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**Abstract**

To what extent can we predict attachment orientation, well-being and friendship intimacy among adults from their friendship intimacy in adolescence? Is the capacity to be intimate with a close friend in adolescence retained after nearly 40 years? A 37-year follow-up on 107 participants (59 women, 48 men) was conducted. During adolescence, self-reports of intimate friendship quality were measured and, in adulthood, self-reported measures of well-being, attachment orientation, and intimacy were assessed. Results revealed a complex, gender-specific pattern. Men who reported a lower level of attachment to a close friend in adolescence were consistently more avoidant in their close adult relationships. Women who were more intimate with their best friend during adolescence reported enhanced well-being and less negative affect as adults. Our findings shed light on the longitudinal associations of friendship, attachment, and well-being.

**Intimate Friendship During Adolescence: A 37-Year Longitudinal Study on Well-Being, Attachment, and Intimacy**

The ability to maintain intimate friendships is associated with both secure attachment (Fraley et al., 2013) and a greater sense of well-being (Carmichael et al., 2015; Petegem et al., 2018). However, little is known regarding the associations between friendship, attachment, and well-being from a life-span perspective. The present study is a 37-year follow-up study of friendship intimacy, from adolescence to adulthood. We were interested in the joint and unique contributions of adolescent and adult friendship intimacy as it pertained to two central psychological constructs in adulthood: attachment and well-being. We were also interested whether friendship intimacy levels would remain stable throughout the 37 year period. Our analyses considered the role of gender, relationship status and life events across the two time-points.

This research study conceptualized and operationalized friendship intimacy on the basis of Sharabany’s (1994a; 1994b) definition, which draws from linguistic, sociological and psychoanalytic sources. Her friendship intimacy scale (the scale used in this study) is based upon an integrated theoretical framework, which regards intimate friendship as a continuous process in development, and has been used in many studies that have examined intimate friendships across various cultures and stages of development (Chou, 2000; Mikulincer & Florian, 2000; Oliva & Arranz, 2005; Van Petegem et al., 2018; Wiseman, 1997a).

Friendship intimacy consists of eight diverse, coherently organized constructs: (1) frankness and spontaneity, which is a form of self-disclosure about both positive and negative aspects of oneself, as well as honest feedback about deeds; (2) sensitivity and knowing, which describes a sense of empathy or understanding that is not necessarily achieved by talking or actively self-disclosing; (3) attachment, which captures the feeling of attachment to a friend, a feeling of connection and sense of importance of the friend; (4) exclusiveness, which refers to unique characteristics of the friendship and to one’s preference for the friendship over others; (5) giving and sharing, which includes spending time listening to the friend and sharing material goods; (6) imposing and taking, which refers to the degree to which one can receive things from the friend and the extent to which the friend can be imposed upon; (7) common activities, which represents one’s enjoyment of spending time with the friend, one of the basic features of friendship; (8) trust and loyalty, which is the degree to which the friend can be counted on for support, secrecy and loyalty (Sharabany, 1994b).

**Friendship and Attachment**

Friendship has been studied extensively within the context of attachment. Research has demonstrated that differences in attachment styles can account for differences in friendship intimacy levels across various developmental stages, including adolescence (De Goede et al., 2009) and adulthood (Grabill & Kerns, 2000; Mayseless & Scharf, 2007; Welch & Housner, 2010). Adult attachment is a dynamic process, which evolves from very early relationships. It has been shown that adolescent and adult friendships also fulfill specific attachment needs (Nickerson & Nagle, 2005; Fraley & Davis, 1997). Differences in early adulthood attachment styles can be traced back to friendship quality in childhood and adolescence (Fraley et al., 2013). Overall, previous work has established that close and intimate friendships are more likely to occur among securely attached individuals.

Building upon the assumption that there is a considerable degree of stability in attachment style over the life span (Scharfe & Cole, 2006), we expected to find links between attachment and concurrent friendship intimacy in adulthood. Also, due to the stability assumption, we hypothesized that attachment in adulthood would be related to friendship intimacy during adolescence. Life events and relationship status were expected to be mediating variables in the association between adolescent friendship intimacy and adult attachment.

**Friendship and Psychological Well-Being**

Friendship researchers have well established the associations between aspects of friendship quality and psychological well-being across various stages of development, e.g., adjustment during adolescence (Chou, 2000). Friendship quality in adulthood contributes to happiness, even after controlling for gender and personality characteristics (Demir & Weitekamp, 2007). Adolescent girls who reported being in disengaged friendships – friendships that are characterized by low intimacy levels -- had higher levels of depression than girls who reported being in interdependent friendships, which were characterized by higher levels of friendship intimacy (Selfhout et al., 2009). Friendship quality among adolescents, specifically elements of self-disclosure and perceived support, was found to have a positive influence on psychological well-being and a negative influence on victimization (Cuadros & Berger, 2016). Further, a recent longitudinal design demonstrated the contribution of friendship *quantity* in early adulthood to psychosocial outcomes (e.g., depression, loneliness and well-being) when participants were in their fifties; the association was mediated by friendship *quality* in adulthood (Carmichael et al., 2015). Taking previous research into account, we formulated our second hypothesis. We expected to find a positive correlation between friendship intimacy and psychological well-being, both longitudinally and concurrently, when controlling for life events, attachment and relationship status.

**Stability and Change in Friendship Intimacy**

Longitudinal studies have indicated that there is a degree of continuity in friendship quality and intimacy from adolescence to young adulthood. For example, there is evidence that friendship quality in adolescence relates to positive relations with friends, family and spouses in early adulthood (Stein & Newcomb, 1999). Additionally, a recent study has found correlations in the quality of individuals’ friendships from age 19 to 23 (Miething et al., 2016).

Life-span friendship theorists argue that there is diversity in the values, meanings and significance that intimate friendships have across different stages in life (Sherman et al., 2000; Wrzus et al., 2015). According to Berndt (1989), friendship in adolescence consists of common activities, augmented by self-disclosure and expectations of loyalty and trust. Instrumental and emotional support from friends increases steadily throughout adolescence (Asendorpf & Van Aken, 2003; Selfhout et. al, 2009). Research is somewhat less consistent regarding the functions and values of adult friendship. Several studies have demonstrated that, in adulthood, friends come second to romantic partners in providing emotional resources such as disclosure, reassurance, and companionship (Bost et al., 2002; Carbery & Buhrmester, 1998; Eshel et al., 1998). In terms of theory, it is expected that there would be developmental shifts in regard to close relationships, such that the focus would shift from attachment to parents, to peer friendships, and then to romantic partners and spouses (Sharabany, 1994a). Nonetheless, Fehr (1996) argued that friends largely maintain their functions as confidants, attachment figures, and partners for leisure activities in adulthood. In addition to providing validation and emotional closeness, friends provide practical support as well (for example, by helping one move or lending belongings). These functions correspond with the assumed underlying psychological dimensions of friendships: emotional closeness and reciprocity of support (Hartup & Stevens, 1997; Neyer et al., 2011). Considering previous research, we expected to find continuity in the level of friendship intimacy from adolescence to middle adulthood, both generally and specifically in the various dimensions of friendship intimacy.

**Gender and Friendship Intimacy**

Gender differences in friendship intimacy are often addressed in the friendship literature. Gender differences do not emerge in all studies but when they do, both adolescent girls and adult women are found to have greater intimacy in their friendships (for reviews, see Berndt, 1996; Grabill & Kerns, 2000; Jones & Dembo, 1989; Sharabany, Gershoni & Hofman, 1981; Shulman et al., 1997; You & Malley-Morrison, 2000). Another perspective suggests that boys and girls focus on different aspects or tasks of friendship (Rose & Asher, 2017). The friendships of women have been described as “face-to-face” friendships, such that women have more of an affective focus on the other; in contrast, men’s friendships have been described as “side-by-side” friendships, with an emphasis on external activities and tasks (Wright, 1982). The concept of intimate friendship in our current work (based on Sharabany, 1994b) included aspects that were more characteristic of female friendships (e.g., self-disclosure), aspects defined as more “masculine” (e.g., doing activities together), as well as less gender-typed ones (e.g., giving and taking). According to the literature, we expected to find higher levels of friendship intimacy among women than men, across both timepoints (adolescence and middle adulthood).

**Hypotheses**

1. Friendship intimacy in adolescence and adulthood will be positively associated with attachment security in adulthood.
2. Friendship intimacy in adolescence and adulthood will be positively associated with psychological well-being in adulthood.
3. There will be continuity in levels of friendship intimacy across adolescence and adulthood.
4. Friendship intimacy will be higher for women than for men in both adolescence and adulthood.

**Method**

**Participants**

The first wave of the study took place in 1977-1978 and included 259 adolescents from two urban high schools in Haifa, Israel. Participants were ninth and eleventh graders between 14 to 17 years old (*M* = 15.71). The second wave of the study was conducted in 2014, in which 107 (59 women) of the 160 participants who were located (see procedure below) agreed to participate in the follow-up (41.35% of those located). The age range of the adults in the follow-up portion of the study was 51 to 54 (*M* = 52.33). Participants who took part in the follow-up did not differ from those who could not be located in regard to friendship intimacy levels in adolescence [*t*(106) = .32, *ns*].

**Procedure**

In the *first wave*, questionnaires were administrated in the classrooms when teachers were not present. Participants responded to an intimate friendship questionnaire (Sharabany, 1974; 1994b) regarding their best friend. Participants’ privacy was guaranteed. During the *second wave,* participants were located through social networks, the phonebook, internet searches and classmates. Respondents were provided with an overview of the project over the phone. An informed consent form and the questionnaires were sent via e-mail.

**Measures**

***First Wave: Adolescence***

**Friendship Intimacy.** Friendship intimacy was assessed with Sharabany’s Intimacy Scale (SIS; Sharabany, 1974; 1978), which consisted of eight dimensions. Each dimension included four statements that were to be rated on a 6-point Likert scale. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to assess the reliability of the entire scale was (α = .95). Correlations among the eight dimensions (see descriptions below) in the first wave questionnaire ranged from .63 to .79.

***Second Wave: Adulthood***

**Sharabany Intimate Friendship Scale**.A similar questionnaire (Sharabany, 1994b) to that used during the first wave, with very minor adaptations of content, was administered. Cronbach’s alpha for the total measure was .94. Correlations among the eight dimensions ranged from .34 to .76 (the correlation of .34 was found between the trust and loyalty dimension and the exclusiveness dimension).

**Attachment orientation.** The 12-item version of the Experience in Close Relationship Scale (ECR) (Wei et al., 2007) was used to assess attachment. The self-report scale tapped into the two basic dimensions of attachment: anxiety and avoidance (Brennan et al., 1998). Items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale. Scale reliability was assessed with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients (α = .50 for the anxiety scale; α = .65 for the avoidance scale). The reliability of the anxiety scale increased to .63 when the following item was removed, the only item phrased in the negative: “I do not often worry about being abandoned.” The correlation between the two scales was not significant (*r* = .10, *ns*).

**Psychological well-being.** Well-beingwas assessed with the Bradburn Affect Balance Scale (ABS; Bradburn, 1969), a self-report questionnaire that is widely accepted as a measure of well-being (Bradburn, 2015; Helmes et al., 2010). The scale was comprised of 10 items related to recent positive and negative experiences, coded on a 1-4 scale. The scale yielded three scores: Positive Affect (PA; α = .78), Negative Affect (NA; α = .69), and Affect Balance (AB), calculated by subtracting negative from positive affect. PA and NA were not significantly correlated (*r* = -.11, *ns*).

**Life events.** Participants completed the Life Event Questionnaire (LEQ) (Eisikovits et al., 1988), a self-report measure. The questionnaire included various life events for participants to rate as positive or negative, as well as a 4-point scale on which to rate the degree to which each event had an influence on one’s life. In this study we used 28 items, primarily ones that were related to relationships. Participants could add more events if they wanted. Positive and negative events were positively correlated for both women and men [*r*(47)= .29, *p* < .05; *r*(53)= .23, *p* < .05, respectively]. We computed three scores based on this scale: the influence of positive events; the influence of negative events; and a total influence of life events, calculated as the average score of both negative and positive life events. The total influence of all life events will be referred to as “life events” from here on out.

**Demographic** **measures**. Participants reported on their age and relationship status in adulthood: married (*n* = 72), divorced (*n* = 21), in a relationship (*n* = 7), single (*n* = 2), widowed (*n* = 1). Relationship status was condensed into two categories: in a romantic relationship or not in a romantic relationship.

**Results**

**Gender, Life Events and Relationship Status**

The effect of background variables on the dependent variables were tested prior to conducting further analyses. Friendship intimacy in adolescence differed by gender; girls were higher in friendship intimacy than boys [*t*(105)= 5.35, *p* <.01], a finding that partially supported hypothesis 4. Life events, only as the combined format score, correlated positively with adult friendship intimacy among men [*r*(47)= .33, *p* < .05]. Men who reported that they felt that their experienced life events, as a whole, affected their lives to a greater extent, also rated their adult friendships as more intimate. Relationship status correlated positively with negative affect in both men [*r*(47)=.33, *p* < .05] and women [*r*(54)= .41, *p* < .01], and negatively with affect balance among women only [*r*(54)= -.36, *p* <.01]. Participants who were not in a relationship also reported a decreased sense of well-being as compared to those in relationships. In addition, women who were not in a relationship reported higher levels of attachment anxiety [*r*(56)= .30, *p* <.05].

**Friendship Intimacy and Attachment**
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| --- | --- | --- |
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Bivariate correlations between friendship intimacy and attachment dimensions were calculated for men and women separately. The correlations were tested with a one-tailed test of significance due to the hypothesis that higher intimacy level would be positively correlated with attachment security (see Table 1). We found that men’s friendship intimacy correlated negatively with avoidance, and that the correlation was stronger in adulthood. We conducted further analyses, specifically examining correlations between friendship dimensions and attachment dimensions (see Tables 2 and 3).Most of the links between friendship intimacy and attachment were in the expected directions, such that closer friendships correlated negatively with attachment insecurity. However, most of the significant correlations between friendship subscales and avoidance levels were found among men in adolescence (see Table 2) and adulthood (see Table 3). Women reported reduced self-disclosure at higher levels of avoidance, but heightened self-disclosure and feelings of knowing one’s friend at higher levels of anxious attachment in adulthood (see Table 2). The percent of significant correlations between intimacy in adolescence and intimacy in adulthood (out of the 36 correlations that were calculated) was 16% and 25%, respectively; such percentages were higher than chance.

A hierarchical regression analysis with men’s attachment-avoidance as the dependent variable was run. Friendship intimacy during adolescence (four items: I feel close to him/her; I like him/her; When s/he is not around I miss him/her; When s/he is not around I wonder where s/he is and what s/he is doing) and adult attachment were included as predictor variables. Results revealed that both the attachment dimension of adolescent friendship and overall friendship intimacy in adulthood explained 25% of the variance in adult avoidance [*F*(46) = 7.70, *p* <.01] (see Table 4). Our results partially support the first hypothesis that friendship intimacy in adolescence and adulthood will be positively linked to attachment security in adulthood; however, this association was significant only for men.

**Friendship Intimacy and Psychological Well-Being**

In order to examine the specific links between friendship intimacy and well-being, preliminary bivariate correlations were conducted between friendship intimacy variables (adolescent and adult friendship, attachment dimensions, relationship status) and well-being measures (PA, NA, AB) (see Table 5). We performed hierarchical regression analyses with AB (Table 6) and NA (Table 7) as the outcome measure, in an attempt to reveal the unique contributions of friendship intimacy, attachment and relationship status. We did not perform regression analyses for PA because it correlated positively only with adult men’s friendship and negatively with women’s avoidance attachment.

Adult men’s sense of well-being is predicted by avoidance levels [*F*(46)= 10.93, *p* < .01]; avoidance levels explained 17% of the variance in well-being (see Table 6). In terms of adult women’s affective balance, friendship intimacy in adolescence accounted for 13% of the variance [*F*(53)= 9.23, *p* < .01]. The entire set of predictor variables in the regression model explained 40% of the variance in adult women’s affective balance. Avoidance and relationship status accounted for 30% of men’s NA [*F*(46)= 9.56, *p* < .01]. Similarly, relationship status and adolescent friendship quality accounted for 27.4% of women’s NA [*F(*53)= 9.64, *p* < .01].

Results partially supported hypothesis 2 that friendship intimacy in adolescence and adulthood would be linked positively to psychological well-being in adulthood; however, this association only held for women participants. Adolescent friendship intimacy accounted for 13% of the variance in adult affect balance (AB) and 7% of the variance in adult negative affect (NA) among women. Men’s positive affect (PA) and affect balance (AB) was linked directly with friendship intimacy in adulthood. Interestingly, adult friendship did not correlate with any of the women’s affect measures.

**Stability and Change in Friendship Intimacy**

Stability and change in friendship intimacy were preliminary addressed via bivariate correlations between friendship intimacy in adolescence and adulthood. Correlations were not significant for neither men nor women (see Table 8). However, we found a pattern in post-hoc analyses, such that older adolescent girls’ intimate friendship quality were significantly related to adult women’s reports of giving and taking (dimensions 5 and 6) within their close intimate friendships (see appendix).

**Discussion**

This study was a 37-year follow-up on friendship intimacy, from adolescence to adulthood. Intimate friendship in adolescence and adulthood corresponded with attachment dimensions and psychological well-being in adulthood. However, evidence for continuity was found only for some friendship dimensions.

**Friendship Intimacy and Attachment**

The present study demonstrated that even after 37 years of aging and development, adolescent friendship was relevant to attachment in adulthood. Adult men who reported a higher level of avoidance also reported being less attached (in at least one of the eight friendship dimensions) to their best friend during adolescence, and were overall less intimate with their best friend as adults. Correspondingly, nearly one-third of the variance in adult men’s avoidance was accounted for by a lowered sense of closeness and mutuality in friendship during adolescence. This is consistent with a developmental theory, which connects across early attachment, adolescents’ close relationships, and adults’ close relationships (Sharabany, 1994a), as well as empirical research findings (Fraley, 2019; Fraley et al., 2013; Fraley & Davis, 1997; Furman et al., 2002; Nickerson & Nagle, 2005).

Our hypotheses were not specific regarding the two non-secure attachment orientations (avoidant and anxious). Evidently, our study results were in line with past findings on the tendency of avoidant individuals to be less intimate in their relationships. Links between avoidance and lower friendship intimacy have been found in several studies (Bartholomew & Horowitz,1991; Furmann, 2001; Miller & Hoicowitz , 2004). Attachment is an important process and the two insecure styles were shown to interact with gender. The results of the current study were consistent with previous studies, which have indicated that avoidance is related to lower levels of intimate friendship. This pattern was found both in adolescence and adulthood. However anxious attachment revealed less consistent connections with friendship intimacy (see Mayseless & Scharf, 2007). Our interpretation of this inconsistency is that whereas individuals with an avoidant attachment style pursue a path that diminishes closeness with others, those with an anxious style of attachment sometimes lean towards over-intimacy when they self-report about their intimacy levels. This corresponded with the definition of the anxious attachment style, such that those with this style seek greater closeness and intimacy. In this respect, when using self-report measures of anxious attachment style we often cannot distinguish between individuals with anxious attachment and individuals with secure attachment (Mayseless & Scharf, 2007).

In terms of gender, avoidant men reported lower capacity for romantic intimacy and less affective relationships with friends; attachment anxiety did not correlate with these outcomes (Mayseless & Scharf, 2007). It is possible that women’s intimate friendships are more gender-typed than those of men’s, and thus may show a ceiling effect. Therefore, more complex measurements may be required to examine the connection between attachment style and intimate friendship among women. In sum, whereas adult women generally engage in intimate friendships regardless of their attachment orientations, avoidant men tend to be less engaged in intimate friendships than secure men.

**Friendship Intimacy and Well-Being**

We predicted that adolescent and adult friendship intimacy would predict well-being in adulthood. Our results revealed different associations for men and women. Men who reported more positive affect (PA) also reported more intimate friendships as adults. Men’s negative affect (NA) was predicted by avoidance attachment levels and relationship status. Men’s affect balance (AB) was predicted only by attachment avoidance. Women who reported more PA were less avoidant. Women’s NA was predicted by relationship status and friendship in adolescence. Women’s AB was predicted by attachment avoidance, adolescent friendship intimacy and romantic relationship status. Overall, we found support for the hypothesis that adolescent friendships are valuable for psychological well-being in adulthood among women. It may be that women’s higher friendship intimacy in adolescence buffered against negative affect in adulthood and contributed to an overall sense of well-being, even after taking attachment and romantic relationship status into account.

Considering our results, a central question that emerges is: Why were women’s *adolescent* friendships and men’s *adult* friendships differentially tied to well-being? A possible explanation relates to women generally reaching social maturity earlier in life (Colom & Lynn, 2004; Silberman & Snarey, 1993); therefore, their early experiences might be fundamental in terms of adjustment and well-being, which lasts through later stages in development. For men, this phenomenon is much weaker but still evident, supporting a potential maturation explanation.

A central finding in the present study is that avoidance attachment has a significant adverse contribution to overall well-being for both men and women. This result is in line with previous studies (see Stanton et al., 2017 for a review). Our more specific finding is that the mechanism involved in this negative association differs by gender. Men’s avoidance was related to elevated negative affect, while women’s avoidance to reduced positive affect. The literature shows that positive and negative affect play different roles. For example, positive affect has been found to relate to friendship closeness, lower levels of irritation with friends and fewer friendship conflicts, whereas negative affect has not been found to influence these same variables (Berry et al., 2000). Similarly, friendship quality has been shown to contribute to happiness above and beyond personality characteristics, but not conflict (a proxy for negative affect) (Demir & Weitkamp, 2007). In our study, gender played a role in the link between avoidance and type of affect.

**Stability and Change in Friendship Intimacy**

In general, we did not find stability in friendship intimacy between adolescence and adulthood. Post-hoc analyses revealed that adult women who, during late adolescence (11th grade only) were closer and more intimate with their best friend, were also more helpful and reliant on their best friend for help as adults. From this pattern of results, we derived two main conclusions. First, as in the case of friendship and well-being, women in our sample displayed continuity in friendship from adolescence to adulthood. The gender difference found in friendship intimacy continuity might also be due to the advantage girls have with respect to socio-cognitive functioning, as mentioned previously in the context of well-being.

One secondary finding worth mentioning was the preliminary link found between life events (specifically, the degree to which one felt that life events were significant) and friendship intimacy among men. Life events did not correlate with any other dependent variable. It is possible that a greater tendency towards self-disclosure explains this link. Men who openly reported that life events had greatly affected their lives, also reported feeling more intimate and open in their adult friendships.

**Limitations and Conclusions**

Although longitudinal data is valuable and rare, our research included several limitations. The first limitation was that we had data on well-being and attachment only in adulthood. The original study (Sharabany 1974, 1978) was carried out when attachment research was only starting to emerge (Bowlby, 1973). However, part of the original measurement of intimate friendship with one’s best friend in adolescence (Sharabany, 1974) included a dimension of attachment to the friend. We found that adolescents’ attachment to their best friend was correlated with their attachment in adulthood. This association both validates close relationship attachment as a consistent personality trait and establishes its longitudinal consistency across the 37 years. These consistencies are expected based on theoretical considerations such as internal working models (Bowlby, 1973; Lahat et al., 2020; Sharabany, 1994a).

Second, as in any longitudinal design, there may be cohort effects, which may have influenced the results. Furthermore, due to difficulties in locating participants from the first wave of the study (who were over 50 years old by the second wave) and gaining their consent to participate in adulthood, only about half of the original participants took part in the second wave of the study. To evaluate if there were meaningful differences between those who we were able to establish contact with in adulthood and those who we were not, we compared their levels of adolescent friendship intimacy and their background characteristics. We did not find any differences in these measures, lending support to the idea that the two groups did not differ meaningfully.

Third, the measures in our study were all based on self-report. For example, the well-being measure was based on the subjective report of the participants. Fourth, first- and second-wave measurements were collected 37 years apart and we did not have any data in between, which would have allowed us to track participants’ development to a greater extent. The lack of timepoints in between may have weakened our likelihood to find associations that might have existed across other points of development. To account for this limitation, we included a measure of participants’ life events. Regardless of this limitation, it is likely that the findings of the study, which indicate consistency over time, are robust.

In conclusion, this longitudinal study sheds light on the associations among friendship, attachment and well-being over time. Although we were not able to show a simple pattern of overall stability in the capacity for intimate friendship between adolescence and adulthood, our findings supported the notion that attachment security and friendship intimacy share a common path, most likely through individuals’ internal working models (Lahar, 2020; Sharabany, 1994a). By adopting a lifespan perspective, we were able to show that both attachment and friendship intimacy related to one’s sense of well-being in a gender-specific manner. Friendship intimacy in adolescence might be an important precursor to individuals’ overall psychological and social adjustment in midlife.
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**Table 1**

*Pearson Correlations between Friendship Intimacy and Attachment Measures in Adults*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Anxiety | Avoidance |
|  | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Friendship intimacy |  |  |  |  |
| Adolescence | .01 | -.15 | -.20† | .00 |
| Adulthood | -.12 | .07 | -.40\*\* | -.13 |

†*p* < .1. \*\**p* < .01.

**Table 2**

*Pearson Correlations between Friendship Intimacy Subscales in Adolescence and Attachment Subscales in Adulthood*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Adult attachment |  |  |
| Avoidance | Anxiety |  |  |
| Women | Men | Women | Men |  |  |
| -.13 | -.01 | -.07 | .00 | 1. Frankness & Spontaneity
 | Adolescent friendship |
| -.02 | -.09 | -.10 | .14 | 1. Knowing & Feeling
 |
| -.04 | -.28\* | -.06 | .02 | 1. Attachment
 |
| .05 | -.15 | -.14 | -.08 | 1. Exclusivity
 |
| .05 | -.24† | -.17† | -.07 | 1. Giving & Sharing
 |
| .07 | -.25\* | -.15 | .04 | 1. Imposing & Taking
 |
| .00 | -.19† | -.19† | -.07 | 1. Common Activities
 |
| .04 | -.09 | -.12 | -.05 | 1. Trust & Loyalty
 |
| .00 | -.20† | -.15 | .01 | **Total intimacy score** |

†*p* < .1. \**p* < .05.

**Table 3**

 *Pearson Correlations in Adulthood between Friendship Intimacy Subscales and Attachment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Adult attachment |  |  |
| Avoidance | Anxiety |  |  |
| Women | Men | Women | Men |  |  |
| -.25\* | -.37\*\* | .19† | -.12 | 1. Frankness & Spontaneity
 | Adult friendship |
| -.09 | -.32\* | .18† | -.31\* | 1. Knowing & Feeling
 |
| -.09 | -.38\*\* | .04 | -.02 | 1. Attachment
 |
| -.01 | -.41\*\* | .09 | .00 | 1. Exclusivity
 |
| -.11 | -.28\* | .03 | -.01 | 1. Giving & Sharing
 |
| -.13 | -.14 | -.16 | -.15 | 1. Imposing & Taking
 |
| -.07 | -.35\*\* | .09 | -.12 | 1. Common Activities
 |
| -.06 | -.31\* | -.01 | -.10 | 1. Trust & Loyalty
 |
| -.13 | -.40\*\* | .07 | -.12 | **Total intimacy score** |  |

†*p* < .1 \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01.

**Table 4**

*Regression Model Predicting Males’ Avoidance*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Δ*R*2 | *t* | *Β* |
| Adult friendship | .15 | -3.30 | -.43\*\* |
| Adolescence friendship –attachment | .10 | -2.31 | -.30\* |

\**p* < .05. \*\**p* <.01.

**Table 5**

*Pearson**Correlations between Affect and Friendship Intimacy of Adolescents and Adults: Attachment Dimensions and Relationship Status*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Men |  | Women |
|  | AB | PA | NA |  | AB | PA | NA |
| Adolescence friendship | .20 | .07 | -.25† |  | .39\*\* | .20 | -.29\* |
| Adult friendship | .39\*\* | .50\*\* | -.04 |  | .05 | -.01 | -.03 |
| Anxiety | -.35\* | -.14 | .40\*\* |  | -.25† | .00 | .37\*\* |
| Avoidance | -.45\*\* | -.23 | .46\*\* |  | -.43\*\* | -.36\*\* | .26† |
| Relationship status | -.22 | .05 | .41\*\* |  | -.39\*\* | .14 | .45\*\* |

†*p* < .1 \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01.

AB = affect balance; PA = positive affect; NA= negative affect.

**Table 6**

*Regression Models for Affect Balance (AB) among Men and Women*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Δ*R*2 | *t* | *Β* |
| Men |  |  |  |
| Avoidance | .17 | -.30 | -.41\*\* |
| Women |  |  |  |
| Avoidance | .18 | -2.87 | -.32\*\* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Adolescence friendship | .13 | 3.04 | .34\*\* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relationship status | .09 | -2.69 | -.30\* |

\**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01.

**Table 7**

*Regression Models for Negative Affect (NA)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Δ*R*2 | *t* | *Β* |
| Men |  |  |  |
| Avoidance | .18 | 2.95 | .37\*\* |
| Relationship status | .12 | 2.77 | .35\*\* |
| Women |  |  |  |
| Relationship status | .20 | 3.55 | .42\*\* |
| Adolescence friendship | .07 | -2.25 | -.27\* |

*\*p < .*05*. \*\*p < .*01.

**Table 8**

Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations between the Two Waves

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Adolescence | Adulthood |  |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *r*  |
| Male friendship | 4.30 | .59 | 4.51 | .71 | .01 |
| Female friendship | 4.91 | .57 | 4.70 | .68 | .07 |

**Appendix**

**Table A1**

*Adolescent (11th grade) and Adulthood Friendship Intimacy Dimensions among Girls/Women*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Adulthood friendship intimacy |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Friendship intimacy (*n* = 25) | 1 |  |  |  |  | .36† | .39† |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | .36† | .48\* |  |  |
| 3 | .39† |  |  |  | .45\* |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  | .48\* | .58\*\* |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | .42\* | .40\* |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -.34† |
| 7 | .40\* |  |  | .38† | .39† | .54\*\* |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  | .38† | .47\* |  |  |

†*p* < .1 \**p* < .05. *\*\*p* < .01.