Yllo, K. (1990, March). *Feminist reformulations: A critique of conjoint treatment for violent couples.* Paper presented at the Harvard Medical School Conference on Abuse and Victimization, Boston, Mass.

Yllo, K., & Bograd, M. (Eds.) (1988). *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse.* Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.

Women's Friendships

Suzanna Rose

Two women, long lost friends, were deeply engrossed in a conversation in a bar when a man walked over and said to one woman, disregarding the friend, "Well, I see you're all alone. Do you mind if I buy you a drink?" Almost every woman who has tried to socialize with a friend in a public setting has experienced a similar situation. Its commonness reflects the widely held view that women's friendships are relatively unimportant and easily relinquished in favor of male companionship. Historically, women have been portrayed as unable to bond with other women; our capacity to commit to each other has been regarded as inferior to both woman-to-man and man-to-man relationships. However, negative views of women's friendships recently have been challenged. New research has revealed a long tradition of female friendships throughout history and established their significance for the modern woman. The supposed superiority of men's friendships has been disputed by evidence showing that women's friendships are deeper and more intimate. The focus in this chapter will be on the large body of work now available that reveals the rich texture of women's friendships; explores their variety across social class, race, sexual orientation, and gender roles; and examines their broader social context and impact.

THE NATURE OF FRIENDSHIP

Friendship has been exalted and celebrated throughout the ages. "No one would choose to live without friends," proclaimed Aris-

totle over two thousand years ago (trans. 1962). In 1792 Mary Wollstonecraft (1967) declared, "Friendship is the most holy bond of society" and "the most sublime of all affections." Friendship has been described as "the most universal and noblest form of communication" (Lepp, 1966), a form of love (Sadler, 1970), and one of the most fundamental human values (Rake, 1970). In some cultures, friendships are considered of such importance to the individual and society that formal rights and responsibilities are associated with them. For instance, among the Bangwa of the Cameroon, a lifelong best friendship often is arranged by parents for their children, much like marriage is (Brain, 1974).

In Western culture, friendships typically are relationships of "voluntary interdependence" (Wright, 1974). Friendship is willingly undertaken, is self-managed, and has as its only motive the preservation and enjoyment of the relationship. The voluntariness of friendship contributes to its attractiveness, but also to its fragility (Wiseman, 1986). A change in the quality or quantity of companionship, belongingness, stimulation, or emotional support provided by the friendship can place it in jeopardy. Unlike kin and work relationships, friendships have no formal bonds to induce the pair to salvage the relationship.

Friendships exist in many forms. Some are emotionally close, committed, and long-term; others are based solely on shared tasks or leisure activities. Generally, best, close, or true friendships are regarded as those that are based on an appreciation of the friend's uniqueness and a sincere wish for the other's well-being. In contrast, superficial friendships are ones established for personal gain or pleasure (Wright, 1974). The distinction between true and superficial friendships parallels one Clark and Mills (1979) have made between communal and exchange relationships. In communal relationships, partners are motivated to fulfill the needs of the other without concern for who gives and who gets. In exchange relationships, whatever is given is expected to be returned.

True friendships have five basic elements, according to Sadler (1970). First, they provide joy. Friends delight in each others' company, they introduce each other to new ideas and activities, and their liking and acceptance give pleasure. Friendships also involve communion. Friends build a common life by playing or working together and talking openly and intimately. Freedom is

the third quality. Friends must be free to enhance their personal development. The friend's loyalty and forgiveness encourage this growth. The fourth element is truth. Truthfulness enables friends to develop a genuinely intimate relationship; both strengths and limitations are revealed and understood. Last, friendships require sacrifice. Responding to a friend in need requires that important plans or activities be set aside. Some friendships will require greater effort and commitment to maintain than others.

A degree of equality between people along key dimensions such as age and social class often is reported as a precondition for friendship. Equality is significant because it is a widely held belief that friendship involves a reciprocal "give and take" (Argyle & Henderson, 1984). Friends also tend to be similar in terms of sex, race, intelligence, and marital status, which may ensure equality as well.

The potential benefits of friendship are numerous. Friendships provide emotional resources, including intimacy, support, acceptance, belongingness, self-esteem, and status. They also offer material resources, such as help with tasks or tangible goods, and cognitive ones, like stimulation, social comparison, and information. They contribute to happiness and life satisfaction and improve one's ability to cope with stress as well. People with friends are less lonely and depressed and more stable than those who have no friends (e.g., Ferraro, Mutran, & Barresi, 1984). As Cicero observed, "A friend multiplies our joys and divides our sorrows."

Friendships are believed to be lasting; the loss of a friend is often painful. To be an ex-friend is a negative role, not a neutral one (Bell, 1981). External forces, such as a move, marriage, or death, can drive friends apart, but friendships ultimately are broken from the inside. Anger, resentment, or disappointment in the friend leading to unresolved conflict or avoidance can spur the demise. However, actively dissolving a friendship is a drastic step. Many people prefer just to let them "drift apart" gracefully (Rose & Serafica, 1986).

WOMEN'S FRIENDSHIPS

Women's friendships began to receive positive attention with the advent of the women's movement in the 1960s. Feminism pro-

moted an ideology of sisterhood that encouraged friendships between women, both to help them identify common forms of oppression and as rewards for their own sake (Seiden & Bart, 1975). Prior to this, historians and anthropologists regarded women as incapable of true friendship, as described earlier, or their relationships as secondary and inferior to male-female bonds. For example, "abnormal" impulses once were attributed to women who regularly sought out one another socially, and "normal" ones to women who preferred the company of men (Taylor & Lasch, 1963).

Current evidence suggests that women's friendships are deep and abiding, in contrast to previous negative portrayals. Diaries and private letters written by women reveal that close emotional ties between women friends have occurred since the sixteenth century (Faderman, 1981). "Dear darling Sarah!" wrote a twenty-nine-year-old woman to her friend in 1864. "You are the joy of my life. . . . I cannot tell you how much happiness you gave me . . . [and] . . . how I long for the time when I shall see you" (Smith-Rosenberg, 1975, p. 4). These passionate romantic friendships were a widely recognized and accepted social institution. Women were expected to seek and form strong bonds with friends, apart from marriage and family. Friendships provided help and companionship, survived marriages and geographic separation, and played a central emotional role in women's lives.

Intimacy in particular is very highly valued in contemporary women's friendships (Reisman, 1990). An ideal woman friend provides a trusting ear for sharing confidences and is accepting, affectionate, and dependable. Ease and comfort with and respect for the friend are of less concern. Actual friendships reflect these ideals. Women's friendships tend to be "face-to-face." They are affectively rich, communal, reciprocal, and empathic (Wright, 1988).

Talking is central to most women's friendships, even if the relationship is oriented around shared activities or work. The conversational content of women's friendship is geared toward disclosure. For instance, Johnson and Aries (1983) found that young women college students discussed family activities and problems, personal problems, doubts and fears, intimate relationships, secrets about the past, sexual concerns, daily life, shared activities, and reminiscences with their friends in depth

and often. Talking also serves to entertain. "A friend, like a storyteller, builds a solid knowledge of the characters, setting the plot by piling detail on detail, adding touches of humor and pathos . . . [and] . . . interpreting along the way" (Gouldner & Strong, 1987, p. 67).

Women tend to seek "all purpose" friends to whom they can relate in many different areas, as opposed to developing different friends to meet different needs (Barth & Kinder, 1988). Young women usually have more friends than women in their forties and fifties, who in turn have more frequent, specialized interactions with fewer friends (Shulman, 1975). However, not every woman has a friend. Anywhere from 7 percent to 57 percent of women report not having a close or best friend at some point in their lives (Ratcliff & Bodgan, 1988; Goodenow & Gaier, 1990).

The characteristics of women's friendship appear to be established in childhood. Girls prefer to have a few close relationships rather than a "gang" of less intimate friends and to enjoy exploring interpersonal issues with them (Sharabany, Gershoni, & Hofman, 1981). Yet difficulties are not unknown to female friendship. Young girls demonstrate a friendship pattern that alternates between intimacy and repudiation (Bardwick, 1979). Close relationships between "best friends" often are broken by a third girl, and the triad reassembles in a different configuration soon after. This pattern may be one basis for mistrust of other females. Adolescent friendships are particularly intense, with girls relying very much on friends for emotional support, but the nature of friendship changes once dating begins. They become more playful, and sometimes, competitive. Relationships with boys may become more significant and ones with girls denigrated.

Establishing a heterosexual relationship often has a negative impact on women's friendships. Women more often than men report that dating or marriage precipitates the loss of a friendship (Rose, 1984; Rose & Serafica, 1986). Among married couples, the typical pattern is for the husband's friends to become the couple's friends (Fischer & Oliker, 1983). This is even the case when both the man and woman work and have no children and when, presumably, both would have equal access to work-based friendships. Several structural factors have been used to explain men's advantage in selecting and maintaining the couple's friends (Fischer & Oliker, 1983). First, women have less income and social

status relative to husbands. Therefore, the men have more privilege to select joint friendships, and the man's work friends are likely to be more important to improving the couple's social status. Second, marriage increases the amount of time women spend doing housework and subsequently decreases the amount of time available for socializing with friends. Third, women usually have primary responsibility for childrearing, which limits friendship interactions and, for full-time homemakers, eliminates the workplace as a context for making friends.

If marriage has a negative impact on women's friendships, does divorce have a positive one? There is some evidence that women's friend networks eventually expand after divorce, although there may be a temporary decrease if the couple's friends originated with the husband and their loyalty is to him, as is often the case. The major reason given for the increase in friendships by both white and Mexican American divorced women in a study by Wagner (1987) was that the ex-husband could no longer prevent them from having a more active social life.

In old age, friendships provide increased social support. The elderly population is largely comprised of women, many of whom do not have a spouse. Consequently, older women often expand their network of women friends and also are likely to begin to include more younger women and relatives as friends (Armstrong & Goldsteen, 1990). Having close friends is particularly important to widows' life satisfaction (Reinhardt & Fisher, 1989).

Throughout life, women's friendships appear to fulfill three major functions, according to Candy, Troll, and Levy (1981), who asked 172 women between the ages of fourteen and eighty to describe up to five best friendships. First, the most valued function for all age groups was intimacy-assistance. The women disclosed their most private or personal feelings to one another and gave or received help, including money, emotional support, and comfort. Second, they supplied status by conveying esteem for the friend or offering prestige. Friends viewed each other as important and encouraged other people to do so too. Power was the third friendship function. Being a friend gave the women the authority to give advice or influence their friends.

Psychological well-being is associated with certain aspects of friendship for women. Affirmation from a same-sex friend was reported by Goodenow (1985) to be the most important function in determining well-being among a large group of white, college-educated women, ages twenty-five to sixty-seven. Women whose friends were emotionally encouraging, treated them as worthwhile, supported their individuality, and enabled them to "be themselves" had higher self-esteem and more integrated identities, were more satisfied with life, and were less depressed than women whose friends were less affirming or who had no friends. Equality in friendship also was related to mental health. Women with friendships in which both women talked about the same amount, made about equal numbers of decisions, and received equal benefits reported more well-being. Lastly, having friendships that were easy to maintain was associated with positive mental health, whereas having friends who were hard to get along with, troublesome, or who "put down" their friends was related to psychological distress. Research on poor and working-class women indicates that the positive benefits of friendship cut across social class lines (e.g., Ferraro, Mutran, & Barresi, 1984).

VARIATION IN WOMEN'S FRIENDSHIP

The pattern of women's friendship described above is by no means universal. What accounts for differences in friendship among women? A comprehensive answer to this question is not available, but some examples will serve to demonstrate the effect various influences such as social class, race, sexual orientation, physical ability, and gender role have on friendship.

The role of social class illustrates how economic resources and class values affect friendship. According to Allan (1977), white working-class friendships tended to be situation-specific, with friends formed in one setting, such as a darts team, being confined to that setting, and rarely planned for outside it. Friends seldom were entertained at home, which was regarded as the exclusive preserve of the family. In contrast, white middle-class friendships were not limited to one sphere of activity. The relationships tended to "flower out" to other activities, including entertaining friends at home, and were often planned for the express purpose of seeing the friend, not for the activity itself. Also, in terms of intimacy, Hacker (1981) reported that women of working-class origins disclosed significantly more to their

women friends than did upper-class women. These patterns might reflect class differences in resources and values: middle-class women have larger, more comfortable homes, have more funds for socializing, and are perhaps more likely to socialize as a couple, thus reducing opportunities for intimacy.

Race also influences friendship. A pattern of regarding friends as part of an extended family network appears to distinguish African Americans from white Americans, at least among the poor, working, and middle class. African American women on welfare were described by Stack (1974) as having set up a unique extended family network that included kin and a number of friends classified as kin. The networks shared resources, childrearing, and households, and enabled the women to survive on an inadequate income. Poor middle-aged and elderly African Americans also were found to seek help from a broad base, including friends and multiple family members, in contrast to whites, who relied on one family member (usually the spouse) almost exclusively (Gibson, 1982). Similarly, McAdoo (1980) reported that middle-class African American women, especially those who were single mothers, counted heavily on friends for financial assistance, emotional support, and child care.

Among young Mexican American women (Chicanas), the reliance on friends versus family followed a different pattern. Chicanas depended more on their families for support at the beginning of their first year of single parenthood, whereas white women focused more on their friends. However, both Chicanas and white women were using their friends more than family for support a year later (Wagner, 1987). These findings point to the need for race and culture to be taken into account more fully when describing friendship.

The case of professional black women demonstrates another way race and class interact to affect friendship. Professional black women operate almost entirely in a white male culture and continually must negotiate the stress of being bicultural, that is, of balancing the conflicting demands of the majority culture and the black community (Bell, 1990). Bonds with other black women help in identifying sources of racism and coping techniques. For instance, in an investigation of seventy-one professional black women, Denton (1990) found that friendships with other black women fulfilled many of the same functions reported earlier, pro-

viding social companionship, support, and instrumental bonding, including help and problem solving. However, in response to the question, "What are you able to do in life because of this friendship?" many women specifically told how the friendship helped them manage bicultural stress. "She helps me manage my feelings better with respect to negative situations at work. With her I can show my anger about whites on my job," replied one (p. 454). Bicultural support is also likely to be a characteristic of friendship for other women of color.

Sexual orientation is another variable affecting friendship about which there is little knowledge. Lesbians, particularly feminists, appear to place a very high value on women's friendship (Raymond, 1986). Friendship may be even more highly valued than romantic relationships, and often the friendship with a lover is regarded as more important than sexual aspects of the relationship (Rose, Zand, & Cini, 1994). This is not surprising, given that lesbians have been socialized similarly to other women. In a study comparing lesbians and heterosexual women, Rosenbluth (1990) found that both groups viewed friendships with women as being facilitated by similar interests, understanding, support, and the ability to deal with feelings. However, lesbians placed more emphasis than heterosexual women on equality and trust as being important to intimacy. Other differences no doubt exist, particularly in terms of how being in a relationship with a woman instead of a man affects women's friendships. Numerous questions remain to be explored.

Physical disability affects women's friendships with nondisabled women in at least three major ways (Fisher & Galler, 1988). First, opportunities to establish friendships often are limited for women with disabilities. Because nondisabled people tend to avoid interactions with the disabled, the disabled woman often must take the initiative when starting a friendship. Second, how reciprocity is to be achieved in the friendship must be negotiated so that both parties think that what they contribute and what they receive are fairly balanced. Typically, the nondisabled friend provides physical help or special accommodations to the disabled friend, who reciprocates by being especially attentive and supportive in the emotional sphere. Third, both the disabled friend and nondisabled friend must be willing to assume responsibility for the relationship. This often means the disabled woman

will have to educate her friend about the disability. In turn, the nondisabled woman has the responsibility to use her knowledge to educate others and act as a liaison between her disabled friend and the rest of the world (Fisher & Galler, 1988).

Lastly, not all women's friendships fit the close, intimate prototype. One aspect of personality that has been shown to have an effect is gender role. Girls and women who have more "feminine" and androgynous personality traits tend to have more intimate friendships, possess more support from other people, and are less lonely than more "masculine" women or women who have few strong feminine or masculine traits (Williams, 1985). Thus, "feminine" expressive traits are more facilitative of friendship than are "masculine" instrumental ones.

These examples demonstrate that variations among women are actually so extensive that they may be more important to understanding any one woman's friendships than the more general pattern described for women earlier. They also suggest that women's friendship patterns overlap with men's considerably, a fact that often is overlooked when gender differences alone are the focus of discussion (Lott, 1990).

FRIENDSHIPS WITH MEN

Developing close cross-sex friendships poses a challenge for most women. Although the rules for establishing same-sex friendships are fairly consistent, even across cultures, the norms for cross-sex friendship are unclear (Argyle & Henderson, 1984). Many adults have no strategy for making friends with the other sex; they either "just happen" or occur "by default" when a romantic relationship fails or a sexual attraction is unreciprocated (Bell, 1981; Rose, 1985). The default pattern may account for the greater occurrence of cross-sex friendships among young single women, most of whom Rose (1985) found were able to identify a man other than a romantic partner as a close friend. Among middle-aged and married women fewer, about 25 percent to 66 percent, reported having a close cross-sex friend (e.g., Rose, 1985). Even fewer elderly women, about 4 percent to 20 percent, have close men friends (Adams, 1985; Babchuk & Anderson, 1989).

Because close cross-sex friendships are much less common than same-sex ones, they are often viewed as deviant, taboo, or

suspect (O'Meara, 1989). No role models for platonic female-male relationships exist. Friendships between women and men depicted in movies and on television invariably end up as romances, as in the movie When Harry Met Sally. The cultural expectation that cross-sex interactions are sexually based places constraints on such interactions, especially for married women. A married woman who may not think twice about spending all day Saturday with a woman friend is likely to not even consider doing so with a man friend. To lessen the threat to the marital partner, cross-sex friendships usually are nested in relationships with other couples. This permits married women to have a larger number of "safe" men friends, but reduces the intimacy and frequency of interactions compared to those of single women (Booth & Hess, 1974).

Women and men appear to view the role of sexual attraction in cross-sex friendship differently. For instance, none of the women interviewed by Rose (1985) mentioned sexual attraction as motivating them to be friends with men, but most believed it was what primarily motivated men. The men proved the women correct. Single and married men alike gave sexual attraction as the most common reason for pursuing a cross-sex friendship. Once a friendship was established, however, sexual attraction was not necessary to maintain it.

Explanations for why women and men differ in their view about sexual attraction are varied. One is that heterosexual men are less able than heterosexual women to differentiate friendly from romantic cues in cross-sex interaction, as Shotland and Craig (1988) found, and so misinterpret friendship overtures from women as indicating sexual interest. Another is that women may tend to separate intimacy from sexuality more than men do. For example, Sapadin (1988) found that women were less likely than men to think that sex deepened friendship. Alternatively, Lipman-Blumen (1976) has proposed that because men have more power, resources, and status than women, women may be perceived as having little to offer in friendship other than sexuality. Lastly, both sexual orientation and gender role have an impact on the role of sexual attraction in friendship. When the other-sex friend is gay or lesbian, "the ubiquitous pressure for sex is absent . . . allowing the friends to relate more freely as individuals divorced of sexual availability" (Phillis & Stein, 1983, p. 222).

Similarly, nonconventional men were found to be more at ease in cross-sex friendships and view them as more appropriate than did traditionally sex-typed men (Bell, 1981).

If established, cross-sex friendships are highly valued for the help, companionship, and insight into the other sex that they provide (Rose, 1985; Sapadin, 1988). The course of such friendships is not always easy, however, particularly for women. Women and men bring different expectations to cross-sex friendships based on their prior experience in same-sex relationships. For instance, as noted earlier, women's friendships tend to focus on intimacy and expressiveness and to be "all purpose." Men's friendships tend to be "side-by-side." Shared activities, tasks, and sports are emphasized, and communication is less personal and generally more superficial (O'Meara, 1989). One likely consequence of these differing expectations is that women's desire for intimacy may go unmet in cross-sex friendships, or at least fall short of what can be attained in same-sex ones.

Indeed, evidence indicates that women experience what Bernard (1976) has called "social deprivation" in friendships with men. Rose (1985) found that women reported receiving less acceptance and intimacy in friendships with men than with women, whereas men received as much from both women and men. Men also often describe cross-sex friendships as being closer than women do and report deriving more therapeutic value from them (Aukett, Ritchie, & Mill, 1988; Buhrke & Fuqua, 1987). Furthermore, women report feeling happy more often in same-sex friendships than cross-sex ones, whereas men are happy more often in friendships with women (Helgeson, Shaver, & Dyer, 1987). Lastly, women describe friendships with men as being more superficial, patronizing, and sexist than men do (Sapadin, 1988).

Self-disclosure patterns are one reason women fare less well in cross-sex friendships. Women are more likely to reveal their weaknesses, and men their strengths (Hacker, 1981). Women talk more to men about feminine aspects of the self, such as how understanding of others they are or how often they express liking for others, than masculine aspects, such as how assertive they are or how strongly they usually defend their own opinions (Snell et al., 1988). The reverse is true for men. These patterns reinforce typical gender-role inequalities between women and men.

Friendship in marriage appears to be more satisfying for women than other cross-sex friendships, but less so than same-sex ones (O'Connor, 1992; Rawlins, 1992). Middle-class couples aspire to "an ideal of best friendship between the spouses" (Oliker, 1989, p. 33), and many couples do view each other as best friends. At their best, marital friendships "build the attachment and affective bond that make couples willing to go through the difficult processes of relationship repair" (Gottman, 1982, p. 119). However, other aspects of marriage contradict the conditions necessary for friendship to flourish (Rawlins, 1992). For example, friendships are voluntary attachments, whereas marriages are legally and often religiously sanctioned bonds. They also are not always relationships of equality. As in other cross-sex friendships, husbands tend to be happier with the friendship than wives and to consider their wives as their best friend and sole confidante (Gerstel, 1988; Oliker, 1989). On the other hand, wives value their friendships with husbands, but also typically have a female friend to whom they feel closer (Gouldner & Strong, 1987).

Despite the problems and inequalities in friendships with men, four benefits have been associated with them (Basow, 1992). Many women report particularly enjoying getting to see how men think and learning their perspectives about women. Second, women sometimes feel more comfortable revealing certain feelings (e.g., love) to men than to women friends. Third, women often like the companionship, activity orientation, and easier, less intense style of interaction of men friends. Fourth, women gain access to men's greater resources and status through friendship. Buhrke and Fuqua (1987) also found that women wanted more contact with men friends, wanted to be closer to them, and wanted more balance in those relationships, perhaps, as the authors concluded, in the hope of making those friendships more satisfying.

Although it appears from the preceding discussion that women and men are vastly different in their approaches to friendship, it is important to point out that they share more similarities than differences (Wright, 1988). This is good news, because as more women enter the workforce, opportunities for friendships will increase. Working women are more likely than homemakers to have men friends other than their spouses; mar-

ried professional women who belong to professional and recreational associations and whose husbands also have professional jobs are almost certain to have men friends (Booth & Hess, 1974).

Women's greater professional roles have not yet changed the gender pattern described above, however. Cross-sex friendships among professionals studied by Sapadin (1988) were reportedly less enjoyable, intimate, and nurturing for women than men. In addition, even though men are more satisfied in cross-sex friendships than women, they are not welcoming to women as friends in the workplace. Lack of access to men's social networks has been identified as a major barrier to women's achievement (Epstein, 1971). Women scientists, professors, and medical students have difficulty finding male colleagues with whom to talk, study, or have lunch (e.g., Long, 1990). Men often exclude women from friendships and informal contexts such as athletic clubs, bars, and poker games where important contacts or decisions are made. Research on professional networks has shown that women's lack of contact with men, particularly higher-ranking ones, is detrimental to their careers (e.g., Rose, 1989). Women also experience social isolation and hostility from men in blue-collar jobs (Palmer & Lee, 1990; Schroedel, 1990). The resistance of this pattern to change points to the need to view friendship in a broader context.

THE WIDER CONTEXT OF FRIENDSHIP

Friendships are so much viewed as private, personal relationships in Western culture that how they are shaped by a wider social context is frequently ignored (O'Connor, 1992). People's general tendency is to focus on variables that lie within the individual, such as personality, in explaining women's and men's friendships. The almost exclusive attention to such person-centered variables overlooks situationally relevant factors external to the individual that also may determine behavior (Riger & Galligan, 1980).

Person-centered explanations of women's friendships suggest that female socialization encourages personality development that predisposes women to be more emotionally expressive, nurturing, and "relational." According to Chodorow's (1974) object-relations theory, identity development in girls follows a different path from that in boys primarily because universally

women are almost exclusively responsible for infant care. The gender similarity between mother and daughter results in the mother identifying more with a girl than with a boy based on body sameness and support from cultural norms. This identification causes the mother to be more empathic to the daughter and to encourage a stronger connection between them. The mother is less likely to view the son as "like her" and also is under social pressure to encourage him to be separate and independent. These early experiences supposedly lead females to desire closeness in relationships with women and males to feel comfortable with distance.

Gilligan's (1982) theory of women's moral development also posits that women are more relational than men. She argues that female morality develops around the themes of caring for and being responsible to others. When faced with a moral dilemma, girls and women lean toward assessing the impact of their actions on others first and on the self second. In contrast, males value individual rights and fairness and are more inclined, when faced with a moral dilemma, to consider first how they will be affected and only secondarily how others will be affected.

In the same vein, "self-in-relation" theory contends that girls' internal mental representation of the self is a more encompassing one than occurs in boys (Jordan et al., 1991). This means that girls and women feel enhanced, satisfied, motivated, and empowered by being close to others and that their self-esteem is based on taking care of relationships.

Peer socialization may play a role in personality as well. According to Maccoby (1990), distinctive interaction styles develop in all-girl and all-boy groups. Female groups develop an *enabling* style that encourages social bonding. Enabling styles are those that acknowledge another's comments, express agreement, support whatever the partner is doing, and keep the interaction going. Male groups develop a *restrictive* style that is used to establish and protect dominance. A restrictive style tends to derail the interaction, such as threatening a partner, contradicting or interrupting, boasting, or topping the partner's story. Children's preference for same-sex play guarantees they will learn and prefer the styles of their group.

Viewed through the person-centered lens, then, women's close intimate friendship pattern can be attributed to a feminine

personality. The core features coincide with gender stereotypes of women as warm, expressive, and talkative. Women's identity develops in the context of a system of relationships of which friendships form a part. The preference for dyadic interaction is based on early childhood experiences with the mother. Because this style of relating has intrapsychic origins, women are unlikely to be able to change them; also, problems in cross-sex friendships will be difficult to surmount.

Although person-centered explanations provide insight into the psychological dynamics of friendship, they are unable to account for numerous situational variables. For instance, Reis, Senchak, and Solomon (1985) found that men were capable of acting as intimately as women in same-sex interactions when the situation made it desirable to do so. These results raise the question of whether the gender differences posited by person-centered approaches are indeed ingrained in identity or are the outcome of other forces. Similarly, class, race, and other variations in friendships are not explained easily by person-centered views.

Situation-centered explanations provide an alternative paradigm for understanding friendship by underscoring structural and cultural forces in the environment that shape behavior. One approach suggests that power and resources are determinants of women's intimate and men's nonintimate style. According to Miller (1987), any dominant group in a society relegates activities it finds undesirable to the subordinate group. Subordinates "must learn to be attuned to the vicissitudes of mood, pleasure, and displeasure of the dominant group" (p. 39). Relationships that fit this pattern include parent-child, white-black, and male-female relationships. The subordinates in all cases are expected to be submissive, obedient, grateful, and nurturing to the dominant group. In terms of women and men specifically, women are expected to cater to men's claims of superiority. They also are responsible for maintaining the emotional bonds of the society. The social importance of this role is largely unrecognized. Consequently, women often look to other women for the nurturance and recognition they are denied as subordinates.

Situational factors such as lack of concrete resources, including time, money, and transportation, also place major constraints on women's friendships (O'Connor, 1992). For instance, among

the seven hundred women studied by Green, Hebron, and Woodward (1990), few had free time for their own leisure activities, especially uninterrupted time. Domestic and family activities were given a higher priority than the women's individual pursuits. Wives continue to shoulder about 70 percent of the housework and child care responsibilities (Berardo, Shehan, & Leslie, 1987), spending about 19.5 hours per week compared to 9.8 hours for men (Pleck, 1985). Single mothers and married women who work for pay have increased opportunities to meet potential friends, but may not be able to pursue them if lunch hours or breaks are used to attend to family or household matters.

Women on the average earn less than men or are financially dependent on them. This affects both how much money they have to socialize with friends and their freedom to make such expenditures a priority. Finally, women are less likely than men to have a driving license or access to a car, particularly if they are poor or working-class (Allan, 1989). Thus, women often do not have the resources to engage in the routine sociability necessary to establish and maintain friendships.

In addition, women have less access to and control of public space than men. Male social control over playgrounds, bars, social clubs, basketball or racquetball courts, and pinball or video arcades effectively prohibits women from mingling with other women. Women unaccompanied by men are subject to stares, silent disapproval, joking or ridicule, sexual harassment, or open hostility (Green, Hebron, & Woodward, 1990). Fear of sexual or physical assault also inhibits many women from utilizing public facilities. As two young women friends explained a decision to cancel their plans to dine at a posh urban restaurant one Saturday night, "We were scared to walk from the parking lot to the restaurant by ourselves."

Public places more welcoming to women also have limitations. Traditional settings such as laundries or churches lack appeal for many women. Shopping malls, often frequented by women, are not designed to facilitate meeting new people. Alternative venues depend on a woman's race or social class. Very few public places other than churches exist for women of color to meet. Working-class women may meet at bingo games; middle-class women have more choices, such as aerobics classes or gyms. However, few of the above are as widely available geographi-

cally, are "drop-in," or are as inexpensive as the public spaces utilized freely by men.

Access to public space is easily available to women only if they accompany men. The necessity of a male escort precludes single women from interacting publicly primarily with other single women. Married women are able to socialize with friends publicly if their husbands are willing to participate. A husband is likely to be motivated to do so the more he likes the friends. As a result, his friendships may dominate the couple's social time. However, separation, divorce, or widowhood may jeopardize these ties. For instance, at many elite country clubs, membership renewal is withheld from women if they divorce or are widowed. Loss of the social setting in which the friendships were formed often causes the relationships to deteriorate. Men who divorce or are widowed retain their memberships, allowing their friendship patterns to continue uninterrupted.

By shifting the focus away from women's personality as a causal factor in friendship, the situation-centered explanations cited above highlight ways in which current social inequities create gender difference. Women's tendency to form dyadic same-sex friendships that emphasize talking is not surprising when viewed from this context. Women look to women to compensate for the intimacy, status, and nurturance lacking in marriage and society. They also turn to women because they are excluded from men's friendship networks. They generally meet in a domestic situation because they have few other places to go. Cars, clubs, bars, and other activities require financial resources, freedom of movement, transportation, and personal safety.

Men's greater access to resources and public space define a different context for their friendships—one in which group social activities occur easily and on a regular basis. Collective friendships rather than dyadic ones develop focusing on specific activities, such as work or sports. The friendships promote a strong group identity that both reflects and maintains male attitudes (Morris, 1985). Ease and comfort with and respect for the friend are more highly valued than expressing feelings or being affectionate. Men's nonintimate friendship style is used to establish their dominance in both same- and cross-sex friendships.

From the standpoint of social change, it is particularly important that situation-centered perspectives be taken into account when explaining friendships. A bias toward person-centered explanations implies that the cause of gender inequality lies within women by suggesting, for example, that women could overcome barriers to cross-sex colleague friendships by learning to adopt men's restrictive style of interaction. Situation-centered ones infer that women are excluded by men, not because they lack the right style, but because they lack power and resources. Thus, remedial efforts should be focused on the environment, not on women.

FRIENDSHIP AND FEMINISM

The feminist ideology of "sisterhood" as having the power to transform the self and society emphasizes the idea of friendship itself as being a force for social change. Friendships between women are believed to result in greater support and intimacy, increased personal power, awareness that "the personal is political," and ultimately, political activism (Strommen, 1977). In turn, feminism was thought to deepen friendship (Seiden & Bart, 1975). To date, friendship between women has helped create a social movement, but not to the extent originally hoped. This is because, depending on the social context, friendship can either be a repressive or liberating force.

One way friendship can repress women is by reinforcing gender status. O'Connor (1992) has pointed out that women's friendships may shore up unsatisfactory marriages by fulfilling the women's unmet intimacy needs and by diffusing anger and disappointment with the marriage. Oliker (1989) found that married women's friendships promoted marital stability by generating empathy for a woman's husband, using humor to defuse situations, reminding the woman of her financial dependence on her husband, and reinforcing her sensitivity to her children's needs for family stability. Ratcliff and Bogdan (1988) found that many friends were unsupportive when married women lost their jobs because they were opposed to the women working in the first place.

Friendships can reinforce the primacy of marriage and male dominance in violent relationships as well. Although many battered women do not have friends or do not tell them about the abuse, those who do confide in friends often receive limited or no

help (Dobash & Dobash, 1980). The friends' offers of assistance depend on their beliefs about the sanctity of marriage and their access to resources, such as a spare room or money.

The bridal shower has been used to illustrate how gender status is reinforced by female friendship and social rituals (Cheal, 1989). The focus on the bride in marriage reflects the societal belief that marriage is more important to women than to men, wives' social and financial status generally being determined by the husband. The redistribution of resources that occurs at a shower through gift-giving enables friends to help the bride achieve a certain standard of living, similar to how resources were shared among the African American community observed by Stack (1974). However, "the female solidarity that women achieve within these networks produces a female consciousness, rather than a feminist consciousness" (Cheal, 1989, p. 9). The domestic gifts received confirm the legitimacy of the traditional gender arrangement with the woman as food server, domestic servant, and caregiver.

Women's gender status also is reinforced by the overvaluation of intimacy as a defining feature of women's friendship, according to Cancian (1986). First, disclosure of weakness—fears and disappointments—usually is interpreted as a sign of intimacy, not disclosure of victories and achievements. Thus, in friendships women emphasize their vulnerabilities rather than their skills, their helplessness rather than their power. Second, high expectations for intimacy may create tensions in relationships. The demands for "getting as well as giving" are sometimes emotionally and materially draining and burdensome (Rawlins, 1992). Women's tendency to get "up close and personal" also makes their friendships more fragile. By confronting strains in the relationship instead of ignoring them as men do, women more often risk severing the friendship (Rawlins, 1992). Lastly, the expectation that women's friendships be entirely supportive creates tension when negative emotions, such as anger, envy, and competition, are experienced.

Class and status homophily also inhibits women's friendships (O'Connor, 1992). Upper- and middle-class women may "look down" on lower-class women. Their class solidarity can be maintained by rejecting friendships with lower-class women or viewing their friendship overtures as "social climbing." Lower-

class women, in turn, may view women of higher social standing as being snobbish or lacking in sensitivity about the constraints imposed by a less affluent lifestyle. Thus, class tensions have an adverse impact on women's ability to bond across class lines. Surprisingly, class barriers to friendship have received little attention, perhaps because friendship has been idealized as being a self-sacrificing relationship, not a self-serving one.

Status homophily in friendship helps reproduce class divisions in the workplace. Higher-ranking women often are advised not to develop close personal ties with lower-ranking women and, if promoted from the lower ranks, to break off old friendships and confine their affiliations to those of a similar rank. This advice effectively denies women in male-dominated occupations a support network, given that high-status men are unlikely to generously open their ranks to women.

Race divisions similarly impede sisterhood. Tensions between black and white women have been documented by See (1989), who investigated black women's responses to the feminist movement. Black women perceived white women to be insensitive to the discrimination black women and men had experienced and viewed white feminists as advancing an agenda that primarily would benefit white middle-class women. In the business world, black women also saw white women who had been promoted as unwilling to examine how their race privilege had benefited them professionally over black women who were not promoted. See's research suggests that although black and white women share similar burdens, unresolved antagonisms concerning race make friendships between them unlikely.

Women are also divided by sexual orientation. Heterosexual women acquire a number of privileges due to their willingness to mate with men that lesbians do not have, including respectability, spousal benefits, and job security. Those privileges could be jeopardized by friendships with lesbians; hence, heterosexual women may prefer to avoid them. Conversely, lesbians may reject heterosexual women for failing to renounce their privilege.

Friendships constitute a liberating force in women's lives, then, only under certain conditions. Friendships create a "moral universe," or social climate, which may either impede or promote growth (Gullestad, 1984). In order for friendships to effect change, that climate must promote gender and other forms of equality.

At their best, this is what feminist friendships do. Heterosexual and lesbian feminists surveyed by Rose and Roades (1987) claimed that feminism resulted in closer friendships, greater valuation of and loyalty toward women friends, and increased self-respect. Feminist friendships provided a support group and substitute kinship system that sustained feminist values.

The extent to which a social movement can be based on friendship or sisterhood has just begun to be explored. Friendship has been institutionalized in women's political groups, business networks, and professional caucuses with some success. On the other hand, as has been demonstrated, friendships are not uniformly positive. They may, indeed, affirm or heal, but they also may be a source of conflict, anxiety, or emotional pain. Moreover, the shape this deeply personal and private relationship takes is profoundly affected by structural forces maintaining gender, race, class, or other social divisions.

Thus, friendship is a prime example of how "the personal is political." As O'Connor (1992) pointed out, "Friendship is a personal relationship, but its importance transcends the purely personal: something which has only begun to be appreciated" (p. 193). Understanding it reveals key issues in women's lives.

REFERENCES

Adams, R. G. (1985). People would talk: Normative barriers to cross-sex friendships for elderly women. *The Gerontologist, 25,* 605-611.

Allan, G. (1977). Class variation in friendship patterns. *British Journal of Sociology, 28,* 389-393.

Allan, G. A. (1989). *Friendship: Developing a sociological perspective.* London: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.

Argyle, M., & Henderson, M. (1984). The rules of friendship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 1,* 211-237.

Aristotle. (Trans. 1962). *The Nicomachean ethics.* Book VIII, 214-273. Trans. Martin Oswald. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Armstrong, M. J., & Goldsteen, K. S. (1990). Friendship support patterns of older American women. *Journal of Aging Studies, 4,* 391-404.

Aukett, R., Ritchie, J., & Mill, K. (1988). Gender differences in friendship patterns. *Sex Roles, 19,* 57-66.

Babchuk, N., & Anderson, T. B. (1989). Older widows and married women: Their intimates and confidants. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 28,* 21-35.

Bardwick, J. (1979). *In transition.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Barth, R. J., & Kinder, B. N. (1988). A theoretical analysis of sex differences in same-sex friendships. *Sex Roles, 19,* 349-363.

Basow, S. (1992). *Gender: Stereotypes and roles.* 3rd ed. Pacific Grove, Calif.: Brooks/Cole.

Bell, E. (1990). The bicultural life experience of career-oriented black women. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11,* 459-477.

Bell, R. (1981). *Worlds of friendship.* Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Berardo, D. H., Shehan, C. L., & Leslie, G. R. (1987). A residue of tradition: Jobs, careers, and spouses' time in housework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49,* 381-390.

Bernard, J. (1976). Homosociality and female depression. *Journal of Social Issues, 32,* 213-238.

Booth, A., & Hess, E. (1974). Cross-sex friendship. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 36,* 38-74.

Brain, R. (1974). *Friends and lovers.* New York: Basic Books.

Buhrke, R. A., & Fuqua, D. R. (1987). Sex differences in same- and cross-sex supportive relationships. *Sex Roles, 17,* 339-352.

Cancian, F. M. (1986). The feminization of love. *Signs, 11,* 692-709.

Candy, S. G., Troll, L. E., & Levy, S. G. (1981). A developmental exploration of friendship functions in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5,* 456-472.

Cheal, D. J. (1989). Women together: Bridal showers and gender membership. In B. J. Risman & P. Schwartz (Eds.), *Gender in intimate relationships* (pp. 87-93). Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth.

Chodorow, N. (1974). *The reproduction of mothering.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clark, M., & Mills, J. (1979). Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37,* 12-24.

Denton, T. C. (1990). Bonding and supportive relationships among black professional women: Rituals of restoration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11,* 447-457.

Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. (1980). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy.* London: Open Books.

Epstein, C. F. (1971). *Women's place.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Faderman, L. (1981). *Surpassing the love of men.* New York: William Morrow.

Ferraro, K. F., Mutran, E., & Barresi, C. M. (1984). Widowhood, health, and friendship support in later life. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 25,* 245-259.

Fisher, B., & Galler, R. (1988). Friendship and fairness: How disability affects friendship between women. In M. Fine & A. Asch (Eds.), *Women with disabilities* (pp. 172-194). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fischer, C. S., & Oliker, S. J. (1983). A research note on friendship, gender and the life cycle. *Social Forces, 62,* 124-133.

Gerstel, N. (1988). Divorce and kin ties: The importance of gender. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50,* 209-219.

Gibson, R. C. (1982). Blacks at middle and late life: Resources and coping. *Annals of the American Academy, 464,* 79-90.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Goodenow, C. (1985, August). *Women's friendships and their association with psychological well-being.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, Calif.

Goodenow, C., & Gaier, E. L. (1990, August). *Best friends: The close reciprocal friendships of married and unmarried women.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Gottman, J. M. (1982). Emotional responsivenes in marital conversations. *Journal of Communication, 32,* 108-120.

Gouldner, H., & Strong, M. S. (1987). *Speaking of friendship: Middle class women and their friends.* New York: Greenwood.

Green, E., Hebron, S., & Woodward, D. (1990). *Women's leisure, what leisure?* London: Macmillan.

Gullestad, M. (1984). *Kitchen table society.* Oslo, Norway: Universitets forlaget.

Hacker, H. M. (1981). Blabbermouths and clams: Sex differences in self-disclosure in same-sex and cross-sex friendship dyads. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5,* 385-401.

Helgeson, V. S., Shaver, P., & Dyer, M. (1987). Prototypes of intimacy and distance in same-sex and opposite-sex relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4,* 195-233.

Johnson, F. L., & Aries, E. J. (1983). Conversational patterns among same-sex pairs of late-adolescent close friends. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 142,* 225-238.

Jordan, J. V., Kaplan, A. G., Miller, J. B., Stiver, I. P., & Surrey, J. L. (1991). *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center.* New York: Guilford.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (1976). Toward a homosocial theory of sex roles: An explanation of the sex segregation of social institutions. In M. M. Blaxall & B. Reagan (Eds.), *Women and the workplace* (pp. 15-32). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Lepp, I. (1966). *The ways of friendship.* Trans. Bernard Murchland. New York: Macmillan.

Long, J. S. (1990). The origins of sex differences in science. *Social Forces, 68,* 1297-1315.

Lott, B. (1990). Dual natures or learned behavior: The challenge to feminist psychology. In R. T. Hare-Mustin & J. Maracek (Eds.), *Making a difference: Psychology and the construction of gender* (pp. 65-101). New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

McAdoo, H. P. (1980). Black mothers and the extended family support network. In L. Rodgers-Rose, (Ed.), *The black woman* (pp. 125-144). Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Maccoby, E. (1990). Gender and relationships. *American Psychologist, 45,* 513-520.

Miller, J. B. (1987). *Toward a new psychology of women* (2nd ed.). Boston: Beacon.

Morris, L. (1985). Local social networks and domestic organizations: A study of redundant steelworkers and their wives. *Sociological Review, 33,* 327-341.

O'Connor, P. (1992). *Friendships between women: A Review.* New York: Guildford.

Oliker, S. J. (1989). *Best friends and marriage: Exchange among women.* Berkeley: University of California.

O'Meara, J. D. (1989). Cross-sex friendship: Four basic challenges of an ignored relationship. *Sex Roles, 21,* 525-543.

Palmer, H. T., & Lee, J. A. (1990). Female workers' acceptance in traditionally male-dominated blue collar jobs. *Sex Roles, 22,* 607-625.

Phillis, D. E., & Stein, P. J. (1983). Sink or swing? The lifestyles of single adults. In E. R. Allgeier & N. B. McCormick (Eds.), *Changing Boundaries* (pp. 202-225). Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield.

Pleck, J. H. (1985). *Working wives, working husbands.* Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Rake, J. M., Sr. (1970). Friendship: A fundamental description of its subjective dimension. *Humanitas, 6,* 161-176.

Ratcliff, K. S., & Bogdan, J. (1988). Unemployed women: When social support is not supportive. *Social Problems, 35,* 54-63.

Rawlins, W. K. (1992). *Friendship matters: Communication, dialectics, and the life course.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Raymond, J. (1986). *A passion for friends.* London: The Women's Press.

Reinhardt, J. P., & Fisher, C. B. (1989). Kinship versus friendship: Social adaptation in married and widowed elderly women. In *Women in the Later Years* (pp. 191-211). New York: Haworth.

Reis, H. T., Senchak, M., & Solomon, B. (1985). Sex differences in the intimacy of social interaction: Further examination of potential expla-

nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5,* 1204-1217.

Reisman, J. M. (1990). Intimacy in same-sex friendships. *Sex Roles, 23,* 65-82.

Riger, S., & Galligan, P. (1980). Women in management: An exploration of competing paradigms. *American Psychologist, 35,* 902-910.

Rose, S. (1984). How friendships end: Patterns among young adults. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 1,* 267-277.

Rose, S. (1985). Same- and cross-sex friendships and the psychology of homosociality. *Sex Roles, 12,* 63-74.

Rose, S. (1989). Women biologists and the "old boy" network. *Women's Studies International Forum, 3,* 349-354.

Rose, S., & Roades, L. (1987). Feminism and women's friendships. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11,* 243-254.

Rose, S., & Serafica, F. C. (1986). Keeping and ending casual, close and best friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 3,* 275-288.

Rose, S., Zand, D., & Cini, M. (1994). Lesbian courtship rituals. In E. D. Rothblum & K. A. Brehony (Eds.), *The Boston marriage today: Romantic but asexual relationships between contemporary lesbians* (pp. 70-85). Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press.

Rosenbluth, S. (1990, August). *Intimacy: Women's experiences of same-sex and cross-sex couples.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Mass.

Sadler, W. A. (1970). The experience of friendship. *Humanitas, 6,* 117-210.

Sapadin, L. A. (1988). Friendship and gender: Perspectives of professional men and women. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5,* 387-403.

Schroedel, J. R. (1990). Blue collar women: Paying the price at home and on the job. In H. Y. Grossman & N. L. Chester (Eds.), *The experience and meaning of work in women's lives* (pp. 142-165). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

See, L. A. L. (1989). Tensions between black women and white women: A study. *Affilia, 2,* 31-45.

Seiden, A. M., & Bart, P. (1975). Woman to woman: Is sisterhood powerful? In N. Glazer-Malbin (Ed.), *Old family/New family* (pp. 189-228). New York: D. Van Nostrand.

Sharabany, R., Gershoni, R., & Hofman, J. E. (1981). Girl friend, boy friend: Age and sex differences in development of intimate friendships. *Developmental Psychology, 17,* 800-808.

Shotland, R. L., & Craig, J. M. (1988). Can men and women differentiate between friendly and sexually interested behavior? *Social Psychology Quarterly, 51,* 66-73.

Shulman, N. (1975). Life cycle variations in patterns of friendship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37,* 813-821.

Smith-Rosenberg, C. (1975). The female world of love and ritual: Relations between women in nineteenth-century America. *Signs, 1,* 1-29.

Snell, W. E., Jr., Belk, S. S., Flowers, A., & Warren, J. (1988). Women's and men's willingness to self-disclose to therapists and friends: The moderating influence of instrumental, expressive, masculine, and feminine topics. *Sex Roles, 18,* 769-776.

Stack, C. (1974). *All our kin: Strategies for survival in a black community.* New York: Harper & Row.

Strommen, E. A. (1977). Friendship. In E. Donelson & J. E. Gullahorn (Eds.), *Women: A psychological perspective* (pp. 154-167). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Taylor, W. R., & Lasch, C. (1963). Kindred spirits: Sorority and family in New England, 1839-1846. *New England Quarterly, 36,* 23-41.

Wagner, R. (1987). Changes in the friend network during the first year of single parenthood for Mexican American and Anglo women. *Journal of Divorce, 11*(2), 89-109.

Williams, D. G. (1985). Gender, masculinity-femininity, and emotional intimacy in same-sex friendship. *Sex Roles, 12,* 587-600.

Wiseman, J. P. (1986). Friendship: Bonds and binds in a voluntary relationship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 3,* 191-211.

Wollstonecraft, M. (1967). *A vindication of the rights of woman.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Wright, P. (1974). The delineation and measurement of some key variables in the study of friendship. *Representative Research in Social Psychology, 5,* 196-207.

Wright, P. (1988). Interpreting research on gender differences in friendship: A case for moderation and a plea for caution. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5,* 367-373.