-group acceptance, and intimate exchange, respectively.

Children comments about intimacy in friendship do increase greatly between middle childhood and adolescence. As children move into late childhood and pre adolescence, equality and reciprocity become key element. Exchange favors and sharing activity, continue to matter as children get older, but by the time they enter adolescence, they place greater emphasize on psychology qualities such as trust, mutual support and loyalty. Friends and confidants provide support when they are feeling emotionally vulnerable, assistance when they need it, and companionship in variety of activities and contests. Without question, close relationships are extremely important to people of all ages particularly to adolescents (Yoniss, cited in Robert, 1994).

↳ During the course of preadolescence and adolescence, relationships are gradually transformed from the friendly but activity centered friendships of childhood to the more self-conscious, analytical, and intimate relationship. One study reveals that responses mentioning intimacy and loyalty, which were virtually absent among the kindergarten students, increased dramatically between the fourth and sixth grade. A similar study revealed comparable result. (Savian and Berndt cited in Steinberg, 1996).

Beginning from preadolescence period friendship is thought to serve numerous functions, including the provision, security, trust, instrumental aid, and norm teaching. Thus, forming and maintaining strong, qualitatively rich friendships become of central importance during middle childhood and adolescence. Researchers have shown that with age, children become increasingly reliant on friends. Because the provisions offered by friendship become increasingly important during these periods, it seems likely that the quality of friendship must have some bearing on children's psychosocial adjustment.

According Steinberg (1989) Children's friendships are activity oriented, for example, built around games and shared pastimes but teenagers close

friendships are more likely to have a strong emotional foundation; they are built on the sorts of bonds that form between people who care about and know and understand each other in special way. Until adolescence truly intimate relationships characterized by openness, honesty, self-disclosure and trust doesn't emerge.

In line with this Steinberg (2002) report, those young children's conceptions of friendship differ from the conceptions of older children and adolescents. It is not until late childhood and early adolescence that a growing emphasis is placed on issues such as loyalty, trust and honesty. Older children and adolescents think more about their friendships in terms of closeness and intimacy; they also act more intimately in interpersonal situations. Older children and adolescents tend to know more intimate information about their friends than younger children, and they tend to act more empathically toward friend than younger children

As adolescents need for intimacy increases, so might they emphasize that they place on intimacy as an important component of friendship. The conceptions of friendship come to place greater weight on such dimension of intimacy as loyalty, trust, and self-disclosure (Savian William and Berndt cited in Resiman, & Shorr, 1978).

Richey and Richey (1980)⁷ found out that in late adolescence intimacy is emphasized much more than in early adolescence. Adolescent want friends those are loyal and trust worthy and that provide support in emotion crisis. According to Hartup (Cited in Steinberg, 2002) during the adolescent years, friendships become an integral part of an individual's life. Adolescents close friends are usually of the same gender. For adolescents, the essential characteristics of friendship include loyalty, trust, self-disclosure, openness, and affection.

2.4.3. Sex Difference in Friendship and its implication for intimacy

It has been suggested that boys and girls have different forms of experience with in their peers, with boy's friendships being extensive that is, oriented

toward a group of peers, and girls friendships being intensive, that is, oriented toward processes experienced at the level of the dyad. Girls friendships experience at the dyadic level lead to an emphasis on issues concern with the maintenance of relationships and the protection of trust and intimacy. (Waldrop & Halverson cited in Bukowski and Iorrie, 1983).

In recent years, an increasing number of theorists have noted that different "cultures" that are manifest in boys' and girls' peer relationships. Then the gender of a child seems to provide different context for the development friendship. Boys' friendships more extensively focus on a genetic concerns and needs, whereas girls' friendship focus more on communal concern and needs. These need shape the form of relationships going to be established with their friend and the level of intimacy in their relationship.

2.4.4. Sex difference in intimate friendship

Defining intimacy as emotional closeness, Radmacher and Asmith (2006) found that boys and girls reported similar levels of emotional closeness in their friendships, but the pathway that they pursue to achieve the closeness varied by gender. For girls, only self-disclosure, for boys' self-disclosure and share activates predicted emotional closeness. It appears that during the course of adolescent, self-disclosure increasingly becomes the primary pathway for intimacy for both boys and girls, but sharing activities remains important for boys.

In contrast with the abovementioned finding Hurlock (1980) indicate that girls at all age level are slightly more stable in their friendship than boys. According to him the major different was that females are more concerned than male with loyalty, understanding and self-disclosure in a best friendship. In addition to self-disclosure the intimate friendship of female' for example, Berndt (1982) characterized emotional closeness and support in their relationships as opposed to boys' relationships with each other. Boys form intimate relationship based on actions.

The above claim is supported by, Maccoby, (1998) that females place more value on these dimensions than males. Loyalty, self-disclosure and commitment also appear to be critical with regard to the termination of friendship.

Sharabany (1981), for example, found that preadolescents, early adolescents, & late adolescent girls were more likely than boys to express their thoughts and feelings to a friend was an important aspect of intimacy. In contrast, boys were more likely than girls to emphasize the role of sharing activities together or producing instrumental help in establishing intimacy in friendships.

There is extensive documentation that, beginning in preadolescence, girls report more frequent interactions of an intimate and supportive nature with female friends than boys do with male friends (Buhrmester & Prager, 1995). Findings of others studies were also shows that female friendships provide more opportunity than male friendships for the fulfillment of communal needs. Females reported somewhat more frequent interaction with friends than males did, and they reported substantially higher levels of self-disclosures and emotional support than males did in daily interactions.

Buhrmester and Furman (1987), the manners boys and girls pursue in establishment of intimacy with friend help to validate one's self-worth. Girls depend on conversation they made with friends and males focus on the agnatic activities they involved. Girls in general talk about how they are feelings or what try they think about certain issues. Boys are more likely to talk about such as Monday night football, or who is starting the next week games. Girls are more open with their feelings; if a friend is upset a girl will be more likely than boy to console her with soothing words and maybe even a hug on the other hand. A boy might say to his friend "Don't worry about it, forget it, or it's not worth it any way", and leave it at that. This makes clear those females' friendships are characterized by high intimacy on the other hand male friendship by low intimacy (Anthony, 1980) ✓

Sex differences were found in progression along the developmental scale of friendship. In early adolescence, females were somewhat ahead (44% versus 28%). In late adolescence, many more females were advanced developmentally (65% of 39%) much of the superiority found for late adolescents female is due to the greater emphasis placed on intimacy variables (Bukowski et al, 1996).

The findings of many researches shows consistently that female score better than male in intimacy and in its components such as self-disclosure, trust and loyalty, understanding and support. However there are some researchers who have question over the difference between male and female in intimacy and its components. For example, Lawrence & Misty (2003) suggest that the difference could be emanated from on how its defined and measured. In addition to that Britt (2008) pointed out that the influence of culture, living condition ,and political system of the country on the development of components of friendship intimacy.

2.5. Summary and Implication

Human being lives in societies composed of family and friends and work-place relationships. All of these relationships involve different level of intimacy. So far we have been discussing the level of intimacy experienced particular in the context of childhood and adolescence friendships.

To get more insight on the development of friendship intimacy, two principal theories were discussed. The two theories have different view concerning the time of its emergent and patterns of development during childhood and adolescent. Sullivan believes that the beginning of intimate relationship is during preadolescence; roughly age 8 to 10 in the same sex relationship he called a 'chum ship'. On the other hand, Erikson views that intimacy is the task of the young adult. But now different researchers confirm that intimate friendship can become a part of a person's experience beginning somewhere around middle child hood and it increases with age .The biological changes, cognitive and moral development, psychological and other contribute for the

development of intimate friendship in preadolescence and adolescence periods.

In general, literatures have shown that at all levels of development females' rate higher than male in intimacy and have more friendship characterized as intimate. It appears those females are consistently socialized to be more intimate while male are socialized to compete and maintain individuality at the expenses of intimacy.

Friendship is one of the most essential and rewarding forms of interaction in life. Intimate friends are more important than ever. Children and adolescents need to have close friends that they can talk about their feelings and problem in order to get emphatic, non-judgmental hearing as a means of stabilizing and guiding their lives. Psychologists have demonstrated the crucial role that friends play in everything from development of self identity to self esteem. Thus, looking on nature and development of intimate friendship is helpful to promote healthy development of children and adolescents in Ethiopia.

III. Methods

This section discusses data sources, the sample selection procedure, development of intimacy measuring instrument, data collection procedure and analysis described below.

3.1. Study Area

The study area is Cheha Woreda which is inhabited by Gurage people and found south-west of Addis Ababa. They inhabit an area of land approximately 150Km. The Cheha Woreda was selected because the researcher is acquainted with the culture and psychological makeup of the people so, it is hoped that studying the area would be smoother in many aspects. Moreover, the people live in this area are less diverse in many aspect of their life. Thus, it is possible to prevent the intervention of other variables, which could affect the result of the study.

3.2. Population & Sampling

The populations under investigation were students currently learning in Emdiber-primary, secondary & preparatory schools. Since, preadolescence, early adolescents, & late adolescents were the target population of the study the samples were selected purposely from 5&6, 9&12 grades respectively. Moreover, selecting purposely students from these grades level enable to get clear cut age difference and to see developmental changes in intimate friendship of the students.

According to the official of the respective schools the total number of students currently attending in grade 5&6, 9 and 12 were 332,364&420 respectively. Among these students in grade five and six there were 226 boys& 106 girls, in grade nine there were 247boys & 117 girls and in grade twelve there were 265 boys & 155 girls. The total sample consists of 136 boys &101 girls selected by using systematic sampling(every nth student selected from respective class from their attendance sheet). out of the total 332 grades 5 & 6, 364 grade nine and 420 grade twelve students attending

ye kate

at Emdiber primary, secondary & preparatory school 68,76,&93 students were participate in the study respectively .There were eight Sections in grade five & six ,each sections contain about 40 students .out of the eight section ,four sections were randomly chosen by using lottery method & from each four sections about 15 participants were selected by using systematic sampling.

In a cause of grade nine there were seven sections, each section containing about 52 students. From seven sections, three sections were selected randomly & an average of 24 students taken from the selected sections. Concerning students in preparatory level, there were eight sections in grade12, each section containing about 53 students. From eight sections four sections were selected randomly. From each section an average of 23 students were taken as a sample of the study. From all grade level additional five students were selected, to replace in the place students who wouldn't have best friend.

92
164

Table 2. Number of Respondents by Education Level and Sex

Education Level	Sex	No	%	Mean Age
Primary	boys	40	58.82	11.08
	girls	28	41.17	
Secondary	boys	46	60.52	14.6
	girls	30	39.47	
Preparatory	boys	50	53.76	18.05
	girls	43	46.23	
Total	boys	136	57.38	
	girls	101	42.61	

The age of the participant at all level range from 9 to 20 years. The samples in the primary school were in the age range of 9 to 13 & students in secondary school were between the age of 14 to 16 & the samples from preparatory school were in the age interval of 17 to 20. The mean age of

participants in primary, secondary & preparatory were 11.08, 14.76 & 18.09 respectively.

3.3. Instrument

To measure intimate friendship of student in primary, secondary and preparatory school, items from two standardized tests (scale) were adapted. The two standardized scale were intimate friendship scale of Sharabany and Miller with reliability coefficient of .78 and .84 respectively. The selection of these instruments was based on the evidence that they were used in several research works to measure intimacy among different social groups (Jones, 1996; Mullet and Stolberg, 2002). Particularly the intimacy friendship scales of Sharabany used to measure intimate friendship of children and adolescents (Sharabany, 1994). The adoption of the two instrument help to get items that are appropriate for the participants of the study.

The instrument was likert-scaled questionnaire consisting of sentences descriptive of friendship intimacy. The items in the scale worded from the point of the subject (e.g. I like to do things with him/her). The entire scale was subdivided into eight components. The eight components in the scale were self-disclosure, Understanding, Attachment, Exclusiveness, Giving & sharing, Imposition, Common activity, Trust & loyalty.

The wording of each item was in short sentences and to avoid socially desirable responses, it was worded both negatively and positively. Moreover, the items were translated into Amharic-English and back to English-Amharic by Graduate Students of developmental psychology and language students. And it was finalized according to their agreement.

Table3. Instrument Used in this Study

Sub scales	Illustrative items
Self-disclosure	I feel free to talk with him/her about every thing
Trust & loyalty	I know that whatever I tell him/her is kept secret between us
Imposition	I can use his/hers things without asking permission
Attachment	I feel close to him/her
Common activity	I work with him/her on some of his school work
Giving & sharing	I offer him/her the use of my things
Understanding	I know how he feels about things without his /her telling me.
Exclusiveness	I do things with him/her that are quite different from what I do with other.

3.4. Procedure

3.4.1. Item Selection

In order to evaluate the appropriateness of the items and to avoid overlap eight (8) judges were involved in selecting the items for final administration

Table 4: .Judges who participated in the evaluation of items

Position	Sex	No. of judges	Qualification	Specialty
Graduate students of A.A.U	M	5	BA	Development psychology
Graduate Students of A.A.U	M	1	BA	Social psychology
Program coordinator OPRIF	F	1	MA	Developmental psychology
Graduate Students of A.A.U	M	1	BA	Measurement evaluation

Before the judges make categorization of the items into different dimension of friendship intimacy, the researcher, in addition to operational definition already given in the questionnaire, the researcher has spent enough time in explaining and briefing his objective to the judges.

A total of 71 items were presented for the judges and for almost each dimension of intimacy there were 9 items. Then the judges were required to categorize each items by assigning number to different dimension of intimacy i.e. self-Disclosure, exclusiveness etc.

The responses of the judges then converted into median evaluation the median of each item & the keyed answers were compared. Pearson r was calculated to see the presence of significant relationship between the median rating of each item and its keyed answers. The result indicate that ($r=0.908$) it is significant, and this means the grouping of the items into different dimension of friendship intimacy made by the judges were good. Based on the evaluation of the judges the total number of items was reduced to 57. The following items were rejected 8, 9, 10, 11, 23, 24, 32, 37, 46, 47, 58, 60, 54& 66.

While the judges were evaluating the items, the following modifications were made. First, the operational definitional definition of exclusiveness was changed. The judges were confused the definition of attachment with that of exclusiveness changed. The other modification made was that the items that were supposed to measure imposition were lack the qualities to measure imposition. Then based on the operational definition the items were rewritten.

3.4.2. Pilot Study

Though the adopted instruments (Scales) have are already been standardized and their authors have established their reliability and validity, the time, environment and situation under which they were standardized were different the environment and situation here in Ethiopia. Hence, it has

worthwhile that pilot study had to be made to check the reliability of the instrument in context like ours.

The objectives of pilot study were to test and improve instrument, to establish working relationship and to find out factors, which could affect the main study. Thus, after the pilot study items 9, 12, 13 & 15 were improved. Moreover, a good insight was gained on how to administrate the instrument for the final study.

Table 5. Participants in the pilot study

Subject	Sex		Total sample size
	M	F	
Primary	8	7	15
Secondary	6	9	15
Preparatory	7	8	15

A cross-section of the population has served for the pilot study for this purpose, equal number of subjects from elementary, high school & preparatory were randomly selected by lottery methods.

Based on the pilot study results, instruments and the way of administration were improved. Items that indicate poor inter-item correlation were improved. And items that were confusing the subject during the pilot study were modified. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was .87. The reliability coefficient of the sub scales were found to be in the range of .56 to .93. The reliability in the total scale and sub scale were fulfilling the desirable reliability coefficient. Thus the instrument was found valuable to collect data for the main study.

3.4.3. Administration

Two sessions were scheduled for each group of individual to whom the questionnaires were to be administered. All sessions were conducted by investigator and his assistance, and all items were read out loudly by the

investigator in all sessions, regardless of the age level of the subject. Except for the first part of the questionnaire, all answers were marked by drawing a circle around one of the number given in the scale.

In addition for students in primary school were told how to read the words that shows female and male specific pronoun .learning from pilot study the subject were asked to identify their one best friends and to fill the questions based up on the personal relationship they do have with this best friend. They were given a definition of best friendship by investigator, and were asked if they had any questions. In all grade level before the administration of the questions, the subjects were given full instructions and definitions of terms, as well as sample question and definitions and chance to ask question. All participants were given time for asking any questions about the items or the overall purpose of the study.

3.4.4. Analysis

First, the completed questionnaires were marked and scores assigned to each sub-scale of intimacy. The scores of the sub scale were added to get the score the participants on each sub-scale and to get the total score of an intimate friendship the score of each sub-scale were added together.

The pre-coded variables were entered into SPSS version 12. Reverse coded items were also entered after revising.

In order to describe the data descriptively statistical values such as means and standard deviation were calculated. One sample T-test was used to test the presence of intimate friendship among the participants. To test the prevalence of intimate friendship among the participants, their expected man was compared with their actual mean. The expected mean was obtained by taking the median point on the scale and multiplied by the total items. Since the distribution was assumed to be normally distributed the median value taken as mean. One way ANOVA was conducted to measure the level of intimate friendship among primary, secondary and preparatory Students. A post significant test in ANOVA, post-hoc comparison procedure

was employed to see where the statically difference lies. The same producer was also employed to compute gender and grade level difference on components of intimacy.

It was also necessary to make independent t-test. This test is applied to see whether there would be any statically difference between male and female in overall level of intimate friendship.

IV. RESULTS

This chapter is concerned with the presentation of the analysis of the data gathered from primary, secondary and preparatory school students to answer the main question in the study. The data were analyzed in accordance with the research question. The results of the study presented on the following order. Demographic characteristics of the respondents, existence of intimate friendship, difference in the intimate friendship of among primary, secondary, and preparatory students, difference on the components of intimacy among the same group. Finally, sex difference in intimate friendship and components of intimacy are presented respectively.

4.1. Characteristics of Respondents

Table.6 Presents, the demographic characteristic of the study participants. Out of 237 students, 136(57.4%) males and 101, (42.6%) females were included in the study. Among them 68(28.7%) of the participants were in the age interval of (9-13), 109(45.9%) were in the age interval (14-17) and the rest of 60 (25.4%) were between 18-21. With respect to their education level, 68(28.7%), were primary, 76(32.18) and 93 (39.2) were secondary and preparatory students respectively.

Table 6. Characteristics of Respondents

Variables	Characteristics	No	%
Sex	Male	136	57.4
	Female	101	42.6
	Total	237	100
Age	9-13	68	28.7
	14-17	109	45.9
	18-21	60	25.4
	Total	237	100
Edu.Level	primary	68	28.7
	Secondary	76	32.1
	preparatory	93	39.2
	Total	237	100

4.2. Existence of intimate friendship

In this part to present and analyze the existence of intimate friendship among the selected participants one sample t-test employed

Table.7 One sample t-test for the existence of intimacy among the sampled respondents

No	Mean	Std. deviation	t -test value	t	df	sig.(2-tailed)
237	164.95	21.04	142.5	16.4	236	.000
				3		

Table 7 displays that the average value of the participants' friendship intimacy is significantly greater than the expected mean.

4.3. Age patterns in intimate friendship.

Under this section to present and analyze intimate friendship and its components at different educational level, descriptive statics and analysis of variance are employed with reference to participants at different education level .

Table 8. Means and standard deviations for the intimate friendship of students in primary, secondary and preparatory schools (N=237)

Education level	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Primary	155.32	68	17.717
secondary	162.11	76	19.677
Preparatory	174.31	93	20.670
Total	164.95	237	21.037

Table 8 in p.34 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students in friendship intimacy at different level of education. They scored the mean of 155.32, 162.11 & 174.31 in the primary, secondary and preparatory schools respectively. Thus, the intimacy of students increases as one move from primary to preparatory. The variability in their scores also increases in the same direction.

Table 9. Summary ANOVA for the difference in intimate friendship of primary, secondary and preparatory students(N=237)

	Sum or Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	15067.395	2	7533.698	19.724	.000
Within Groups	89377.997	234	381.957		
Total	104445.392	236			

One way ANOVA was calculated on intimacy score of 68 primary students ($x=155.32$), 76 secondary school students ($x=162$) and 93 preparatory students ($x=174.31$) and significant difference was found, $F(2, 19.724)=0.00$, $P<0.05$. Implying there is significant difference in intimate friendship of primary, secondary and preparatory school students.

Table 10. Post-hoc comparison for the mean difference in the intimate friendship of primary, secondary and preparatory students. (Scheff procedure.)

(I) Education level (J) Education level		Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
		Lower Bound	Lower Bound
Primary	Secondary	-6.782	.118
	Preparatory	-18.988(*)	.000
Secondary	Primary	6.782	.118
	Preparatory	-12.207(*)	.000
Preparatory	Primary	18.988(*)	.000
	Secondary	12.207(*)	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

In table 10 p.35 Post-hoc comparisons (Scheff =0.05) revealed that there were no significant difference between primary and secondary school students, but the mean score of preparatory students was significantly higher than primary and secondary school students in intimate friendship.

Table 11. Means and Standard deviations for Primary, Secondary & Preparatory Students in the eight components of friendship intimacy (N=237)

Education Level	Descriptive statistics	Self-disclosure	Trust & loyalty	Imposition	Exclusiveness	Common activity	attachment	Giving & sharing	Understanding
Primary	Mean	22.04	17.24	15.93	19.29	19.44	22.90	20.07	18.41
	N	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68
	Std. Deviation	4.20	3.399	3.34	3.38	3.38	4.33	3.79	3.15
Secondary	Mean	23.79	18.28	16.49	18.91	20.37	23.42	21.45	19.41
	N	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
	Std. Deviation	4.00	3.57	3.65	3.42	3.21	4.77	3.79	3.81
Preparatory	Mean	25.75	24.43	15.56	20.62	21.99	25.54	23.12	21.30
	N	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	93
	Std. Deviation	3.77	3.29	2.84	3.73	3.69	4.20	3.69	3.98
Total	Mean	24.08	18.43	16.35	19.69	20.74	24.10	21.71	19.86
	N	237	237	237	237	237	237	237	237
	Std. Deviation	4.28	3.51	3.26	3.60	3.52	4.56	3.88	3.88

Table 11 presents the descriptive comparison of primary, secondary and preparatory school students in the eight components of friendship intimacy.

The table shows an increment on the mean scores of on the seven components of friendship intimacy when moving from primary to preparatory .on the other hand the mean score of imposition raise to moderate level and decline then after. In relation to others the variability in attachment and self-disclosure was high.

Table-12. Summary ANOVA for the difference in the components of friendship intimacy among primary, secondary and preparatory students.(N=237)

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Self-Disclosure	Between Groups	548.362	2	274.181	17.096	.000
	Within Groups	3752.811	234	16.038		
	Total	4301.173	236			
Trust and Loyalty	Between Groups	191.873	2	95.936	8.222	.000
	Within Groups	2730.228	234	11.668		
	Total	2922.101	236			
Imposition	Between Groups	17.684	2	8.8842	.827	.438
	With Groups	2500.544	234	10.686		
	Total	2518.228	236			
Exclusiveness	Between Groups	138.214	2	69.107	5.522	.005
	within Group	2928.301	234	12.514		
	Total	3066.515	236			
Common activity	Between Groups	270.342	2	135.171	11.885	.000
	Within Group	2661.438	234	11.374		
	Total	2931.781	236			
Attachment	Between Groups	325.646	2	162.823	8.286	.000
	Within Group	4597.924	234	19.649		
	Total	4923.570	236			
Giving and sharing	Between Groups	371.791	2	185.895	13.614	.000
	Within Groups	3195.121	234	13.654		
	Total	3566.911	236			
Understanding	Between Groups	351.284	2	175.642	12.778	.000
	within Groups	3216.396	234	13.745		
	Total	3567.697	236			

Table 12 in p.37 provides a calculated one-way ANOVA value of the eight components of friendship intimacy at different levels of education. The result of one way ANOVA above revealed that there were statically significant differences in the following components of intimacy friendship among primary, secondary preparatory school students: i.e. Self-disclosure $F(2, 17.096) = 0.000, P < 0.05$, Trust & Loyalty $F(2, 8.22) = 0.000, P < 0.05$, Exclusiveness, $= 0.000, P < 0.05, P < 0.05$, Common activity $(2, 11.885) = 0.000, P < 0.05$, Giving & sharing $F(2, 13.614) = 0.000, P < 0.05$. On the other hand there was no statically difference among these groups on imposition $F(2, 0.827) = 0.438, P > 0.005$. Implying there were difference among primary, secondary and preparatory students all most in all components of friendship intimacy except in imposition.

Table 13. Post-hoc comparison for the mean difference in the components of friendship intimacy (N=237)

Dependent Variable	(I) Education.L		(J)	Mean Difference	Sig.
	Eductionn.L		(I-J)	Lower Bound	
Self-Disclosure	primary	secondary		-1.745(*)	.035
		preparatory		-3.709(*)	.000
	secondary	Primary		1.745(*)	.035
		Preparatory		-1.963(*)	.007
	Preparatory	Primary		3.709(*)	.000
		secondary		1.963(*)	.007
Trust and Loyalty	primary	secondary		-1.041(*)	.191
		preparatory		-2.195(*)	.000
	secondary	Primary		1.041(*)	.191
		Preparatory		-1.154(*)	.094
	Preparatory	Primary		2.195(*)	.000
		secondary		1.154(*)	.094
Exclusiveness	primary	secondary		.386(*)	.808
		preparatory		-1.330	.064
	secondary	Primary		-.386	.808
		Preparatory		-1.716(*)	.008
	Preparatory	Primary		1.330	.064

		secondary	1.716(*)	.008
Common Activity	primary	secondary	-9.27	.260
		preparatory	-2.548(*)	.000
	secondary	Primary	.927	.260
		Preparatory	-1.621(*)	.009
	Preparatory	Primary	2.548(*)	.000
		secondary	1.621(*)	.009
Attachment	primary	secondary	-.524	.778
		preparatory	-2.641(*)	.001
	secondary	Primary	.524	.778
		Preparatory	-2.117(*)	.009
	Preparatory	Primary	2.641(*)	.001
		secondary	2.117(*)	.009
Giving and Sharing	primary	secondary	-1.374	.086
		preparatory	-3.045(*)	.000
	secondary	Primary	1.374	.086
		Preparatory	-1.671(*)	.015
	Preparatory	Primary	3.045(*)	.000
		secondary	1.671	.015
Understanding	primary	secondary	-.996	.276
		preparatory	-2.889(*)	.000
	secondary	Primary	.996	.276
		Preparatory	-1.893(*)	.005
	Preparatory	Primary	2.889(*)	.000
		secondary	1.893(*)	.005

The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

In order to locate the point where the significant F lies a follow up analysis, specifically, scheffe's multiple comparison was employed. Accordingly, significance differences among primary, secondary and preparatory school students were observed in the self-disclosure. Scheff's multiple comparison also suggest that there was not significance difference between primary and secondary school students in Attachment, Trust & Loyalty ,giving & sharing, exclusiveness, common activity and understanding . Significant difference was found only preparatory students with secondary and primary school

students. There was no significant difference among them in their mean score of imposition.

4.4. Sex difference in intimate friendships

To see sex difference in intimate friendship and its components descriptive statistics and t-test used in this part.

Table 14. Means and SD for the intimate friendship of male and female (N=237)

Sex	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Female	166.93	101	22.235
Male	163.48	136	20.058
Total	164.95	237	21.037

As presented in the table 14 the mean score of female in intimate friendship measures 166.93 and male average is 163.48, implying that females had higher over all intimacy than males. However, the scores of the females had high variability than males. The standard deviation of male and female were 20.058 and 22.235 respectively.

Table 15. Sex difference in the intimate friendship (N=237)

Sex	No	mean	Std. deviation	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
M	136	166.93	20.058	1.251	235	.212
F	101	163.48	22.235			

Table 15 shows that there was no significant difference between male and female in intimate friendship.

Table 16. Means and Standard deviations for male and female in the eight components of friendship intimacy (N=237)

Sex		Self-Disclosure	Trust and Loyalty	Imposition	Common activity	Exclusiveness	Attachment	Giving and sharing	Understanding
Female	Mean	23.98	18.64	16.71	19.98	20.95	24.57	21.74	20.35
	No	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101
	Std. Dev	4.939	3.799	3.380	3.566	3.462	4.659	3.714	3.951
Male	Mean	24.12	18.27	16.09	19.48	20.58	23.75	21.68	19.51
	No	136	136	136	136	136	136	136	136
	Std. Dev	3.901	3.301	3.166	3.631	3.575	4.483	4.025	3.816
Total	Mean	24.4	18.43	16.35	16.69	20.74	24.10	21.71	19.86
	No	237	237	237	237	237	237	237	237
	Std. Dev	4.269	3.519	3.267	3.605	3.525	4.568	3.888	3.888

To see if there is a difference in terms of the components of friendship intimacy between male and females, it was compared their mean and standard deviation. Whether this difference is significant or not is to be seen in the forthcoming table. When we see at the face value, the mean of female almost in all components slightly exceeds than male. Females were exceeding male in the following components of friendship intimacy: Trust and Loyalty, Imposition, Exclusiveness, Common activity, Attachment, giving & sharing, and Understanding. Male exceed female only in one component of friendship intimacy i.e. self-disclosure, male scored 24.12 and female 23.98. Comparing to other components of friendship intimacy mean value of female in attachment and understanding was higher than males. The variability of the mean score in the following component was high for the male than females: Common activity, exclusiveness, giving and sharing. On the other hand, female show high variability in the self-disclosure, trust & loyalty, imposition and understanding.

Table 17. T-test for the difference between male and female in the eight components of friendship intimacy (N=237)

Components	Sex	N	mean	std	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
self-Disclosure	M	136	24.12	3.901	.245	235	.807
	F	101	23.98	4.939			
Trust and Loyalty	M	136	18.27	3.301	.803	235	.423
	F	101	18.64	3.799			
Imposition	M	136	16.09	3.166	1.459	235	.146
	F	101	16.71	3.380			
Common activity	M	136	19.48	3.631	1.061	235	.290
	F	101	19.98	3.566			
Exclusiveness	M	136	20.58	3.575	-.061	235	.426
	F	101	20.95	3.462			
Attachment	M	136	24.10	3.575	1.3761	235	.170
	F	101	24.57	4.659			
Giving and sharing	M	136	21.71	4.025	-.115	235	.908
	F	101	21.74	3.714			
Understanding	M	136	19.86	3.888	-1.649	235	.100
	F	101	20.35	3.951			

Based on the information in corporate in the table 16 p.41, attempt was made to see the statically difference in each components of friendship intimacy between male and female. Independent T test was select as an instrument to handle this case thus table 17 shows, statically insignificant difference in the 8 components of friendship intimacy between male and female.

V. Discussion

In this section, implication of the result obtained and the consistency and inconsistency of the result obtained in the past study with present study are discussed in line with the basic question stated earlier. The discussion is made under the following headings.

- Existence of intimate friendship
- Difference in the intimate friendship among primary, secondary school and preparatory students.
- Difference in the components of friendship intimacy among primary, secondary school and preparatory students.
- Sex difference in intimate friendship
- Sex difference in components of friendship intimacy

5. 1. Existence of intimate friendship among participants of the study

Results of one sample t-test summarized in Table 7 p.34 suggest that the Participants of the study had intimacy in their friendship. This result is analogous with the assumption of Erikson (cited in Jones, 1996) that supposes formation of intimate friendship is possible only during late adolescence. However, the result of the present study shows that intimate friendship can be formed started from preadolescence. Accordingly Sullivan (1953) said that the beginning of intimate friendship is preadolescence roughly age 8 to 10, which is congruent with present study. This is also consistent with the findings of (Jones, 1986, Gottman & Mettetal, 1986). As stated in literature review sections of this study, in each of above study, it was found that the possibility of intimacy in preadolescence period and intimacy increase with age.

5.2. Difference in the Intimate Friendship among Primary, Secondary and Preparatory Students.

The present study shows that there were significant difference in the level of intimacy among primary, secondary and preparatory school students. These results are congruent with the result of other. (Gottman & Meteeal, 1986; Laursen, 1996; Steinberg, 2000). The findings by these researchers indicate that intimacy in friendship do increase greatly between childhood & adolescence.

In this study the overall average value on intimate friendship scale increases. This progression shows the general pattern of rising in intimacy. This is reasonable in light of the concurrent cognitive, biological and moral development of this age group. In line with this Steinberg (2000) also indicated the increasing emphasis on intimate in relationship is supported by adolescent's social cognitive capability and the young person's growing independence. As one getting order because of many changes, facilitate the formation of intimate relationships among adolescent.

The post-hoc comparisons revealed that the significance difference lies between preparatory & secondary and between preparatory & primary students. As indicate above the mean value on the friendship intimacy increase as one move form primary to preparatory. Even though, the difference between secondary and primary student is insignificant. The intimacy value of preparatory student significantly higher than both primary & secondary school students.

The finding is consistent with past research result of (Resiman, & Shorr, 1978). In late adolescence intimacy is emphasizes much more than in preadolescence and early adolescence. In line with this Colmen(1974) found that as child getting older changes in description of friends & thinking about friendship. A shift from playing together ,giving each other goods to more abstract such as caring for one another, sharing feeling & thought, and

provide comfort one another .This lead them to the formation of high intimacy in the older children.

5.3. Difference in the Components Friendship Intimacy among Primary, Secondary and Preparatory Students.

The result of the study shows that there is significant difference among primary, secondary and preparatory students in self-disclosure, trust & loyalty, common activity, attachment, exclusiveness, giving & sharing and understanding the several components of intimacy .This would seem to fit with the study Douvan & Adelson (1966) the intensity of intimate friendship become stronger once move from middle childhood to late adolescent, because of the development of components of intimacy. The study revealed that in the seven components of intimacy the mean scores of the students in the preparatory greater than students in secondary and primary school and also the score of students in secondary school better than primary students. In line with this Selman (1989) indicate that the behaviors which lead to intimacy develop through time & age-related shift is brought in the intimate friendship of children & adolescence.

Another possible explanation is that Gottman and Meteeal(1986) suggest that the presence of developmental changes in themes and concern of friendship. Due to this, the intimate behaviors become important to the maintenance and stability of friendship change with the advancement of the age. In line with this Yoniss cited in Robert (1994) suggest that as children move in to adolescence they place greater emphasize on psychological qualities such as trust & loyalty, mutual understanding and self-disclosure.

Post-hoc comparisons conducted for each of component accordingly, there is significant difference observed in self-disclosure among primary, secondary school & preparatory students. The mean score of secondary school students significantly higher than primary students and the mean score of preparatory students is significantly higher than primary and secondary school students. This support the study of Gottman & Meteeal (1986)

suggests that due to the emergent concerns about self-exploration & self-definition lead to considerable self-disclosure during early adolescence. Moreover, Erikson (1968) suggests that due to the establishment of identity, they commit themselves to their friends. This encourages them to be open with each other and disclose what they are really feeling in late adolescence.

Post hoc comparison also shows that preparatory students were significantly higher than primary students in the other six components of intimacy were but there was no significant difference between primary and secondary school students. These changes reflect an increasing ability to coordinate social perspective. Steinberg(2000) also suggest that older children know more intimate information about their friends, in turn this lead to the development of intimate behavior.

ANOVA result have indicate that no significant difference among primary, secondary school and preparatory students in the intimacy component of imposition. It support the study (Jones, 1986) that imposition rise to moderate level, then decline thereafter.

5.4. Sex Difference in Intimate Friendship

The result obtained indicates that there was no significant difference in intimacy of male & female. The result of the present study is, however, in consistent with the findings of (Sharbany, 1981; Berdnt, 1982; Anthony, 1980). Virtually all studies report sex difference intimate friendship male scores lower than females. Buhrmester & Prager (1995), for example, found that the pattern of interaction in female friendship in general develop better intimacy among them than male. Similarly, Anthony (1980) suggested that female's friendships are characterized by high intimacy on the other hand male friendships by low intimacy.

In explaining the difference in intimate friendship between male & female Dovan & Adelson (1966) said that male and female have different development task in adolescence period ,boys are dominated by need of

achievement independence; for girls, develop inter personal skill and love ,which leads to male low intimacy and female to high intimacy respectively. Unlike Dovan and Adelson cited in Shaffer and Ogdence (1986) suggest that the extent of male and female intimate friendship depend on the purpose of the established relationship. The lack of difference in their friendship in this study may be traced to as having similar purpose or developmental task in their culture.

Another possible expiation that can be attached to this may be cultural variation between Ethiopia & the countries where the research conducted. In line with this, it has been suggested by different researchers that cultural factors and natural settings could influence intimate friendship of male and female. Finally they suggest that the role & socialization processes which lead to intimacy are not necessarily inherent in human nature. (Bukowski, 1996).

5.5. Sex Difference in Components of Friendship

Intimacy

The analysis made by sex has indicted that females students are found to posses mean scores in the seven components of friendship intimacy (trust &loyalty, imposition, commonactivity, exclusiveness, attachment, giving &sharing and understanding) higher than males. But the result of the ANOVA has indicated a statistically insignificant difference between male and female in the eight components of friendship intimacy.

This finding contradicts with the study of (Buhrmester & Prager, 1995) which justified that girls were more likely than boy to express their though to a friend and understand the feeling of their friends. The same study reported that female interact more frequently than male did, and the level of emotional support is high in female friendship. In line with this Sharabany (1981) find out that girls were more likely than boy consider that understanding how a friend feel was an important aspect of intimacy .Also

Davison & Doberman(1982)report that females understand their friend more than males.

One way ANOVA result also shows there is no significant difference between male and female in trust and loyalty. In contrast to the study Maccoby (1998)which shows that females are more concerned than male in trust & loyalty .In one study comparing friendship in united state &Russia Sheets & Lugar cited in Britt(2008),it was observed that Russian participant view the ability to “keep confident” as being more critical to maintain friendship than American. It suggests that the former ruling system (communist), has increased the Russian caution. The culture, political system and other can affect the qualities, which are desirable in friendship relation. Moreover, Britt (2008) has suggested that the living condition of an individual matter on the level of trust &loyalty seeking from relationship. Based on this, the possible interpretations of the importance attach to trust & loyalty in friendship of male like female might be the collective nature of the culture in which participants live.

The analysis further reveals insignificant difference between male and female in self-disclosure. The result inconsistent with those researcher who reported that female self-disclosure higher than male (Richey &Richey, 1980: Fehr, 2004).On the other hand, Radmacher & Asmith (2006) contend that self-disclosure increasing become an important path way for intimacy of both boy & girls. The same researches suggest that the pathway for intimacy of male & female is more or less similar. In contrast, the study by Berdnt (1982) indicated that male & female form intimate friendship in a different manner. Boy form based on actions & deeds, where as female through self-discussions, trust & emotional closeness. Nevertheless, in this study male & female score similar on those components of intimacy important in the formation of intimate friendship.

VI. Summary, conclusion and Recommendation

This study was designed to assess the nature and quality of intimate friendship among primary, secondary and preparatory school students. Research into the nature and development of intimacy previously centered on late adolescents and early adulthood, but in this study preadolescent, and early adolescents were also the subject of the study. It was also the intention of the study to find out the existence of intimate friendship, to determine age and sex difference on different means of intimate friendship. Accordingly, the following research questions were raised:

1. Does intimate friendship exist among the sampled participants?
2. Is there significant difference in the in intimate friendship across grade level?
3. Is there significant difference in the components of intimacy among Primary, secondary school and preparatory students?
4. It there significant sex difference in intimate friendship?
5. Is there significant difference between male and female in components of friendship?

In order to answer these questions and to accomplish the objective of the study 68 primary, 76 secondary and 93 preparatory students selected randomly. From this respondent information was gathered using intimate friendship scale. Finally, the data were analyzed with different statistical technique and the following findings were obtained.

- The intimacy mean value of the participants significantly greater than expected mean of intimacy.
- There is significant difference among primary, secondary school and preparatory school students in their intimacy. Post-hoc comparisons analysis indicates a preparatory student had significant difference with

both primary & secondary school students. There was no significant difference between primary& secondary school students

- There was statistical significant difference among primary, secondary & preparatory students in the seven components of intimacy. And there was not significance difference among them in the imposition.
- There was no statistical significant difference between male participants and female participants in intimate friendship.
- There was no statistical significant difference between male and female in the eight component of intimacy.

Conclusions

Based on the result of this study one may tentatively conclude the following.

1. Intimate friendship exists among the participants of the study. Students from primary, secondary and preparatory school experience intimacy in their friendship.
2. As education level increases, the importance of intimate friendship increases. Comparing to the three groups of students, students in the preparatory level were significantly higher than students in the primary and secondary school in their intimacy. Even though the difference between primary & secondary school was insignificant, secondary school students score better than primary school students in their friendship intimacy.
3. With education level, the following components of friendship intimacy become the main organizer of intimate friendship: Self-disclosure, understanding, attachments, exclusiveness, support, sharing activity, and trust & loyalty. Unlike other imposition didn't make difference in their friendship.
4. The finding of the present study indicated that there was no sex difference in intimate friendship. Intimate friendship was equally important for male and female participants.
5. In this study, the pathway male and female pursuing in attaining intimacy in friendship was similar. The friendship intimacy component of self-disclosure, attachment, understanding, exclusiveness, sharing activity, imposition and trust & loyalty were equally important for both male and female in their friendship.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations are forwarded.

- a. Intimate friendship becomes an integral part of students of primary, secondary & preparatory. Thus, it should be encouraged by parents and teachers when it starts emerge by creating environment which is favorable for formation of intimate friendship.
- b. There are multiple factors that can influence the development of intimate friendship and its component. However, the present study has considered only the two variables education level & sex. Future research should consider the effect of other factors which are not considered in this study.

References

- Anthony, M. (1980). **The Development of Children's Friendship**. In Foot Chapman and Smith (Ed), *Friendship and social Relation in Children* (PP.45-60). New York :Wiley.
- Berdnt, T.J. (1974). **The feature and Effect of Friendship in Early adolescence**. London :Academic Press.
- Berndt, T.J. (1982). Feature & Effects of Friendship in early adolescence. **Journal of Child development, 53, 1447-1460.**
- Britt. F. (2008). **Friendship among Women in Addis Ababa**. In Embet Mulugeta (Ed), *Urban poverty in Ethiopia the economic and social Adaptations of Women*. (pp112-162) Addis Abba, Ethiopia: Addis Ababa university press
- Buhrmester, D. (1996). **Need Fulfillment, Interpersonal Competence, and the Developmental Contexts of Early Adolescent Friendship**. *The Company they keep: friendship in childhood adolescence* (pp.195-182). Cambridge, UK. Cambridge university press.
- Bukowski, W.M ,and Lorrie K.S .(1983) .**Friendships & Morality: How are they related?** In W.M Bukowiski, F.A Newcomb. & W.W Hartup (Eds), *they company they keep: friendship in childhood & adolescence* (pp.235-258) Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Pres.
- Buhrrmester, D., & Furnman, W. (1987). *The Development of Companionship and Intimacy*. **Journal of Child development, 58, No. 4,** pp361-398 .[http://www. Jstro.org](http://www.Jstro.org)

- Camarena, P. M., & Petersen, A. C. (1990). Gender-Specific Pathways to Intimacy in Early Adolescence. **Journal of Personal Relationships**, 10, 1. <http://jar.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/21/4/415>.
- Chapman, A.J., and Smith, J. American Psychologies, 45, 513-520. R (1980). **Friendship and Social Relation in children. Network**. In Maccoby, E.E. (1990) Gender & relationships: A development account.
- Chapman, A.J., and Smith, J.R. (1980). **Friends and Social Relations in children**. New York. John Wiley and sons.
- Colmen, J.C. (1974). **Relationship in Adolescence**. London. Routledge and Regan Paul.
- Donvan, E., and Aderson, J. (1966) **The Adolescent Experience**, New York:
- Erikson, E.H. (1968) John Wiley and sons 8). **Identity: youth and Crisis**, New York: W:W Norton
- Fehr, B. (2004) .Intimacy Expectations In Same-sex Friendship: A Preototype interaction-pattern model. **Journal of personality and social psychology**, 86 (2), 265-28. <http://www.jstro.org>. December 3/2008.
- Floyed, K. (1997). **Brotherly love: A development Perspective on Liking, love, and Closeness In The Fraternal dyad**. Journal family psychology, 11, 196-209.
- Foot, C. (1977). Friendship and Social Responsible in Boys and Girls. **Journal of personality and social psychology**, 35-40 - 41).

- Gottman, J.M., & Mettetal, G. (1986). *Speculations about Social and Affective development: Friendship and Acquaintanceships through Adolescence*. In J.M Gottman and Parker (Ed) conversations of friends: speculation on affective development (pp. 1992-240). New York. Cambridge University Press
- Hatfield, E. & Rapson, R. L. (2000). **Love**. In W. E. Craighead & C.B. [.http://books.google.com.et](http://books.google.com.et).
- Hurlock, E.B. (1980). *A life Span Approach (fifth education)*. McGraw-Hill, inc. USA.
- Bukowski, W.M Newcomb, F.A, & Hartup W.W. (1996). *The Company they Keep: friendship in childhood & adolescence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Pres.
- Jones, P. (1986). *The Development of Friendship and Intimacy in Childhood and Adolescence*. University of south California.
- Laursen, B. (1996). *Closeness and Conflict in Adolescence Peer Relationship: Interdependence with Friends and Romantic partner*. In W.M. Bukowski, A. F, New Com, & W. W, Hartup (Eds). *The company they keep; Friendship in childhood and adolescent*. (pp: 1986-2007). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University pres.
- Lawrence, H, & Misty, K (2003). *How close are we? Measuring Intimacy and Examining Gender Differences*. **Journal of Counseling Development**. http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-19477196_ITM
- Leaper, c. (1994). *Exploring the Consequences of Gender Segregations on Social Relationships*. In leaper, c (Ed), *childhood gender segregation: causes and consequences*. New direction for child development (pp67-86). San Francisco: Jossey -Bass.

Maccoby, E.E. (1998). *The two sexes .Growing Apart, Coming together*, Cambridge, MA :Harvard university Press. Retrieved from <http://com/p/articles/mi-m2248/15-130-331-6530649/>

Maccoby, E.E. (1974). *The Psychology of Sex Difference*. Stanford, CA. Stanford University Press.

Mullet, E., & Stolberg, A.L. (2002). Divorce and Its Impact on Intimate Relationships of Young Adults. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 38 (1/2), 39-59. <http://www.kon.org/urc/bruce.html>.

_____. *The Concise Encyclopedia of Psychology and Behavioral Science*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 898-901. <http://74.125.77.132/>

Prager, K.J. (1995). *The Psychology of Intimacy*. New York: Guilford.

Prager, K.J., & Buhrmester, D. (1988). Intimacy and Fulfillment in Couple Relationships. *Journal of social and personal Relationship*, 4, 435-469. <http://spr.sagepub.com/lgi/content/abstract/15/4/435>

Radmacher, K., and Asmith, M. (2006). Are there Gendered Path Ways to Intimacy in Early Adolescents' and emerging adults friendship. *Journal of youth and Adolescence*, 19, 19-32.

Resiman, J.M., & Shorr, S.E. (1978). Friendship Claims and Expectations Among Children and Adults. *Child development*, 49, 13-916

Richey, M.H., and Richey, H.W. (1980). *The Significance of Best Friend Relationship in Adolescence*. *Psychology in school*, 17, 536-540. <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICwebportal/custom/protest/reord>

- Roberts, F. M. (1994). *Essentials of understanding psychology* (second edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rosenblum, L. P. (1997). *Friendship Dyads of Adolescents with Visual Impairment*. University of Arizona. Doctoral dissertation. <http://psycnet.apa.org/index.cfm>.
- Sharbany, R. (1994). Intimate Friendship Scale: Conceptual Underpinnings, Psychometric Properties and Constructive Validity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 11,3,449-469. <http://sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/11/3/449>
- Sharbany, R. (1981). Girl Friend, Boy friend: Age and Sex difference in intimate Friendship. *Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 17, 800-8008.
- Seifert, K., and Hoffnung, R. (1994). *Child and Adolescence Development*. Boston Toronto: Mifflin Company.
- Steinberg, L. (2000). *Psychosocial Development during Adolescence*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Higher Education.
- Steinberg, L. (1989). *Adolescence* (4th edition). New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The Development of Social Knowledge: Morality and convention*. New York: Cambridge University press
- Westen, D. (2002). *Psychology: Mind, Brain, & Culture*. USA: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Appendix A

ከዚህ በታች (ከ1-71) የተዘረዘሩት ዓረፍተ ነገሮች ከ9 እስከ 20 ዓመት ዕድሜ ክልል ላሉ ታዳጊና ወጣቶች የጓደኛ ቁርኝት ለመለካት የተዘጋጁ ናቸው። ይህ ደግሞ በተለያዩ የዕድሜ ክልል ያሉትን ልጆች የጓደኛ ቁርኝትን ለማነፃፀር ይረዳሉ ተብለው የተዘጋጁ ናቸው። ዓረፍተ ነገሮች በጥያቄ መልክ የሚቀርቡት ለልጆች ነው። ይህ ከመሆኑ በፊት ግን የዓረፍተ ነገሮቹ (የጥያቄዎቹ) የመመዘን ብቃት ለመወሰን የእርስዎ አስተያየት አስፈላጊ ስለሆነ፣ እያንዳንዱ ዓረፍተ ነገር በጥምና በማንበብ፣

1. ከሚከተሉት አማራጮች (ግልፅኝነት፣ ቅርብነት፣ አብሮ ጊዜ ማሳለፍ፣ መረዳዳት፣ በሃሳብ መግባባት፣ ታማኝነት፣ ክሌሎች ተለይቶ አብሮ መሆንን እና ጫናን መፍጠር) ውስጥ የትኛውን ለመግለጽ (ለመለካት) ብቁ እንደሆነ ✓/ ምልክት በማሳየት፣ እና
2. ዓረፍተ ነገሩ ግልጽ ካልሆነ «ግልፅ አይደለም» በሚለው ስር የ/×/ ምልክት ያድርጉ።

ሌላ ካለ _____

4.2 ተከራይተህ/ሽ የምትኖሪ ከሆነ ከማን ጋር ነው የተከራየኸው/ሽው

- ከጓደኞቼ
- ከዘመዶቼ
- ከሰፈር ልጆች ጋር
- ብቻዬን

5. የጓደኛ ሁኔታ

5.1 ጓደኛ አለህ/ሽ አዎ አይደለም

5.2 በ5.1 ለተጠየቀው ጥያቄ ምላሽህ/ሽ «አዎ» ከሆነ ከጓደኞችህ/ሽ ውስጥ አንተን/ቺን በጣም የሚቀርብህ/ሽ ጓደኛ አለህ/ሽ

አዎ አይደለም

Appendix B

አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ
«የሳይኮሎጂ» ትምህርት ክፍል
የድኅረ ምረቃ ፕሮግራም

ውድ ተማሪዎች

የዚህ መጠይቅ አላማ በተለያዩ የእድሜ ክልል የሚገኙትን የታዳጊዎችና የወጣቶችን የጓደኛ አመስራረት ለማወቅ የተዘጋጁ ናቸው። ይህን አላማ ለማሳካት በዚህ መጠይቅ ላይ የተካተቱትን የተለያዩ ጥያቄዎች በመመለስ ይተባበሩኝ ዘንድ እጠይቃለሁ።

ለጥያቄዎቹ የምትሰጧቸው ምላሾች እውነት ወይም ሐሰት ሊባሉ የሚችሉ ሳይሆን የእያንዳንዱን ልጅ የግል አስተያየት የሚያንፀባርቅ ስለሆነ የራሴን ግንኙነት ያለመክታል የሚሉትን ብቻ ይመልሱ። ለመጠይቁ የምትሰጡት ምላሽ ለጥናቱ አላማ ብቻ የሚውል ነው። ስለዚህ በእያንዳንዱ ክፍል ውስጥ ያሉትን መመሪያዎችና ጥያቄ በጥሞና በማንበብ የእናንተን ትክክለኛ ምላሽ እንድትሰጡ በትህትና እጠይቃለሁ።

አመሰግናለሁ

ክፍል አንድ: አጠቃላይ መረጃ

መመሪያ አንድ: ከቀረቡት ምርጫዎች ውስጥ የአንተን/አንቺን/ ትክክለኛውን ምላሽ ላይ የ «ቴክ» «✓» ምልክት በተሰጠው ቦታ ላይ አስቀምጥ/ጭ።

ሀ. የግል መረጃ

- 1. ፆታ ወንድ ሴት
- 2. ዕድሜ
- 3. የትምህርት ደረጃ
 - 5 6 9 12

4. የኑሮ ሁኔታ

- 4.1 ከማን ጋር ነው አሁን እየኖርህ/ሽ ያለኸው/ሽው
 - ከቤተሰቦቹ ጋር
 - ተከራይቹ

ክፍል ሁለት

መመሪያ ሁለት

ከዚህ በታች የተዘረዘሩት ዓረፍት ነገሮች በአንተ/ቺ እና የቅርብ ጓደኛህ/ሽ መካከል ያለውን ግንኙነት ለማወቅ ነው። ከተሰጡት አራት አማራጮች ውስጥ የአንተን/ቺን ትክክለኛ ግንኙነት ያሳያል በምትለው/በምትይው አንዱ ላይ አክብብ/ቢ።

4. በጣም እስማማለሁ
3. እስማማለሁ
2. አልስማማም
1. በጣም አልስማማም

ዓ.ነገሮቹ					
1	ለሌሎች የማልነግራቸው የግል ሚስጥራን የምነግረው ለእርሱ/ሷ ነው	1	2	3	4
2	ክርሱ/ሷ ጋር ስለማንኛውም ነገር ሳልፈራና ሳላፍር አወራለሁ	1	2	3	4
3	ክርሱ/ሷ ጋር ያቀያየሁኝ ነገር ቢኖር በግልፅ እነግረዋለሁኝ/ታለሁኝ	1	2	3	4
4	ስለ ወደፊቱ ተስፋዬና እቅዴ ክርሱ/ሷ ጋር አወራለሁ	1	2	3	4
5	ለሌሎች የማልነግራቸው ስራዎቼን ለእርሱ/ሷ ግን ሳልደብቅ እነግረዋለሁ/ታለሁ	1	2	3	4
6	ጠንካራና ደካማ ጎኖቼን ሳልደብቅ እነግረዋለሁ/ታለሁ	1	2	3	4
7	በችግሮቻችን ዙሪያ ሁሌ አንወያይም	1	2	3	4
8	ከእርሱ/ሷ የምደብቀው ምንም ነገር የለም	1	2	3	4
9	ሌሎች ቢያንቋሽሹትም/ሷት እንኳ እኔ ከእርሱ/ሷ አልርቅም	1	2	3	4
10	የሚተማመንበኝ/ የምትተማመንብን ጓደኛው/ዋ ነኝ	1	2	3	4
11	የምነግረውን/ራትን ሚስጥር ለሌሎ እንደሚያወራ/ምታወራ እጠራጠረዋለሁ/ታለሁ	1	2	3	4
12	ከሌሎች ልጅ ስለእርሱ/ሷ አምቸው/ቻት አውቃለሁ	1	2	3	4
13	ሌሎች ልጆች ስለእርሱ/ሷ መጥፎ ነገር ሲያወሩ እሚገትለታሁ/ታለሁ	1	2	3	4
14	እርሱ/ሷ በሌለበት/ችበት ስለ እርሱ/ሷ ጥሩ ጥሩ ነገር ለሌሎች አወራለሁ	1	2	3	4
15	የእርሱ/ሷ ነገሮች የእኔ አንደሆኑ ስለሚሰማኝ የፈለግሁትን አደርጋለሁ	1	2	3	4

16	ብዙ ጊዜ የእኔ ሀሳብ እንዲቀበል/እንድትቀበል አደርገዋለሁ/ታለሁ	1	2	3	4
17	የእርሱ/ሷን እርዳታ ስፈልግ በመጀመሪያ ፍቃደኝነቱን/ቷን	1	2	3	4
18	የፈለኩትን ነገር እንዲያደርግልኝ/እንድታደርግልኝ ብጠይቀው/ብጠይቃት ያደርግላኛል/ታደርግላኛለች	1	2	3	4
19	የእርሱ/ሷ እርዳታ ካስፈለገኝ እንዲያደርግልኝ አስገድደዋለሁ	1	2	3	4
20	ከርሱ/ሷ ጋር ላደርገው ያሰብኩትን ነገር ሳላማክረው/ራት በፍፁም አላደርገም	1	2	3	4
21	ብዙ ጊዜ በኔ ሀሳብ ይመራል/ትመራለች	1	2	3	4
22	በሕይወቴ በጣም ደስ የሚለኝ ሰዓት እኔና እርሱ/እርሷ ብቻችን ስንሆን ነው	1	2	3	4
23	ከርሱ/ሷ ጋር የምሰራቸው ሥራዎች ከሌሎች ጋር ሆኜ ከምሰራቸው ይለያሉ	1	2	3	4
24	ሁለታችን ብቻ ሆነን ስንሰራ ሌሎች መጥተው ሲቀላቀሉ ደስ አይለኝም	1	2	3	4
25	ብዙ ስራዎችን ሲሰራ/ስትሰራ ከእርሱ/ሷ ጋር አልሆንም	1	2	3	4
26	እኔና እርሱ/ሷ ብዙ ጊዜ ሳንለያይ አብረን እንሆናለን	1	2	3	4
27	እኔን ትቶኝ/ትታኝ ከሌሎች ጋር ሲሆን/ስትሆን ቅር አይለኝም	1	2	3	4
28	እኔና እርሱ/ሷ ብቻ የምናደርጋቸው ብዙ ነገሮች አሉ	1	2	3	4
29	ከርሱ/ሷ ጋር አንዳንድ ነገሮችን አብረን እንድንሰራ እጠይቀዋለሁ/ታለሁ	1	2	3	4
30	ብዙ ጊዜ አንዳንድ ነገሮችን አብረን እንድንሰራ እጠይቀዋለሁ/ታለሁ	1	2	3	4
31	ብዙ ጊዜ ከርሱ/ሷ ጋር አብራ የማልሰራቸው ነገሮች አሉ	1	2	3	4
32	ት/ቤት የሚሰጡን ስራዎች አብረን ነው የምንሰራው	1	2	3	4
33	እርሱ/ሷ ባለበት ቦታ እኔ እንደምገኝ እርግጥ ነው።	1	2	3	4
34	ከእርሱ/ሷ ጋር አብረን ብዙ ጊዜ እንጫወታለን	1	2	3	4
35	ሌሎች ልጆች ሊተባበሩት/ሯት የማይችሉት ነገሮች አብራው/ራያት አደርገዋለሁ	1	2	3	4
36	ብንጣላም እንኳ ቶሎ ታርቀን አብረን እንሆናለን	1	2	3	4
37	ከርሱ/ሷ ጋር ቁጭ ብሎ ጊዜ ማሳለፍ ያዝናናኛል	1	2	3	4
38	ትቶኝ/ትታኝ የትም እንዲሄድ/እንድትሄድ አልፈልገም	1	2	3	4
39	ከእርሱ/ሷ ጋር በጣም ቅርብርብነት ይሰማኛል	1	2	3	4
40	እርሱ/ሷን በጣም ልቀርበው አልፈልገም	1	2	3	4
41	እወደዋለሁ/ወዳታለሁ	1	2	3	4
42	እርሱ/ሷ ከእኔ ጋር ባይኖር/ባትኖር ቅር ቅር አይለኝም	1	2	3	4

43	እርሱ/ሷ ከእኔ ጋር ከሌለ/ሌለች ያለበትን ቦታ እፈልጋለሁኝ	1	2	3	4
44	እኔና እርሱ/ሷ ብዙ ነገሮች እንዋዋላለን	1	2	3	4
45	አንዳንድ አርሱ/ሷ የማያቃቃው/የማታቃቃው ስራዎች ጋሉ እንሚሰራ/ትሰራ አሳየዋለሁ/አሳያታለሁ	1	2	3	4
46	አንዳንድ ጥሩ ጥሩ ነገሮች ሳገኝ አካፍለዋለሁ/አካፍላታለሁ	1	2	3	4
47	ብዙ ጊዜ የእኔን እቃዎች እንዲጠቀም/እንድትጠቀም እስጠዋለሁኝ/እሰጣታለሁኝ	1	2	3	4
48	አንዳንድ ጥሩ ጥሩ ነገሮች ሳገኝ አካፍለዋለሁ/አካፍላታለሁ				
49	ብዙ ጊዜ የእኔን እቃዎች እንዲጠቀም/እንድትጠቀም እስጠዋለሁኝ/እሰጣታለሁኝ	1	2	3	4
50	አንዳንድ ነገሮች ከእኔ ከፈለገ በጣም የምፈልጋቸው ነገር ከሆነ እንዲጠቀምበት/እንድትጠቀምበት አልፈቅድለትም/አልፈቅድላትም	1	2	3	4
51	እርሱ/ሷ የተከፋባትን/የተከፋችበትን ነገር አውቃለሁኝ	1	2	3	4
52	እኔ ከሌሎች የተሻለ እገነዘበዋለሁ/እገነዘባታለሁ	1	2	3	4
53	እርሱ/ሷ ለማለት የፈለገውን/የፈለገችውን ነገር ባንዴ እረዳዋለሁ/እረዳታለሁ	1	2	3	4
54	እርሱ/ሷ ሳይነግረኝ/ሳትነግረኝ ስሜቱን/ቷን እረዳታለሁ/እረዳዋለሁ	1	2	3	4
55	ምን አይነት ነገሮችን እንደምትወድ አላውቅም	1	2	3	4
56	የሚወደውን/የምትወደውን ልጅ አውቃለሁ	1	2	3	4
57	ስለእርሱ/ሷ ማወቅ የሚገባኝ ግን የማላውቃቸው ነገሮች አሉኝ።	1	2	3	4

Declaration

I, undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work and that all sources of material used for this thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name Israei Atrif

Signature _____

Place A.A.U

Date of submission _____

I, undersigned, declare that this thesis has been submitted for examination with any approval as a university advisor.

Name Beleny Zepu

Signature _____

Place _____

Date _____