

**FRIENDSHIP QUALITY AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS**

Gina C. Malquisto

Amelie S. Sarile

Kent Alvillee B. Rodriguez

Gaudencio G. Abellanosa

Emmalinda A. Garillos

Filjohn M. Jumao-as

Graduate School of Government and Management, University of Southeastern Philippines,  
Philippines**ABSTRACT**

The study was conducted to determine the quality of friendship among college students. A non-experimental quantitative research design was used with 109 college students as respondents. Mean, t-test, and ANOVA was the statistical tool. The findings of the study revealed that friendship quality among college students is high. Moreover, the reflected high level in terms of validation and caring, conflict resolution, help and guidance, and companionship and recreation. However, they manifested moderate levels of conflict and betrayal as well as in intimate exchange. More so, they manifested nonsignificant differences in their level of friendship quality when they are grouped by gender, ethnicity, type of student, and religion.

**Keywords:**

Friendship quality scale, Validation, Caring, Conflict, Betrayal, Help

**INTRODUCTION**

College students, who are in the midst of profound personal and social development, can significantly benefit from cultivating and maintaining friendships of high quality. Having supportive connections at college has been found to improve student's mental health, academic performance, and social integration (Lent et al., 2018). It has also been observed that college students' friendships contribute to the development of the student's sense of self, values, and perspectives on various parts of life (Shanahan et al., 2018). Given the significance of friendship quality, it is essential to investigate the causes and effects of healthy friendship development and maintenance among university students.

Friendship is important because humans are social creatures who benefit much from having those they can lean on, talk to, or count on in times of need. Friends always want what's best for one another and are patient and kind to one another. They rely on one another for comfort and encouragement and don't hold each other to perfection. The cognitive awareness of loneliness has physiological effects on the brain, leading to the unpleasant emotions of melancholy, emptiness, isolation, and a general decline in one's mental health because of a lack of friends and social contact (Marano, 2016).

A strong friendship has few conflicts or rivalries and is marked by high levels of prosocial conduct, intimacy, and other positive characteristics. It has been theorized that a child's self-esteem and level of social adjustment might be influenced directly by the quality of their friendships. However, new studies show that children's social performance among their classmates is mostly influenced by the quality of their friendships. A friend's influence on another's outlook and actions may be amplified or dampened depending on the quality of their friendship. There is some evidence that children who have close, supportive friendships are less likely to model their conduct after that of their shy or withdrawn peers, but there is less evidence to support the idea that such friendships have a disproportionately large impact on their development.

Recent research has provided new insight into the factors that determine college students' quality of friendships. Positive friendship quality among college students has been linked to shared activities, emotional support, and trust (Chan & Cheng, 2019). It has been established that a person's gender, ethnicity, and personality qualities all have a role in their ability to make and keep friends at college (Wang et al., 2019). College administrators, teachers, and mental health experts can better assist students in developing and maintaining healthy friendships by understanding the elements that affect friendship quality.

**OBJECTIVES**

The objective of this study is to determine the friendship quality among college students and to find out the significant difference in their friendship quality in their demographic profile.

**METHODOLOGY**

A quantitative non-experimental research design was utilized in this study. This descriptive comparative method of research was adopted using 109 college students as respondents. Mean, T-Test, and ANOVA were the statistical tools used in the study.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION***Table 1. Level of Friendship Quality*

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
Validation and Caring	.70	4.21	High
Conflict Resolution	.74	4.03	High
Conflict and Betrayal	.93	2.51	Moderate
Help and Guidance:	.81	4.10	High
Companionship and Recreation	.80	4.00	High
Intimate Exchange	1.10	3.21	Moderate
Overall	.44	3.68	High

Table 1 presented in table 1 is friendship quality among college students. And they revealed a high level with a mean rating of 3.68. Moreover, they revealed high levels in terms of validation and caring with a mean rating of 4.21; 4.10 for help and guidance; 4.03 for conflict resolution; 4.00 for companionship and recreation respectively. However, they revealed a moderate level in terms of intimate exchange at 4.21 and conflict and betrayal at 2.51 respectively. This means that college students manifested a high level of friendship quality. A high-quality friendship is distinguished by high levels of prosocial activity, intimacy, and other positive characteristics, as well as low levels of conflicts, rivalry, and other negative characteristics. Friendship quality directly impacts many areas of children's social development, such as self-esteem and social adjustment.

*Table 2. Significant Difference in the Level of Friendship Quality among College Students when they are Grouped by Gender*

Indicator	Male	Female	T-Test	P-Value
Validation and Caring	4.26	4.17	.708	.481
Conflict Resolution	4.11	3.98	.911	.364
Conflict and Betrayal	2.58	2.46	.670	.504
Help and Guidance:	4.13	4.07	.366	.715
Companionship and Recreation	3.89	4.09	1.302	.196
Intimate Exchange	2.97	3.40	2.037	.044
Overall	3.66	3.69	.433	.666

Disclosed in Table 2 is the non-significant in friendship quality when grouped by gender. As reflected in the t-value 0.433 with a p-value of 0.666, greater than the 0.05 significance level. The result is not significant and the acceptance of the null hypothesis implies that male and female college students manifested equal levels of friendship quality.

However, a significant difference in friendship quality was noted in the indicator intimate exchange with a p-value of 0.044 with a level of significance of 0.05. This implies that female college students showed higher intimate exchanges than males.

**Table 3. Significant Difference in the Level of Friendship Quality among College Students when they are Grouped by Ethnicity**

Indicator	IP	NON - IP	T-Test	P-Value
Validation and Caring	3.93	4.34	2.976	.004
Conflict Resolution	3.88	4.12	1.613	.110
Conflict and Betrayal	2.58	2.47	.577	.565
Help and Guidance:	3.94	4.17	1.421	.158
Companionship and Recreation	3.82	4.09	1.686	.095
Intimate Exchange	3.85	2.91	4.498	.000
Overall	3.66	3.68	.208	.836

Disclosed in Table 3 is the nonsignificant in friendship quality when grouped by ethnicity. As reflected in the t-value of .208 with a p-value of 0.896 which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance. The result is not significant and the acceptance of the null hypothesis is. This implies that IP and Non-IP college students manifested equal levels of friendship quality.

However, a significant difference in friendship quality was noted in the indicator validation and caring with a p-value of 0.004 with a level of significance of 0.05. This implies that non-IP college students showed higher validation and caring than IP students.

**Table 4. Significant Difference in the Level of Friendship Quality among College Students when they are Grouped by Type of Student**

Indicator	Fulltime	Working	T-Test	P-Value
Validation and Caring	4.27	4.17	.787	.433
Conflict Resolution	4.10	4.00	.621	.536
Conflict and Betrayal	2.58	2.46	.642	.522
Help and Guidance:	4.15	4.06	.515	.607
Companionship and Recreation	4.12	3.93	1.243	.217
Intimate Exchange	2.80	3.47	3.273	.001
Overall	3.67	3.68	.157	.876

Disclosed in Table 4 is the non-significant in friendship quality when grouped by type of student. As reflected in the t-value of 0.157 with a p-value of 0.876 which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance. The result is not significant and the acceptance of the null hypothesis implies that full-time and working college students manifested equal levels of friendship quality.

However, a significant difference in friendship quality was noted in the indicator intimate exchange with a p-value of 0.001 with a level of significance of 0.05. This implies that full-time college students showed higher intimate exchange than working students.

**Table 5. Significant Difference in the Level of Friendship Quality among College Students when they are Grouped by Religion**

Indicator	Catholic	Protestant	Islam	F-Test	P- Value
Validation and Caring	4.19	4.21	4.50	.273	.761
Conflict Resolution	3.94	4.21	4.67	2.768	.067
Conflict and Betrayal	2.59	2.26	3.33	2.791	.066
Help and Guidance:	4.16	3.92	4.48	1.458	.237
Companionship and Recreation	4.10	3.75	4.53	2.945	.057
Intimate Exchange	3.00	3.66	3.22	4.446	.014
Overall	3.66	3.67	4.12	1.587	.209

Revealed in Table 5 is the nonsignificant difference in the level of friendship quality of college students when they are grouped by religion with an f-value of 1.587 and a p-value of 0.209 greater than the 0.05 significance level. The result is not significant and the acceptance of the null hypothesis is. This implies that catholic, protestant, and Islamic students are equal when it comes to friendship quality.

However, protestants college students manifested higher intimate exchange compared to catholic and Islam students as reflected in the f-value 0.014 which is lesser than the 0.05 level of significance.

#### CONCLUSION

Based on the findings the researchers conclude that the friendship quality among college students is high. Moreover, the reflected high level in terms of validation and caring, conflict resolution, help and guidance, and companionship and recreation. However, they manifested moderate levels of conflict and betrayal as well as in intimate exchange. More so, they manifested nonsignificant differences in their level of friendship quality when they are grouped by gender, ethnicity, type of student, and religion.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Foster, G. (2005) Making friends: A non-experimental analysis of social pair formation. *Human Relations*, 58, 1443-1465.
- [2] Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1999). Friendships and adaptation across the life span. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(3), 76-79
- [3] Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497
- [4] Cohen, S. (2004). Social relationships and health. *American Psychologist*, 59(8), 676-684
- [5] Thoits, P. A. (1995). Stress, coping, and social support processes: Where are we? What next? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 35, 53-79. doi:10.2307/2626957
- [6] Larson, R., Mannell, R., & Zuzanek, J. (1986). Daily well-being of older adults with friends and family. *Psychology and Aging*, 1(2), 117-126. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.1.2.117
- [7] Diener, E., & Seligman, M. E. (2002). Very happy people. *Psychological Science*, 13(1), 81-84. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00415
- [8] MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., Podsakoff, N. P. (2011). Construct measurement and validation procedures in MIS and behavioral research: Integrating new and existing techniques. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(2), 294-334.
- [9] Thien, L. M., Razak, N. A., & Jamil, H. (2012). Friendship Quality Scale: Conceptualization, Development, and Validation. *Australian Association for Research in Education* (NJ1).