

Comparative Study

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

Nishtha^{1*}, Dr. Daisy Sharma²

ABSTRACT

“A friend to all is a friend to none”, by Aristotle is one set quality a friend has. Friendship, like any other relationship plays an important role in a person’s Self esteem, social support and the growth of the people. It is the relationship which enhance happiness (Leibowitz, 2018). This research study aims to understand the relationship between friendship quality and subjective well-being, comparing adolescents (age 12-18) and young adults (age 19-26). Friendship Quality was measured using McGill Friendship Questionnaire – Friend functions was used and for subjective well being, Satisfaction with Life Scale and SPANE was used. The questionnaires were distributed via offline and online mode (n=63). The result showed that there is no significant difference among the adolescents and young adults in their friendship quality and subjective well being but some of the friendship quality components were shown significantly correlated with negative affect component of Subjective well being. Further studies need to be done to understand the relationship better.

Keywords: *Friendship quality, Subjective well-being, Affect, Life satisfaction*

A friend in need is a friend indeed is a famous proverb which means that a friend is someone who can accompany you when you need them. There are multiple such proverbs written on a friend. India is a vast culture filled with friendship stories and fables. One of the famous stories is of Lord Krishna and Sudama. Despite of having gap in their socio-economic conditions, their friendship sets an example to all of us. Friendship comes in various colours and hence there is no one definition of a friend since the experiences differ in this society. Friends form a relationship of autonomy with each other. Friendship is that one relationship where there is freedom of mutual choice. The English word “Friendship” refers to a bond of mutual affection. In contemporary society, friendship can be viewed as important social glue (Pahl, 2000). Friends can be categorised in various categories and levels, ranging from formal to informal, close to distant, and offline to online. The topic of friendship has been a matter of concern for philosophers, novelists, (Leibowitz, 2018) and now even for psychologists (Hojjat & Moyer, 2017). Their expertise knowledge formulate the standards for a friend which are the result of interpersonal anticipations and expectations.

¹Research Scholar, Delhi University, New Delhi

²Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Keshav Mahavidyalaya University, New Delhi

*Corresponding Author

Received: March 21, 2025; Revision Received: June 10, 2025; Accepted: June 14, 2025

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

Friendship standards create a set of ideal expectations that are set up by a friend for another friend, it can be overt or covert. Friendship expectations can be defined as cognitive conceptualizations about attributes individuals would like their friends to possess and behaviors individuals would like their friends to enact (Hall, 2011). The six factors of expectations (i.e., symmetrical reciprocity, agency, enjoyment, instrumental aid, similarity, and communion) constitute the ideal standards of friendship (Hall, 2012). Friendship expectations can be Collectively, these expectations create a standard against which current and new friendships are judged (Fehr, 1996; Hall, Larson, & Watts, 2011). Those friends who meet those standards vouch for the quality of the relationship a person has Friendship quality is the set of standards or characteristics a relationship possess. The features of a High quality friendship include high levels of intimacy, prosocial behaviour and low levels of negative features like conflicts (Berndt, 2002). There are various standardised measures to assess these qualities in friendship e.g. Friendship quality Scale (Bukowski, Hoza, & Boivin, 1994), Cambridge friendship questionnaire (2000), McGill Friendship Questionnaire (Mendelson, & Aboud, 2014).

The scale by Mendelson & Aboud has been taken to assess the friendship quality. According to them, Friendship quality has been based on six friendship functions namely Stimulating Companionship, Help, intimacy, reliable alliance, self validation and emotional security. Stimulating Companionship indicates the things done together which stimulates amusement, enjoyment and excitement. This is one of the qualities where most of the time are spent together doing the things which interests you. Help is another quality which indicates tangible aids provided to the other person, it can be in the form of assistance or guidance (Jones, 1991). Intimacy is signified by the quality of comfortness provided, where the person feels free enough to express themselves in honest ways. This component focuses on the sensitivity and explicit disclosure. Reliable alliance signifies the ability to count on the loyalty and availability of a friend. It refers to the durability of friendship (Selman, 1980). Another component, self validation refers to the perception of someone as providing reassurance, agreement, encouragement so as the person can maintain their self image as that of a worthy person. Emotional security, the sixth or the last component signifies the confidence and comfort provided by the other person during threatening situations. Wright (1991) includes items in a Security subscale to measure perception of the friend as safe and unthreatening since they do not betray trust of the other person or bring attention to their weaknesses. Friendship quality affects social development in adolescence including their self worth, and self validation (Berndt, 2002). The same can be understood for young adults as well. Many empirical studies on friendship quality have consistently showed a positive association between friendship quality and happiness among young adults across cultures (Brannan et al. 2013; Cheng and Furnham 2003; Demir and Weitekamp 2007; Demir et al. 2007, 2011b, 2012, 2013a, 2013c; Lu 1995, 1999). Friendship is a cherished, personal relationship among young adults (Demir, 2015). If we can consider the media, there are multiples shows and songs which narrate the relationship of friendship and their various facets which play important roles in a person life.

Happiness is often associated with well-being. Well being can be defined as the well health of a being which can be categorised as psychological, subjective and social. There have been multiple studies which have already established the relationship between the psychological well being and the friendship quality. Subjective well-being (SWB) is an individual's cognitive and affective evaluation of his or her life, primarily based on three components: life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect (Griffin & Ward, 2016). Life satisfaction

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

refers to the contentment a person has with their life. Affective component of subjective well-being can be understood as the feelings a person has been experiencing over a past few days or weeks. The Greater the positive affect and life satisfaction, and the lower the negative affective component, the greater the subjective well-being will be (Griffin & Ward, 2016).

The subjective well-being can be enhanced with positive relationships and positive connections in the society. And friends play an immense role in providing the social support ageing needs. Being socially connected is important to achieve personal well-being which eliminates the risk of suicide as it is one of the reasons which provides meaning in someone's life (Durkheim, 1951). Friendship support can be categorised in two categories, perceived or received. Perceived support is the support which a person assumes to have and it has been correlated with each component of well-being (high positive affect, low negative affect, high satisfaction with life) among college students in Iran, Jordan, and the United States (Brannan and colleagues, 2012). Received support can be defined as an actual support provided to a person (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Unlike perceived support, the benefits of *received* support have provided conflicting results (Stroebe & Stroebe, 1996).

The standards of friendship have evolved and modified over a period of time. With globalisation, the standards and the constructs have been evolving and getting modified (Pahl, 2000). Friendship expectations are a cultivation of past and present experiences with friends, which create a cycle that further modifies and reinforces individuals' expectations (Elkins & Peterson, 1993; Wiseman, 1986). These expectations have been changing and getting modified over years and its impact on the current scenario is what is aimed to be studied in the current study. However, it should be considered as assumption that with friendship, only few qualities can be studied (Mendelson & Aboud, 2014). The ages where there comes a life decision shift mark the major social developmental changes (Berndt, 2002) and changes in social, psychological, behavioral, educational, occupational, health, ethical, and civic dimensions (Scales, Benson, Oesterle, Hill, Hawkins & Pashak, 2015) in a person's life.

Objectives of the study:

1. The study aims to understand the correlation between the components of friendship quality with the components of subjective well being.
2. Compare the differences between friendship quality and subjective well-being in adolescents (age 12-18) and young adults (age 19-26).

Hypothesis

1. There will be a positive correlation between the components of friendship quality with the components of subjective well being.
2. Friendship quality plays an important role in the subjective well being during the age of adolescents more than during the young adults.

Description of the tests used:

- **Friendship quality was measured using McGill Friendship questionnaire-** friend functions by Morton J. Mendelson and Frances E. Aboud (2012). The author has created two forms – Respondent affection and Friend's functions. For the study, only Friendship functions have been used which identifies six functions to assess friendship quality. The components are stimulating companionship, Help, Intimacy,

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

Reliable alliance, Self-validation and Emotional Security. The scale contains 30 items to assess these six functions. The participant needs to respond thinking of one close friend on a 9 (0-8) point scale ranging from never to always.

- **Subjective well-being has two major components-** life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect (Andrews & Withey, 1976). Life Satisfaction was measured using Satisfaction with life Scale by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, Griffin (1985). It is a 5 item scale which measures cognitive judgments of a person's satisfaction with their life. The participants respond with their agreement or disagreement on a 7 point scale. For the Affective component, SPANE which stands for Scale for positive and negative experience (Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R., 2009) was used. It has 12 items, 6 items to assess positive feelings and six items to assess negative ones. Here, participants need to respond with their feelings on a 5 point scale ranging from very rarely to very often with respect to their experience of those feelings in a span of last 4 weeks. SPANE assess the components in three parts, SPANE-P measures the positive feelings a person had over the past 4 weeks. SPANE-N measures the negative feelings they had since past one month. And the third component, SPANE-B measures the balance between the positive and negative affect score.

METHOD

To understand the variables, a quantitative approach was used. Three scales were taken to understand the relationship between two variables – Friendship Quality and Subjective well-being. For the first variable, McGill Friendship questionnaire – Friendship Functions (Mendelson & Aboud, 2014) was used and to measure Subjective well-being, for cognitive component, Satisfaction with Life scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, Griffin, 1985) and for Affective component, SPANE (Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R., 2009) was used. Forms were given both online and offline. The online form was made using google forms with first section included informing the respondent about the research study and taking their consent. The next sections included these three forms. Total 63 participants filled the form (Adolescents = 33, Adults = 30). The forms were scored and the Correlation coefficient and paired samples t test was conducted. The results are reported using mean, standard deviation, pearson correlation coefficient (r) and paired samples t in a comparative tables in the results section.

RESULTS

The data was collected from both online and offline mode. After scoring the questionnaire according to the scoring manual, the data was analysed using SPSS and the resultant values are shared in this section (after reference page). The table 1 shows the descriptive analysis of the variables. Table 2 represents the correlation analysis of the components of Friendship quality and subjective-well being of both adolescents and young adults altogether (n=63). The table 3 showcases the correlations of both adolescents (n=33) and young adults (n=30) separately. and Table 4 shows the comparison of the variables between the adolescents and the young adults using t-test.

DISCUSSION

The research study aims to understand the relationship between friendship quality and Subjective well being among adolescents and young adults. Friendship quality is the set of standards which informs about the characteristics of a friend. The study hypothesised that there will be a positive correlation between the friendship quality and subjective well being.

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

The other hypothesis was that the young adults will have less correlation in between the variables than as compared to the adolescents probably because during the young adulthood, the vicinity to acquire friends increases. In this study, Friendship quality is assessed using a McGill Friendship Questionnaire-friend's functions where six functions have been measured namely stimulating companionship, help, intimacy, reliable alliance, self-validation and emotional security. Friendship quality could also have indirect effects, by magnifying or diminishing the influence of friends on each other's attitudes and behaviours (Berndt, 2002). Subjective well being was assessed using two scales, for cognitive component, Satisfaction with Life scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, Griffin, 1985) and for Affective component, SPANE (Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R., 2009).

The questionnaires were distributed via both online and offline mode, administering friendship quality first and then the components of subjective well-being. The data was analysed using SPSS dividing the data in two sets, one having adolescents responses (n=33) and the other set of young adults (n=30). The collected results have been included in the results section.

Table 1 represents the mean and standard deviation values of all the components of Friendship quality and Subjective well-being. It can be seen that there are negligible differences in the mean values of friendship quality but taking a look at subjective well-being, it can be noticed that life satisfaction and the balance in positive and negative experiences are more in the adolescents than the young adults. The finding came out to be different than what we assume to be true in the current world. Due to the improvement in the status of relationship, economic, health, less life stressors and living conditions, the well being are considered to be improved as well (Kumar, K.V., 2016). But this study is showing different perspective. Although the difference in mean is not huge and significant (Table 1), more studies need to be done to have a better understanding of the difference between the two ages. Table 3 shows the Pearson coefficient values between the components of friendship quality and Subjective well being among adolescents and young adults. Although, there is no strong correlation between the overall friendship quality and well-being, some of the components show that there have been strong correlations in some of the components which have been discussed further in detail. Table 4 indicates the independent samples t values for the components of Friendship Quality and Subjective well being between adolescents and young adults. The study had hypothesised that there will be the significant difference between the two ages but the data refutes the hypothesis suggesting that there is no significant difference in how an adolescent friendship quality affects/gets affected by their well – being in comparison to the young adults. Table 3 shows that there is a weak correlation between the friendship quality and subjective well being of both adolescents and young adults. But looking at the Table 2, there have been significant correlations found among some of the components of the friendship quality and Subjective well being. Friendship quality component of stimulating companionship is negatively correlated with Negative affect component of SPANE significant for Adolescents (significant at 0.05 level), and young adults (Significant at 0.01 level) which suggests that with the increase in companionship activities which stimulates things like excitement and amusement, there can be a decrease in negative affect like anger and sadness Or vice-versa, since the correlation values doesn't show cause and effect between the two variables. Stimulating companionship appears to be imperative to stress the excitement and fun in common activities (Jones, 1991; Wright, 1991) which can ultimately decrease or are decreased with

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

the experience of negative feelings. Similarly, Help and intimacy component of MFQ-FF are negatively correlated with Spane N, with young adults only (significant at 0.05 level). This indicates that there is a negative relationship between the negative affect and the tangible aids provided including assistance and guidance i.e. with the increase in one, there will be the decrease in the other. According to Jones (1991), Help need not to be reciprocal and hence the decrease in negative experiences can be achieved by increasing the pro social behaviour among friends. Anxious withdrawals might be moderated with peer-valued behaviours like pro social behaviour (Freitas, Santos, Ribeiro, Daniel & Rubin, 2019). With intimacy component, sensitivity with other's need is negatively correlated with negative affect. From table 3, it is evident that Reliable alliance is negatively correlated with Spane N, with young adults only (Significant at 0.01 level). Reliable alliance concerns self-disclosure and the correlation value suggests with the increase in one, there can be decrease in the other one. Selman (1980) talks about the durability of a friend during conflicting situations, if a friend leaves during the threatening situation, it can cause a person to experience negative experiences and will ultimately affect the future relationships (Pahl, 2002). For young adults, Self validation positively correlated with Life Satisfaction, but negatively correlated with SPANE N and SPANE B. Self validation which reassures a person to maintain their perception of worth has a positive relationship with life satisfaction but negatively correlated with the negative affect and balance between positive and negative affect. Self validation is associated with self affirmation (Wright, 1991) and the results can suggest that if the balance between the negative and positive experiences are compromised, then it can affect the self validation or vice-versa. Emotional security component is also negatively correlated with SPANE N (Significant at 0.01 level) for young adults. This suggests that emotional security, which signifies the comfort given by a person during novel situations have an opposite relationship with the negative affect i.e. with the increase in one can cause decrease in the other. An emotionally secure person might get affected by their negative experiences or it might affect the person's security. Since this component refers to the comfort provided during threatening situations, it might undermine the person's negative experiences. India has witnessed many friendships, from its political nature to the stories of sacrifices on friendship. This particular study takes one of the leads to explore the nature of quality a friendship has with respect to the subjective well-being.

Overall, the significant difference has been found only among young adults which suggests that there is a relationship between friends functions and negative affect during the adulthood while not as much effect during adolescence. Table 2 shows many components of both subjective well-being and friendship quality are related significantly with many other components which has been stated as follows. *Positive affect* is correlated with life satisfaction indicating the positive association with each other while negatively correlated with negative affect and balanced effect showing inverse relation. *Negative affect* is significantly correlated negatively with life satisfaction component, stimulating companionship, help, reliable alliance and emotional security while positively correlated with intimacy and balanced effect. The *Balance affect* is negatively correlated with life satisfaction component, stimulating companionship, and reliable alliance while positively correlated with negative affect. The component of *stimulating companionship* is negatively correlated with negative affect, balanced affect and help while positively correlated with intimacy, reliable alliance, self validation and emotional security. *Help* is negatively correlated with negative affect, and stimulating companionship, while positively correlated with intimacy, reliable alliance, self validation and emotional security. *Intimacy* is positively correlated with stimulating companionship. Help, reliable alliance, self validation and

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

emotional security. *Reliable alliance* is positively correlated with intimacy, help, stimulating companionship, self validation and emotional security while negatively correlated with life satisfaction, negative and balanced affect. *Self validation* component is significantly correlated with help, intimacy, reliable alliance, and emotional security. The last component of *emotional security* is also seen positively correlated with help, intimacy, reliable alliance, and stimulating companionship except negative affect, which is negatively correlated. If we draw the overall picture of the variables relationship with each other, it can be highlighted that some components follows an interesting association pathway i.e. with the increase in the help component, stimulation of companionship decreases and vice versa. Stimulation of companionship is the early stage of a relationship where people consciously form bonds by doing favours, hanging together etc. However, the negative association indicates that providing help need not to be one of the stimulating agents of companionship. Since, helping one often can increase dependency and expectations of one person on the other, providing assistance for self efficiency might be found fruitful (Von Bergen, et.al., 2017). Also, with the increase in life satisfaction, reliable alliance decreases and vice versa. Reliable alliance signifies the importance of support when a person is in the dire need of. The same supportive statement as the above, when a person feels self sufficient yet requires a support of a friend, that is what is called as an ideal and healthy relationship. The various studies show complete opposite results on how alliance and life satisfaction are correlated, it needs an in-depth understanding of the same. While intimacy and negative affect follows a linear relationship where with the increase in one, the other one also increases. The possible reason can be that when a person is confiding to the other person, and getting close to them, some insecurities or fear of intimacy (Vangelisti, Anita & Beck, Gary., 2007) can appear concerning the bond and possible future of their relationship which may increase their negative affect of the person. However, attachment theory shifts the focus on individual differences.

Friendship is reaching new levels of depth and complexity in the modern world (Pahl, 2002) and hence the field needs a deeper and wider exploration. This study tries to bring in the perspective of how well being factors can affect the quality of a relationship and vice versa. However, The study limits the understanding of the friendship functions of different levels of friendship a person shares with their friend relationship. The study also fails to understand the gender, economic, social and culture effects on a human being's relationships and their subjective well being which can be studied further using qualitative methods.

Further studies and suggestions:

1. The test, MFQ-FF is conducted considering one friend's perspective in mind which limits the understanding of different bonds a person has with their different friends.
2. The Subjective well being has been correlated with the friends function but there must be more factors for the score of people on the Subjective well being.

CONCLUSION

On exploring, Friendship quality and subjective well-being among adolescents and young adults, it was found out that there are no significant difference in the friendship quality and subjective well being of adolescents and the young adults. However, there have been significant correlations found in some of the components of the Friendship quality and Subjective well being component of negative experiences, majorly in young adulthood.

REFERENCES

- Berndt, T. J. (2002). Friendship Quality and Social Development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11(1), 7–10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00157>
- Brannan, D. & Mohr, C. D. (2022). Love, friendship, and social support. In R. Biswas-Diener & E. Diener (Eds), *Noba textbook series: Psychology*. Champaign, IL: DEF publishers. Retrieved from <http://noba.to/s54tmp7k>
- Demir, M., Clark, H. O., Özdemir, M., & Özdemir, S. B. (2015). *Friendship and happiness across the lifespan and cultures*. Springer dordrecht heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9603-3>
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.
- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (in press). New measures of well-being: Flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*.
- Freitas, M., Santos A. J., Ribeiro O., Daniel J.R. & Rubin K.H. (2019) Prosocial behaviour and friendship quality as moderators of the association between anxious withdrawal and peer experiences in Portuguese young adolescents. *Front. Psychol.* 9:2783. Doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02783
- Griffin, P., & Ward, P. (2016). Happiness and subjective well-being. *Researchgate*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-397045-9.00041-0>
- Hall, J. A. (2012). Friendship standards: The dimensions of ideal expectations. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 29(7), 884–907. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407512448274>
- Hojjat, M., & Moyer, A. (2017). *Psychology of friendship*. Oxford university press.
- Kumar, K. V. (2016). *Control of emotions and well-being in adulthood*. Anveshana's international journal of research in education, literature, psychology and library sciences, ISSN-2456-3897
- Mendelson, M. J. & Aboud, F. (2014). McGill Friendship Questionnaire- Friendship Functions. Measurement Instrument Database for the Social Science. Retrieved from www.midss.ie
- Mendelson, M. J., & Aboud F. E. (1999). Measuring friendship quality in late adolescents and young adults: The McGill Friendship Questionnaires. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 31, 130–132.
- Pahl, R. (2000). *On friendship*. blackwell publishers inc.
- Peter C. Scales, Peter L. Benson, Sabrina Oesterle, Karl G. Hill, J. David Hawkins & Travis J. Pashak (2015): The dimensions of successful young adult development: A conceptual and measurement framework, *Applied Developmental Science*, DOI: 10.1080/10888691.2015.1082429
- Vangelisti, Anita & Beck, Gary. (2007). Intimacy and Fear of Intimacy. 10.1007/0-387-36899-X_20.
- Von Bergen, Clarence & Bressler, Martin & Boatman, Tim. (2017). Helping behaviors can negatively impact long-term well-being: How “skin in the game” more effectively helps others. *Society and Business Review*. 13. 10.1108/SBR-09-2017-0070.

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

How to cite this article: Nishtha & Sharma, D. (2025). Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 13(2), 3475-3487. DIP:18.01.305.20251302, DOI:10.25215/1302.305

FIGURES/TABLES

This section shows the result tables from the study.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the friendship quality and Subjective well being components among adolescents and young adults (n=63)

| VARIABLES | Mean | | Std. Deviation | | Skewness | | Kurtosis | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|--------|
| | Adoloscents | Yo ung Adults | Adoloscents | Yo ung Adults | Adoloscents | Yo ung Adults | Adoloscents | Yo ung Adults | |
| Subje ctive well-being | SWLS | 20.55 | 22.00 | 6.55 | 7.08 | -0.55 | 0.07 | 0.129 | -0.103 |
| | SPANEP | 20.33 | 21.57 | 5.08 | 4.69 | -0.838 | .124 | 0.292 | -0.153 |
| | SPANEN | 18.21 | 17.43 | 5.08 | 6.07 | 0.410 | -0.224 | -0.441 | -0.245 |
| | SPANEB | -2.12 | -4.13 | 9.46 | 9.13 | 0.808 | 0.455 | 0.316 | 0.304 |
| Friend ship quality | STIMULATING COMPANIONS | 7.10 | 7.03 | 0.75 | 1.19 | -0.869 | 0.067 | 0.559 | 8.996 |
| | HELP | 6.86 | 6.82 | 0.90 | 1.16 | -0.363 | 0.124 | -1.254 | 6.116 |
| | INTIMACY | 6.72 | 6.88 | 1.03 | 1.33 | -0.624 | -0.224 | -0.568 | 1.518 |
| | RELIABLEALLIANCE | 7.06 | 7.16 | 0.91 | 1.27 | -0.777 | -0.455 | -0.537 | 6.390 |
| | SELFVALIDATION | 6.72 | 6.77 | 0.89 | 1.45 | -0.327 | -2.589 | -0.620 | 2.043 |
| | EMOTIONALS EURITY | 7.03 | 7.02 | 0.91 | 1.24 | -1.299 | -1.941 | 1.781 | 6.987 |

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

Table 2: Correlation between the components of friendship quality and Subjective well being among adolescents and young adults (n=63)

| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----|
| 1. SWLS | • | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. SPANE P | .507** | - | | | | | | | | |
| 3. SPANE N | - | - | - | | | | | | | |
| | .545** | .577** | | | | | | | | |
| 4. SPANE B | - | - | .902** | - | | | | | | |
| | .593** | .873** | | | | | | | | |
| 5. STIMULATING COMPANIONSHIP | 0.217 | 0.063 | - | - | - | | | | | |
| | | | .443** | .298* | | | | | | |
| 6. HELP | 0.165 | 0.002 | - | - | .770** | - | | | | |
| | | | .281* | 0.169 | | | | | | |
| 7. INTIMACY | 0.064 | - | - | - | .678** | .708** | - | | | |
| | | 0.002 | .290* | 0.172 | | | | | | |
| 8. RELIABLE ALLIANCE | .290* | 0.087 | - | - | .694** | .715** | .650** | - | | |
| | | | .384** | .275* | | | | | | |
| 9. SELF VALIDATION | 0.214 | 0.058 | - | - | .689** | .771** | .773** | .701** | - | |
| | | | 0.229 | 0.167 | | | | | | |
| 10. EMOTIONAL SECURITY | 0.096 | - | - | - | .799** | .781** | .716** | .730** | .800** | - |
| | | 0.062 | .262* | 0.124 | | | | | | |

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 3: Correlation between the components of friendship quality and Subjective well being among adolescents (n=33) and young adults (n=30)

| | SWLS | | SPANEP | | SPANEN | | SPANEB | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------|
| | Adolosc nts | You ng adult s | Adolosc nts | You ng adult s | Adolosc nts | You ng adult s | Adolosc nts | You ng adult s | |
| STIMULATINGCOMPANIONSHIP | | .131 | .280 | .115 | .037 | -.350* | -.510* | -.250 | -.359 |
| HELP | | -.094 | .360 | .020 | -.010 | -.070 | -.437* | -.048 | -.285 |
| INTIMACY | | -.301 | .317 | -.159 | .125 | -.115 | -.409* | .023 | -.337 |
| RELIABLEALLIANCE | | .285 | .289 | .245 | -.055 | -.228 | -.486* | -.254 | -.296 |

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--------|-------|-------|------|------|--------|------|--------|
| SELFVALIDATION | -0.125 | .415* | -.106 | .179 | .087 | -.412* | .104 | -.367* |
| EMOTIONALSECURITY | -.106 | .237 | -.142 | .004 | .054 | -.477* | .105 | -.320 |

** p≤0.01

* p≤0.05

Table 4: Independent samples t-test values for the components of Friendship Quality and Subjective well being between adolescents and young adults

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variance | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------|--|-------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|---------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| SWLS | Equal variances assumed | 0.404 | 0.527 | -1.272 | 61 | 0.208 | -2.09091 | 1.64335 | -5.377 | 1.19518 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.269 | 59.698 | 0.209 | -2.09091 | 1.64741 | -5.38657 | 1.20475 |
| SPANEP | Equal variances assumed | 1.694 | 0.198 | -1.474 | 61 | 0.146 | -1.80606 | 1.22538 | -4.25636 | 0.64424 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.488 | 60.362 | 0.142 | -1.80606 | 1.21369 | -4.2335 | 0.62138 |
| SPANEN | Equal variances assumed | 0.981 | 0.326 | 1.244 | 61 | 0.218 | 1.73333 | 1.39343 | -1.053 | 4.51966 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.257 | 57. | 0.2 | 1.733 | 1.403 | - | 4.54 |

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|------|------|
| | l | | | 35 | 506 | 22 | 33 | 64 | 1.07 | 353 |
| | varia | | | | | | | | 686 | |
| | nces | | | | | | | | | |
| | not | | | | | | | | | |
| | assu | | | | | | | | | |
| | med | | | | | | | | | |
| SPANEB | Equa | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 61 | 0.1 | 3.539 | 2.317 | - | 8.17 |
| | l | 67 | 97 | 27 | | 32 | 39 | 37 | 1.09 | 327 |
| | varia | | | | | | | | 448 | |
| | nces | | | | | | | | | |
| | assu | | | | | | | | | |
| | med | | | | | | | | | |
| | Equa | | | 1.5 | 60. | 0.1 | 3.539 | 2.305 | - | 8.14 |
| | l | | | 35 | 99 | 3 | 39 | 14 | 1.07 | 882 |
| | varia | | | | | | | | 003 | |
| | nces | | | | | | | | | |
| | not | | | | | | | | | |
| | assu | | | | | | | | | |
| | med | | | | | | | | | |
| STIMULATINGCOM | Equa | 1.6 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 61 | 0.0 | 0.464 | 0.240 | - | 0.94 |
| PANIONSHIP | l | 17 | 08 | 28 | | 59 | 24 | 81 | 0.01 | 577 |
| | varia | | | | | | | | 728 | |
| | nces | | | | | | | | | |
| | assu | | | | | | | | | |
| | med | | | | | | | | | |
| | Equa | | | 1.8 | 46. | 0.0 | 0.464 | 0.246 | - | 0.96 |
| | l | | | 83 | 105 | 66 | 24 | 5 | 0.03 | 04 |
| | varia | | | | | | | | 192 | |
| | nces | | | | | | | | | |
| | not | | | | | | | | | |
| | assu | | | | | | | | | |
| | med | | | | | | | | | |
| HELP | Equa | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 61 | 0.0 | 0.504 | 0.253 | - | 1.01 |
| | l | 94 | 6 | 95 | | 51 | 85 | 07 | 0.00 | 089 |
| | varia | | | | | | | | 119 | |
| | nces | | | | | | | | | |
| | assu | | | | | | | | | |
| | med | | | | | | | | | |
| | Equa | | | 1.9 | 50. | 0.0 | 0.504 | 0.257 | - | 1.02 |
| | l | | | 59 | 316 | 56 | 85 | 65 | 0.01 | 228 |
| | varia | | | | | | | | 258 | |
| | nces | | | | | | | | | |
| | not | | | | | | | | | |
| | assu | | | | | | | | | |
| | med | | | | | | | | | |
| INTIMACY | Equa | 4.5 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 61 | 0.0 | 0.630 | 0.286 | 0.05 | 1.20 |
| | l | 96 | 36 | 97 | | 32 | 3 | 93 | 656 | 405 |
| | varia | | | | | | | | | |
| | nces | | | | | | | | | |
| | assu | | | | | | | | | |
| | med | | | | | | | | | |

Friendship Quality and Subjective Well-Being: A Comparative Study on Adolescents and Young Adults

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.1 59 | 50. 922 | 0.0 36 | 0.630 3 | 0.291 89 | 0.04 429 | 1.21 632 |
| RELIABLE ALLIANCE | Equal variances assumed | 3.9 33 | 0.0 52 | 1.7 54 | 61 | 0.0 85 | 0.472 73 | 0.269 59 | - 0.06 634 | 1.01 18 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.7 17 | 47. 724 | 0.0 93 | 0.472 73 | 0.275 39 | - 0.08 107 | 1.02 652 |
| SELFVALIDATION | Equal variances assumed | 3.6 53 | 0.0 61 | 2.4 64 | 61 | 0.0 17 | 0.704 85 | 0.286 04 | 0.13 287 | 1.27 683 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.4 12 | 47. 551 | 0.0 2 | 0.704 85 | 0.292 27 | 0.11 706 | 1.29 263 |
| EMOTIONAL SECURITY | Equal variances assumed | 6.0 46 | 0.0 17 | 3.0 7 | 61 | 0.0 03 | 0.78 | 0.254 05 | 0.27 199 | 1.28 801 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.9 83 | 41. 887 | 0.0 05 | 0.78 | 0.261 49 | 0.25 226 | 1.30 774 |